

JUDICIAL EVALUATION SURVEY:

JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION ELECTION IN 2000

PREPARED FOR

THE ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL

MAY 2000

JC# 0021

JUSTICE CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>BAR</u>	<u>PPO</u>	<u>SW/GAL/ CASA</u>
Supreme Court			
Justice Alexander O. Bryner.....	19	--	--
Justice Dana Fabe.....	23	--	--
Justice Warren W. Matthews.....	27	--	--
Court of Appeals			
Judge Robert G. Coats	31	--	--
Judge David Stewart	35	--	--
First Judicial District			
Judge Larry Weeks	39	43	47
Judge Larry C. Zervos	51	55	59
Second Judicial District			
Judge Richard H. Erlich.....	63	67	71
Judge Ben Esch	75	79	83
Third Judicial District			
Judge Elaine M. Andrews.....	87	91	95
Judge Harold M. Brown	99	103	107
Judge Rene J. Gonzalez	111	115	119
Judge Dan A. Hensley	123	127	131
Judge Donald D. Hopwood	135	139	143
Judge Jonathan H. Link	147	151	155
Judge Peter A. Michalski.....	159	163	167
Judge Eric Sanders	171	175	179
Judge Eric Smith	183	187	191
Judge Sen K. Tan	195	199	203
Judge Fred Torrisi	207	211	215
Judge Michael L. Wolverton	219	223	227
Judge Peter G. Ashman.....	231	235	239
Judge Joel H. Bolger.....	243	247	251
Judge Natalie K. Finn	255	259	263
Judge Suzanne Lombardi.....	267	271	275
Judge James N. Wanamaker.....	279	283	287

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

Fourth Judicial District

Judge Dale O. Curda.....	291	295	299
Judge Mary E. Greene	303	307	311
Judge Raymond Funk	315	319	323
Judge Mark I. Wood	327	331	335

I. BACKGROUND

The Constitution and laws of the State of Alaska require that each justice and judge be subject to approval or rejection on a non-partisan ballot at the general election. By law, the Alaska Judicial Council evaluates each justice and judge and makes its recommendations to the voters prior to the election. In making its evaluation, the Council surveys Peace and Probation Officers, social workers, Guardians Ad Litem, CASA volunteers, and active members of the Alaska Bar Association regarding their ratings of the judges and justices eligible to stand for retention.¹ The following report contains the results of those surveys.

¹ In addition, the Council evaluated judges and justices not standing for retention until 2002, in order to give them an opportunity to assess their performance in mid-term. Those results are reported separately.

II. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire booklets containing the names of thirty-four judges eligible to stand for retention in 2000 and seventeen judges and justices eligible to stand for retention in 2002 were sent to active members of the Alaska Bar Association and all Alaska Peace and Probation Officers. In addition, questionnaire booklets containing the names of twenty-nine judges eligible to stand for retention in 2000 were sent to social workers, Guardians Ad Litem, and CASA volunteers. The portion of the questionnaire regarding those eligible to stand for retention in 2000 contained a more extensive series of evaluation items than did the section for those eligible to stand in 2002.

The initial mailing took place on January 25, 2000 with a follow-up mailing to non-respondents on February 28, 2000.

A. CONFIDENTIALITY

The Council assured all respondents to the questionnaire of confidentiality. Each questionnaire contained the following assurance:

All responses will be aggregated solely for statistical analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Responses to the demographic questions also are confidential. Demographic data are critical to our analysis; strict guidelines are followed to protect the identities of all respondents.

B. VALIDATION

To guarantee a fair evaluation and avoid duplications, all returns were validated by comparing the mailing lists with signatures on the return envelopes.* Respondents were instructed to take the following steps to assure validity:

A self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluation. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked "Confidential" and seal the envelope. Place the "Confidential" envelope in the return envelope and sign in the space provided. The return envelope **MUST BE SIGNED** in order for your survey to be counted. Also, please print your name and address on the return envelope.

*Note: A total of 77 surveys were returned without signatures, and therefore were not tallied or analyzed.

C. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Each questionnaire booklet contained detailed information about how to evaluate the judges:

In this survey booklet you will evaluate justices and judges eligible to stand for retention in 2000 and 2002. ***Please rate only those justices and judges for whom you have a sufficient basis for evaluation.*** Your evaluation may be based upon direct professional experience, social contacts, or professional reputation. If you lack sufficient knowledge to evaluate, circle the number 9 ("insufficient knowledge to evaluate this justice or judge") under Question 1, and go on to the next justice or judge.

All questions relate only to the qualities of the justice or judge in the performance of judicial duties. The first set of items on each page asks for your experience with each justice or judge. Please circle the appropriate numbers. For remaining items, use the following rating scale.

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. Unacceptable | Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 2. Deficient | Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 3. Acceptable | Meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 4. Good | Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 5. Excellent | Consistently exceeds minimum standards for this court. |

D. DESCRIPTIVE RATINGS

This report contains detailed breakdowns of each candidate's evaluation scores on a series of traits, and tables displaying the mean scores of seven composite scales derived from those traits: Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation. (The Peace and Probation Officers' and the Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers' questionnaire did not contain the Legal Ability scale). The survey instrument defines each trait, and specifies the meaning of each number on the five-point scale (see Appendix I for a copy of the actual survey form). **Unless otherwise noted, mean ratings are tabulated only from replies by respondents based on direct professional experience with the applicant.** The responses each applicant received on the five scales (each with a range from 1 (unacceptable) to 5 (excellent)) were summarized into arithmetic means. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

Mean Score	Range Description
4.0-5.0	Excellent
3.5-3.9	Good
3.0-3.4	Acceptable
2.5-2.9	Deficient
1.0-2.4	Unacceptable

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

III. RESPONSE RATE

By the final cut-off date, a total of 2085 questionnaire booklets were returned:

A.	PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS	
	Total mailed	1890
	Total responding	725
	Response rate38%
B.	ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION MEMBERS	
	Total mailed	2644
	Total responding	1216
	Response rate	46%
C.	SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS	
	Total mailed	399
	Total responding	144
	Response rate	36%
D.	COMBINED RESULTS	
	Total mailed	4933
	Total responding	2085
	Response rate	42%

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS

A. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

1. Type of Practice

Which of the following best describes your practice?

	1989 Membership Survey <u>Results*</u>
Private, solo.....	24%
Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	19%
Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	19%
Private corporate employee.....	2%
State judge or judicial officer	6%
Government	20%
Public service agency or organization (not government)	2%
Other.....	2%
No response.....	6%
	16%
	28%
	23%
	2%
	4%
	21%
	4%
	2%
	--

2. Length of Alaska Practice

How many years have you practiced law in Alaska?

5 years or less (1-3 yrs.).....	14%	(12%)
6-10 years (4-9 yrs.).....	13%	(31%)
11-15 years (10-15 yrs.)	15%	(34%)
16-20 years (16-19 yrs.)	20%	(9%)
21 or more years (20+ yrs.)	33%	(14%)
No response.....	6%	--
Mean.....	16.9	11.6

* The 1989 Alaska Bar Membership Survey, the first and only general survey of the legal profession in Alaska, contains baseline information about Bar members' economic and professional characteristics, experience, and professional activities.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

1989
Membership
Survey
Results

3. Gender

Male.....	67%	75%
Female	27%	25%
No response.....	6%	--

4. Cases Handled

The majority of your practice consists of:

Prosecution.....	5%	5%
Mainly criminal	6%	4%
Mixed criminal and civil	19%	15%
Mainly civil.....	58%	71%
Other.....	6%	5%
No response.....	6%	--

5. Location of Practice

In which judicial district is most of your work conducted?

First District	14%	14%
Second District.....	2%	2%
Third District.....	65%	73%
Fourth District.....	10%	11%
Not in Alaska	4%	--
No response.....	6%	

B. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

1. Type of Work

My current position in law enforcement is:

State law enforcement officer	26%
Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	32%
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	4%
Probation/parole officer.....	10%
Other	19%
No response	10%

2. Length of Time as Alaska Officer

How many years have you been a peace or probation officer in Alaska?

Less than 5 years	33%
6-10 years.....	19%
11-15 years.....	15%
16-20 years.....	14%
Over 21 years.....	7%
No response	13%
Mean.....	9.7

3. Gender

Male	70%
Female.....	20%
No response	10%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

4. Location of Work

In which judicial district has **most** of your work been conducted during the past six (6) years?

First District	17%
Second District	8%
Third District	47%
Fourth District.....	17%
Outside	1%
No response	11%

5. Community Population

What is the population of the community in which you work?

Under 2,000	11%
Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	44%
35,000 or over.....	36%
No response	9%

C. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIAN AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

1. Type of Work

My current position is:

Social Worker	54%
GAL	13%
CASA Volunteer	22%
Other	1%
No response	12%

2. Length of Experience

How many years have you been a social worker, GAL or CASA volunteer in Alaska?

Less than 5 years	56%
6-10 years.....	19%
11-15 years.....	9%
16-20 years.....	2%
Over 21 years.....	2%
No response	12%
Mean	5.2

3. Gender

Male	18%
Female.....	71%
No response	11%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

4. Location of Work

In which judicial district has **most** of your work been conducted during the past six (6) years?

First District	19%
Second District	4%
Third District	47%
Fourth District.....	13%
Outside	1%
No response	16%

5. Community Population

What is the population of the community in which you work?

Under 2,000	4%
Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	35%
35,000 or over.....	48%
No response	13%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

D. ALASKA BAR MEMBERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Justice Alexander O. Bryner	74%	23%	1%	2%	646	40%
Justice Dana Fabe	80%	15%	1%	4%	823	55%
Justice Warren W. Matthews	75%	16%	1%	9%	688	43%
Judge Robert G. Coats.....	73%	22%	2%	3%	287	18%
Judge David Stewart.....	77%	14%	2%	5%	327	22%
Judge Larry Weeks.....	81%	14%	1%	3%	443	30%
Judge Larry C. Zervos.....	86%	10%	2%	3%	263	19%
Judge Richard H. Erlich	84%	11%	2%	4%	171	12%
Judge Ben Esch	79%	15%	5%	2%	256	17%
Judge Elaine M. Andrews	81%	14%	1%	3%	639	44%
Judge Harold M. Brown.....	76%	19%	2%	3%	322	22%
Judge Rene J. Gonzalez.....	88%	7%	1%	5%	559	41%
Judge Dan A. Hensley	86%	10%	1%	3%	466	33%
Judge Donald D. Hopwood.....	87%	10%	1%	3%	237	17%
Judge Jonathan H. Link.....	85%	9%	1%	4%	299	22%
Judge Peter A. Michalski	90%	5%	2%	4%	608	46%
Judge Eric Sanders	83%	12%	1%	4%	455	33%
Judge Eric Smith	81%	14%	1%	4%	240	17%
Judge Sen K. Tan.....	83%	12%	1%	4%	495	35%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

**ALASKA BAR MEMBERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING
FOR RETENTION (Continued)**

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience</u>
Judge Fred Torrisi	86%	12%	1%	1%	147	11%
Judge Michael L. Wolverton.....	85%	10%	1%	4%	509	36%
Judge Peter G. Ashman	84%	11%	1%	4%	307	22%
Judge Joel H. Bolger	90%	8%	1%	1%	108	8%
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	85%	11%	2%	3%	362	25%
Judge Suzanne Lombardi	86%	10%	4%	0%	170	13%
Judge James N. Wanamaker	85%	12%	1%	3%	335	24%
Judge Dale O. Curda	86%	13%	1%	0%	190	14%
Judge Mary E. Greene.....	87%	11%	1%	2%	356	26%
Judge Raymond Funk.....	84%	8%	3%	5%	196	14%
Judge Mark I. Wood.....	86%	7%	0%	8%	187	14%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

E. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Judge Larry Weeks.....	75%	15%	1%	10%	95	10%
Judge Larry C. Zervos.....	81%	9%	0%	11%	47	5%
Judge Richard H. Erlich	82%	9%	0%	9%	54	6%
Judge Ben Esch	74%	20%	0%	7%	46	5%
Judge Elaine M. Andrews	83%	12%	0%	6%	126	14%
Judge Harold M. Brown.....	84%	7%	0%	9%	55	6%
Judge Rene J. Gonzalez.....	68%	24%	2%	7%	62	6%
Judge Dan A. Hensley.....	58%	21%	0%	21%	19	2%
Judge Donald D. Hopwood.....	84%	6%	0%	10%	49	6%
Judge Jonathan H. Link.....	81%	8%	0%	12%	77	9%
Judge Peter A. Michalski	83%	9%	0%	8%	65	8%
Judge Eric Sanders	78%	14%	0%	8%	51	6%
Judge Eric Smith	87%	2%	0%	9%	44	5%
Judge Sen K. Tan.....	56%	31%	0%	13%	16	1%
Judge Fred Torrisi	76%	11%	2%	11%	46	5%
Judge Michael L. Wolverton.....	82%	9%	1%	9%	104	12%
Judge Peter G. Ashman	87%	7%	0%	6%	86	10%
Judge Joel H. Bolger	77%	8%	0%	15%	26	3%
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	80%	13%	0%	8%	93	10%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

FOR RETENTION (Continued)

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience</u>
Judge Suzanne Lombardi	83%	2%	2%	12%	42	5%
Judge James N. Wanamaker	83%	2%	0%	15%	54	6%
Judge Dale O. Curda	83%	10%	0%	7%	42	5%
Judge Mary E. Greene	72%	21%	0%	7%	95	9%
Judge Raymond Funk	68%	17%	3%	12%	65	6%
Judge Mark I. Wood	73%	4%	0%	23%	79	8%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

F. SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA VOLUNTEERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Judge Larry Weeks.....	86%	5%	5%	5%	22	13%
Judge Larry C. Zervos.....	71%	14%	0%	14%	14	7%
Judge Richard H. Erlich	68%	33%	0%	0%	9	4%
Judge Ben Esch	50%	50%	0%	0%	4	1%
Judge Elaine M. Andrews	75%	13%	3%	9%	32	17%
Judge Harold M. Brown.....	78%	22%	0%	0%	18	10%
Judge Rene J. Gonzalez.....	79%	5%	0%	16%	19	10%
Judge Dan A. Hensley.....	77%	18%	0%	6%	17	10%
Judge Donald D. Hopwood.....	75%	25%	0%	0%	4	2%
Judge Jonathan H. Link.....	73%	18%	0%	9%	11	6%
Judge Peter A. Michalski	74%	9%	0%	17%	23	12%
Judge Eric Sanders	63%	13%	0%	25%	8	4%
Judge Eric Smith	62%	8%	8%	23%	13	6%
Judge Sen K. Tan.....	54%	31%	0%	15%	13	5%
Judge Fred Torrissi	86%	0%	0%	14%	7	4%
Judge Michael L. Wolverton.....	71%	6%	0%	24%	17	8%
Judge Peter G. Ashman	44%	33%	0%	22%	9	4%
Judge Joel H. Bolger	80%	20%	0%	0%	5	3%
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	75%	25%	0%	0%	4	2%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

**SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA VOLUNTEERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING
FOR RETENTION (Continued)**

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience</u>
Judge Suzanne Lombardi	80%	0%	0%	20%	5	4%
Judge James N. Wanamaker	20%	40%	0%	40%	5	1%
Judge Dale O. Curda	77%	8%	8%	8%	13	7%
Judge Mary E. Greene	80%	13%	0%	7%	15	8%
Judge Raymond Funk.....	50%	50%	0%	0%	4	1%
Judge Mark I. Wood.....	33%	67%	0%	0%	3	1%

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ALEXANDER O. BRYNER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 19%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 18%
		Private, corporate employee..... 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 11%
		Government 19%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 3%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years..... 6%
		6-10 years 9%
		11-15 years 14%
		16-20 years 22%
		20+ years..... 45%
		No Answer..... 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 72%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 8%
		Mixed criminal and civil 26%
		Mainly civil..... 54%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 10%
		Second District 2%
		Third District 74%
		Fourth District 8%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ALEXANDER O. BRYNER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	1%	11	2%	52	11%	136	29%	271	57%	4.4
Writing clarity and precision	6	1%	6	1%	41	9%	129	30%	250	58%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	7	1%	11	2%	74	16%	130	28%	249	53%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	7	2%	14	3%	60	14%	130	30%	229	52%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	6	1%	7	2%	50	11%	106	23%	296	64%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	1%	15	3%	54	12%	88	20%	278	63%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	17	4%	34	7%	83	18%	129	28%	205	44%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	13	3%	26	6%	74	17%	132	30%	194	44%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	5	1%	9	2%	44	10%	110	24%	283	63%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	7	1%	16	3%	61	13%	137	29%	259	54%	4.3

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 480 Alaska Bar members evaluated Justice Bryner based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 35% had a substantial amount of experience, 36% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.3). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5) and preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument (4.5), while the lowest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ALEXANDER O. BRYNER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.01]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	24%	24%	52%	21	4.3
SOLO.....	3%	2%	12%	38%	44%	90	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	6%	12%	31%	50%	101	4.2
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	4%	10%	33%	52%	89	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	71%	0%	29%	7	3.6
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	4%	4%	15%	77%	53	4.7
GOVERNMENT.....	1%	2%	17%	27%	52%	92	4.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	6%	25%	69%	16	4.6
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	9%	91%	11	4.9
[p<.01]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	19%	24%	57%	21	4.4
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%	30	4.7
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	7%	7%	38%	48%	42	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	6%	19%	40%	33%	63	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	7%	17%	20%	55%	106	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	2%	1%	11%	28%	58%	218	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	20%	25%	50%	20	4.2
MALE.....	2%	3%	13%	27%	55%	346	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	4%	11%	33%	53%	114	4.4
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	20	4.3
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	25%	20%	55%	20	4.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	21%	37%	42%	38	4.2
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	4%	10%	23%	61%	126	4.4
CIVIL.....	2%	4%	11%	32%	51%	257	4.3
OTHER.....	5%	0%	5%	16%	74%	19	4.5
[p<.05]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	25%	55%	20	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	2%	36%	60%	47	4.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	13%	0%	13%	75%	8	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	3%	13%	27%	55%	356	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	3%	8%	26%	33%	31%	39	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	10%	0%	0%	40%	50%	10	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	18%	12%	65%	17	4.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	3%	13%	25%	56%	167	4.3
MODERATE.....	1%	5%	12%	29%	53%	174	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	12%	36%	50%	122	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	36%	14%	43%	14	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	13%	29%	54%	480	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	1%	10%	30%	55%	148	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DANA FABE

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	21%
		Private, corporate employee	2%
		State judge or judicial officer	8%
		Government	16%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	2%
		Other	2%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years	5%
		6-10 years	11%
		11-15 years	15%
		16-20 years	23%
		20+ years	41%
		No Answer	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	72%
		Female	24%
		No Answer	4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3%
		Mainly criminal	7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	22%
		Mainly civil	62%
		Other	3%
		No Answer	4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	9%
		Second District	1%
		Third District	76%
		Fourth District	7%
		Not in Alaska	3%
		No Answer	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DANA FABE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	10	2%	21	3%	70	11%	153	23%	402	61%	4.4
Writing clarity and precision	6	1%	11	2%	64	10%	152	25%	382	62%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	22	3%	28	4%	70	11%	142	22%	394	60%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	18	3%	25	4%	64	10%	137	22%	383	61%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	10	2%	17	3%	56	9%	129	20%	433	67%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	12	2%	24	4%	64	10%	137	22%	379	62%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	13	2%	27	4%	56	9%	116	18%	440	67%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	9	1%	27	4%	53	8%	132	21%	407	65%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	8	1%	2	0%	49	8%	122	20%	422	70%	4.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	11	2%	29	4%	67	10%	136	21%	411	63%	4.4

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 654 Alaska Bar members evaluated Justice Fabe based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 38% had a substantial amount of experience, 36% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest mean score came for preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument (4.6), while the lowest scored items were equal treatment of all parties (4.3) and sense of basic fairness and justice (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DANA FABE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.001]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	0%	20%	20%	57%	30	4.3
SOLO.....	5%	5%	11%	20%	59%	147	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	1%	7%	10%	22%	60%	147	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	1%	6%	24%	69%	135	4.6
CORPORATE.....	0%	27%	18%	18%	36%	11	3.6
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	2%	2%	15%	81%	54	4.8
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	4%	18%	21%	55%	105	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	8%	0%	0%	92%	13	4.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	12	4.8
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	21%	66%	29	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	3%	6%	18%	71%	34	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	3%	5%	7%	21%	64%	73	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	7%	13%	21%	58%	100	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	6%	9%	19%	65%	153	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	2%	3%	11%	22%	62%	265	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	3%	17%	23%	53%	30	4.2
MALE.....	2%	4%	11%	21%	61%	467	4.4
FEMALE.....	0%	4%	8%	19%	69%	157	4.5
CASES HANDLED							
[p<.05]							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	3%	17%	21%	55%	29	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	11%	26%	32%	32%	19	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	7%	21%	72%	43	4.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	4%	12%	19%	63%	142	4.4
CIVIL.....	1%	5%	9%	22%	63%	403	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	6%	6%	89%	18	4.8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	0%	14%	21%	61%	28	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	5%	25%	68%	63	4.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	8	4.9
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	5%	11%	19%	63%	494	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	7%	13%	33%	44%	45	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	31%	69%	16	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	10%	13%	71%	31	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	5%	9%	18%	65%	251	4.4
MODERATE.....	1%	4%	10%	25%	59%	238	4.4
LIMITED.....	0%	3%	13%	20%	64%	134	4.5
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
[p<.05]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	19%	31%	44%	36	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	4%	10%	21%	63%	654	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	2%	6%	19%	72%	126	4.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	14%	0%	0%	14%	71%	7	4.3

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WARREN W. MATTHEWS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 22%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 9%
		Government 15%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 5%
		6-10 years 9%
		11-15 years 13%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 46%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 72%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 2%
		Mainly criminal 6%
		Mixed criminal and civil 23%
		Mainly civil 62%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 11%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 72%
		Fourth District 9%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WARREN W. MATTHEWS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	1%	15	3%	79	15%	175	34%	238	47%	4.2
Writing clarity and precision	1	0%	14	3%	80	16%	177	36%	223	45%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	11	2%	30	6%	84	17%	161	32%	222	44%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	13	3%	28	6%	90	18%	160	32%	202	41%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	6	1%	12	2%	70	14%	128	25%	290	57%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	11	2%	19	4%	68	14%	127	26%	263	54%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	21	4%	44	9%	108	21%	142	28%	195	38%	3.9
Human understanding and compassion	16	3%	37	8%	99	21%	155	32%	174	36%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	5	1%	15	3%	80	17%	141	29%	242	50%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	8	2%	29	6%	86	17%	166	32%	224	44%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 513 Alaska Bar members evaluated Justice Matthews based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 35% had a substantial amount of experience, 35% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), while the lowest scored items were courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.9) and human understanding and compassion (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WARREN W. MATTHEWS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.001]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	13%	33%	50%	24	4.3
SOLO.....	4%	6%	15%	40%	36%	109	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	11%	18%	29%	39%	112	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	6%	19%	34%	41%	113	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	13%	38%	25%	25%	8	3.6
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	13%	13%	75%	48	4.6
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	1%	21%	36%	42%	78	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	42%	58%	12	4.6
OTHER.....	0%	11%	11%	22%	56%	9	4.2
[p<.001]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	8%	33%	54%	24	4.4
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	4%	42%	54%	24	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	12%	26%	23%	40%	43	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	9%	24%	36%	26%	66	3.7
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	5%	16%	30%	49%	115	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	2%	5%	16%	33%	45%	241	4.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	4%	15%	31%	46%	26	4.1
MALE.....	2%	6%	16%	32%	44%	370	4.1
FEMALE.....	1%	3%	20%	35%	41%	117	4.1
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	16%	32%	48%	25	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	30%	60%	10%	10	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	0%	7%	13%	33%	47%	30	4.2
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	3%	23%	28%	44%	116	4.1
CIVIL.....	2%	7%	14%	33%	43%	316	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	19%	25%	56%	16	4.4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	8%	33%	54%	24	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	3%	3%	14%	34%	45%	58	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	6%	17%	31%	44%	372	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	7%	28%	35%	28%	43	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	9%	0%	0%	45%	45%	11	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	7%	21%	32%	36%	28	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	3%	17%	26%	52%	182	4.2
MODERATE.....	1%	6%	14%	37%	42%	180	4.1
LIMITED.....	1%	9%	19%	36%	36%	123	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	10%	12%	34%	41%	59	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	6%	17%	32%	44%	513	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	2%	21%	30%	46%	111	4.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4

COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE ROBERT G. COATS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	17%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	16%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	8%
		Private, corporate employee	0%
		State judge or judicial officer	21%
		Government	27%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	4%
		Other	3%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years	9%
		6-10 years	9%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	22%
		20+ years	43%
		No Answer	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67%
		Female	29%
		No Answer	3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	9%
		Mainly criminal	18%
		Mixed criminal and civil	47%
		Mainly civil	20%
		Other	4%
		No Answer	3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	7%
		Second District	2%
		Third District	73%
		Fourth District	14%
		Not in Alaska	1%
		No Answer	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE ROBERT G. COATS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	2%	17	8%	63	30%	75	36%	49	24%	3.7
Writing clarity and precision	3	2%	16	8%	63	32%	70	35%	47	24%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	3	1%	22	11%	48	23%	59	28%	77	37%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	1%	24	12%	46	23%	58	29%	70	35%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	2	1%	9	4%	44	21%	60	29%	91	44%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	3%	15	8%	41	21%	56	28%	80	41%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	5	2%	15	7%	43	21%	60	29%	84	41%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	7	4%	17	9%	47	24%	64	33%	61	31%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	3	2%	14	7%	56	28%	65	33%	62	31%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	3	1%	22	10%	53	25%	69	33%	63	30%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 210 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Coats based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 48% had a substantial amount of experience, 24% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.1), while the lowest scored items were legal and factual analysis (3.7) and writing clarity and precision (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE ROBERT G. COATS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.001]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	38%	25%	38%	8	4.0
SOLO.....	3%	23%	23%	34%	17%	35	3.4
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	18%	38%	26%	15%	34	3.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	12%	35%	12%	41%	17	3.8
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	2%	2%	15%	30%	50%	46	4.2
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	9%	25%	46%	20%	56	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	22%	22%	56%	9	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	38%	0%	63%	8	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	24%	35%	41%	17	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	6%	22%	17%	28%	28%	18	3.5
11-15 YEARS.....	4%	11%	37%	26%	22%	27	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	13%	25%	40%	21%	48	3.6
21+ YEARS.....	0%	10%	23%	35%	33%	92	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%	7	4.0
MALE.....	2%	12%	24%	32%	30%	142	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	8%	26%	36%	30%	61	3.9
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	6	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	16%	26%	42%	16%	19	3.6
CRIMINAL.....	0%	11%	24%	32%	32%	37	3.9
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	11%	26%	33%	26%	99	3.7
CIVIL.....	0%	10%	22%	29%	39%	41	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	43%	0%	57%	7	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	8%	0%	31%	46%	15%	13	3.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	10%	23%	36%	31%	154	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	4%	21%	32%	21%	21%	28	3.4
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	50%	25%	17%	12	3.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	12%	22%	29%	35%	101	3.8
MODERATE.....	0%	12%	24%	33%	31%	51	3.8
LIMITED.....	0%	7%	28%	43%	22%	46	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	13%	13%	13%	50%	13%	8	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	10%	25%	33%	30%	210	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	5%	5%	24%	41%	25%	63	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8

COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE DAVID STEWART

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 15%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 14%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 17%
		Government 21%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 3%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 6%
		6-10 years 8%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 24%
		20+ years 42%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 70%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 6%
		Mainly criminal 11%
		Mixed criminal and civil 40%
		Mainly civil 35%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 7%
		Second District 2%
		Third District 76%
		Fourth District 8%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE DAVID STEWART

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	1%	18	7%	53	21%	102	40%	82	32%	3.9
Writing clarity and precision	2	1%	15	6%	53	23%	88	37%	77	33%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	6	2%	15	6%	45	18%	70	28%	117	46%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	5	2%	17	7%	42	17%	71	29%	110	45%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	5	2%	9	4%	43	17%	65	26%	131	52%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	8	3%	11	5%	41	18%	65	28%	107	46%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	2%	10	4%	45	17%	74	28%	125	48%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	7	3%	14	6%	44	18%	75	31%	102	42%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	5	2%	12	5%	36	16%	85	38%	86	38%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	5	2%	18	7%	37	14%	97	38%	100	39%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 257 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Stewart based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience, 33% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean scores came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2) and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.2), while the lowest scored items were legal and factual analysis (3.9) and writing clarity and precision (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE DAVID STEWART

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	31%	23%	46%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	14%	14%	29%	43%	58	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	5%	5%	12%	44%	34%	41	4.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	3%	6%	9%	49%	34%	35	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	0%	14%	35%	49%	43	4.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	2%	10%	17%	42%	29%	52	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	14%	14%	29%	43%	7	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	31%	46%	13	[p<.001] 4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	6%	6%	59%	29%	17	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	37%	21%	16%	21%	19	3.1
11-15 YEARS.....	3%	10%	15%	45%	28%	40	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	5%	13%	38%	43%	61	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	2%	3%	14%	36%	45%	107	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	31%	46%	13	4.2
MALE.....	2%	6%	15%	40%	38%	181	4.1
FEMALE.....	3%	13%	11%	33%	40%	63	3.9
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	12	[p<.05] 4.3
PROSECUTION.....	6%	0%	19%	38%	38%	16	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	28%	10%	38%	24%	29	3.6
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	7%	19%	32%	39%	102	4.0
CIVIL.....	1%	3%	10%	44%	41%	88	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	10	4.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	23%	54%	13	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	29%	41%	29%	17	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	8%	11%	40%	40%	197	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	15%	40%	20%	25%	20	3.6
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	19%	50%	25%	16	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	7%	13%	30%	47%	102	4.1
MODERATE.....	1%	10%	17%	36%	37%	84	4.0
LIMITED.....	2%	4%	13%	51%	31%	55	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	0%	44%	25%	25%	16	3.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....							
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	7%	14%	38%	39%	257	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	2%	4%	22%	43%	28%	46	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 16%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 19%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 11%
		Government 21%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 6%
		6-10 years 11%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 20%
		20+ years 44%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 74%
		Female 22%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 25%
		Mainly civil 55%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 39%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 52%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	7	2%	10	3%	62	17%	130	36%	149	4	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	7	2%	9	3%	56	16%	125	36%	150	4	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	2%	4	1%	51	15%	105	31%	172	5	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	7	2%	17	5%	44	12%	97	27%	190	5	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	8	2%	13	4%	39	11%	91	26%	199	5	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	6	2%	5	1%	33	9%	89	25%	223	6	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	1%	8	2%	37	11%	88	26%	197	5	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	8	2%	9	3%	41	11%	92	26%	207	5	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	5	1%	10	3%	49	14%	93	28%	181	5	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	4	1%	2	1%	32	10%	91	29%	186	5	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	5	1%	7	2%	47	14%	108	32%	170	5	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	5	1%	5	1%	43	13%	91	27%	190	5	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	5	3%	6	3%	25	14%	56	32%	85	4	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	2%	2	1%	22	12%	49	26%	109	5	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	5	3%	3	2%	23	12%	50	27%	107	5	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	4	1%	11	3%	45	13%	112	31%	187	5	4.3

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 359 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Weeks based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.3). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5). The lowest scored item was legal and factual analysis (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .01]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	21%	14%	14%	50%	14	3.9
SOLO.....	2%	4%	14%	37%	42%	83	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	3%	22%	24%	48%	58	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	2%	15%	38%	45%	66	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	3%	18%	80%	40	4.8
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	8%	30%	60%	77	4.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
OTHER.....	9%	0%	0%	36%	55%	11	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	23%	0%	15%	62%	13	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	5%	5%	20%	70%	20	4.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	5%	13%	28%	54%	39	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	2%	10%	40%	43%	58	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	1%	15%	29%	54%	72	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	1%	2%	14%	32%	51%	157	4.3
GENDER							
[p < .05]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	12	4.0
MALE.....	1%	3%	15%	34%	48%	267	4.2
FEMALE.....	1%	1%	8%	24%	66%	80	4.5
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	23%	0%	23%	54%	13	4.1
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	6%	41%	53%	17	4.5
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	21%	25%	54%	24	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	1%	3%	16%	24%	56%	90	4.3
CIVIL.....	1%	3%	13%	34%	50%	200	4.3
OTHER.....	7%	0%	0%	40%	53%	15	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	27%	0%	18%	55%	11	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	11%	28%	59%	142	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	2%	14%	35%	47%	188	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	9%	0%	27%	27%	36%	11	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	20%	0%	20%	60%	5	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	14%	14%	19%	48%	21	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	3%	9%	26%	60%	144	4.4
MODERATE.....	1%	1%	16%	33%	49%	95	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	3%	14%	39%	43%	99	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	14	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	13%	31%	52%	359	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	3%	16%	48%	33%	64	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%	6	4.5

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	25%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	42%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	4%
		Probation/Parole officer	16%
		Other.....	11%
		No Answer	2%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	22%
		6-10 years	23%
		11-15 years	21%
		16-20 years	22%
		20+ years	10%
		No Answer	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	82%
		Female.....	18%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	70%
		Second District.....	4%
		Third District.....	16%
		Fourth District.....	8%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	1%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,001.....	18%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	63%
		35,000 or over	19%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	3	4%	6	9%	25	37%	34	50%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	3	4%	7	10%	25	37%	33	49%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	11%	20	31%	37	57%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	2	3%	7	11%	19	31%	34	55%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	2	3%	6	9%	26	39%	32	48%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	14%	28	43%	28	43%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	1	2%	1	2%	7	11%	17	28%	35	57%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	2%	2	3%	3	5%	23	37%	33	53%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	2%	0	0%	5	9%	23	40%	28	49%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	2%	1	2%	4	9%	20	44%	19	42%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	3%	2	3%	8	13%	23	37%	27	44%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	3	7%	9	20%	12	27%	19	43%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1%	2	3%	6	8%	32	45%	30	42%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 71 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Weeks from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 28% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 24% had a moderate amount, and 39% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety (4.4), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.4), ability to control courtroom (4.4), reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.4), and willingness to work diligently (4.4). The item scored lowest was talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	6%	50%	44%	18	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	3%	3%	0%	57%	37%	30	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	8%	33%	58%	12	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	14%	29%	29%	29%	7	3.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	7%	13%	33%	47%	15	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	47%	53%	17	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	7%	67%	27%	15	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	6%	0%	6%	50%	38%	16	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	17%	17%	17%	50%	6	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
MALE.....	2%	2%	8%	46%	42%	59	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	8%	8%	42%	42%	12	4.2
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	2%	2%	4%	46%	46%	50	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	23%	38%	38%	13	4.2
2,000-35,000.....	2%	2%	0%	49%	47%	45	4.4
OVER 35,000.....	0%	8%	23%	38%	31%	13	3.9
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	6	[p<.05] 3.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	20	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	47%	53%	17	4.5
LIMITED.....	4%	4%	7%	50%	36%	28	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	11%	11%	11%	44%	22%	9	[p<.05] 3.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL							
EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	8%	45%	42%	71	4.2
PROFESSIONAL							
REPUTATION.....	7%	0%	43%	21%	29%	14	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 74%
		Guardian Ad Litem 16%
		CASA Volunteer 11%
		Other0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years 68%
		6-10 years 16%
		11-15 years 11%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years5%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 21%
		Female 79%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District 74%
		Second District0%
		Third District 21%
		Fourth District5%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,0000%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000 84%
		35,000 or over 16%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY WEEKS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	16%	16	84%	4.8
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	4	21%	13	68%	4.6
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	8	42%	9	47%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	22%	14	78%	4.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	37%	12	63%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 19 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Weeks from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 20%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 17%
		Private, corporate employee 0%
		State judge or judicial officer 16%
		Government 18%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 7%
		6-10 years 11%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 24%
		20+ years 39%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 75%
		Female 22%
		No Answer 3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 35%
		Mainly civil 47%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 43%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 40%
		Fourth District 13%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	0%	8	4%	26	12%	90	40%	101	45%	4.2
Knowledge of substantive law.....	1	0%	3	1%	30	13%	93	42%	97	43%	4.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	0%	3	1%	30	14%	93	42%	92	42%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	5	2%	25	11%	75	33%	120	53%	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	0%	4	2%	25	11%	74	33%	119	53%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	21	10%	62	28%	138	62%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	2	1%	26	13%	68	34%	106	52%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	3	1%	23	10%	72	32%	130	57%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	5	2%	26	12%	79	37%	105	49%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	0%	1	0%	26	13%	85	42%	91	45%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	4	2%	34	16%	82	39%	89	43%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	2	1%	21	10%	75	36%	113	54%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	4	4%	15	14%	34	33%	51	49%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	2%	2	2%	16	13%	44	37%	56	47%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	1	1%	20	17%	34	29%	62	53%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	4	2%	21	9%	90	40%	110	49%	4.4

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 225 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Zervos based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 35% had a substantial amount of experience, 32% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest mean score came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.2), knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.2), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.2).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .05]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	10%	20%	70%	10	4.6
SOLO.....	0%	0%	6%	41%	53%	49	4.5
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	13%	48%	39%	46	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	3%	14%	30%	54%	37	4.4
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	32%	68%	34	4.7
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	7%	12%	46%	34%	41	4.1
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	38%	63%	8	4.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	63%	38%	16	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	4%	38%	58%	26	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	9%	17%	29%	46%	35	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	2%	9%	43%	46%	54	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	86	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	8	4.8
MALE.....	0%	2%	10%	41%	48%	167	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	2%	10%	40%	48%	50	4.3
CASES HANDLED							
[p < .01]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	0%	25%	63%	8	4.4
PROSECUTION.....	0%	9%	27%	55%	9%	11	3.6
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	0%	53%	47%	15	4.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	1%	5%	40%	53%	77	4.5
CIVIL.....	0%	1%	13%	39%	47%	106	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	8	4.8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	7	4.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	1%	7%	41%	51%	98	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	15%	39%	43%	87	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	46%	54%	28	4.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	13%	13%	75%	16	4.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	3%	9%	33%	56%	79	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	3%	13%	45%	39%	71	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	5%	51%	44%	59	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
[p < .05]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	44%	56%	9	4.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	9%	40%	49%	225	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	4%	0%	20%	40%	36%	25	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	21%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	31%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	5%
		Probation/Parole officer	21%
		Other.....	21%
		No Answer	3%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	28%
		6-10 years	26%
		11-15 years	15%
		16-20 years	21%
		20+ years	8%
		No Answer	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	74%
		Female.....	23%
		No Answer	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	72%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	10%
		Fourth District.....	8%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	8%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	15%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	77%
		35,000 or over	5%
		No Answer	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C.ZERVOS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	10	27%	15	41%	12	32%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	11	30%	14	38%	12	32%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	30%	6	16%	20	54%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	15	41%	10	27%	12	32%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	21%	15	39%	15	39%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	17	45%	14	37%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	9	24%	14	37%	15	39%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	28%	12	33%	14	39%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	25%	13	36%	14	39%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	1	4%	8	31%	12	46%	5	19%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	3	9%	9	26%	14	41%	8	24%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	2	7%	7	25%	12	43%	7	25%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	10	26%	17	45%	11	29%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 38 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Zervos from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 18% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.2), human understanding and compassion (4.2), and ability to control courtroom (4.2). The items scored lowest were: settlement skills (3.8) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%	8	4.1
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	33%	42%	25%	12	3.9
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	10	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%	10	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	38%	38%	25%	8	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	28%	45%	28%	29	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	8	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	26%	56%	19%	27	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	24%	55%	21%	29	4.0
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	24%	53%	24%	17	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	14	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	26%	45%	29%	38	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	40%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	10%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	40%
		6-10 years	30%
		11-15 years	20%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	10%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	10%
		Female	80%
		No Answer	10%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	80%
		Second District	10%
		Third District	0%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	10%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	90%
		35,000 or over	0%
		No Answer	10%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY C. ZERVOS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	9	90%	4.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	7	70%	4.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	2	20%	6	60%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	8	80%	4.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 10 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Zervos from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 20%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 15%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 12%
		Private, corporate employee 0%
		State judge or judicial officer 23%
		Government 20%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 3%
		Other 5%
		No Answer 2%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 8%
		11-15 years 13%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 44%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 70%
		Female 29%
		No Answer 1%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 10%
		Mixed criminal and civil 42%
		Mainly civil 38%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 1%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 6%
		Second District 12%
		Third District 64%
		Fourth District 15%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 1%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	4%	10	7%	45	32%	49	35%	32	23%	3.6
Knowledge of substantive law.....	6	4%	8	6%	43	30%	53	37%	33	23%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	5	4%	8	6%	43	31%	50	36%	31	23%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	4	3%	6	4%	24	17%	38	27%	71	50%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	2%	4	3%	25	18%	36	26%	73	52%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	3	2%	3	2%	34	24%	35	25%	67	47%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	3%	6	5%	29	22%	37	28%	56	42%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	2%	6	4%	25	17%	37	26%	73	51%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	2%	4	3%	21	15%	39	27%	76	53%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	5%	5	4%	25	19%	48	37%	46	35%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	2%	10	7%	26	19%	51	38%	45	33%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	3	2%	4	3%	20	15%	43	33%	61	47%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	3	4%	2	3%	23	31%	25	34%	21	28%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	3%	1	1%	16	18%	32	36%	36	41%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	3	3%	5	5%	16	17%	28	30%	41	44%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	4	3%	7	5%	32	22%	54	38%	46	32%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 143 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Erlich based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 42% had a substantial amount of experience, 24% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean score came for human understanding and compassion (4.3). The lowest scored item was legal and factual analysis (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .05]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
SOLO.....	3%	3%	17%	24%	52%	29	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	9%	18%	55%	18%	22	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	12%	12%	35%	24%	18%	17	3.2
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	18%	42%	39%	33	4.2
GOVERNMENT.....	4%	7%	29%	39%	21%	28	3.7
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	5	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	13	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	27%	27%	45%	11	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	5%	32%	32%	26%	19	3.7
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	3%	27%	33%	36%	33	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	5%	8%	19%	39%	29%	62	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
MALE.....	4%	7%	21%	37%	31%	100	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	27%	37%	37%	41	4.1
CASES HANDLED							
[p < .05]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	14%	14%	29%	29%	14%	7	3.1
CRIMINAL.....	0%	7%	13%	40%	40%	15	4.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	0%	23%	41%	34%	61	4.1
CIVIL.....	4%	9%	26%	33%	28%	54	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	11%	11%	56%	22%	9	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	6%	11%	56%	28%	18	4.1
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	4%	22%	32%	38%	92	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	5%	43%	38%	14%	21	3.6
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	3%	25%	28%	37%	60	3.9
MODERATE.....	0%	3%	20%	51%	26%	35	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	8%	24%	43%	24%	37	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%	6	4.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	5%	22%	38%	32%	143	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	6%	6%	33%	50%	6%	18	3.4
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	23%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	25%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	7%
		Probation/Parole officer	20%
		Other.....	23%
		No Answer	2%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	27%
		6-10 years	18%
		11-15 years	25%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years	9%
		No Answer	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	77%
		Female.....	20%
		No Answer	2%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	57%
		Third District.....	16%
		Fourth District.....	23%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	11%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	66%
		35,000 or over	20%
		No Answer	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	1	2%	4	10%	8	20%	15	37%	13	32%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	5%	2	5%	9	22%	14	34%	14	34%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	2%	1	2%	6	14%	18	43%	16	38%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	2%	4	10%	10	24%	11	27%	15	37%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	4	9%	8	19%	12	28%	19	44%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	2%	8	20%	9	22%	23	56%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	3%	1	3%	9	24%	6	16%	20	54%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	26%	15	38%	14	36%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	18%	11	28%	21	53%	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	1	3%	8	26%	12	39%	10	32%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	5	12%	8	20%	9	22%	18	44%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	3%	4	11%	7	20%	8	23%	15	43%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	2%	4	9%	7	16%	14	32%	18	41%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 44 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Erlich from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 48% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 16% had a moderate amount, and 32% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest scored items were: human understanding and compassion (4.3) and willingness to work diligently (4.3). The items scored lowest were: equal treatment of all parties (3.9), sense of basic fairness and justice (3.9), makes decisions without regard to possible criticism (3.9), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.9), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	30%	10%	10%	50%	10	3.8
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	9%	36%	55%	11	4.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	11%	11%	56%	22%	9	3.9
OTHER.....	10%	0%	20%	40%	30%	10	3.8
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	8%	8%	17%	17%	50%	12	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	13%	13%	38%	38%	8	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	9%	9%	45%	36%	11	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	25%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MALE.....	3%	9%	15%	29%	44%	34	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	11%	22%	44%	22%	9	3.8
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	8%	12%	32%	48%	25	4.2
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	14%	14%	29%	43%	7	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	10%	10%	20%	40%	20%	10	3.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
2,000-35,000.....	3%	3%	17%	31%	45%	29	4.1
OVER 35,000.....	0%	33%	0%	44%	22%	9	3.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	10%	14%	19%	52%	21	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	14%	21%	43%	21%	14	3.7
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	40%	20%	20%	20%	5	3.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	9%	16%	32%	41%	44	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%	5	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	67%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	17%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	17%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	33%
		6-10 years	17%
		11-15 years	17%
		16-20 years	17%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	17%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	17%
		Female	67%
		No Answer	17%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	33%
		Third District	33%
		Fourth District	17%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	17%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	33%
		35,000 or over	50%
		No Answer	17%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD H. ERLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	3.8
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	3.3
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	3.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	2	33%	3.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 6 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Erlich from their direct professional experience. The mean scores for integrity and diligence were in the “good” range. The mean scores for impartiality, respect, and overall evaluation were in the “acceptable” range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 21%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 17%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 18%
		Government 12%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 8%
		11-15 years 11%
		16-20 years 18%
		20+ years 49%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 77%
		Female 20%
		No Answer 3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 3%
		Mainly criminal 6%
		Mixed criminal and civil 35%
		Mainly civil 50%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 3%
		Second District 9%
		Third District 76%
		Fourth District 9%
		Not in Alaska 0%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	0	0%	4	2%	45	22%	102	51%	50	25%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law.....	1	1%	3	2%	44	23%	94	48%	52	27%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	0	0%	2	1%	45	24%	88	47%	53	28%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	3	2%	8	4%	34	17%	65	33%	87	44%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	2%	7	4%	30	16%	68	35%	85	44%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	4	2%	32	17%	69	36%	87	45%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	2%	3	2%	31	18%	66	38%	70	40%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	1%	6	3%	36	18%	67	34%	88	44%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	1%	6	3%	32	17%	70	36%	82	43%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	32	19%	69	41%	69	41%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	5	3%	34	19%	76	42%	67	37%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	4	2%	32	18%	71	40%	71	40%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	3	3%	19	17%	47	41%	45	39%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	3	3%	19	16%	45	38%	51	43%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	1	1%	21	18%	48	42%	43	38%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	8	4%	41	20%	86	43%	66	33%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 201 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Esch based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience, 31% had a moderate amount, and 30% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean scores came for: sense of basic fairness and justice (4.2), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.2), human understanding and compassion (4.2), ability to control courtroom (4.2), willingness to work diligently (4.2), settlement skills (4.2), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.2). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.0), knowledge of substantive law (4.0), and knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	38%	50%	13%	8	3.8
SOLO.....	0%	9%	12%	47%	33%	43	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	27%	29%	39%	49	4.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	24%	50%	26%	34	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%	4	2.8
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	11%	56%	33%	36	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	15%	40%	45%	20	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	22%	56%	22%	9	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	20	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	13%	7%	40%	40%	15	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	10%	29%	24%	38%	21	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	14%	63%	23%	35	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	4%	19%	40%	38%	101	4.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
MALE.....	0%	4%	19%	38%	38%	156	4.1
FEMALE.....	0%	5%	23%	59%	13%	39	3.8
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	29%	14%	57%	7	4.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	8%	33%	42%	17%	12	3.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	3%	14%	40%	43%	72	4.2
CIVIL.....	0%	5%	23%	46%	25%	99	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	22%	61%	18	4.4
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	22%	43%	32%	153	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	18%	6%	59%	18%	17	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	43%	29%	21%	14	[p<.05] 3.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	3%	19%	30%	48%	63	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	6%	10%	51%	33%	63	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	28%	51%	20%	61	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....							
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	4%	20%	43%	33%	201	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	11%	21%	42%	26%	38	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	15%	31%	31%	23%	13	3.6

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	20%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	17%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	14%
		Probation/Parole officer	26%
		Other.....	14%
		No Answer	9%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	23%
		6-10 years	29%
		11-15 years	11%
		16-20 years	20%
		20+ years	6%
		No Answer	11%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	71%
		Female.....	20%
		No Answer	9%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	54%
		Third District.....	23%
		Fourth District.....	14%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	9%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	14%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	54%
		35,000 or over	23%
		No Answer	9%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	12	35%	19	56%	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	11	33%	20	61%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	12	38%	18	56%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	14	42%	16	48%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	0	0%	4	12%	7	21%	22	65%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	3%	2	6%	11	32%	20	59%	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	10	30%	21	64%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	13%	11	37%	15	50%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%	10	36%	16	57%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	7	33%	13	62%	4.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	3	11%	9	33%	15	56%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	8	38%	11	52%	4.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	3%	2	6%	11	32%	20	59%	4.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 34 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Esch from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 32% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 15% had a moderate amount, and 44% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.5). The highest scored item was settlement skills (4.6). The items scored lowest were: makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.4), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.4), reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.4), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.4), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	14%	0%	86%	7	4.7
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	5	3.8
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	8	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%	5	4.4
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	13%	0%	63%	25%	8	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	22%	22%	56%	9	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	7	4.6
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
MALE.....	0%	4%	8%	36%	52%	25	4.4
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	6	4.7
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	5%	42%	53%	19	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	14%	14%	14%	57%	7	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	5	3.8
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	37%	63%	19	4.6
OVER 35,000.....	0%	14%	14%	0%	71%	7	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	18%	82%	11	4.8
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
LIMITED.....	0%	7%	13%	47%	33%	15	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	3%	6%	32%	59%	34	4.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	44%	33%	22%	9	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

[p<.05]

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 50%
		Guardian Ad Litem 50%
		CASA Volunteer0%
		Other0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years 50%
		6-10 years 50%
		11-15 years0%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male0%
		Female 100%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District 100%
		Third District0%
		Fourth District0%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,0000%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000 100%
		35,000 or over0%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEN ESCH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	4.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	4.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 2 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Esch from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 26%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 20%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 17%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 10%
		Government 18%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 8%
		6-10 years 14%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 37%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 67%
		Female 29%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 9%
		Mixed criminal and civil 27%
		Mainly civil 52%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 2%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	4	1%	8	2%	38	7%	185	35%	287	55%	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law.....	4	1%	9	2%	44	9%	178	35%	278	54%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	4	1%	6	1%	39	8%	167	33%	290	57%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	8	2%	18	3%	56	11%	148	28%	297	56%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	9	2%	17	3%	58	11%	129	25%	304	59%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	7	1%	7	1%	45	9%	116	22%	345	66%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	2%	19	4%	49	10%	118	24%	308	61%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	5	1%	15	3%	39	7%	141	27%	327	62%	4.5
Human understanding and compassion.....	9	2%	18	3%	61	12%	127	25%	301	58%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	3	1%	2	0%	36	7%	143	28%	319	63%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	1%	6	1%	56	11%	156	31%	275	55%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	3	1%	8	2%	42	9%	146	30%	294	60%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	5	1%	10	3%	26	8%	89	26%	209	62%	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	5	2%	6	2%	34	11%	76	24%	193	61%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	7	2%	7	2%	24	8%	67	21%	214	67%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	6	1%	12	2%	38	7%	160	31%	303	58%	4.4

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 519 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Andrews based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 43% had a substantial amount of experience, 29% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.5), ability to control courtroom (4.5), willingness to work diligently (4.5), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.5). The lowest scored items were: equal treatment of all parties (4.3) and human understanding and compassion (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	18	4.7
SOLO.....	1%	5%	6%	33%	56%	135	4.4
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	3%	9%	32%	53%	106	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	1%	8%	32%	59%	88	4.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	14%	0%	86%	7	4.7
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	2%	0%	11%	87%	53	4.8
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	0%	8%	41%	48%	95	4.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	10	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	14%	86%	7	4.9
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	16	4.8
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	0%	5%	44%	49%	39	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	1%	1%	11%	28%	58%	72	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	1%	7%	29%	61%	82	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	2%	8%	36%	53%	118	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	1%	4%	7%	27%	61%	192	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	6%	24%	71%	17	4.6
MALE.....	1%	2%	8%	33%	56%	351	4.4
FEMALE.....	2%	3%	7%	27%	62%	151	4.4
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	6%	29%	65%	17	4.6
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	28	4.6
CRIMINAL.....	2%	7%	16%	33%	42%	45	4.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	4%	8%	22%	64%	139	4.4
CIVIL.....	0%	1%	7%	34%	57%	269	4.5
OTHER.....	5%	0%	0%	29%	67%	21	4.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	14	4.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	6%	56%	39%	18	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	3%	8%	30%	58%	461	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	12	4.7
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	11	4.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	3%	8%	33%	55%	40	4.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	3%	8%	23%	64%	221	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	3%	9%	33%	56%	150	4.4
LIMITED.....	0%	1%	5%	44%	51%	108	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	22	4.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	2%	7%	31%	58%	519	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	2%	9%	41%	48%	92	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	29%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	36%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	1%
		Probation/Parole officer	23%
		Other.....	8%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	26%
		6-10 years	16%
		11-15 years	15%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years	19%
		No Answer	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	71%
		Female.....	25%
		No Answer	4%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	90%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20%
		35,000 or over	72%
		No Answer	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	12	12%	24	24%	64	64%	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	1%	11	11%	21	21%	65	66%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	1%	11	11%	20	20%	68	68%	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	1%	0	0%	9	9%	28	29%	59	61%	4.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	10%	21	20%	72	70%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	10%	25	25%	67	66%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	1	1%	8	8%	28	28%	64	63%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	12	12%	27	28%	59	60%	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	12%	22	24%	58	64%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	0	0%	11	16%	15	22%	42	61%	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	1%	1	1%	7	7%	23	24%	62	66%	4.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	0	0%	6	9%	15	23%	42	66%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	1%	0	0%	9	9%	22	21%	72	69%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 104 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Andrews from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 33% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 27% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.6). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.6), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.6), and human understanding and compassion (4.3). The item scored lowest was settlement skills (4.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	10%	27%	63%	30	4.5
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	16%	73%	37	4.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	4%	0%	4%	21%	71%	24	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	8	4.9
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	7%	19%	74%	27	4.7
6-10 YEARS.....	6%	0%	6%	29%	59%	17	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	6%	19%	75%	16	4.7
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	16%	16%	68%	19	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	10%	15%	75%	20	4.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
MALE.....	0%	0%	8%	16%	76%	74	4.7
FEMALE.....	4%	0%	12%	31%	54%	26	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	0%	9%	20%	70%	94	4.6
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	10%	29%	62%	21	4.5
OVER 35,000.....	1%	0%	8%	19%	72%	75	4.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	0%	6%	3%	88%	34	4.7
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	11%	11%	79%	28	4.7
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	11%	42%	47%	38	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	57%	14%	7	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	0%	9%	21%	69%	104	4.6
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	27%	53%	20%	15	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	58%
		Guardian Ad Litem	17%
		CASA Volunteer	21%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	63%
		6-10 years	21%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	17%
		Female	79%
		No Answer	4%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	4%
		Third District	92%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	4%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	8%
		35,000 or over	88%
		No Answer	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ELAINE M. ANDREWS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	9	38%	14	58%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	13	54%	9	38%	4.3
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	4	17%	8	33%	12	50%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	4%	4	17%	7	29%	12	50%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%	9	38%	12	50%	4.4

OVERVIEW: In all, 24 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Andrews from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 24%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 19%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 23%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 11%
		Government 13%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 0%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 5%
		6-10 years 9%
		11-15 years 14%
		16-20 years 19%
		20+ years 48%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 74%
		Female 20%
		No Answer 5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 3%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 26%
		Mainly civil 56%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 9%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 79%
		Fourth District 4%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	12	5%	28	11%	75	30%	82	32%	56	22%	3.6
Knowledge of substantive law	12	5%	24	10%	74	30%	86	34%	54	22%	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	15	6%	19	8%	69	29%	83	35%	50	21%	3.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	16	6%	26	10%	57	23%	75	30%	76	30%	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	13	5%	23	9%	58	23%	78	32%	75	30%	3.7
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	11	5%	17	7%	50	21%	78	32%	85	35%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	9	4%	21	9%	52	23%	64	28%	80	35%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	10	4%	32	13%	43	17%	75	30%	89	36%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion	8	3%	30	12%	53	22%	67	28%	83	34%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom	4	2%	20	9%	49	22%	69	32%	76	35%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	15	7%	18	8%	66	29%	80	35%	49	21%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	16	7%	18	8%	51	23%	80	36%	58	26%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	16	7%	18	8%	51	23%	80	36%	58	26%	3.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	4%	12	11%	25	23%	34	31%	36	32%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	11	9%	12	10%	27	22%	39	32%	33	27%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	10	4%	23	9%	69	28%	83	34%	60	24%	3.7

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 245 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Brown based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 41% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.9) and ability to control courtroom (3.9). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.6), knowledge of substantive law (3.6), knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.6), reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.6), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .05]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	14%	21%	36%	21%	14	3.5
SOLO.....	5%	11%	14%	41%	29%	56	3.8
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	8%	8%	35%	35%	13%	48	3.4
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	7%	39%	29%	23%	56	3.6
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	21%	34%	41%	29	4.1
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	3%	18%	33%	27%	18%	33	3.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
[p < .01]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	8%	15%	46%	23%	13	3.7
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	21%	21%	36%	21%	14	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	20%	40%	25%	10%	20	3.2
11-15 YEARS.....	6%	12%	36%	30%	15%	33	3.4
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	20%	33%	20%	24%	45	3.4
21+ YEARS.....	4%	2%	24%	40%	30%	120	3.9
[p < .05]							
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	15%	15%	38%	23%	13	3.5
MALE.....	4%	7%	27%	38%	24%	182	3.7
FEMALE.....	4%	16%	34%	18%	28%	50	3.5
[p < .01]							
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	14%	21%	36%	21%	14	3.5
PROSECUTION.....	0%	13%	25%	25%	38%	8	3.9
CRIMINAL.....	17%	17%	17%	44%	6%	18	3.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	5%	6%	24%	32%	33%	66	3.8
CIVIL.....	2%	9%	32%	35%	22%	133	3.6
OTHER.....	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	6	3.7
[p < .01]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	8%	17%	42%	25%	12	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	5%	29%	14%	52%	21	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	10%	30%	36%	19%	195	3.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	18%	27%	55%	11	4.4
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
[p < .05]							
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	25%	31%	31%	16	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	13%	27%	26%	27%	100	3.5
MODERATE.....	2%	8%	35%	33%	23%	66	3.7
LIMITED.....	2%	6%	24%	48%	21%	63	3.8
[p < .05]							
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	10	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	9%	28%	34%	24%	245	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	7%	20%	40%	30%	60	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%	7	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	35%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	24%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	2%
		Probation/Parole officer	17%
		Other.....	13%
		No Answer	9%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	13%
		6-10 years	22%
		11-15 years	22%
		16-20 years	17%
		20+ years	13%
		No Answer	13%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	72%
		Female.....	20%
		No Answer	9%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2%
		Second District.....	2%
		Third District.....	85%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	9%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	65%
		35,000 or over	22%
		No Answer	9%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	2%	11	24%	11	24%	22	49%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	2%	2	5%	8	18%	11	25%	22	50%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	16%	11	25%	25	57%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	20%	14	34%	19	46%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	2%	1	2%	7	15%	15	33%	22	48%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	15%	14	30%	24	52%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	1	2%	8	18%	14	31%	22	49%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	2%	1	2%	8	19%	15	36%	17	40%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	3%	10	29%	11	31%	13	37%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	3%	0	0%	10	29%	12	35%	11	32%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	1	2%	13	31%	13	31%	15	36%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	3%	1	3%	7	24%	6	21%	14	48%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	2%	1	2%	7	15%	18	39%	19	41%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 46 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Brown from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 37% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 20% had a moderate amount, and 41% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored item was conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4). The item scored lowest was settlement skills (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
STATE OFFICER.....	6%	6%	6%	56%	25%	16	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	9%	18%	73%	11	4.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%	8	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	10%	0%	0%	30%	60%	10	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	20%	50%	30%	10	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	13%	13%	50%	25%	8	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
MALE.....	3%	3%	15%	39%	39%	33	4.1
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	11%	22%	67%	9	4.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	3%	10%	36%	49%	39	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	3%	13%	40%	43%	30	4.2
OVER 35,000.....	10%	0%	10%	30%	50%	10	4.1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	6%	0%	12%	41%	41%	17	4.1
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	44%	56%	9	4.6
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	26%	32%	37%	19	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	5	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	2%	15%	39%	41%	46	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	29%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	21%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	36%
		6-10 years	29%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	21%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	14%
		Female	64%
		No Answer	21%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	71%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	29%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	50%
		35,000 or over	29%
		No Answer	21%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE HAROLD M. BROWN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%	0	0%	9	69%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	1	7%	3	21%	2	14%	8	57%	4.2
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	1	7%	2	14%	4	29%	7	50%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	43%	2	14%	6	43%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	7%	2	14%	3	21%	8	57%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 14 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Brown from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 25%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 20%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 8%
		Government 15%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 6%
		6-10 years 11%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 40%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 74%
		Female 22%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 23%
		Mainly civil 61%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 2%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	11	2%	49	10%	163	34%	189	39%	74	15%	3.5
Knowledge of substantive law.....	10	2%	48	10%	163	34%	180	38%	79	16%	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	9	2%	40	8%	150	32%	184	39%	91	19%	3.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	12	2%	30	6%	102	21%	155	32%	190	39%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	13	3%	24	5%	97	20%	143	30%	206	43%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	8	2%	9	2%	79	16%	162	34%	224	46%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	7	2%	13	3%	83	18%	151	34%	195	43%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	11	2%	19	4%	90	18%	139	28%	233	47%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	14	3%	18	4%	89	19%	143	30%	213	45%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	10	2%	26	6%	116	25%	160	35%	150	32%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	22	5%	57	12%	149	31%	149	31%	101	21%	3.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	19	4%	39	8%	134	29%	159	34%	116	25%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	13	5%	24	9%	90	32%	81	29%	71	25%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	10	4%	10	4%	53	23%	73	32%	83	36%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	16	6%	19	7%	73	26%	87	31%	85	30%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	15	3%	33	7%	133	27%	194	40%	116	24%	3.7

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 491 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Gonzalez based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 37% had a substantial amount of experience, 32% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.5) and reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.5).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	4%	8%	21%	46%	21%	24	3.7
SOLO.....	5%	6%	24%	38%	27%	123	3.8
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	1%	5%	33%	39%	22%	120	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	7%	26%	52%	14%	97	3.7
CORPORATE.....	0%	25%	38%	25%	13%	8	3.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	3%	13%	37%	47%	38	4.3
GOVERNMENT.....	8%	11%	33%	25%	22%	72	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	10%	10%	45%	30%	20	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	3%	31%	41%	21%	29	3.7
6-10 YEARS.....	4%	4%	20%	50%	22%	50	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	4%	6%	32%	44%	14%	81	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	10%	38%	26%	26%	112	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	4%	6%	22%	42%	27%	199	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	14%	9%	50%	23%	22	3.7
MALE.....	3%	5%	26%	41%	24%	362	3.8
FEMALE.....	2%	10%	35%	32%	21%	107	3.6
CASES HANDLED							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	5%	10%	10%	50%	25%	20	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	17%	11%	39%	22%	11%	18	3.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	4%	8%	27%	62%	26	4.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	4%	4%	16%	43%	33%	113	4.0
CIVIL.....	2%	7%	34%	39%	17%	300	3.6
OTHER.....	0%	7%	7%	50%	36%	14	4.1
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	11%	11%	44%	28%	18	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	5%	16%	32%	32%	16%	19	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	6%	28%	40%	24%	430	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	8%	8%	8%	50%	25%	12	3.8
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	10%	40%	30%	20%	10	3.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	7%	19%	55%	14%	42	3.7
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	6%	31%	35%	24%	181	3.7
MODERATE.....	3%	9%	25%	36%	28%	158	3.8
LIMITED.....	2%	5%	27%	46%	20%	110	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	35%	38%	23%	26	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	7%	27%	40%	24%	491	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	5%	13%	36%	36%	10%	39	3.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	40%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	29%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	4%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	9%
		Other.....	11%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	16%
		6-10 years.....	11%
		11-15 years.....	16%
		16-20 years.....	29%
		20+ years.....	20%
		No Answer.....	9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	82%
		Female.....	13%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	82%
		Fourth District.....	7%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	13%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	24%
		35,000 or over.....	58%
		No Answer.....	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	3	7%	4	10%	13	32%	11	27%	10	24%	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	3%	4	11%	11	29%	12	32%	10	26%	3.7
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	4	10%	11	28%	11	28%	14	35%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	3%	4	10%	14	36%	7	18%	13	33%	3.7
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	7%	3	7%	13	31%	7	17%	16	38%	3.7
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	3%	3	8%	14	37%	8	21%	12	32%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	3	8%	5	13%	13	33%	7	18%	11	28%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	8%	4	11%	11	29%	12	32%	8	21%	3.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	6%	2	6%	12	35%	9	26%	9	26%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	2	6%	2	6%	12	36%	8	24%	9	27%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	5%	9	23%	10	26%	9	23%	9	23%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	7%	5	17%	8	28%	5	17%	9	31%	3.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	2%	6	14%	15	36%	10	24%	10	24%	3.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 42 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Gonzalez from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 12% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 33% had a moderate amount, and 45% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest scored item was conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.9). The item scored lowest was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
STATE OFFICER.....	6%	22%	22%	28%	22%	18	3.4
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	9%	55%	18%	18%	11	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	4	3.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	0%	50%	25%	4	3.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	6	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	5	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	7	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	27%	36%	18%	18%	11	3.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	22%	44%	11%	22%	9	3.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
MALE.....	3%	14%	34%	23%	26%	35	3.5
FEMALE.....	0%	20%	60%	0%	20%	5	3.2
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	18%	38%	21%	21%	34	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
2,000-35,000.....	0%	9%	36%	27%	27%	11	3.7
OVER 35,000.....	4%	22%	39%	17%	17%	23	3.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4	2.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	21%	36%	21%	21%	14	3.4
LIMITED.....	0%	11%	42%	32%	16%	19	3.5
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	50%	25%	0%	4	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	14%	36%	24%	24%	42	3.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	27%	27%	33%	7%	15	3.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	40%
		Guardian Ad Litem	33%
		CASA Volunteer	20%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	33%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	27%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	13%
		Female	80%
		No Answer	7%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	7%
		Second District	7%
		Third District	80%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20%
		35,000 or over	73%
		No Answer	7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RENE J. GONZALEZ

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	5	36%	7	50%	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	4	27%	8	53%	4.1
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	1	7%	0	0%	3	20%	4	27%	7	47%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	7%	1	7%	2	14%	3	21%	7	50%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	7%	1	7%	2	13%	4	27%	7	47%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 15 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Gonzalez from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 26%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 7%
		Government 11%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 0%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 9%
		6-10 years 11%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 39%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 69%
		Female 27%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 2%
		Mainly criminal 4%
		Mixed criminal and civil 20%
		Mainly civil 66%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 5%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 1%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	3	1%	16	4%	42	10%	146	36%	194	48%	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law.....	5	1%	9	2%	50	13%	133	34%	198	50%	4.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	3	1%	6	2%	46	12%	139	36%	189	49%	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	4	1%	22	6%	34	9%	127	32%	212	53%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	1%	12	3%	44	11%	115	29%	217	55%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	4	1%	4	1%	39	10%	104	27%	241	61%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	1%	8	2%	41	11%	95	26%	222	60%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	2%	11	3%	46	12%	93	23%	243	61%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	4	1%	11	3%	52	13%	97	25%	224	58%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom.....	3	1%	3	1%	51	14%	121	32%	196	52%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	5	1%	12	3%	45	12%	136	35%	186	48%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	1%	8	2%	39	10%	121	32%	208	55%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	8	3%	4	2%	29	12%	77	31%	128	52%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	2%	2	1%	11	8%	44	30%	86	59%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	3	1%	3	1%	25	12%	62	31%	110	54%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	3	1%	11	3%	45	11%	136	34%	204	51%	4.3

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 399 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Hensley based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 46% had a substantial amount of experience, 25% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.3). The highest mean score came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.3), knowledge of substantive law (4.3), knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.3), equal treatment of all parties (4.3), ability to control courtroom (4.3), reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.3), settlement skills (4.3), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .05]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	0%	29%	65%	17	4.5
SOLO.....	3%	4%	14%	30%	49%	100	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	2%	10%	39%	49%	90	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	2%	12%	37%	49%	106	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	29%	57%	14%	7	3.9
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	14%	86%	28	4.9
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	4%	16%	36%	44%	45	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	0%	33%	61%	18	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	6%	6%	34%	54%	35	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	5%	16%	43%	36%	44	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	2%	9%	36%	52%	58	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	3%	15%	29%	52%	91	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	1%	1%	11%	34%	53%	153	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	0%	25%	69%	16	4.6
MALE.....	1%	3%	12%	34%	51%	278	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	2%	12%	36%	50%	105	4.3
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	0%	25%	69%	16	4.6
PROSECUTION.....	0%	13%	38%	38%	13%	8	3.5
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	6%	33%	61%	18	4.6
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	2%	9%	32%	55%	82	4.3
CIVIL.....	0%	2%	13%	35%	49%	263	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	8%	0%	33%	58%	12	4.4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	0%	27%	67%	15	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	11%	21%	37%	32%	19	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	2%	11%	33%	53%	353	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	6	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	3%	26%	65%	34	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	4%	12%	28%	56%	185	4.3
MODERATE.....	1%	1%	10%	41%	47%	98	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	1%	15%	44%	40%	82	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	19%	25%	56%	16	4.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	11%	34%	51%	399	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	4%	15%	44%	35%	48	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	36%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	9%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	9%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	18%
		Other.....	27%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	45%
		6-10 years.....	9%
		11-15 years.....	27%
		16-20 years.....	9%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	91%
		Female.....	9%
		No Answer.....	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	91%
		Fourth District.....	9%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	9%
		35,000 or over.....	82%
		No Answer.....	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3	27%	7	64%	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	4.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3	27%	7	64%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3	27%	7	64%	4.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	1	11%	6	67%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	4.6
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	7	70%	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	6	75%	4.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%	7	78%	4.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	7	70%	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%	7	78%	4.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3	27%	7	64%	4.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 11 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Hensley from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 18% had a moderate amount, and 27% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.5). The highest scored items were: settlement skills (4.7) and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.7). The item scored lowest was human understanding and compassion (4.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
MALE.....	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	10	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	[p<.001]
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%	10	4.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	[p<.05]
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	9	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	11	4.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	64%
		Guardian Ad Litem	29%
		CASA Volunteer	7%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	64%
		6-10 years	21%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0%
		35,000 or over	93%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DAN A. HENSLEY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%	8	62%	4.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	38%	7	54%	4.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	4	31%	8	62%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	42%	7	58%	4.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	9	69%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 13 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Hensley from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 24%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 20%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 12%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 17%
		Government 20%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 0%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 9%
		6-10 years 16%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 18%
		20+ years 36%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 73%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 2%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 8%
		Mainly criminal 10%
		Mixed criminal and civil 36%
		Mainly civil 40%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 8%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 81%
		Fourth District 6%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	3%	24	12%	45	22%	71	34%	62	30%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law.....	5	2%	19	9%	50	24%	72	35%	62	30%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	3	2%	18	9%	46	23%	69	35%	62	31%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	8	4%	27	13%	43	21%	57	28%	70	34%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	10	5%	22	11%	43	21%	56	28%	72	35%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	5	3%	12	6%	34	17%	54	27%	93	47%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	4%	13	7%	35	18%	57	30%	77	41%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	7	3%	23	11%	40	20%	55	27%	80	39%	3.9
Human understanding and compassion.....	12	6%	18	9%	51	25%	54	27%	66	33%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom.....	4	2%	6	3%	50	27%	56	30%	71	38%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	7	4%	11	6%	44	22%	59	30%	77	39%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	2%	10	5%	41	21%	56	29%	81	42%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	5	5%	10	10%	22	23%	24	25%	35	36%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	5	4%	13	12%	24	21%	29	26%	42	37%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	9	9%	15	14%	17	16%	29	28%	34	33%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	10	5%	22	11%	48	23%	59	29%	66	32%	3.7

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 205 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Hopwood based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 38% had a substantial amount of experience, 31% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.1). The lowest scored item was talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	13%	38%	8	3.9
SOLO.....	10%	8%	18%	35%	29%	49	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	17%	31%	19%	31%	42	3.6
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	4%	16%	32%	24%	24%	25	3.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	3%	6%	8%	36%	47%	36	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	5%	13%	20%	33%	30%	40	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	6%	6%	12%	47%	29%	17	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	9%	3%	38%	22%	28%	32	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	11%	11%	30%	24%	24%	37	3.4
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	21%	18%	24%	37%	38	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	3%	11%	20%	32%	35%	75	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
MALE.....	6%	9%	25%	27%	33%	152	3.7
FEMALE.....	2%	17%	19%	35%	27%	48	3.7
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	17%	50%	6	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	6%	25%	25%	44%	16	4.1
CRIMINAL.....	5%	10%	29%	19%	38%	21	3.8
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	7%	14%	23%	27%	30%	74	3.6
CIVIL.....	5%	7%	24%	34%	29%	82	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	6	3.7
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	6%	6%	24%	53%	12%	17	3.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	11%	25%	25%	34%	167	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	17%	8%	42%	33%	12	3.9
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	8%	15%	38%	31%	13	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	8%	14%	23%	18%	36%	77	3.6
MODERATE.....	2%	10%	25%	33%	30%	63	3.8
LIMITED.....	4%	8%	23%	37%	29%	52	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%	7	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....							
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	5%	11%	23%	29%	32%	205	3.7
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	4%	17%	25%	38%	17%	24	3.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	27%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	29%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	5%
		Probation/Parole officer	12%
		Other.....	24%
		No Answer	2%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	29%
		6-10 years	27%
		11-15 years	20%
		16-20 years	10%
		20+ years	7%
		No Answer	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	68%
		Female.....	29%
		No Answer	2%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	5%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	88%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	68%
		35,000 or over	22%
		No Answer	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	22%	12	29%	20	49%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	2%	6	15%	14	34%	20	49%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	15%	13	32%	22	54%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	23%	12	31%	18	46%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	14	34%	23	56%	4.5
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	18%	14	35%	18	45%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	23%	9	23%	21	54%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	21	55%	12	32%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	19%	15	42%	14	39%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	20%	13	43%	11	37%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	2	5%	7	18%	11	29%	18	47%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	4%	5	20%	9	36%	10	40%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	2%	6	15%	15	37%	19	46%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 41 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Hopwood from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 32% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 29% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.3). The highest scored item was courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.5). The item scored lowest was talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							[p<.05]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	9%	36%	55%	11	4.5
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	8%	17%	42%	33%	12	4.0
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%	10	4.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	12	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	9%	9%	64%	18%	11	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	8	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MALE.....	0%	4%	18%	32%	46%	28	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	8%	42%	50%	12	4.4
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	8%	36%	53%	36	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
2,000-35,000.....	0%	4%	7%	39%	50%	28	4.4
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	9	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	8%	46%	46%	13	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	25%	17%	58%	12	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	7%	13%	40%	40%	15	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	15%	37%	46%	41	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	67%
		Guardian Ad Litem	33%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	33%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	33%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	33%
		Female	67%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	33%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	67%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	100%
		35,000 or over	0%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DONALD D. HOPWOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	4.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	4.7
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	4.7

OVERVIEW: In all, 3 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Hopwood from their direct professional experience.. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	22%
		Private, corporate employee	2%
		State judge or judicial officer	11%
		Government	11%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	0%
		Other	1%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	8%
		6-10 years	11%
		11-15 years	12%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years.....	47%
		No Answer.....	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	78%
		Female	18%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4%
		Mainly criminal	8%
		Mixed criminal and civil	28%
		Mainly civil.....	53%
		Other	4%
		No Answer.....	4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District	1%
		Third District	85%
		Fourth District	8%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	5	2%	21	8%	59	23%	108	42%	64	25%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law.....	5	2%	20	8%	61	24%	109	43%	59	23%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	4	2%	17	7%	53	22%	104	42%	67	27%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	7	3%	28	11%	44	17%	86	34%	91	36%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	6	2%	27	11%	43	17%	87	34%	92	36%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	7	3%	21	8%	41	16%	81	33%	99	40%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	3%	21	9%	39	16%	78	33%	91	38%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	7	3%	24	10%	38	15%	80	32%	103	41%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	6	2%	13	5%	49	20%	88	35%	94	38%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	2%	13	5%	45	19%	87	36%	92	38%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	8	3%	20	8%	57	23%	94	39%	65	27%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	11	4%	15	6%	53	22%	94	38%	73	30%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	4	3%	6	4%	34	23%	55	36%	52	34%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	4	3%	6	5%	29	22%	47	35%	47	35%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	4	3%	8	6%	26	20%	47	36%	45	35%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	6	2%	22	9%	53	21%	101	40%	73	29%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 255 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Link based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 47% had a substantial amount of experience, 24% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.0), human understanding and compassion (4.0), ability to control courtroom (4.0), settlement skills (4.0), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.0). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.8), knowledge of substantive law (3.8), reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8), and willingness to work diligently (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	30%	10%	10%	50%	10	3.8
SOLO.....	3%	8%	13%	40%	37%	63	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	8%	17%	44%	29%	63	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	4%	7%	31%	36%	22%	55	3.7
CORPORATE.....	0%	50%	25%	25%	0%	4	2.8
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	4%	7%	39%	50%	28	4.4
GOVERNMENT.....	4%	7%	46%	39%	4%	28	3.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	27%	9%	18%	45%	11	3.8
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	45%	25%	30%	20	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	15%	19%	41%	26%	27	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	7%	10%	23%	40%	20%	30	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	11%	23%	43%	23%	47	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	3%	6%	17%	43%	32%	120	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	30%	10%	20%	40%	10	3.7
MALE.....	3%	7%	19%	42%	30%	200	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	11%	31%	36%	22%	45	3.7
CASES HANDLED							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	30%	20%	10%	40%	10	3.6
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	30%	40%	30%	10	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	5%	29%	33%	24%	10%	21	3.0
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	6%	17%	42%	32%	71	4.0
CIVIL.....	2%	6%	20%	43%	29%	134	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	11%	22%	44%	22%	9	3.8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	33%	11%	11%	44%	9	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	6	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	9%	21%	39%	29%	214	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	19%	57%	24%	21	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	12%	6%	18%	29%	35%	17	3.7
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	9%	20%	36%	32%	119	3.9
MODERATE.....	2%	12%	18%	37%	32%	60	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	25%	53%	17%	59	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	42%	25%	33%	12	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL							
EXPERIENCE.....	2%	9%	21%	40%	29%	255	3.8
PROFESSIONAL							
REPUTATION.....	0%	11%	43%	32%	14%	28	3.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	29%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	31%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer	21%
		Other.....	10%
		No Answer	6%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	19%
		6-10 years	19%
		11-15 years	16%
		16-20 years	26%
		20+ years	13%
		No Answer	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	71%
		Female.....	23%
		No Answer	6%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	85%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	8%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	65%
		35,000 or over	24%
		No Answer	6%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0%	0	0%	8	13%	19	32%	33	55%	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	8	14%	14	24%	36	62%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	14%	16	27%	35	59%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	10%	18	30%	36	60%	4.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	7	11%	19	31%	35	57%	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	7	11%	19	31%	35	57%	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	7	12%	17	29%	35	59%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	13%	23	41%	26	46%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	12%	17	35%	26	53%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	15	38%	20	50%	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	9	16%	15	27%	31	56%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	13	34%	18	47%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	7	11%	22	35%	33	53%	4.4

OVERVIEW: In all, 62 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Link from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 37% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 31% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest scored items were: sense of basic fairness and justice (4.5), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.5), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.5), human understanding and compassion (4.5), and ability to control courtroom (4.5). The items scored lowest were: reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.3) and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	39%	50%	18	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	5%	26%	68%	19	4.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	15%	31%	54%	13	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	12	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	8%	42%	50%	12	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	10	4.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	6%	38%	56%	16	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	8	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
MALE.....	0%	0%	11%	34%	55%	44	4.4
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	14	4.4
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	9%	34%	57%	53	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	8%	33%	60%	40	4.5
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	13%	47%	40%	15	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	4%	22%	74%	23	4.7
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	5%	37%	58%	19	4.5
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	16	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	44%	22%	9	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	11%	35%	53%	62	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	17%	0%	33%	50%	0%	6	3.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	25%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	25%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	25%
		6-10 years	38%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	25%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	13%
		Female	63%
		No Answer	25%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	63%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	38%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	75%
		35,000 or over	0%
		No Answer	25%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JONATHAN H. LINK

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	7	88%	4.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	2	25%	5	63%	4.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	3	38%	3	38%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	6	75%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	4	50%	4.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 8 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Link from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range except respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc. which was in the "good" range (3.9).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 24%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 21%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 7%
		Government 16%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 7%
		6-10 years 12%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 22%
		20+ years 40%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 73%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 21%
		Mainly civil 63%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 87%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	16	3%	41	7%	124	22%	214	39%	159	29%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law.....	13	2%	41	8%	125	23%	205	38%	160	29%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	11	2%	26	5%	116	22%	218	41%	163	31%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	21	4%	38	7%	99	18%	162	29%	233	42%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	17	3%	38	7%	96	18%	162	30%	235	43%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	14	3%	15	3%	86	16%	135	25%	300	55%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	15	3%	18	3%	72	14%	127	24%	296	56%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	13	2%	19	3%	74	13%	144	26%	300	55%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	12	2%	30	6%	85	16%	156	29%	259	48%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	1%	26	5%	116	22%	176	34%	200	38%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	14	3%	22	4%	129	24%	186	35%	187	35%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	13	2%	32	6%	117	22%	171	32%	200	38%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	19	6%	42	13%	82	26%	88	28%	83	26%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	6	3%	10	5%	49	22%	58	27%	95	44%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	13	5%	18	7%	67	24%	79	29%	99	36%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	19	3%	39	7%	110	20%	201	37%	179	33%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 548 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Michalski based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 49% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 17% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.3), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.3), and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.3). The lowest scored item was settlement skills (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	9%	14%	9%	32%	36%	22	3.7
SOLO.....	5%	9%	21%	37%	28%	131	3.7
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	6%	9%	29%	32%	24%	127	3.6
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	5%	23%	43%	26%	115	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	9%	9%	45%	36%	11	4.1
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	3%	30%	68%	37	4.6
GOVERNMENT.....	1%	3%	16%	38%	41%	87	4.1
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	9%	9%	45%	36%	11	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	14%	0%	14%	71%	7	4.4
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	9%	14%	5%	23%	50%	22	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	5%	21%	33%	38%	39	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	2%	19%	36%	39%	64	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	4%	4%	28%	39%	26%	80	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	9%	21%	38%	30%	122	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	3%	9%	19%	38%	32%	221	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	9%	18%	5%	32%	36%	22	3.7
MALE.....	4%	6%	21%	37%	32%	401	3.9
FEMALE.....	1%	7%	21%	38%	34%	125	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	19%	5%	33%	38%	21	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	15%	30%	55%	20	4.4
CRIMINAL.....	0%	4%	29%	46%	21%	24	3.8
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	6%	5%	20%	28%	41%	117	3.9
CIVIL.....	3%	8%	21%	40%	28%	347	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	5%	11%	32%	53%	19	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	17%	6%	28%	44%	18	3.9
FIRST DISTRICT.....	4%	0%	17%	46%	33%	24	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	7%	22%	37%	32%	478	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	6%	6%	6%	35%	47%	17	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	11%	22%	0%	22%	44%	9	3.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	2%	5%	25%	30%	39%	44	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	9%	21%	29%	37%	270	3.8
MODERATE.....	3%	6%	15%	51%	25%	142	3.9
LIMITED.....	2%	4%	24%	40%	29%	92	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	15%	38%	42%	26	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	7%	20%	37%	33%	548	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	6%	24%	30%	36%	33	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	33%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	29%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer	9%
		Other.....	19%
		No Answer	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	17%
		6-10 years	22%
		11-15 years	16%
		16-20 years	17%
		20+ years	17%
		No Answer	10%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	72%
		Female.....	21%
		No Answer	7%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	5%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	81%
		Fourth District.....	5%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	9%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	12%
		35,000 or over	24%
		No Answer	7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	2%	1	2%	14	25%	16	29%	23	42%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	2%	1	2%	13	24%	17	31%	22	41%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	2	4%	11	21%	14	27%	25	48%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	2%	1	2%	12	24%	14	27%	23	45%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	2%	0	0%	13	25%	13	25%	26	49%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	2%	1	2%	10	20%	13	26%	25	50%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	1	2%	12	25%	14	29%	21	44%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	4%	1	2%	13	26%	12	24%	22	44%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	5%	0	0%	13	30%	12	27%	17	39%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	2	5%	1	2%	12	29%	8	20%	18	44%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	4%	1	2%	14	28%	11	22%	22	44%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	1	2%	14	32%	8	18%	20	45%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	2%	2	4%	13	24%	14	26%	24	44%	4.1

OVERVIEW: In all, 54 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Michalski from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 26% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 26% had a moderate amount, and 35% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.2), and human understanding and compassion (4.2). The items scored lowest were: reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0), willingness to work diligently (4.0), settlement skills (4.0), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.0), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	6%	33%	22%	39%	18	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	6%	19%	31%	44%	16	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
OTHER.....	10%	0%	0%	30%	60%	10	4.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	6	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	9%	27%	36%	27%	11	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	13%	0%	0%	13%	75%	8	4.4
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	30%	30%	40%	10	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	10%	30%	20%	40%	10	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
MALE.....	0%	5%	23%	23%	50%	40	4.2
FEMALE.....	10%	0%	30%	50%	10%	10	3.5
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	0%	60%	5	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	4%	20%	29%	44%	45	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	7	3.9
OVER 35,000.....	3%	5%	18%	26%	49%	39	4.1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	14%	29%	0%	43%	7	3.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	21%	14%	64%	14	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	21%	29%	50%	14	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	26%	42%	26%	19	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	5	3.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE							
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	33%	0%	17%	50%	6	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	47%
		Guardian Ad Litem	12%
		CASA Volunteer	29%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	12%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	59%
		6-10 years	18%
		11-15 years	12%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	12%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	12%
		Female	76%
		No Answer	12%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	82%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	18%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0%
		35,000 or over	88%
		No Answer	12%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PETER A. MICHALSKI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	5	33%	9	60%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	4	24%	11	65%	4.4
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	2	12%	1	6%	4	24%	10	59%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	6%	0	0%	2	12%	5	29%	9	53%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	6	35%	9	53%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 17 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Michalski from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 27%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 18%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 9%
		Government 16%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 3%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 13%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 18%
		20+ years 40%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 73%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 8%
		Mixed criminal and civil 24%
		Mainly civil 57%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 2%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 92%
		Fourth District 2%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	7	2%	14	4%	63	16%	131	34%	169	44%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	8	2%	14	4%	64	17%	119	31%	174	46%	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	8	2%	19	5%	50	14%	121	33%	172	46%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	15	4%	24	6%	50	13%	122	32%	167	44%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	13	3%	18	5%	62	17%	113	30%	169	45%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	10	3%	19	5%	48	13%	104	28%	195	52%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	9	3%	23	6%	46	13%	97	27%	182	51%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	22	6%	32	8%	81	21%	97	26%	146	39%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	14	4%	20	5%	89	24%	98	27%	148	40%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	7	2%	12	3%	50	14%	109	30%	182	51%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	7	2%	11	3%	56	16%	114	32%	169	47%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	8	2%	11	3%	47	13%	114	31%	183	50%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	7	3%	7	3%	29	12%	58	23%	146	59%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	7	4%	7	4%	25	14%	51	29%	88	49%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	12	6%	13	7%	25	13%	55	28%	88	46%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	9	2%	21	6%	49	13%	138	37%	159	42%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 376 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Sanders based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 51% had a substantial amount of experience, 25% had a moderate amount, and 18% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest mean score came for settlement skills (4.3). The lowest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.8)

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .05]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	8%	33%	50%	12	4.3
SOLO.....	7%	2%	13%	40%	38%	91	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	1%	6%	11%	27%	55%	101	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	1%	9%	54%	35%	69	4.2
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	3%	6%	12%	21%	58%	33	4.2
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	15%	20%	37%	27%	59	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	29%	57%	14%	7	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
[p < .001]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	11	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	5%	18%	32%	42%	38	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	8%	15%	10%	44%	23%	48	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	9%	13%	32%	45%	56	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	6%	17%	34%	41%	70	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	1%	2%	11%	39%	46%	153	4.3
[p < .001]							
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
MALE.....	1%	3%	13%	36%	46%	275	4.2
FEMALE.....	6%	13%	13%	39%	29%	90	3.7
[p < .001]							
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
PROSECUTION.....	0%	41%	29%	24%	6%	17	2.9
CRIMINAL.....	7%	4%	26%	44%	19%	27	3.6
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	7%	8%	20%	30%	36%	92	3.8
CIVIL.....	0%	2%	8%	40%	50%	217	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	8%	8%	42%	42%	12	4.2
[p < .001]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	10	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	7	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	6%	14%	35%	42%	347	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
[p < .001]							
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	15%	35%	42%	26	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	6%	11%	33%	46%	191	4.1
MODERATE.....	1%	4%	19%	40%	35%	93	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	6%	9%	44%	41%	66	4.2
[p < .001]							
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	22%	39%	33%	18	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL							
EXPERIENCE.....	2%	6%	13%	37%	42%	376	4.1
PROFESSIONAL							
REPUTATION.....	2%	5%	20%	44%	29%	55	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	17%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	37%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	5%
		Probation/Parole officer	27%
		Other.....	12%
		No Answer	2%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	37%
		6-10 years	20%
		11-15 years	10%
		16-20 years	15%
		20+ years	17%
		No Answer	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	73%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer	2%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	93%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	2%
		35,000 or over	90%
		No Answer	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	3%	3	8%	11	28%	7	18%	18	45%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	3%	1	3%	11	28%	9	23%	18	45%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	3%	8	20%	12	30%	19	48%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	2	5%	2	5%	7	18%	11	28%	18	45%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	4	10%	7	18%	11	28%	17	43%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	2	5%	10	25%	11	28%	17	43%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	2	5%	3	8%	6	15%	10	26%	18	46%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	3	8%	12	32%	8	21%	15	39%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	12	34%	9	26%	14	40%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	2	7%	6	20%	9	30%	13	43%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	4	11%	10	26%	10	26%	14	37%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	7%	2	7%	6	21%	6	21%	12	43%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	3%	3	8%	10	25%	10	25%	16	40%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 40 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Sanders from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 20% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest scored item was conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2). The items scored lowest were: reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.9), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.9), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	43%	57%	7	4.6
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	7%	13%	33%	13%	33%	15	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	10%	30%	30%	30%	10	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	27%	40%	33%	15	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	14%	0%	43%	43%	7	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	6	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	14%	14%	43%	0%	29%	7	3.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MALE.....	3%	7%	20%	30%	40%	30	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	11%	44%	11%	33%	9	3.7
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	8%	22%	27%	41%	37	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OVER 35,000.....	3%	8%	22%	28%	39%	36	3.9
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	50%	25%	0%	4	2.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	6%	28%	17%	50%	18	4.1
MODERATE.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	8	3.5
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	10	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	8%	25%	25%	40%	40	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	14%	14%	14%	57%	0%	7	3.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

[p<.05]

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	60%
		Guardian Ad Litem	20%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	20%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	60%
		6-10 years	0%
		11-15 years	20%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	20%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	80%
		No Answer	20%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	80%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	20%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0%
		35,000 or over	80%
		No Answer	20%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SANDERS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	3.8
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	4.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	2	40%	2	40%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 5 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Sanders from their direct professional experience. All mean scores were in the "excellent" range except impartiality which was in the "good" range (3.9).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 28%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 28%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 14%
		Private, corporate employee 0%
		State judge or judicial officer 12%
		Government 12%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 3%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 9%
		6-10 years 10%
		11-15 years 19%
		16-20 years 22%
		20+ years 36%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 72%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 31%
		Mainly civil 5%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 3%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	3%	18	9%	29	15%	62	32%	81	41%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law.....	5	3%	18	9%	27	14%	70	36%	72	38%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	5	3%	17	9%	31	16%	62	33%	75	39%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	7	4%	21	11%	25	13%	48	25%	92	48%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	5	3%	14	7%	27	14%	54	28%	92	48%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	4	2%	8	4%	31	16%	44	23%	103	54%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	5	3%	8	4%	28	15%	43	23%	101	55%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	3%	8	4%	24	12%	53	27%	102	53%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	4	2%	5	3%	31	16%	49	26%	101	53%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	7	4%	14	8%	25	14%	56	31%	76	43%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	6	3%	10	5%	29	16%	62	34%	76	42%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	6	3%	7	4%	23	12%	49	26%	101	54%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	5	4%	6	5%	17	14%	41	34%	51	43%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	4	4%	5	5%	9	9%	32	33%	47	48%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	6	5%	8	7%	9	8%	34	30%	55	49%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	8	4%	15	8%	28	14%	65	33%	79	41%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 195 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Smith based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 47% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 19% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean score came for human understanding and compassion (4.3). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.0), knowledge of substantive law (4.0), knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.0), equal treatment of all parties (4.0), ability to control courtroom (4.0), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	0%	67%	17%	6	3.8
SOLO.....	4%	9%	15%	37%	35%	54	3.9
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	8%	9%	15%	28%	40%	53	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	28	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	4%	4%	21%	71%	24	4.6
GOVERNMENT.....	8%	12%	8%	36%	36%	25	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	14%	0%	57%	29%	7	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	5%	16%	47%	32%	19	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	0%	26%	32%	37%	19	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	8%	11%	8%	31%	42%	36	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	7%	10%	31%	52%	42	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	6%	8%	18%	31%	38%	72	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	29%	0%	57%	14%	7	3.6
MALE.....	6%	7%	13%	33%	41%	142	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	7%	20%	30%	43%	46	4.1
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	29%	0%	57%	14%	7	3.6
PROSECUTION.....	25%	13%	13%	38%	13%	8	3.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	11	4.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	7%	13%	31%	46%	61	4.1
CIVIL.....	4%	7%	17%	34%	38%	105	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	3	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	0%	67%	17%	6	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	8%	14%	32%	41%	171	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	43%	0%	57%	7	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	31%	31%	31%	13	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	8%	14%	24%	47%	91	4.0
MODERATE.....	2%	11%	11%	40%	36%	53	4.0
LIMITED.....	3%	3%	13%	47%	34%	38	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	30%	30%	10	3.7
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	8%	14%	33%	41%	195	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	15%	9%	42%	33%	33	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	36%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	10%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	5%
		Probation/Parole officer	31%
		Other.....	8%
		No Answer	10%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	38%
		6-10 years	18%
		11-15 years	8%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years	8%
		No Answer	10%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	64%
		Female.....	26%
		No Answer	10%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	8%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	74%
		Fourth District.....	5%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	13%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	31%
		35,000 or over	51%
		No Answer	10%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	2	5%	7	18%	12	32%	10	26%	7	18%	3.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	8%	6	15%	11	28%	11	28%	8	21%	3.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	5%	2	5%	13	35%	10	27%	10	27%	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	2	5%	8	21%	13	34%	7	18%	8	21%	3.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	3	8%	13	33%	11	28%	11	28%	3.7
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	3%	4	10%	10	26%	14	36%	10	26%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom.....	2	5%	6	16%	9	24%	12	32%	9	24%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	3%	6	16%	12	32%	10	27%	8	22%	3.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	6%	4	12%	9	27%	9	27%	9	27%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	4	16%	10	40%	6	24%	5	20%	3.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	7	19%	6	17%	7	19%	9	25%	7	19%	3.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	8%	3	12%	8	32%	7	28%	5	20%	3.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	5%	7	18%	13	33%	10	26%	7	18%	3.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 39 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Smith from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 54% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 23% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "acceptable" range (3.3). The highest scored items were: courtesy and freedom from arrogance (3.7), and human understanding and compassion (3.7). The item scored lowest was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.3
STATE OFFICER.....	7%	21%	36%	21%	14%	14	3.1
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	4	2.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	17%	25%	33%	25%	12	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	13%	33%	33%	20%	15	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	14%	43%	0%	43%	7	3.7
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	33%	0%	67%	0%	3	3.3
16-20 YEARS.....	14%	29%	29%	29%	0%	7	2.7
21+ YEARS.....	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	3	2.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.3
MALE.....	4%	28%	36%	16%	16%	25	3.1
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%	10	3.9
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	20%	0%	40%	20%	20%	5	3.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	3	3.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	21%	28%	31%	17%	29	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	3	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	25%	25%	42%	8%	12	3.3
OVER 35,000.....	5%	20%	30%	20%	25%	20	3.4
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	19%	24%	19%	33%	21	3.6
MODERATE.....	11%	22%	44%	22%	0%	9	2.8
LIMITED.....	0%	11%	44%	44%	0%	9	3.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	4	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	5%	18%	33%	26%	18%	39	3.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	56%
		Guardian Ad Litem	11%
		CASA Volunteer	11%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	22%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	22%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	11%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	11%
		No Answer	22%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	33%
		Female	44%
		No Answer	22%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	11%
		Third District	67%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	22%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	11%
		35,000 or over	56%
		No Answer	33%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE ERIC SMITH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	2	25%	5	63%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%	2	22%	5	56%	4.2
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	1	11%	1	11%	3	33%	4	44%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	11%	0	0%	2	22%	2	22%	4	44%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	13%	1	13%	3	38%	3	38%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 8 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Smith from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range except reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.9).

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 23%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 7%
		Government 16%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years12 7%
		6-10 years15 12%
		11-15 years25 15%
		16-20 years36 25%
		20+ years4 36%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 68%
		Female 28%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 2%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 19%
		Mainly civil 67%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 5%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 2%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	8	2%	29	7%	66	16%	131	32%	181	44%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	9	2%	31	8%	61	15%	136	33%	174	42%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	2%	27	7%	72	18%	140	35%	151	38%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	9	2%	11	3%	52	13%	126	30%	217	52%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	10	2%	9	2%	47	11%	126	31%	219	53%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	9	2%	9	2%	32	8%	112	27%	254	61%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	11	3%	8	2%	35	9%	108	28%	228	58%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	1%	4	1%	48	12%	105	25%	251	61%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	6	1%	8	2%	55	13%	125	31%	214	52%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	2%	15	4%	68	19%	127	35%	149	41%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	28	7%	41	10%	75	19%	122	31%	129	33%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	11	3%	24	6%	50	13%	124	32%	183	47%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	10	5%	26	12%	31	14%	70	33%	77	36%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	3%	6	5%	12	10%	36	30%	63	53%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	6	3%	11	6%	29	16%	57	31%	82	44%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	13	3%	24	6%	62	15%	151	37%	163	39%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 413 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Tan based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience, 29% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.4), and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.4). The lowest scored item was reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	5%	11%	5%	32%	47%	19	4.1
SOLO.....	2%	4%	13%	40%	41%	91	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	8%	22%	34%	32%	96	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	5%	21%	52%	21%	95	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	6	3.7
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	7%	10%	83%	29	4.8
GOVERNMENT.....	9%	5%	9%	28%	49%	65	4.0
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	38%	63%	8	4.6
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	11%	6%	33%	44%	18	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	0%	17%	34%	45%	29	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	2%	8%	16%	28%	46%	50	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	6%	3%	11%	44%	35%	63	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	4%	21%	32%	42%	101	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	3%	8%	13%	40%	36%	152	4.0
GENDER							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	12%	6%	35%	47%	17	4.2
MALE.....	5%	6%	16%	38%	35%	280	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	15%	34%	48%	116	4.3
CASES HANDLED							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	5%	11%	5%	32%	47%	19	4.1
PROSECUTION.....	33%	33%	17%	17%	0%	6	2.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	17	4.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	5%	5%	7%	32%	51%	81	4.2
CIVIL.....	2%	6%	19%	39%	34%	277	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	13	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							[p<.05]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	6%	38%	44%	16	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	5%	0%	5%	11%	79%	19	4.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	6%	17%	38%	36%	362	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	11%	11%	0%	33%	44%	9	3.9
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	7%	14%	39%	32%	28	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	8%	16%	29%	43%	185	4.0
MODERATE.....	3%	5%	15%	41%	36%	118	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	1%	13%	46%	39%	82	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	16%	11%	16%	53%	19	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	6%	15%	37%	39%	413	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	5%	19%	29%	41%	59	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	40%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	20%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	20%
		Probation/Parole officer	20%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	40%
		6-10 years	20%
		11-15 years	10%
		16-20 years	10%
		20+ years	20%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	100%
		Female.....	0%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	80%
		Fourth District.....	10%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	10%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	20%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20%
		35,000 or over	60%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	56%	1	11%	3	33%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	1	11%	4	44%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	0	0%	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	3.7
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	1	11%	4	44%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	5	56%	1	11%	3	33%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	1	11%	4	44%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	2	22%	3	33%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	1	11%	4	44%	2	22%	2	22%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	1	11%	5	56%	1	11%	2	22%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	1	13%	2	25%	3.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	44%	2	22%	3	33%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 9 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Tan from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 33% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 11% had a moderate amount, and 44% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.0), and ability to control courtroom (4.0). The item scored lowest was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
MALE.....	0%	0%	44%	22%	33%	9	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	44%	22%	33%	9	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	57%
		Guardian Ad Litem	29%
		CASA Volunteer.....	0%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer	14%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	57%
		6-10 years	0%
		11-15 years	29%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	14%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	0%
		Female.....	86%
		No Answer	14%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	86%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	14%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0%
		35,000 or over	86%
		No Answer	14%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SEN K. TAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	4.1
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	2	29%	3	43%	4.1

OVERVIEW: In all, 7 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Tan from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 21%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 13%
		Private, corporate employee 0%
		State judge or judicial officer 19%
		Government 18%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 16%
		11-15 years 12%
		16-20 years 24%
		20+ years 33%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 73%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 7%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 36%
		Mainly civil 42%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 5%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 81%
		Fourth District 7%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	3	2%	7	5%	22	17%	45	35%	53	41%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	3	2%	7	5%	22	17%	45	35%	53	41%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	3	2%	6	5%	21	17%	43	34%	52	42%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	3	2%	7	5%	16	13%	32	25%	70	55%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	4	3%	5	4%	18	14%	30	23%	72	56%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	3	2%	5	4%	13	10%	30	24%	74	59%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	3%	4	3%	14	12%	27	23%	72	60%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	4	3%	2	2%	17	13%	28	22%	77	60%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	4	3%	3	2%	20	16%	25	20%	72	58%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	4	4%	4	4%	18	16%	28	25%	59	52%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	3%	4	3%	16	14%	26	22%	67	58%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	2%	3	3%	21	18%	26	22%	67	56%	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	3%	3	5%	6	10%	16	26%	34	56%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	4%	6	8%	10	13%	18	24%	39	51%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	3	4%	1	1%	9	13%	15	21%	43	61%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	3	2%	6	5%	19	15%	38	30%	61	48%	4.2

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 127 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Torrasi based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 49% had a substantial amount of experience, 17% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.3), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.3), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.3), human understanding and compassion (4.3), reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.3), willingness to work diligently (4.3), settlement skills (4.3), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.1), knowledge of substantive law (4.1), knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.1), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.001]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	0%	67%	6	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	8%	12%	31%	50%	26	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	15%	33%	52%	27	4.4
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	31%	31%	31%	16	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	4%	24%	72%	25	4.7
GOVERNMENT.....	13%	9%	22%	39%	17%	23	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	42%	33%	12	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	5%	15%	30%	45%	20	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	6%	0%	31%	38%	25%	16	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	10%	7%	30%	53%	30	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	2%	5%	14%	27%	52%	44	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%	5	4.4
MALE.....	3%	3%	17%	28%	48%	93	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	7%	10%	41%	41%	29	4.2
CASES HANDLED							
[p<.05]							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	0%	17%	67%	6	4.3
PROSECUTION.....	13%	13%	38%	13%	25%	8	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	22%	22%	56%	9	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	2%	6%	29%	61%	49	4.4
CIVIL.....	2%	6%	19%	37%	37%	52	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	6%	16%	25%	50%	106	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	7	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	18%	45%	36%	11	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	5%	10%	19%	61%	62	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	14%	23%	36%	27%	22	3.8
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	19%	41%	41%	32	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	5%	15%	30%	48%	127	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	11%	0%	6%	39%	44%	18	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	11%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	42%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	14%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	19%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	11%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	31%
		6-10 years.....	19%
		11-15 years.....	14%
		16-20 years.....	14%
		20+ years.....	11%
		No Answer.....	11%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	69%
		Female.....	19%
		No Answer.....	11%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	72%
		Fourth District.....	11%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	14%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	22%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	58%
		35,000 or over.....	8%
		No Answer.....	11%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	2	6%	2	6%	13	37%	8	23%	10	29%	3.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	6%	2	6%	11	33%	8	24%	10	30%	3.7
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	3%	3	9%	13	37%	5	14%	13	37%	3.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	2	6%	5	15%	11	33%	5	15%	10	30%	3.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	6%	3	9%	10	29%	11	31%	9	26%	3.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	3%	0	0%	14	40%	8	23%	12	34%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	2	6%	12	38%	8	25%	10	31%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	3%	1	3%	13	39%	10	30%	8	24%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	3%	0	0%	14	45%	8	26%	8	26%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	4%	2	8%	10	42%	5	21%	6	25%	3.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	9%	6	18%	9	27%	7	21%	8	24%	3.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	11%	3	16%	6	32%	3	16%	5	26%	3.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	6%	3	9%	14	40%	6	17%	10	29%	3.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 35 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Torrisi from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 51% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 29% had a moderate amount, and 17% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest scored item was human understanding and compassion (3.9). The items scored lowest were: consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.3) and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4	2.8
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	25%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.3
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	7%	7%	33%	33%	20%	15	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	5	3.6
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	6	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4	2.8
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	9%	45%	18%	27%	11	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	14%	0%	14%	29%	43%	7	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	5	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	25%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4	2.8
MALE.....	4%	4%	50%	21%	21%	24	3.5
FEMALE.....	0%	14%	14%	14%	57%	7	4.1
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	20%	20%	40%	0%	20%	5	2.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	8%	35%	23%	31%	26	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	0%	25%	4	2.8
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	63%	13%	25%	8	3.6
2,000-35,000.....	5%	10%	35%	25%	25%	20	3.6
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	11%	17%	39%	11%	22%	18	3.2
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	60%	10%	30%	10	3.7
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	5	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	6%	9%	40%	17%	29%	35	3.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	67%
		Guardian Ad Litem	33%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	33%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	17%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	17%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	33%
		Female	67%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	17%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	50%
		35,000 or over	33%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FRED TORRISI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	2	33%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33%	3.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	0	0%	2	33%	3.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 6 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Torrissi from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "good" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 16%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 9%
		Government 19%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 8%
		6-10 years 12%
		11-15 years 17%
		16-20 years 22%
		20+ years 36%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 70%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 8%
		Mixed criminal and civil 27%
		Mainly civil 51%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 90%
		Fourth District 1%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	1%	24	6%	69	16%	187	43%	149	34%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law.....	9	2%	13	3%	83	19%	171	40%	156	36%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	7	2%	11	3%	74	18%	170	40%	160	38%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	6	1%	20	5%	56	13%	133	30%	223	51%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	8	2%	18	4%	57	13%	118	27%	231	53%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	5	1%	7	2%	46	11%	122	28%	250	58%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	2%	15	4%	60	14%	120	29%	211	51%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	8	2%	11	3%	36	8%	113	26%	267	61%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	8	2%	13	3%	47	11%	126	29%	236	55%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	9	2%	13	3%	55	13%	150	36%	190	46%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	22	5%	31	7%	73	17%	151	36%	147	35%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	11	3%	29	7%	66	16%	142	33%	176	42%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	9	4%	11	5%	39	16%	79	33%	99	42%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	4	2%	7	3%	30	13%	71	31%	115	51%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	7	3%	7	3%	32	15%	68	32%	100	47%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	8	2%	23	5%	63	15%	153	35%	186	43%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 433 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Wolverton based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest mean scores came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4) and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.4). The lowest scored was reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p < .01]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	9%	41%	50%	22	4.4
SOLO.....	1%	4%	13%	34%	48%	106	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	7%	19%	31%	41%	100	4.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	4%	14%	39%	41%	69	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%	4	3.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	8%	23%	68%	40	4.6
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	5%	9%	18%	39%	29%	82	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
[p < .05]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	5%	32%	63%	19	4.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	9%	25%	38%	28%	32	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	2%	11%	13%	41%	33%	54	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	1%	15%	39%	39%	74	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	4%	13%	37%	46%	95	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	2%	6%	15%	31%	47%	159	4.1
[p < .05]							
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	37%	53%	19	4.4
MALE.....	2%	6%	14%	34%	43%	306	4.1
FEMALE.....	1%	4%	17%	39%	40%	108	4.1
[p < .05]							
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	10%	10%	33%	48%	21	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	5%	5%	27%	55%	9%	22	3.6
CRIMINAL.....	0%	3%	14%	34%	49%	35	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	1%	4%	15%	27%	53%	117	4.3
CIVIL.....	3%	6%	14%	39%	39%	222	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	6%	13%	25%	56%	16	4.3
[p < .05]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	6%	35%	59%	17	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	6%	19%	19%	19%	38%	16	3.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	5%	15%	36%	42%	388	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	40%	0%	40%	20%	5	3.4
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
[p < .05]							
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	9%	11%	34%	43%	35	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	6%	12%	32%	46%	194	4.1
MODERATE.....	1%	3%	15%	38%	43%	119	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	20%	40%	35%	85	4.1
[p < .05]							
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	16%	32%	42%	19	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	5%	15%	35%	43%	433	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	4%	23%	36%	36%	53	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	24%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	44%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	2%
		Probation/Parole officer	17%
		Other.....	6%
		No Answer	6%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	31%
		6-10 years	17%
		11-15 years	17%
		16-20 years	15%
		20+ years	13%
		No Answer	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	76%
		Female.....	20%
		No Answer	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	90%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	6%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	19%
		35,000 or over	70%
		No Answer	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	3	4%	10	12%	32	38%	40	47%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	2%	12	14%	27	32%	43	51%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	2	2%	12	14%	32	38%	39	46%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	2	2%	15	18%	31	37%	35	42%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	2	2%	11	13%	28	33%	44	52%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	3	4%	13	16%	24	29%	43	52%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	1	1%	11	13%	29	35%	42	51%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	1	1%	14	17%	34	41%	33	40%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	3%	1	1%	10	14%	26	35%	35	47%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	2%	1	2%	10	16%	24	39%	26	42%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	4	5%	15	19%	27	34%	34	43%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	2	4%	8	16%	14	29%	25	51%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	4	5%	9	11%	35	41%	37	44%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 85 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Wolverton from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 36% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 32% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored items were: equal treatment of all parties (4.3), sense of basic fairness and justice (4.3), conduct free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety (4.3), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.3), human understanding and compassion (4.3), ability to control courtroom (4.3), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3). The lowest scored item was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	5%	57%	38%	21	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	11%	5%	43%	41%	37	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	20%	33%	47%	15	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	37%	44%	27	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	20%	7%	40%	33%	15	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	7%	0%	40%	53%	15	4.4
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	77%	23%	13	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	20%	10%	70%	10	4.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
MALE.....	0%	3%	9%	43%	45%	65	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	13%	13%	38%	38%	16	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	5%	8%	43%	43%	76	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	13%	0%	40%	47%	15	4.2
OVER 35,000.....	0%	3%	10%	43%	43%	60	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	78%	11%	9	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	10%	10%	29%	52%	31	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	4%	7%	37%	52%	27	4.4
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	18	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	5%	11%	41%	44%	85	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	22%	11%	22%	44%	9	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	58%
		Guardian Ad Litem	25%
		CASA Volunteer	17%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	50%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	8%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	8%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	8%
		35,000 or over	83%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. WOLVERTON

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	4	33%	6	50%	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	4	33%	6	50%	4.2
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%	8	67%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	8%	2	17%	3	25%	6	50%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	4	33%	6	50%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 12 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litens/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Wolverton from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 9%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 18%
		Government 22%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 0%
		No Answer 3%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 12%
		6-10 years 12%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 22%
		20+ years 33%
		No Answer 3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 70%
		Female 28%
		No Answer 2%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 11%
		Mainly criminal 9%
		Mixed criminal and civil 40%
		Mainly civil 35%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 2%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 2%
		Second District 2%
		Third District 91%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	4	2%	11	4%	47	18%	87	34%	108	42%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	5	2%	12	5%	44	17%	79	31%	113	45%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	5	2%	12	5%	36	15%	81	33%	114	46%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	12	5%	25	10%	37	14%	65	25%	120	46%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	12	5%	21	8%	36	14%	60	23%	128	50%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	9	3%	12	5%	37	14%	70	27%	130	50%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	3%	9	4%	39	16%	65	26%	128	51%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	18	7%	28	11%	42	16%	58	22%	113	44%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	7	3%	18	7%	39	15%	63	25%	128	50%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	2%	9	4%	45	18%	77	31%	108	44%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	1%	14	6%	46	19%	83	34%	95	39%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	5	2%	7	3%	39	16%	80	33%	111	46%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	1%	10	7%	28	19%	38	26%	71	48%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	9	5%	14	8%	21	11%	51	28%	89	48%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	3	2%	11	8%	20	14%	34	23%	77	53%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	11	4%	15	6%	45	18%	81	32%	105	41%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 257 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Ashman based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 51% had a substantial amount of experience, 24% had a moderate amount, and 17% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean scores came for knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.2), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.2), willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.2), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.2). The lowest mean score came for courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
SOLO.....	4%	7%	7%	42%	40%	57	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	3%	26%	28%	43%	58	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	4%	4%	17%	38%	38%	24	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	4%	0%	13%	17%	66%	47	4.4
GOVERNMENT.....	11%	15%	20%	33%	20%	54	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	8	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	7%	3%	27%	30%	33%	30	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	10%	10%	23%	23%	33%	30	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	4%	11%	17%	28%	39%	46	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	4%	5%	16%	39%	37%	57	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	2%	3%	14%	33%	48%	86	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	6	3.8
MALE.....	3%	6%	16%	33%	43%	180	4.1
FEMALE.....	7%	6%	23%	28%	37%	71	3.8
CASES HANDLED							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	6	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	14%	21%	29%	14%	21%	28	3.1
CRIMINAL.....	0%	8%	29%	25%	38%	24	3.9
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	4%	4%	14%	25%	53%	103	4.2
CIVIL.....	3%	2%	16%	46%	33%	90	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	6%	18%	30%	41%	233	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	0%	14%	41%	41%	22	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	6%	10%	21%	19%	44%	131	3.9
MODERATE.....	2%	3%	11%	49%	34%	61	4.1
LIMITED.....	2%	0%	19%	40%	40%	43	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	15%	46%	31%	13	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	6%	18%	32%	41%	257	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	6%	6%	18%	38%	32%	34	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	48%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	27%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	7%
		Other.....	9%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	17%
		6-10 years.....	31%
		11-15 years.....	11%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	13%
		No Answer.....	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	79%
		Female.....	16%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	8%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	81%
		Fourth District.....	4%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	24%
		35,000 or over.....	64%
		No Answer.....	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	1%	1	1%	18	25%	20	27%	33	45%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	1%	2	3%	15	21%	16	22%	38	53%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	2	3%	13	18%	23	32%	34	47%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	1%	4	6%	13	19%	21	30%	31	44%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	3	4%	18	25%	22	30%	30	41%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	0	0%	14	19%	26	36%	31	43%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom	1	1%	1	1%	16	23%	16	23%	36	51%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	3%	4	6%	13	19%	19	28%	30	44%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	13	21%	19	31%	29	47%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	2	4%	1	2%	9	17%	17	33%	23	44%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	3%	1	2%	14	21%	19	29%	30	45%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	3%	9	23%	9	23%	20	51%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1%	2	3%	15	20%	18	24%	39	52%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 75 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Ashman from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 21% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored items were: sense of basic fairness and justice (4.2), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), human understanding and compassion (4.2), ability to control courtroom (4.2), willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.2), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.2). The lowest score was reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	6%	14%	25%	56%	36	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	5%	0%	30%	25%	40%	20	4.0
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	7	4.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	31%	23%	46%	13	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	4%	17%	22%	57%	23	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	8	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	6%	31%	19%	44%	16	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	10%	0%	10%	30%	50%	10	4.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
MALE.....	2%	3%	20%	24%	51%	59	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	12	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	6	5.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	2%	21%	28%	48%	61	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	3	3.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	40%	0%	60%	5	4.2
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	11%	22%	67%	18	4.6
OVER 35,000.....	2%	4%	23%	27%	44%	48	4.1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	0%	43%	14%	29%	7	[p<.05] 3.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	3%	12%	21%	65%	34	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	6%	6%	44%	44%	16	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	39%	17%	44%	18	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	20%	24%	52%	75	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	17%	83%	0%	6	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	80%
		Guardian Ad Litem	20%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	80%
		6-10 years	20%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	60%
		Fourth District	40%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20%
		35,000 or over	80%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 4 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Ashman from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 11%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 20%
		Government 17%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 3%
		Other 0%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 13%
		11-15 years 13%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 37%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 74%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 8%
		Mainly criminal 9%
		Mixed criminal and civil 37%
		Mainly civil 42%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 86%
		Fourth District 5%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	2	2%	1	1%	8	8%	37	39%	48	50%	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law.....	2	2%	0	0%	8	8%	36	38%	50	52%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	2	2%	1	1%	8	9%	32	34%	50	54%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	2	2%	1	1%	5	5%	28	29%	59	62%	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	2%	0	0%	7	7%	22	23%	65	68%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	0	0%	5	5%	24	26%	63	68%	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	1%	0	0%	8	9%	27	30%	55	60%	4.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	1	1%	3	3%	24	26%	65	69%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	2%	0	0%	4	4%	23	25%	64	69%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	1%	0	0%	3	4%	26	33%	50	63%	4.6
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	2%	1	1%	5	6%	27	31%	52	60%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	2%	0	0%	4	4%	26	28%	61	66%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	2%	0	0%	3	6%	14	27%	34	65%	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	0	0%	4	7%	13	22%	42	70%	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	0	0%	4	7%	15	26%	38	66%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	2%	0	0%	5	5%	35	36%	55	57%	4.5

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 97 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Bolger based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 51% had a substantial amount of experience, 21% had a moderate amount, and 27% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.5). The highest mean scores came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.6), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.6), human understanding and compassion (4.6), ability to control courtroom (4.6), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.6). The lowest scored item was legal and factual analysis (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
SOLO.....	5%	0%	5%	50%	40%	20	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	5%	0%	0%	43%	52%	21	4.4
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	9%	45%	45%	11	4.4
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	20	4.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%	10	4.7
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	18%	27%	55%	11	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	8%	0%	0%	54%	38%	13	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	22	4.6
21+ YEARS.....	3%	0%	8%	32%	57%	37	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
MALE.....	3%	0%	4%	34%	59%	73	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	10%	43%	48%	21	4.4
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	8	4.9
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	11%	11%	78%	9	4.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	6%	0%	3%	19%	72%	36	4.5
CIVIL.....	0%	0%	8%	60%	33%	40	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	0%	4%	34%	60%	85	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	[p<.05] 4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	0%	2%	20%	76%	49	4.7
MODERATE.....	5%	0%	10%	45%	40%	20	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	8%	58%	35%	26	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....							
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	0%	5%	36%	57%	97	4.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	56%	44%	9	4.4
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	23%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	23%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	9%
		Probation/Parole officer	14%
		Other.....	23%
		No Answer	9%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	32%
		6-10 years	27%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	14%
		20+ years	14%
		No Answer	14%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	64%
		Female.....	27%
		No Answer	9%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	82%
		Fourth District.....	5%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	14%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	14%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	55%
		35,000 or over	23%
		No Answer	9%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	16%	3	16%	13	68%	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	16%	3	16%	13	68%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	15%	3	15%	14	70%	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	15%	6	30%	11	55%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	4	20%	14	70%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	4	20%	14	70%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	5	29%	11	65%	4.6
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	21%	3	16%	12	63%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	15%	2	10%	15	75%	4.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	21%	2	14%	9	64%	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	5	29%	9	53%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	3	23%	7	54%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	20%	4	20%	12	60%	4.4

OVERVIEW: In all, 20 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Bolger from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 60% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 15% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.6), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.6), human understanding and compassion (4.6), ability to control courtroom (4.6), and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.6). The item scored lowest was talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%	7	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	15%	23%	62%	13	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	12%	24%	65%	17	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	[p<.05] 5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	17%	25%	58%	12	4.4
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	25%	8%	67%	12	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	4	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	20	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	25%
		CASA Volunteer	25%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	0%
		6-10 years	75%
		11-15 years	25%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	50%
		Female	50%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	25%
		Third District	75%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	50%
		35,000 or over	50%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	5.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 4 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Bolger from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 24%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 11%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 12%
		Government 22%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 8%
		6-10 years 15%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 21%
		20+ years 37%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 72%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 9%
		Mainly criminal 10%
		Mixed criminal and civil 34%
		Mainly civil 42%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 2%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 4%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	0%	10	3%	61	20%	124	41%	110	36%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	1	0%	6	2%	61	20%	128	42%	110	36%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	0%	6	2%	54	18%	123	41%	119	39%	4.2
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	2	1%	25	8%	49	16%	107	35%	122	40%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	4	1%	23	8%	46	15%	109	36%	123	40%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	0%	10	3%	47	16%	91	30%	153	51%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	1%	16	5%	46	16%	92	32%	135	46%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	4	1%	30	10%	64	21%	90	30%	117	38%	3.9
Human understanding and compassion.....	4	1%	29	10%	58	19%	104	35%	105	35%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	0%	8	3%	44	15%	108	36%	141	47%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	1%	5	2%	54	18%	115	39%	119	40%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	1%	8	3%	47	16%	112	39%	120	42%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	7	5%	20	14%	54	37%	63	43%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	1%	10	5%	34	17%	67	34%	85	43%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	1%	6	4%	19	14%	48	34%	65	46%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	0%	17	6%	52	17%	119	39%	117	38%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 306 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Finn based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 42% had a substantial amount of experience, 29% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest mean scores came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.3) and ability to control courtroom (4.3). The lowest scored items were: courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.9) and human understanding and compassion (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.01]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	31%	23%	46%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	1%	5%	14%	47%	32%	74	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	9%	25%	37%	29%	68	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	3%	9%	61%	27%	33	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	5	3.2
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	3%	3%	25%	69%	36	4.6
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	6%	19%	31%	44%	68	4.1
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
[p<.05]							
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	18%	18%	64%	11	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	8%	31%	19%	42%	26	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	9%	15%	28%	48%	46	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	0%	24%	52%	22%	46	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	11%	18%	38%	32%	65	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	0%	4%	11%	45%	41%	112	4.2
[p<.05]							
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	36%	18%	45%	11	4.1
MALE.....	0%	5%	15%	44%	35%	223	4.1
FEMALE.....	0%	7%	21%	26%	46%	72	4.1
[p<.05]							
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	30%	20%	50%	10	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	17%	28%	55%	29	4.4
CRIMINAL.....	0%	17%	20%	40%	23%	30	3.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	1%	9%	20%	27%	43%	103	4.0
CIVIL.....	0%	2%	13%	52%	33%	128	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
[p<.05]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	10	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%	7	3.7
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	6%	16%	39%	38%	271	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	8%	58%	12	4.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
[p<.05]							
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	36%	44%	25	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	8%	11%	31%	49%	127	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	2%	19%	44%	34%	88	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	8%	24%	47%	21%	66	3.8
[p<.05]							
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%	10	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	6%	17%	39%	38%	306	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	5%	10%	18%	48%	20%	40	3.7
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	36%
	Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	48%
	Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
	Probation/Parole officer	1%
	Other.....	7%
	No Answer	5%
2. <u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	24%
	6-10 years	15%
	11-15 years	15%
	16-20 years	20%
	20+ years	20%
	No Answer	7%
3. <u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
	Female.....	12%
	No Answer	5%
4. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	1%
	Second District.....	0%
	Third District.....	87%
	Fourth District.....	5%
	Outside Alaska.....	0%
	No Answer	7%
5. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	8%
	35,000 or over	83%
	No Answer	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	1	1%	0	0%	5	7%	28	38%	40	54%	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	1%	0	0%	5	7%	23	32%	44	60%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	0	0%	6	8%	23	32%	43	59%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	1%	0	0%	6	8%	24	34%	40	56%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	1	1%	9	12%	22	29%	43	57%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	15%	23	31%	41	55%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	12%	22	30%	42	58%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	10%	26	37%	37	53%	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	11%	23	37%	33	52%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	1	2%	8	14%	21	38%	26	46%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	0	0%	7	11%	26	39%	32	48%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	14%	15	31%	26	53%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	1%	0	0%	8	11%	27	36%	38	51%	4.4

OVERVIEW: In all, 74 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Finn from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 23% had a moderate amount, and 27% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest scored items were: sense of basic fairness and justice (4.5), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5), and ability to control courtroom (4.5). The items scored lowest were: settlement skills (4.3), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.3), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	44%	44%	27	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	3%	0%	9%	31%	57%	35	4.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	28%	56%	18	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	55%	45%	11	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	27%	73%	11	4.7
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	7%	40%	53%	15	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	7%	0%	21%	36%	36%	14	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
MALE.....	2%	0%	11%	38%	49%	61	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	11%	22%	67%	9	4.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	9%	38%	53%	64	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	25%	0%	25%	0%	50%	4	3.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
OVER 35,000.....	2%	0%	10%	36%	52%	61	4.4
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	14	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	0%	4%	22%	70%	23	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	12%	41%	47%	17	4.4
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	15%	40%	45%	20	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	0%	11%	36%	51%	74	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	12	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 67%
		Guardian Ad Litem0%
		CASA Volunteer0%
		Other0%
		No Answer 33%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years 67%
		6-10 years0%
		11-15 years0%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male0%
		Female 67%
		No Answer 33%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District0%
		Third District 67%
		Fourth District0%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer 33%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,0000%
		Between 2,000 and 35,0000%
		35,000 or over 67%
		No Answer 33%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 3 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Finn from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	9%
		Private, corporate employee	2%
		State judge or judicial officer	14%
		Government	27%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	1%
		Other	1%
		No Answer	3%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	16%
		6-10 years	20%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	19%
		20+ years.....	27%
		No Answer.....	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	69%
		Female	28%
		No Answer.....	3%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	13%
		Mainly criminal	10%
		Mixed criminal and civil	39%
		Mainly civil.....	32%
		Other	3%
		No Answer.....	3%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District	1%
		Third District	88%
		Fourth District	2%
		Not in Alaska.....	2%
		No Answer.....	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	7	5%	11	8%	25	18%	54	38%	44	31%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law.....	7	5%	15	11%	30	21%	44	31%	45	32%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	4%	12	9%	29	21%	46	33%	47	34%	3.8
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	7	5%	10	7%	24	16%	38	26%	68	46%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	8	5%	6	4%	26	18%	34	23%	72	49%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	8	6%	2	1%	21	15%	38	26%	75	52%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	7	5%	9	7%	21	15%	35	26%	65	47%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	4%	8	5%	22	15%	33	22%	78	53%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	6	4%	7	5%	24	16%	36	24%	74	50%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	4%	4	3%	31	23%	35	26%	59	44%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	4	3%	4	3%	24	18%	43	33%	55	42%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	5	4%	6	5%	19	14%	43	33%	59	45%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	4	5%	3	4%	8	11%	23	31%	36	49%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	4	4%	2	2%	15	14%	29	27%	57	53%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	6	8%	3	4%	9	12%	13	17%	44	59%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	8	5%	9	6%	25	17%	48	33%	56	38%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 146 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Lombardi based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 53% had a substantial amount of experience, 21% had a moderate amount, and 19% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean scores came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.2). The lowest scored item was knowledge of substantive law (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL		
						n	Mean	
								[p<.01]
TYPE OF PRACTICE								
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4	
SOLO.....	6%	6%	25%	38%	25%	32	3.7	
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	3%	23%	40%	33%	30	4.0	
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	14%	14%	7%	36%	29%	14	3.5	
CORPORATE.....	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	3	3.0	
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	5%	10%	85%	20	4.8	
GOVERNMENT.....	10%	5%	18%	33%	33%	39	3.7	
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5	
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0	
LENGTH OF PRACTICE								
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2	
1-5 YEARS.....	9%	0%	9%	43%	39%	23	4.0	
6-10 YEARS.....	11%	4%	22%	26%	37%	27	3.7	
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	5%	18%	45%	27%	22	3.9	
16-20 YEARS.....	4%	11%	18%	21%	46%	28	4.0	
21+ YEARS.....	2%	10%	17%	32%	39%	41	4.0	
GENDER								
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5	
MALE.....	7%	6%	20%	33%	34%	102	3.8	
FEMALE.....	3%	8%	13%	30%	48%	40	4.1	
CASES HANDLED							[p<.01]	
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5	
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	16%	47%	37%	19	4.2	
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	16	4.1	
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	2%	15%	32%	47%	59	4.2	
CIVIL.....	13%	13%	20%	27%	27%	45	3.4	
OTHER.....	0%	67%	0%	0%	33%	3	3.0	
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							[p<.01]	
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6	
FIRST DISTRICT.....	50%	0%	17%	33%	0%	6	2.3	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	7%	18%	33%	38%	129	3.9	
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7	
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0	
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE								
NO ANSWER.....	20%	10%	10%	50%	10%	10	3.2	
SUBSTANTIAL.....	6%	5%	12%	28%	49%	78	4.1	
MODERATE.....	3%	7%	23%	37%	30%	30	3.8	
LIMITED.....	0%	7%	29%	36%	29%	28	3.9	
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							[p<.05]	
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0		
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	5%	6%	17%	33%	38%	146	3.9	
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	6%	29%	24%	29%	12%	17	3.1	
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	29%	14%	14%	43%	7	3.7	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	44%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	28%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	6%
		Probation/Parole officer	8%
		Other.....	8%
		No Answer	6%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	19%
		6-10 years	22%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	14%
		20+ years	22%
		No Answer	8%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	11%
		No Answer	6%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	6%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	83%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	8%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	6%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	17%
		35,000 or over	72%
		No Answer	6%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	20%	15	43%	13	37%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	20%	15	43%	13	37%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	20%	14	40%	14	40%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	3%	8	23%	12	34%	14	40%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	17	49%	14	40%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	17%	17	49%	12	34%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	26%	13	37%	13	37%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	3%	9	27%	11	33%	12	36%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	26%	12	39%	11	35%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	29%	10	32%	12	39%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	1	3%	8	24%	12	36%	12	36%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	26%	8	35%	9	39%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	23%	14	40%	13	37%	4.1

OVERVIEW: In all, 35 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Lombardi from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 34% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 23% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.3). The items scored lowest was reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	16	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	9	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	8	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	0%	60%	5	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	8	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
MALE.....	0%	0%	24%	41%	34%	29	4.1
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	45%	38%	29	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
OVER 35,000.....	0%	0%	15%	42%	42%	26	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	17%	42%	42%	12	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	38%	25%	38%	8	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%	8	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	23%	40%	37%	35	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	60%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	40%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	40%
		6-10 years	60%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	20%
		Female	80%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	40%
		Second District	40%
		Third District	20%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20%
		35,000 or over	80%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	4.0
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 4 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Lombardi from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	14%
		Private, corporate employee	1%
		State judge or judicial officer	10%
		Government	18%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	1%
		Other	1%
		No Answer	6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	9%
		6-10 years	13%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	17%
		20+ years.....	42%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	74%
		Female	20%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7%
		Mainly criminal	8%
		Mixed criminal and civil	33%
		Mainly civil.....	44%
		Other	2%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District	1%
		Third District	91%
		Fourth District	1%
		Not in Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	10	3%	19	7%	73	25%	112	39%	74	26%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	9	3%	20	7%	74	26%	109	38%	75	26%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	8	3%	18	6%	75	26%	104	36%	80	28%	3.8
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	11	4%	15	5%	51	18%	102	36%	104	37%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	10	4%	16	6%	52	18%	100	35%	107	38%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	11	4%	4	1%	51	18%	88	31%	131	46%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	9	3%	9	3%	49	18%	93	35%	106	40%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	10	3%	10	3%	42	15%	81	28%	146	51%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	12	4%	14	5%	49	17%	90	31%	121	42%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	9	3%	15	5%	69	25%	86	31%	97	35%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	12	5%	16	6%	64	25%	92	35%	76	29%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	8	3%	16	6%	50	19%	98	37%	92	35%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	6	4%	9	7%	28	20%	49	36%	45	33%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	7	4%	7	4%	40	23%	63	37%	55	32%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	5	4%	4	4%	27	24%	39	34%	39	34%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	11	4%	13	5%	59	21%	116	41%	85	30%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 284 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Wanamaker based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 44% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 19% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean score came for courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.2). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.8), knowledge of substantive law (3.8), knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.8), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	24%	29%	35%	17	3.8
SOLO.....	3%	1%	17%	42%	36%	69	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	7%	7%	21%	40%	25%	68	3.7
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	0%	24%	39%	34%	41	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	6%	24%	54%	14%	50	3.7
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	25%	31%	31%	16	3.8
1-5 YEARS.....	4%	19%	33%	33%	11%	27	3.3
6-10 YEARS.....	3%	3%	15%	41%	38%	34	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	8%	0%	33%	44%	15%	39	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	4%	2%	23%	45%	26%	47	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	2%	4%	14%	41%	38%	121	4.1
[p<.01]							
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	7%	27%	27%	33%	15	3.7
MALE.....	4%	4%	18%	44%	31%	212	3.9
FEMALE.....	4%	7%	30%	33%	26%	57	3.7
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	7%	20%	33%	33%	15	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	0%	5%	21%	63%	11%	19	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	8%	16%	32%	36%	8%	25	3.2
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	4%	6%	21%	33%	36%	95	3.9
CIVIL.....	3%	1%	18%	47%	31%	124	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	17%	50%	6	4.2
[p<.05]							
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	7%	27%	27%	33%	15	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	5	4.2
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	5%	21%	41%	30%	258	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	13%	10%	50%	23%	30	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	8%	6%	22%	34%	30%	125	3.7
MODERATE.....	0%	1%	21%	41%	37%	76	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	23%	51%	25%	53	4.0
[p<.05]							
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	9	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	5%	21%	41%	30%	284	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	5%	20%	34%	39%	41	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	28%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	46%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	4%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	7%
		Other.....	9%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	33%
		6-10 years.....	15%
		11-15 years.....	15%
		16-20 years.....	15%
		20+ years.....	13%
		No Answer.....	9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	85%
		Female.....	9%
		No Answer.....	7%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	87%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	9%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000.....	7%
		35,000 or over.....	78%
		No Answer.....	7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	1	2%	1	2%	11	24%	14	31%	18	40%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	2%	1	2%	11	25%	16	36%	15	34%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	2%	1	2%	9	21%	15	35%	17	40%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	2%	2	5%	11	25%	14	32%	16	36%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	2%	1	2%	10	22%	16	36%	17	38%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	2%	3	7%	9	20%	17	38%	15	33%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	2%	3	7%	15	36%	7	17%	16	38%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	4	10%	2	5%	13	31%	12	29%	11	26%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	6%	1	3%	10	28%	11	31%	12	33%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	3%	2	6%	10	29%	12	35%	9	26%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	3	7%	11	26%	13	31%	14	33%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	4%	1	4%	9	36%	5	20%	9	36%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	2%	3	7%	10	22%	18	40%	13	29%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 45 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Wanamaker from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 36% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 7% had a moderate amount, and 33% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest scored item was conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.1). The item scored lowest was reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
STATE OFFICER.....	8%	17%	17%	42%	17%	12	3.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	24%	43%	33%	21	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	7%	33%	27%	33%	15	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	29%	0%	57%	14%	7	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	17%	0%	17%	50%	17%	6	3.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
MALE.....	3%	8%	26%	37%	26%	38	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	8%	21%	41%	28%	39	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
OVER 35,000.....	3%	9%	23%	46%	20%	35	3.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	27%	55%	18%	11	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	19%	31%	25%	25%	16	3.6
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
LIMITED.....	7%	0%	13%	53%	27%	15	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	8	3.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	7%	22%	40%	29%	45	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker0%
		Guardian Ad Litem 100%
		CASA Volunteer.....0%
		Other.....0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years0%
		6-10 years 100%
		11-15 years0%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....0%
		Female 100%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District.....0%
		Third District..... 100%
		Fourth District.....0%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,0000%
		35,000 or over 100%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	.
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	.
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Wanamaker from their direct professional experience. The overall mean score was in the “unacceptable” range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	12%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	17%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	9%
		Private, corporate employee	1%
		State judge or judicial officer	22%
		Government	28%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	4%
		Other	2%
		No Answer	5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	12%
		6-10 years	8%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	24%
		20+ years.....	39%
		No Answer.....	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67%
		Female	28%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	11%
		Mainly criminal	12%
		Mixed criminal and civil	34%
		Mainly civil.....	35%
		Other	4%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	5%
		Second District	2%
		Third District	58%
		Fourth District	31%
		Not in Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	8	5%	25	15%	62	37%	53	32%	18	11%	3.3
Knowledge of substantive law.....	7	4%	21	13%	65	39%	53	32%	19	12%	3.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	8	5%	23	14%	60	37%	51	31%	20	12%	3.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	10	6%	25	15%	43	26%	53	32%	35	21%	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	8	5%	24	14%	42	25%	51	31%	42	25%	3.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	10	6%	18	11%	38	23%	47	29%	51	31%	3.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	8	5%	19	12%	47	30%	38	25%	43	28%	3.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	4	2%	9	5%	35	21%	51	31%	66	40%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	5	3%	19	12%	38	23%	52	32%	50	30%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom.....	8	5%	17	11%	47	31%	46	31%	32	21%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	5	3%	17	12%	48	33%	50	34%	26	18%	3.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	5	3%	13	9%	47	32%	50	34%	33	22%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	4	7%	3	5%	20	33%	21	35%	12	20%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	5	5%	9	9%	38	37%	30	29%	22	21%	3.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	6	7%	8	9%	25	28%	27	30%	23	26%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	7	4%	23	14%	52	32%	53	33%	28	17%	3.4

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 163 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Curda based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 42% had a substantial amount of experience, 28% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "acceptable" range (3.4). The highest mean score came for courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.0). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.3), knowledge of substantive law (3.3), and knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	11%	67%	11%	9	3.8
SOLO.....	5%	19%	10%	52%	14%	21	3.5
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	8%	12%	38%	27%	15%	26	3.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	7%	13%	27%	40%	13%	15	3.4
CORPORATE.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	3%	11%	29%	20%	37%	35	3.8
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	15%	41%	30%	11%	46	3.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	17%	17%	50%	17%	0%	6	2.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	7	3.6
1-5 YEARS.....	11%	21%	37%	11%	21%	19	3.1
6-10 YEARS.....	8%	38%	15%	38%	0%	13	2.8
11-15 YEARS.....	10%	10%	24%	38%	19%	21	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	3%	15%	38%	33%	13%	40	3.4
21+ YEARS.....	2%	8%	33%	35%	22%	63	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	13%	38%	25%	8	3.6
MALE.....	5%	12%	30%	35%	17%	110	3.5
FEMALE.....	2%	18%	40%	24%	16%	45	3.3
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	13%	50%	13%	8	3.5
PROSECUTION.....	5%	11%	42%	37%	5%	19	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	10%	30%	45%	5%	10%	20	2.8
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	11%	33%	27%	27%	55	3.7
CIVIL.....	5%	13%	25%	45%	13%	56	3.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	6	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	33%	11%	33%	22%	9	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	6%	12%	35%	33%	15%	95	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	16%	34%	28%	20%	50	3.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	13%	13%	13%	50%	13%	8	3.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	15%	32%	22%	24%	68	3.4
MODERATE.....	2%	11%	41%	35%	11%	46	3.4
LIMITED.....	0%	17%	24%	44%	15%	41	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	14%	32%	33%	17%	163	3.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	12%	24%	32%	20%	12%	25	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0

[p < .05]

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	32%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	13%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	13%
		Probation/Parole officer	26%
		Other.....	11%
		No Answer	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	24%
		6-10 years	37%
		11-15 years	8%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years	5%
		No Answer	8%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	71%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	8%
		Second District.....	11%
		Third District.....	24%
		Fourth District.....	50%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	8%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	18%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	58%
		35,000 or over	18%
		No Answer	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	1	3%	3	9%	6	18%	13	38%	11	32%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	3%	2	6%	7	21%	14	41%	10	29%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	3%	3	9%	4	12%	18	53%	8	24%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	2	6%	5	15%	7	21%	14	41%	6	18%	3.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	0	0%	6	17%	11	31%	17	49%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	3%	6	18%	9	26%	18	53%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	2	6%	4	13%	6	19%	8	25%	12	38%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	3%	6	18%	4	12%	16	47%	7	21%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	22%	14	44%	10	31%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	4%	1	4%	6	26%	8	35%	7	30%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	6%	2	6%	8	24%	11	33%	10	30%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	5%	1	5%	5	25%	5	25%	8	40%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	6%	3	9%	6	17%	13	37%	11	31%	3.8

OVERVIEW: In all, 35 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Curda from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 63% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 14% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest scored item was human understanding and compassion (4.3). The item scored lowest was makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.5).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
STATE OFFICER.....	8%	8%	17%	33%	33%	12	3.8
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	10%	0%	10%	60%	20%	10	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	13%	13%	50%	25%	8	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	8%	0%	8%	38%	46%	13	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	14%	14%	29%	43%	0%	7	3.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
MALE.....	4%	7%	19%	37%	33%	27	3.9
FEMALE.....	17%	0%	0%	50%	33%	6	3.8
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	3	2.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	11%	0%	11%	44%	33%	9	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	6%	12%	6%	35%	41%	17	3.9
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
2,000-35,000.....	5%	10%	20%	40%	25%	20	3.7
OVER 35,000.....	14%	0%	0%	43%	43%	7	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	14%	18%	36%	27%	22	3.7
MODERATE.....	20%	0%	40%	0%	40%	5	3.4
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	71%	29%	7	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	3	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	6%	9%	17%	37%	31%	35	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	70%
		Guardian Ad Litem	20%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	10%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	60%
		6-10 years	20%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	10%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	10%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	10%
		Female	80%
		No Answer	10%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	10%
		Third District	30%
		Fourth District	50%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	10%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	30%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	40%
		35,000 or over	20%
		No Answer	10%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE DALE O. CURDA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	5	50%	4	40%	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	40%	3	30%	3	30%	3.9
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	4	40%	4	40%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	5	50%	2	20%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	5	50%	3	30%	4.1

OVERVIEW: In all, 10 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Curda from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range except reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8) and impartiality/fairness (3.9) which were in the "good" range.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 20%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 18%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 18%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 13%
		Government 21%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 3%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 7%
		6-10 years 10%
		11-15 years 17%
		16-20 years 25%
		20+ years 37%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 72%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 29%
		Mainly civil 52%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 6%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 56%
		Fourth District 33%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	2%	14	5%	28	9%	77	25%	186	60%	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law.....	6	2%	9	3%	30	10%	72	23%	193	62%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	2%	9	3%	27	9%	65	21%	197	65%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	17	6%	34	11%	49	16%	94	31%	111	36%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	17	6%	29	9%	54	18%	91	30%	116	38%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	14	5%	13	4%	49	16%	74	24%	153	50%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	11	4%	15	5%	35	12%	71	24%	168	56%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	35	11%	54	18%	86	28%	54	18%	77	25%	3.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	29	10%	35	12%	88	29%	70	23%	80	26%	3.5
Ability to control courtroom.....	9	3%	14	5%	42	14%	74	25%	153	52%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	10	3%	7	2%	48	16%	105	36%	124	42%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	6	2%	9	3%	33	11%	72	24%	177	60%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	9	8%	12	11%	20	18%	24	22%	45	41%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	8	5%	6	4%	20	13%	37	24%	82	54%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	7	5%	8	6%	27	20%	39	28%	57	41%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	13	4%	31	10%	44	14%	100	32%	120	39%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 308 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Greene based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 44% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean scores came for: legal and factual analysis (4.4), knowledge of substantive law (4.4), knowledge of evidence and procedure (4.4), and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.4). The lowest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
[p<.001]							
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	15%	31%	46%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	8%	22%	13%	22%	36%	64	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	6%	7%	20%	43%	24%	54	3.7
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	6%	8%	17%	34%	36%	53	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	50%	0%	25%	25%	4	3.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	2%	2%	0%	27%	68%	41	4.6
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	8%	17%	38%	35%	65	4.0
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	8%	25%	67%	12	4.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	5%	19%	29%	48%	21	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	3%	6%	10%	45%	35%	31	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	6%	8%	21%	35%	31%	52	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	3%	11%	12%	32%	43%	76	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	6%	14%	14%	30%	36%	116	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	17%	25%	50%	12	4.1
MALE.....	5%	13%	14%	31%	38%	221	3.8
FEMALE.....	1%	4%	15%	39%	41%	75	4.1
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	8%	25%	58%	12	4.3
PROSECUTION.....	0%	7%	33%	33%	27%	15	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	5%	0%	18%	45%	32%	22	4.0
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	6%	14%	8%	27%	46%	90	3.9
CIVIL.....	4%	10%	14%	34%	37%	161	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	38%	13%	8	3.6
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	10	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	12%	18%	24%	47%	17	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	9%	17%	32%	37%	171	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	5%	13%	9%	37%	36%	102	3.9
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	4	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
[p<.05]							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	24%	20%	28%	20%	25	3.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	8%	10%	29%	46%	136	4.0
MODERATE.....	1%	7%	12%	41%	38%	81	4.1
LIMITED.....	2%	12%	23%	32%	32%	66	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	13%	25%	38%	8	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	4%	10%	14%	32%	39%	308	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	5%	21%	21%	51%	39	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	31%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	21%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer	25%
		Other.....	18%
		No Answer	3%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	19%
		6-10 years	29%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	19%
		20+ years	13%
		No Answer	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	74%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District.....	1%
		Third District.....	24%
		Fourth District.....	71%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	4%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	29%
		35,000 or over	63%
		No Answer	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	6	9%	12	18%	17	25%	17	25%	16	24%	3.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	5	7%	13	19%	16	24%	17	25%	16	24%	3.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	6	9%	5	7%	19	28%	19	28%	19	28%	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	7	10%	8	12%	17	25%	18	27%	17	25%	3.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	9	13%	14	21%	21	31%	14	21%	10	15%	3.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	5%	12	18%	24	36%	19	29%	8	12%	3.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	2	3%	7	10%	20	30%	19	28%	19	28%	3.7
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	3%	9	14%	17	27%	20	32%	15	24%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	3%	6	10%	16	27%	19	32%	17	28%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	5%	7	16%	15	34%	11	25%	9	20%	3.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	5	8%	12	19%	14	23%	16	26%	15	24%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	4	9%	10	21%	14	30%	11	23%	8	17%	3.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	7	10%	10	15%	20	29%	16	24%	15	22%	3.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 68 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Greene from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 26% had a moderate amount, and 32% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.3). The highest scored items were: ability to control courtroom (3.7) and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (3.7). The item scored lowest was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							[p<.001]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
STATE OFFICER.....	5%	19%	29%	29%	19%	21	3.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	36%	29%	21%	14%	0%	14	2.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER....	0%	6%	29%	12%	53%	17	4.1
OTHER.....	8%	0%	25%	50%	17%	12	3.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	4	2.5
1-5 YEARS.....	15%	8%	8%	38%	31%	13	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	15%	30%	25%	25%	20	3.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	11%	44%	22%	22%	9	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	23%	38%	15%	23%	13	3.4
21+ YEARS.....	33%	11%	33%	11%	11%	9	2.6
GENDER							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
MALE.....	14%	18%	28%	24%	16%	50	3.1
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	31%	25%	44%	16	4.1
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	3	2.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	13%	13%	44%	13%	19%	16	3.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	10%	15%	21%	29%	25%	48	3.4
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	3	3.0
2,000-35,000.....	10%	20%	30%	20%	20%	20	3.2
OVER 35,000.....	12%	12%	23%	28%	26%	43	3.4
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							[p<.01]
NO ANSWER.....	43%	29%	29%	0%	0%	7	1.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	14%	14%	24%	14%	33%	21	3.4
MODERATE.....	6%	11%	28%	39%	17%	18	3.5
LIMITED.....	0%	14%	36%	27%	23%	22	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	0%	14%	43%	29%	7	3.7
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	10%	15%	29%	24%	22%	68	3.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	15%	20%	10%	40%	15%	20	3.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 100%
		Guardian Ad Litem0%
		CASA Volunteer.....0%
		Other.....0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years 58%
		6-10 years8%
		11-15 years 33%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male..... 17%
		Female 83%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District.....8%
		Third District.....0%
		Fourth District..... 83%
		Outside Alaska8%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000 17%
		35,000 or over 75%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARY E. GREENE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	42%	7	58%	4.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	50%	6	50%	4.5
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	5	42%	5	42%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	33%	8	67%	4.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	42%	7	58%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 12 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Greene from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 20%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 18%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 12%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 12%
		Government 24%
		Public service agency or organization (not government) 2%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 9%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 8%
		6-10 years 13%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 18%
		20+ years 38%
		No Answer 7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 73%
		Female 19%
		No Answer 8%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 6%
		Mixed criminal and civil 28%
		Mainly civil 51%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 8%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 5%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 42%
		Fourth District 45%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	2	1%	4	2%	28	17%	63	39%	65	40%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law.....	2	1%	4	3%	31	20%	59	37%	62	39%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	1%	5	3%	35	23%	53	34%	60	39%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	5	3%	6	4%	18	11%	46	28%	87	54%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	4	2%	3	2%	17	10%	48	29%	91	56%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	5	3%	1	1%	19	12%	43	27%	94	58%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	5	3%	5	3%	20	14%	43	30%	70	49%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	2%	5	3%	12	7%	40	24%	104	63%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	1%	7	4%	13	8%	40	25%	100	62%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom.....	3	2%	8	6%	23	16%	54	38%	54	38%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	2%	3	2%	17	13%	49	37%	60	45%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	3	2%	2	1%	19	13%	54	36%	71	48%	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	3	3%	1	1%	17	15%	32	28%	61	54%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	4%	2	2%	11	13%	28	33%	40	48%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	4	6%	2	3%	7	11%	19	29%	34	52%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	3	2%	6	4%	19	12%	64	39%	73	44%	4.2

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 165 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Funk based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 53% had a substantial amount of experience, 25% had a moderate amount, and 15% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.4), and human understanding and compassion (4.4). The lowest scored item was ability to control courtroom (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	15%	23%	54%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	3%	12%	6%	30%	48%	33	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	0%	19%	39%	39%	31	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	15%	40%	45%	20	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
OFFICER.....	0%	5%	5%	29%	62%	21	4.5
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	13%	51%	33%	39	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	9	4.7
1-5 YEARS.....	8%	0%	8%	54%	31%	13	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	5%	9%	36%	45%	22	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	4%	4%	19%	38%	35%	26	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	6%	3%	35%	55%	31	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	3%	16%	39%	42%	64	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	9%	36%	55%	11	4.5
MALE.....	2%	4%	11%	37%	46%	123	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	13%	48%	35%	31	4.2
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	0%	36%	55%	11	4.4
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	38%	25%	38%	8	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	10%	0%	20%	50%	20%	10	3.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	4%	7%	11%	43%	35%	46	4.0
CIVIL.....	0%	2%	10%	36%	52%	87	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	9	4.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	11%	11%	33%	44%	9	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	0%	7%	37%	53%	70	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	1%	7%	16%	43%	33%	75	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	12	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	3%	13%	39%	42%	88	4.1
MODERATE.....	0%	5%	12%	39%	44%	41	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	4%	4%	42%	50%	24	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	11%	33%	44%	9	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	4%	12%	39%	44%	165	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	13%	44%	44%	16	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	49%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	22%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	4%
		Probation/Parole officer	9%
		Other.....	11%
		No Answer	4%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	40%
		6-10 years	18%
		11-15 years	2%
		16-20 years	18%
		20+ years	18%
		No Answer	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	80%
		Female.....	16%
		No Answer	4%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	9%
		Fourth District.....	82%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	18%
		35,000 or over	69%
		No Answer	4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	1	2%	10	22%	21	47%	13	29%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	25%	18	41%	15	34%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	10	23%	19	43%	14	32%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	2	5%	11	25%	21	48%	10	23%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	1	2%	6	13%	15	33%	23	51%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	14%	15	34%	23	52%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	1	2%	6	14%	21	49%	15	35%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	2%	11	26%	17	40%	13	31%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	16%	19	50%	13	34%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	28%	14	48%	7	24%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	0	0%	10	29%	15	44%	8	24%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	30%	7	30%	9	39%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	2%	8	18%	18	41%	17	39%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 44 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Funk from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 25% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 32% had a moderate amount, and 34% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored item was human understanding and compassion (4.4). The items scored lowest were: makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.9) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.9).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	5%	9%	41%	45%	22	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%	10	3.9
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	6%	12%	53%	29%	17	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	38%	13%	50%	8	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
MALE.....	0%	3%	19%	36%	42%	36	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	6	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	19%	36%	42%	36	4.2
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
2,000-35,000.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
OVER 35,000.....	0%	3%	13%	43%	40%	30	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	9%	9%	36%	45%	11	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	14	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	27%	33%	40%	15	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	38%	25%	38%	8	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	18%	41%	39%	44	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	9%	18%	55%	18%	11	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 100%
		Guardian Ad Litem0%
		CASA Volunteer.....0%
		Other.....0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years0%
		6-10 years 50%
		11-15 years 50%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male..... 50%
		Female 50%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District.....0%
		Third District..... 50%
		Fourth District..... 50%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000 50%
		35,000 or over 50%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 2 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Funk from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	16%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	15%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	9%
		Private, corporate employee	1%
		State judge or judicial officer	18%
		Government	27%
		Public service agency or organization (not government)	4%
		Other	1%
		No Answer	10%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	11%
		6-10 years	17%
		11-15 years	12%
		16-20 years	17%
		20+ years.....	35%
		No Answer.....	8%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	63%
		Female	29%
		No Answer.....	8%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	8%
		Mainly criminal	9%
		Mixed criminal and civil	34%
		Mainly civil.....	39%
		Other	2%
		No Answer.....	8%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District	2%
		Third District	38%
		Fourth District	49%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	1%	5	3%	34	21%	68	42%	55	34%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law.....	1	1%	5	3%	36	22%	68	41%	54	33%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	1%	3	2%	30	19%	73	45%	55	34%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	3	2%	8	5%	29	18%	65	40%	58	36%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	1%	4	2%	30	18%	64	39%	64	39%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	3	2%	24	15%	54	33%	82	50%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	2%	2	1%	32	21%	54	35%	65	42%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	8	5%	29	18%	54	33%	72	44%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	8	5%	31	19%	52	33%	68	43%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	1%	2	1%	24	15%	64	41%	66	42%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	2	1%	25	16%	68	45%	56	37%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	1%	2	1%	30	19%	64	41%	58	37%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	3	3%	17	18%	31	34%	40	43%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	1%	0	0%	22	21%	40	38%	43	41%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	2	3%	19	25%	22	29%	32	42%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	1%	0	0%	30	19%	73	46%	56	35%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 160 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Wood based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 48% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 18% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.3). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.0), knowledge of substantive law (4.0), and equal treatment of all parties (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	15	4.2
SOLO.....	4%	0%	12%	42%	42%	26	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	24%	44%	32%	25	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	23%	62%	15%	13	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	14%	21%	66%	29	4.5
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	24%	55%	21%	42	4.0
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%	6	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	13	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	44%	39%	18	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	56%	26%	27	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	0%	11%	47%	37%	19	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	41%	26%	27	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	16%	45%	39%	56	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	13	4.3
MALE.....	1%	0%	15%	47%	37%	104	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	28%	44%	28%	43	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	15%	46%	38%	13	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	15%	54%	31%	13	4.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	20%	53%	27%	15	4.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	0%	19%	34%	45%	53	4.2
CIVIL.....	0%	0%	19%	52%	29%	62	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	42%	42%	12	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	5	3.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	0%	18%	41%	39%	61	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	54%	29%	78	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	7%	71%	21%	14	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	0%	19%	39%	40%	77	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	24%	41%	34%	41	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	14%	57%	29%	28	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	36%	21%	36%	14	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	0%	19%	46%	35%	160	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	8%	0%	15%	23%	54%	13	4.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	43%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	26%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer	17%
		Other.....	7%
		No Answer	3%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	22%
		6-10 years	29%
		11-15 years	14%
		16-20 years	19%
		20+ years	12%
		No Answer	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	84%
		Female.....	12%
		No Answer	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	21%
		Fourth District.....	69%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	10%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	31%
		35,000 or over	55%
		No Answer	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	3	5%	10	17%	20	34%	25	43%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	2%	3	5%	8	14%	17	30%	28	49%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	2%	1	2%	10	17%	18	31%	28	48%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	2%	2	4%	7	13%	18	32%	28	50%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	3%	1	2%	8	14%	22	38%	25	43%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	3	5%	8	14%	20	36%	25	45%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	2	4%	8	14%	17	30%	30	53%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	2%	11	20%	18	32%	26	46%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	10	19%	17	33%	24	46%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	3%	0	0%	9	25%	11	31%	15	42%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	1	2%	9	20%	16	36%	17	39%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	24%	9	31%	13	45%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	3	5%	9	16%	19	33%	27	47%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 58 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Wood from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 33% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 26% had a moderate amount, and 33% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.2). The highest scored items were: makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.3) and ability to control courtroom (4.3). The items scored lowest were: settlement skills (4.1) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							[p<.05]
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	8%	44%	48%	25	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	20%	27%	20%	33%	15	3.7
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	10	4.6
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	8%	23%	15%	54%	13	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	12%	18%	47%	24%	17	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	8	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	11	4.6
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
MALE.....	0%	6%	16%	37%	41%	49	4.1
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	14%	14%	71%	7	4.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	8%	33%	58%	12	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	8%	18%	35%	40%	40	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
2,000-35,000.....	0%	11%	11%	44%	33%	18	4.0
OVER 35,000.....	0%	3%	16%	28%	53%	32	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	11%	16%	16%	58%	19	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	25%	44%	31%	16	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	5%	37%	53%	19	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	18	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	5%	16%	33%	47%	58	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker 100%
		Guardian Ad Litem0%
		CASA Volunteer0%
		Other0%
		No Answer0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years0%
		6-10 years0%
		11-15 years 100%
		16-20 years0%
		20+ years0%
		No Answer0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male..... 100%
		Female0%
		No Answer0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District0%
		Second District0%
		Third District0%
		Fourth District 100%
		Outside Alaska0%
		No Answer0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,0000%
		35,000 or over 100%
		No Answer0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 2000**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Integrity</u>											
Integrity.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Impartiality/Fairness.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial Temperament</u>											
Respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Workers/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Wood from their direct professional experience. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

