

*Alaska  
Comprehensive &  
Specialized  
Evaluation  
Services*

Alaska Judicial Council

*Judicial Retention Survey:  
Judges and Justices Standing for Retention in 2002 and 2004*



# ***Judicial Retention Survey: Judges and Justices Standing for Retention in 2002 and 2004***

## ***Table of Contents***

Table of Contents.....	<i>ii</i>
Overview.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Method.....	1
Results.....	5
Tables.....	17
Judges and Justices Standing for Retention in 2002.....	17
A. Supreme Court Justice Walter L. Carpeneti.....	17
B. Court of Appeals Judge David Mannheimer.....	21
C. Superior Court Judge Patricia Collins.....	25
D. Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson.....	35
E. District Court Judge Peter Froehlich.....	45
F. District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller.....	55
G. Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card.....	65
H. District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams.....	75
I. District Court Judge John R. Lohff.....	85
J. District Court Judge Gregory Motyka.....	95
K. District Court Judge Sigurd E. Murphy.....	105
L. District Court Judge M. Francis Neville.....	115
M. District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades.....	125
N. Superior Court Judge Charles R. Pengilly.....	135
O. Superior Court Judge Richard D. Savell.....	145
P. District Court Judge Jane F. Kauvar.....	155
Judges Standing for Retention in 2004.....	165
A. Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens.....	165
B. Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery.....	173
C. Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen.....	181
D. Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler.....	189
E. Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason.....	197
F. Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides.....	205
G. Superior Court Judge John Reese.....	213
H. Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner.....	221
I. District Court Judge Peter G. Ashman.....	229
J. District Court Judge Joel H. Bolger.....	237
K. District Court Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	245
L. District Court Judge Suzanne Lombardi.....	253
M. District Court Judge Nancy J. Nolan.....	261
N. District Court Judge James Wanamaker.....	269
O. Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger.....	277
P. District Court Judge Raymond Funk.....	285
Q. District Court Judge Mark I. Wood.....	293
Appendix: Survey Instrument.....	301

# ***Judicial Retention Survey: Judges and Justices Standing for Retention in 2002 and 2004***

*Prepared by ACSES  
May 10, 2002*

## ***Introduction***

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that justices and judges be approved or rejected on a non-partisan ballot at each general election. The Alaska Judicial Council has been given the responsibility to evaluate judges and justices standing for retention. As part of the information utilized to fulfill this responsibility, surveys of active members of the Alaska Bar Association, Alaska peace and probation officers, social workers, guardians ad litem, and court appointed special advocate (CASA) volunteers are conducted by the Alaska Judicial Council. In these surveys, respondents are asked to rate judges and justices on some or all of the following characteristics, depending upon the respondent's position: legal ability; impartiality/fairness; integrity, judicial temperament; diligence; special skills; respect for parties, attorneys, staff, etc.; reasonable promptness in making decisions; and overall evaluation.

To facilitate the retention survey for calendar years 2002 and 2004, the Alaska Judicial Council entered into a contract with the Alaska Comprehensive and Specialized Evaluation Services (ACSES), a research workgroup administratively housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Alaska Anchorage. ACSES was responsible for receiving, entering, and analyzing the data from these surveys and preparing the current report summarizing survey procedures and findings.

## ***Method***

### ***Respondents***

The Judicial Retention Survey targeted three respondent groups. The first and largest group consisted of 2,860 current members of the Alaska Bar Association. The second target group consisted of 1,704 Peace and Probation Officers. The third target group consisted of 381 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers. Thus, a total of 4,945 individuals were approached for participation in this survey. Return rates and demographic details about actual respondents are provided below.

### ***Instrumentation***

The Alaska Judicial Council developed survey booklets that contained the names of all judges and justices eligible for retention in 2002 and 2004. These survey booklets were individualized to three targeted respondent groups and thus differed slightly on the items and number of judges and justices depending on who was asked to provide ratings. Specifically, the survey booklets targeted for active members of the Alaska Bar Association contained 10 items and the names of

one Supreme Court Justice and one Court of Appeals Judge, 16 items and names of 15 Superior and District Court judges standing for retention in 2002, and six items and names of 17 Superior and District Court judges standing for retention in 2004. The survey booklets targeted for all Alaska Peace and Probation Officers contained 12 items and the names of 15 Superior and District Court judges standing for retention in 2002 and five items and names of 17 judges standing for retention in 2004. The survey booklets targeted for Social Workers, Guardians Ad Litem, and CASA volunteers contained 11 items and the names of 15 Superior and District Court judges standing for retention in 2002. Respondents were asked to provide ratings on more items for judges and justices standing for retention in 2002 than in 2004. After the surveys had been sent out, Fairbanks Superior Court Judge Ralph Beistline was appointed to the federal district court in Alaska. His results are not included in this report

To insure that respondents understood the reasons for having received the survey booklet and the importance of their response, the Alaska Judicial Council provided an explanation for the survey in each booklet. Specifically, the following details were provided about the retention survey:

*“In this survey booklet you will evaluate justices and judges eligible to stand for retention in 2002 and 2004. **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.”*

The survey booklet solicited detailed ratings about each judge or justice standing for retention in seven overall areas of performance: *Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation*. Six of the seven areas were tapped by multiple items, each of which is presented in the tables individually; only *Overall Evaluation* was based on a single item. By adding the number of rated items within an area and dividing this sum by the total number of rated items, total mean scores could be obtained for each area of performance. It should be noted that the survey booklets sent to Peace and Probation Officers, and for Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA volunteers did not contain any items relevant to the *Legal Ability* scale. Each item on the survey was rated by respondents on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from *unacceptable* (1) to *excellent* (5). Following are the specific instructions and anchors provided on the survey booklet.

*“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
9.	Insufficient Knowledge	Insufficient knowledge to rate this judge (justice) on this criteria

A copy of the actual survey booklet is contained in the Appendix of this report.

### ***Procedures***

On January 25, 2002, the Alaska Judicial Council mailed a copy of the respective survey versions to all active Alaska Bar Association members, Peace and Probation Officers, and Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA volunteers. The mailing requested that the completed survey be returned directly to ACSES by February 15, 2002, using an enclosed preaddressed, business reply envelope. On February 18, 2002, ACSES informed the Alaska Judicial Council of those individuals within the three groups who had not yet responded to the survey. The Alaska Judicial Council then mailed a second copy of the survey to these individuals on February 27, 2002, requesting their participation with a return date of March 21, 2002. To facilitate maximum participation and allow for delayed mail delivery from rural areas, surveys were considered received by the deadline if they arrived by March 26, 2002. Surveys received after this date were not included in statistical analyses; however, comments were included until the reports were finalized.

### ***Confidentiality and Data Safety***

The Alaska Judicial Council included a statement in each survey booklet that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Specifically, this statement read as follows:

*“All responses will be aggregated solely for statistical analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Alaska Comprehensive and Specialized Evaluation Services (ACSES), an independent workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage, will conduct the analysis. 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.”*

Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ACSES and translates into specific procedures related to data safety. Because data such as the ones collected through the judicial retention survey are of a sensitive nature, ACSES has instituted rigorous and explicit procedures and made use of established infrastructure that protects data. Specifically, for paper data, ACSES has lockable fire-proof, tamper-resistant file cabinets that are kept locked at all times except during business hours and that are stored in a separately keyed file room. Organizational policies and procedures are in place dictating that all data must stay in the file cabinets at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Once entered, all electronic data are maintained on a dedicated Digital Equipment Corporation Alpha 4000 server; no data are ever maintained on the hard drives of local PCs or on other media. Dedicated exclusively to ACSES, the DEC server is accessible only by ACSES staff.

### ***Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding***

To insure that as few duplicates or invalid surveys as possible were received, the Alaska Judicial Council provided clear instructions to potential respondents about how to handle the survey booklets. Specifically, respondents were asked to follow the procedures detailed below.

*“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.”*

Based on these instructions, procedures were implemented to insure that each respondent returned no more than one survey. Specifically, prior to the return envelope being opened and the survey removed, the individual’s name, as identified on the outside of the return envelope, was added to a survey log and marked as received. If an individual’s name was already on the log and marked as received, the envelope remained unopened and was marked “duplicate.” If a survey was returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. If the identity of the respondent could not be determined, or if the name on the envelope was not on the mailing list, the survey was not used in data analyses and tabulation. These procedures insured that only one survey per respondent was used in data analyses. They revealed a total of 67 surveys were returned without legible signatures, no names, or their name was not on the list; thus, these surveys were excluded from data entry and analyses and are not reflected in the total number of surveys received.

### ***Data Management***

ACSES, with a goal of virtual error-free data handling, has implemented rigorous data handling procedures that insure the accuracy of data entry and final data analyses. These procedures include careful data preparation prior to data entry, development of customized data entry programs with built-in error reduction, and rekey verification (entering the same data twice). With these procedures, error-free data entry is achieved.

Relative to data entry, quantitative data obtained from the surveys were entered using Viking Data Entry System. Viking Data Entry software is ideal for clean data entry as it restricts data entry to valid field parameters and requires rekey verification of each data point as defined when the program is developed. Through the identification of valid field parameters, restriction of invalid data, and rekey verification, the accuracy rate of data entry is virtually 100%.

### ***Data Analyses***

ACSES maintains a site license for SAS, a comprehensive statistical software package capable of a full range of statistical analyses, including those required for the current survey. To achieve maximum relevance of the ratings provided in this report, the information respondents provided regarding their level of knowledge with each judge or justice was used to extract ratings from those respondents who reported direct professional experience with a given judge or justice.

Thus, unless otherwise noted in a given table presenting findings from the survey, the ratings provided are based strictly on those respondents' surveys who have direct professional experience with the indicated judge or justice. Mean ratings, as shown in the tables in the Results section of this report, are best interpreted as follows:

<i>Mean Score Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
4.00 to 5.00	Excellent
3.50 to 3.99	Good
3.00 to 3.49	Acceptable
2.50 to 2.99	Deficient
1.00 to 2.49	Unacceptable

## ***Results***

Four sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, return rates are reported for the overall group of respondents as well as for the three professional subgroups (i.e., Alaska Bar Association members, Peace and Probation Officers, and Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers). Second, demographic characteristics are presented for each of the professional subgroups. These demographics include, but are not limited to, items such as gender, type of practice, years in practice, and district. Third, respondents' level of experience with each judge or justice they rated is shown. These data are reported by professional subgroups. Fourth, ratings of the judges and justices are provided in a variety of ways, including by respondent subgroups.

### ***Return Rates***

The first mailing of the survey took place on January 25, 2002, with a due date of February 15, 2002. By this due date a total of 1,260 completed surveys was received, representing 25.5% of all targeted respondents. A second mailing of the survey took place on February 27, 2002, with a due date of March 21, 2002. By the second due date, a total of 1,862 surveys was received, representing an overall return rate of 37.7%. It should be noted that 59 surveys were returned without signatures and eight surveys were returned by individuals whose names were not on the mailing lists; these 67 surveys were excluded from data entry and analyses and are not reflected in the total number of surveys received. Details about return rates are shown in the table that follows.

<b><i>Overall Return Rate for All Respondent Groups</i></b>	
Total mailed	4,945
Total responding	1862
Response rate	37.7%
<b><i>Return Rate for Alaska Bar Association Members</i></b>	
Total mailed	2,860
Total responding	1138
Response rate	39.8%
<b><i>Return Rate for Peace and Probation Officers</i></b>	
Total mailed	1,704
Total responding	621
Response rate	36.4%
<b><i>Return Rate for Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers</i></b>	
Total mailed	381
Total responding	105
Response rate	27.6%

***Demographic Descriptions of Respondents***

Demographic information was collected from each respondent to provide details about the characteristics of the individuals who provided the ratings summarized in this report. Following is a breakdown of these demographic characteristics by targeted respondent groups.

***Alaska Bar Association***

The demographic characteristics of the Alaska Bar Association members who responded to the current retention survey are presented in the tables that follow.

*Type of Practice: Which of the following best describes your practice?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Private, solo	258	22.7%
Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	212	18.6%
Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	207	18.2%
Private corporate employee	29	2.5%
State judge or judicial officer	67	5.9%
Government	237	20.8%
Public Service Agency Organization (not government)	30	2.6%
Other	36	3.2%
No response	62	5.4%



*Length of Alaska Practice: How many years have you practiced law in Alaska?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	143	12.6%
6-10 Years	141	12.4%
11-15 Years	149	13.1%
16-20 Years	233	20.5%
21 Years or more	407	35.8%
No response	65	5.7%
Mean	1073	17.5
SD	1073	9.4

*Gender*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	746	65.6%
Female	330	29.0%
No response	62	5.4%

*Cases Handled: The majority of your practice consists of which of the following?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Prosecution	49	4.3%
Mainly criminal	70	6.2%
Mixed criminal and civil	204	17.9%
Mainly civil	677	59.5%
Other	77	6.8%
No response	61	5.4%

*Location of Practice: In which judicial district is most of your work conducted?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	160	14.1%
Second District	19	1.7%
Third District	743	65.3%
Fourth District	113	9.9%
Not in Alaska	47	4.1%
No response	56	4.9%

***Peace and Probation Officers***

*Type of Work: My current position in law enforcement is as follows:*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
State law enforcement officer	214	34.5%
Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer	212	34.2%
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	16	2.6%
Probation/parole officer	70	11.3%
Other	64	10.3%
No response	44	7.1%

*Length of Time as Alaska Officer: How many years have you been a peace or probation officer in Alaska?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	191	30.8%
6-10 Years	132	21.3%
11-15 Years	103	16.6%
16-20 Years	87	14.0%
21 Years or more	54	8.7%
No response	53	8.5%
Mean	567	10.3
SD	567	7.1

***Gender***

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	495	79.8%
Female	79	12.7%
No response	46	7.4%

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

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	99	16.0%
Second District	41	6.6%
Third District	314	50.6%
Fourth District	112	18.1%
Outside	1	0.2%
No response	53	8.5%

*Community Population: What is the population of the community in which you work?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 2,000	56	9.0%
Between 2,000 and 35,000	259	41.8%
35,000 or over	260	41.9%
No response	45	7.3%

***Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers***

*Type of Work: My current position is as follows:*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Social Worker	49	46.7%
Guardian ad Litem	17	16.2%
CASA Volunteer	35	33.3%
Other	1	1.0%
No response	3	2.9%

*Length of Experience: How many years have you been a social worker, guardian ad litem, or CASA volunteer in Alaska?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	62	59.0%
6-10 Years	19	18.1%
11-15 Years	13	12.4%
16-20 Years	5	4.8%
21 Years or more	2	1.9%
No response	4	3.8%
Mean	101	5.9
SD	101	5.5

*Gender*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	17	16.2%
Female	85	81.0%
No response	3	2.9%

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

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	17	16.2 %
Second District	1	1.0%
Third District	62	59.0%
Fourth District	19	18.1%
Outside	1	1.0%
No response	5	4.8%

*Community Population: What is the population of the community in which you work?*

	<b>2002</b>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 2,000	6	5.7%
Between 2,000 and 35,000	30	28.6%
35,000 or over	63	60.0%
No response	6	5.7%

***Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Judge or Justice***

All respondents were asked to describe the type of experience (or basis of evaluation) they had with each rated judge or justice, specifically, direct professional experience, professional reputation, or social contacts. The survey booklet allowed respondents to select more than one of these types of experience with a given judge or justice. Respondents who selected more than one response were grouped in a hierarchical manner. If direct professional experience was one of the selected answers, this became the category in which the respondent was placed. If direct professional experience was not a selected response, the next level of grouping was based on professional reputation. Respondents were placed in the social contacts category only if this was their only selected response.

Following is a description and breakdown by targeted respondent group of the type of experience (or basis of evaluation) of respondents. Included in the first column of numbers is the percentage of individuals within a targeted respondent group who rated this judge or justice. This percentage is based on all respondents who rated the judge or justice, not just those with direct professional experience. The percentages in the last four columns of numbers refer to the percentage of individuals in the group who rated each judge or justice.

*Alaska Bar Members' Level of Experience with Judges Standing for Retention in 2002*

<i>Judge or Justice Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 1,138 ABA members who rated this judge</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Direct Professional Experience</i>	<i>Professional Reputation</i>	<i>Social Contacts</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<i>Justice Walter L. Carpeneti</i>	54.0%	614	76.5%	20.2%	1.3%	2.0%
<i>Judge David Mannheimer</i>	32.3%	368	67.7%	24.5%	4.9%	3.0%
<i>Judge Patricia Collins</i>	27.9%	318	78.0%	16.0%	3.5%	2.5%
<i>Judge Michael A. Thompson</i>	17.8%	203	84.7%	8.9%	2.0%	4.4%
<i>Judge Peter Froehlich</i>	18.5%	211	73.0%	17.5%	4.3%	5.2%
<i>Judge Kevin G. Miller</i>	5.6%	64	84.4%	10.9%	3.1%	1.6%
<i>Judge Larry D. Card</i>	42.3%	481	77.1%	17.9%	2.9%	2.1%
<i>Judge Samuel D. Adams</i>	28.3%	324	80.2%	12.7%	4.3%	2.8%
<i>Judge John R. Lohff</i>	31.7%	361	87.0%	6.6%	2.2%	4.2%
<i>Judge Gregory Motyka</i>	27.3%	311	86.8%	6.8%	0.6%	5.8%
<i>Judge Sigurd E. Murphy</i>	51.3%	584	81.5%	10.8%	1.4%	6.3%
<i>Judge M. Francis Neville</i>	11.4%	130	81.5%	10.8%	3.1%	4.6%
<i>Judge Stephanie Rhoades</i>	36.5%	415	83.4%	9.6%	0.7%	6.3%
<i>Judge Charles R. Pengilly</i>	21.9%	249	82.7%	10.0%	1.2%	6.0%
<i>Judge Richard D. Savell</i>	24.8%	282	82.3%	10.3%	1.4%	6.0%
<i>Judge Jane F. Kauvar</i>	15.7%	179	81.6%	6.1%	3.4%	8.9%

*Alaska Bar Members' Level of Experience with Judges Standing for Retention in 2004*

<i>Judge or Justice Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 1,138 ABA members who rated this judge</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Direct Professional Experience</i>	<i>Professional Reputation</i>	<i>Social Contacts</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<i>Judge Trevor Stephens</i>	8.0%	93	78.5%	17.2%	2.2%	2.2%
<i>Judge Michael I. Jeffery</i>	17.8%	203	81.8%	11.8%	2.0%	4.4%
<i>Judge Morgan Christen</i>	15.7%	179	69.8%	21.8%	5.0%	3.4%
<i>Judge Beverly Cutler</i>	40.7%	463	76.2%	19.7%	1.1%	3.0%
<i>Judge Sharon L. Gleason</i>	28.3%	322	78.0%	17.7%	1.2%	3.1%
<i>Judge Stephanie E. Joannides</i>	42.7%	486	83.1%	10.3%	1.2%	5.3%
<i>Judge John Reese</i>	54.8%	624	83.8%	9.3%	1.3%	5.6%
<i>Judge Mark Rindner</i>	32.7%	372	82.8%	10.8%	1.6%	4.8%
<i>Judge Peter G. Ashman</i>	32.8%	373	79.6%	13.4%	2.4%	4.6%
<i>Judge Joel H. Bolger</i>	11.9%	135	83.7%	11.9%	1.5%	3.0%
<i>Judge Natalie K. Finn</i>	32.4%	369	87.3%	8.4%	1.1%	3.3%
<i>Judge Suzanne Lombardi</i>	18.9%	215	81.9%	9.8%	4.2%	4.2%
<i>Judge Nancy J. Nolan</i>	18.7%	213	78.4%	13.6%	4.2%	3.8%
<i>Judge James N. Wanamaker</i>	32.1%	365	81.9%	12.3%	0.5%	5.2%
<i>Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger</i>	23.3%	265	78.5%	12.8%	1.5%	7.2%
<i>Judge Raymond Funk</i>	19.6%	223	75.8%	11.2%	1.8%	11.2%
<i>Judge Mark I. Wood</i>	16.5%	188	76.6%	10.1%	1.1%	12.2%

***Peace and Probation Officers' Level of Experience with Judges Standing for Retention in 2002***

<i>Judge Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 621 Peace &amp; Probation Officers who rated this Judge</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Direct Professional Experience</i>	<i>Professional Reputation</i>	<i>Social Contacts</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<i>Judge Patricia Collins</i>	12.3%	76	82.9%	9.2%	0.0%	7.9%
<i>Judge Michael A. Thompson</i>	6.9%	43	79.1%	4.7%	2.3%	14.0%
<i>Judge Peter Froehlich</i>	10.5%	65	75.4%	7.7%	3.1%	13.8%
<i>Judge Kevin G. Miller</i>	5.2%	32	75.0%	9.4%	0.0%	15.6%
<i>Judge Larry D. Card</i>	15.8%	98	77.6%	15.3%	1.0%	6.1%
<i>Judge Samuel D. Adams</i>	16.6%	103	76.7%	12.6%	1.9%	8.7%
<i>Judge John R. Lohff</i>	8.2%	51	72.5%	3.9%	3.9%	19.6%
<i>Judge Gregory Motyka</i>	8.1%	50	80.0%	8.0%	0.0%	12.0%
<i>Judge Sigurd E. Murphy</i>	14.5%	90	75.6%	10.0%	0.0%	14.4%
<i>Judge M. Francis Neville</i>	6.8%	42	85.7%	4.8%	2.4%	7.1%
<i>Judge Stephanie Rhoades</i>	13.1%	81	70.4%	16.0%	0.0%	13.6%
<i>Judge Charles R. Pengilly</i>	10.3%	64	78.1%	14.1%	0.0%	7.8%
<i>Judge Richard D. Savell</i>	12.6%	78	74.4%	11.5%	2.6%	11.5%
<i>Judge Jane F. Kauvar</i>	10.2%	63	79.4%	9.5%	0.0%	11.1%

***Peace and Probation Officers' Level of Experience with Judges Standing for Retention in 2004***

<i>Judge Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 620 Peace &amp; Probation Officers who rated this judge</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Direct Professional Experience</i>	<i>Professional Reputation</i>	<i>Social Contacts</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<i>Judge Trevor Stephens</i>	4.8%	30	86.7%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
<i>Judge Michael I. Jeffery</i>	6.8%	42	88.1%	4.8%	2.4%	4.8%
<i>Judge Morgan Christen</i>	1.3%	8	12.5%	25.0%	0.0%	62.5%
<i>Judge Beverly Cutler</i>	12.9%	80	70.0%	18.8%	1.3%	10.0%
<i>Judge Sharon L. Gleason</i>	1.6%	11	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	36.4%
<i>Judge Stephanie E. Joannides</i>	9.3%	58	72.4%	12.1%	3.4%	12.1%
<i>Judge John Reese</i>	7.3%	45	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%
<i>Judge Mark Rindner</i>	1.6%	11	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	36.4%
<i>Judge Peter G. Ashman</i>	13.4%	83	80.7%	8.4%	1.2%	9.6%
<i>Judge Joel H. Bolger</i>	5.0%	31	80.6%	9.7%	0.0%	9.7%
<i>Judge Natalie K. Finn</i>	12.6%	78	79.5%	9.0%	0.0%	11.5%
<i>Judge Suzanne Lombardi</i>	7.6%	47	72.3%	12.8%	2.1%	12.8%
<i>Judge Nancy J. Nolan</i>	7.4%	46	76.1%	2.2%	0.0%	21.7%
<i>Judge James N. Wanamaker</i>	10.0%	62	74.2%	11.3%	0.0%	14.5%
<i>Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger</i>	10.5%	65	75.4%	12.3%	0.0%	12.3%
<i>Judge Raymond Funk</i>	10.6%	66	66.7%	13.6%	3.0%	16.7%
<i>Judge Mark I. Wood</i>	11.1%	69	68.1%	10.1%	1.4%	20.3%



***Social Worker/GAL/CASA Volunteers' Level of Experience with Judges Standing For Retention in 2002***

<b><i>Judge Standing for Retention</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of the 105 Social Workers/GAL/CASA Volunteers who rated this Judge</i></b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b><i>Direct Professional Experience</i></b>	<b><i>Professional Reputation</i></b>	<b><i>Social Contacts</i></b>	<b><i>No Answer</i></b>
<i>Judge Patricia Collins</i>	18.1%	19	84.2%	10.5%	0%	5.3%
<i>Judge Michael A. Thompson</i>	5.7%	6	83.3%	16.7%	0%	0%
<i>Judge Peter Froehlich</i>	4.8%	5	60.0%	40%	0%	0%
<i>Judge Kevin G. Miller</i>	3.8%	4	100.0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Judge Larry D. Card</i>	15.2%	16	75%	25%	0%	0%
<i>Judge Samuel D. Adams</i>	2.9%	3	66.7%	0%	33.3%	0%
<i>Judge John R. Lohff</i>	8.6%	9	66.7%	22.2%	0%	11.1%
<i>Judge Gregory Motyka</i>	2.9%	3	100%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Judge Sigurd E. Murphy</i>	5.7%	6	83.3%	16.7%	0%	0%
<i>Judge M. Francis Neville</i>	4.8%	5	40%	40%	20%	0%
<i>Judge Stephanie Rhoades</i>	13.3%	14	78.6%	7.1%	14.3%	0%
<i>Judge Charles R. Pengilly</i>	15.2%	16	62.5%	18.8%	0%	18.8%
<i>Judge Richard D. Savell</i>	16.2%	17	64.7%	11.8%	0%	23.5%
<i>Judge Jane F. Kauvar</i>	4.8%	5	60%	40%	0%	0%

### ***Ratings of Judges and Justices***

In the tables that follow, the responses to the individual survey items for each judge and justice are presented. These responses are shown in a variety of ways. For each individual judge or justice, three tables and one graph are provided. Along with a brief summary of findings for the given judge or justice, the first table provides a demographic description of the respondents who rated the given judge or justice. The second table provides specific ratings for each survey item as well as an average for each item. The third table provides ratings and means on the “*Overall Evaluation*” item, broken down by respondents’ demographic characteristics and level of experience with a given judge. These three tables are followed by a graph that presents a visual representation of average ratings of each judge or justice by respondent subgroups on each of the seven areas of performance (*Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation*). Ratings by all three professional subgroups of the judges and justices standing for retention in 2002 are presented first, followed by ratings of the judges standing for retention in 2004.

**A. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WALTER L. CARPENETI**

**1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION**

***Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=602)***

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	21.1%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	17.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	19.4%
		Private corporate employee	2.7%
		State judge or judicial officer	8.6%
		Government	21.4%
		Public service agency or organization	2.7%
		Other	2.2%
		No Answer	4.3%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.0%
		6-10 Years	9.8%
		11-15 Years	12.3%
		16-20 Years	23.4%
		21 Years or more	45.2%
		No Answer	3.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	69.9%
		Female	25.9%
		No Answer	4.2%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3.0%
		Mainly criminal	4.7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	20.9%
		Mainly civil	63.1%
		Other	4.3%
		No Answer	4.0%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	23.1%
		Second District	1.0%
		Third District	60.8%
		Fourth District	8.5%
		Outside Alaska	3.2%
		No Answer	3.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Justice Walter L. Carpeneti was evaluated by 470 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this justice. Of these 470 respondents, 165 (35.1%) had substantial and recent experience, 144 (30.6%) had moderate experience, 134 (28.5%) had limited experience, and 27 (5.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety* (4.6), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.6), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.4), and *writing clarity and precision* (4.4); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Supreme Court Justice Walter L. Carpeneti:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	8	1.7	9	1.9	44	9.5	116	25.1	286	61.8	4.4
Writing clarity and precision	6	1.4	7	1.6	43	10.1	113	26.6	256	60.2	4.4
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	7	1.5	13	2.8	38	8.3	98	21.3	304	66.1	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	8	1.9	13	3.0	32	7.5	83	19.4	292	68.2	4.5
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	5	1.1	4	0.9	32	7.1	70	15.5	341	75.4	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	1.2	7	1.7	40	9.5	78	18.6	290	69.0	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	5	1.1	8	1.7	33	7.1	75	16.2	343	73.9	4.6
Human understanding and compassion	6	1.4	8	1.9	31	7.2	82	19.1	303	70.5	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	5	1.2	7	1.6	42	9.8	109	25.3	267	62.1	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of justice	6	1.3	13	2.8	33	7.1	106	22.7	308	66.1	4.5

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” of Supreme Court Justice Walter L. Carpeneti:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No answer	22	4.6	0.0	4.6	4.6	13.6	77.3
Private-Solo	96	4.4	3.1	1.0	8.3	25.0	62.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	82	4.4	0.0	3.7	9.8	25.6	61.0
6+ Attorneys	89	4.4	1.1	3.4	10.1	25.8	59.6
Corporate	10	3.8	0.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	30.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	46	4.8	0.0	2.2	0.0	17.4	80.4
Government	100	4.6	2.0	1.0	4.0	22.0	71.0
Public Service	14	4.6	0.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	85.7
Other	7	4.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	16	4.6	0.0	6.3	6.3	6.3	81.3
5 Years or fewer	20	4.3	5.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	65.0
6 – 10 Years	44	4.5	2.3	0.0	9.1	25.0	63.6
11 – 15 Years	61	4.5	0.0	3.3	4.9	29.5	62.3
16 – 20 Years	110	4.5	1.8	3.6	6.4	23.6	64.6
21 Years or more	215	4.5	0.9	2.3	7.4	21.9	67.4
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	22	4.5	0.0	4.6	4.6	22.7	68.2
Male	336	4.4	1.8	3.3	7.4	24.1	63.4
Female	108	4.7	0.0	0.9	6.5	18.5	74.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	20	4.7	0.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	80.0
Prosecution	10	4.1	10.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	50.0
Criminal	21	4.5	4.8	0.0	0.0	28.6	66.7
Criminal and Civil	100	4.6	0.0	2.0	8.0	21.0	69.0
Civil	301	4.5	1.3	3.0	7.6	23.9	64.1
Other	14	4.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	14.3	78.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	17	4.6	0.0	5.9	5.9	5.9	82.4
First District	123	4.8	0.0	0.0	3.3	14.6	82.1
Second District	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	274	4.4	1.8	4.0	9.5	26.3	58.4
Fourth District	35	4.3	2.9	2.9	2.9	40.0	51.4
Outside Alaska	13	4.8	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	84.6
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	27	4.3	0.0	7.4	7.4	29.6	55.6
Substantial	162	4.5	3.1	2.5	4.3	17.3	72.8
Moderate	144	4.5	0.7	2.8	11.1	20.1	65.3
Limited	133	4.5	0.0	2.3	6.0	30.8	60.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	466	4.5	1.3	2.8	7.1	22.8	66.1
Professional Reputation	114	4.5	0.0	1.8	10.5	25.4	62.3
Social Contacts	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4



**B. COURT OF APPEALS JUDGE DAVID MANNHEIMER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=357)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.9%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	14.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	15.1%
		Private corporate employee	0.6%
		State judge or judicial officer	14.0%
		Government	25.2%
		Public service agency or organization	2.2%
		Other	4.2%
		No Answer	4.2%
b.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.8%
		6-10 Years	9.2%
		11-15 Years	10.1%
		16-20 Years	22.1%
		21 Years or more	45.4%
		No Answer	3.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.2%
		Female	28.3%
		No Answer	4.5%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.6%
		Mainly criminal	12.9%
		Mixed criminal and civil	31.4%
		Mainly civil	40.6%
		Other	3.6%
		No Answer	3.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	7.8%
		Second District	1.4%
		Third District	74.5%
		Fourth District	10.6%
		Outside Alaska	2.2%
		No Answer	3.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge David Mannheimer was evaluated by 249 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 249 respondents, 101 (40.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 86 (34.5%) had moderate experience, 42 (16.9%) had limited experience, and 20 (8.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.1), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.1), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.1); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Court of Appeals Judge David Mannheimer:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	6	2.4	12	4.9	26	10.6	63	25.7	138	56.3	4.3
Writing clarity and precision	5	2.2	9	3.9	25	11.0	57	25.0	132	57.9	4.3
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	8	3.3	17	7.0	33	13.5	70	28.7	116	47.5	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	7	3.0	19	8.2	32	13.8	62	26.7	112	48.3	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	6	2.5	4	1.7	27	11.3	50	21.0	151	63.4	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	11	4.8	7	3.1	27	11.9	52	22.9	130	57.3	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	8	3.4	11	4.7	26	11.1	65	27.7	125	53.2	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	9	4.1	14	6.3	31	14.0	58	26.1	110	49.5	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument	5	2.2	5	2.2	20	9.0	44	19.7	149	66.8	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	6	2.5	19	7.8	28	11.5	63	25.8	128	52.5	4.2



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Court of Appeals Judge David Mannheimer:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No answer	13	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.8	69.2
Private-Solo	46	4.0	2.2	10.9	13.0	32.6	41.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	35	3.9	5.7	11.4	17.1	20.0	45.7
6+ Attorneys	25	4.2	0.0	8.0	12.0	32.0	48.0
Corporate	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	44	4.6	0.0	4.6	6.8	11.4	77.3
Government	63	4.0	4.8	9.5	12.7	30.2	42.9
Public Service	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Other	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	9	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
5 Years or fewer	22	4.0	4.6	9.1	9.1	36.4	40.9
6 – 10 Years	22	3.9	9.1	9.1	13.6	22.7	45.5
11 – 15 Years	27	4.2	0.0	3.7	11.1	44.4	40.7
16 – 20 Years	53	4.1	3.8	11.3	11.3	20.8	52.8
21 Years or more	111	4.3	0.9	7.2	12.6	21.6	57.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	14	4.3	0.0	7.1	14.3	21.4	57.1
Male	166	4.2	3.6	7.8	10.2	25.3	53.0
Female	64	4.2	0.0	7.8	14.1	28.1	50.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	12	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Prosecution	22	4.1	4.6	9.1	9.1	22.7	54.6
Criminal	38	3.9	2.6	10.5	18.4	34.2	34.2
Criminal and Civil	94	4.1	3.2	10.6	9.6	24.5	52.1
Civil	69	4.3	1.5	2.9	13.0	24.6	58.0
Other	9	4.3	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	66.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
First District	18	4.2	0.0	11.1	0.0	44.4	44.4
Second District	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Third District	178	4.2	2.8	7.3	10.1	25.3	54.5
Fourth District	32	3.8	3.1	12.5	31.3	12.5	40.6
Outside Alaska	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	20	4.1	0.0	15.0	5.0	35.0	45.0
Substantial	98	4.1	4.1	12.2	7.1	19.4	57.1
Moderate	85	4.2	2.4	3.5	15.3	29.4	49.4
Limited	41	4.3	0.0	2.4	17.1	29.3	51.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	244	4.2	2.5	7.8	11.5	25.8	52.5
Professional Reputation	86	4.3	2.3	2.3	11.6	26.7	57.0
Social Contacts	15	4.5	0.0	0.0	6.7	40.0	53.3



**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=310)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.4%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	17.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	16.5%
		Private corporate employee	0.7%
		State judge or judicial officer	12.6%
		Government	24.2%
		Public service agency or organization	3.2%
		Other	1.6%
		No Answer	4.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	5.8%
		6-10 Years	10.7%
		11-15 Years	12.9%
		16-20 Years	27.1%
		21 Years or more	39.0%
		No Answer	4.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.5%
		Female	30.0%
		No Answer	4.5%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	2.6%
		Mainly criminal	6.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	24.5%
		Mainly civil	57.4%
		Other	4.5%
		No Answer	4.5%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	44.2%
		Second District	1.0%
		Third District	44.2%
		Fourth District	3.6%
		Outside Alaska	3.2%
		No Answer	3.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Patricia Collins was evaluated by 248 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 248 respondents, 123 (50.8%) had substantial and recent experience, 58 (24.0%) had moderate experience, 54 (22.3%) had limited experience, and 13 (5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (4.8). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.4), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.4), and *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.4); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Patricia Collins:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	0	0.0	4	1.6	26	10.7	77	31.7	136	56.0	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law	0	0.0	3	1.3	25	10.6	83	35.2	125	53.0	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	0	0.0	3	1.3	21	9.3	76	33.6	126	55.8	4.4
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	4	1.7	19	7.9	54	22.3	165	68.2	4.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	3	1.3	15	6.4	46	19.5	172	72.9	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	3	1.2	9	3.7	40	16.6	189	78.4	4.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	3	1.3	16	7.2	49	22.0	155	69.5	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	2	0.8	10	4.1	47	19.3	185	75.8	4.7
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	2	0.9	11	4.7	47	20.3	172	74.1	4.7
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	4	1.8	18	8.1	65	29.3	135	60.8	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	6	2.6	17	7.4	73	31.7	134	58.3	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	2	0.9	14	6.0	48	20.7	168	72.4	4.6
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	2	1.3	5	3.3	20	13.2	124	82.1	4.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	1	0.8	12	9.8	22	17.9	88	71.5	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	3	2.3	7	5.3	32	24.1	91	68.4	4.6
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	3	1.2	19	7.9	62	25.6	158	65.3	4.5

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Patricia Collins:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	13	4.8	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.7	84.6
Private-Solo	48	4.5	0.0	2.1	10.4	22.9	64.6
2 – 5 Attorneys	45	4.4	0.0	4.4	4.4	33.3	57.8
6+ Attorneys	40	4.4	0.0	0.0	12.5	35.0	52.5
Corporate	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	28	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.4	78.6
Government	57	4.6	0.0	0.0	10.5	22.8	66.7
Public Service	6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3
Other	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	11	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	72.7
5 Years or fewer	16	4.6	0.0	6.3	6.3	12.5	75.0
6 – 10 Years	23	4.7	0.0	0.0	4.4	21.7	73.9
11 – 15 Years	31	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.5	25.8	67.7
16 – 20 Years	64	4.5	0.0	1.6	7.8	28.1	62.5
21 Years or more	97	4.5	0.0	1.0	10.3	26.8	61.9
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	13	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	84.6
Male	159	4.5	0.0	1.3	8.8	29.6	60.4
Female	70	4.6	0.0	1.4	7.1	18.6	72.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	13	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	76.9
Prosecution	7	4.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9
Criminal	16	4.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
Criminal and Civil	59	4.6	0.0	3.4	3.4	27.1	66.1
Civil	138	4.5	0.0	0.7	8.7	26.1	64.5
Other	9	4.6	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	77.8
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	81.8
First District	114	4.7	0.0	0.9	4.4	22.8	71.9
Second District	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Third District	103	4.5	0.0	1.9	8.7	30.1	59.2
Fourth District	6	3.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
Outside Alaska	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	12	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Substantial	122	4.6	0.0	0.8	6.6	20.5	72.1
Moderate	58	4.5	0.0	1.7	8.6	31.0	58.6
Limited	50	4.4	0.0	2.0	12.0	32.0	54.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	242	4.5	0.0	1.2	7.9	25.6	65.3
Professional Reputation	49	4.6	0.0	0.0	2.0	40.8	57.1
Social Contacts	9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4

**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=70)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	30.0%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	47.1%
		Village Public Safety Officer	4.3%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	14.3%
		Other	1.4%
		No Answer	2.9%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	18.6%
		6-10 Years	32.9%
		11-15 Years	21.4%
		16-20 Years	17.1%
		21 Years or more	7.1%
		No Answer	2.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	87.1%
		Female	10.0%
		No Answer	2.9%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	77.1%
		Second District	2.9%
		Third District	15.7%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	4.3%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	11.4%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	71.4%
		35,000 or over	14.3%
		No Answer	2.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Patricia Collins was evaluated by 63 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 63 respondents, 21 (33.3%) had substantial and recent experience, 21 (33.3%) had moderate experience, 20 (31.7%) had limited experience, and one (1.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The overall evaluation mean score was 4.7, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.8), and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.8). The lowest mean score was obtained on *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.5); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Patricia Collins:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	1.6	3	4.9	15	24.6	42	68.9	4.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	1	1.7	4	6.7	13	21.7	42	70.0	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	11	18.3	47	78.3	4.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	1	1.8	4	7.1	15	26.8	36	64.3	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.3	8	13.3	50	83.3	4.8
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.4	12	20.3	45	76.3	4.7
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.0	15	26.3	38	66.7	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.1	16	27.1	40	67.8	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.4	14	25.0	39	69.6	4.6
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.5	12	22.6	37	69.8	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.4	8	16.7	35	72.9	4.6
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	1	1.6	2	3.3	14	23.0	44	72.1	4.7





**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=19)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	63.2%
		Guardian ad Litem	15.8%
		CASA Volunteer	15.8%
		Other	5.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	47.4%
		6-10 Years	15.8%
		11-15 Years	26.3%
		16-20 Years	5.3%
		21 Years or more	5.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	26.3%
		Female	73.7%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	73.7%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	15.8%
		Fourth District	5.3%
		Outside Alaska	5.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	5.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	68.4%
		35,000 or over	26.3%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Patricia Collins was evaluated by a total of 16 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 16 respondents, 10 (62.5%) had substantial and recent experience, two (12.5%) had moderate experience, three (18.8%) had limited experience, one (6.2%) and did not indicate level of experience. The overall evaluation mean score was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.7), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.7). The lowest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (4.1); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Patricia Collins:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	7.7	0	0.0	2	15.4	2	15.4	8	61.5	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	1	8.3	9	75.0	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	2	15.4	10	76.9	4.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	9	75.0	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.7	4.6
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	9	75.0	4.7
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	5	41.7	6	50.0	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	3	27.3	7	63.6	4.5
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	7.7	1	7.7	3	23.1	8	61.5	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	1	7.7	0	0	3	23.1	9	69.2	4.5





**D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=194)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	24.7%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	16.5%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.3%
		Private corporate employee	0.5%
		State judge or judicial officer	15.5%
		Government	22.2%
		Public service agency or organization	3.1%
		Other	1.6%
		No Answer	4.6%
c.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	7.2%
		6-10 Years	9.8%
		11-15 Years	13.4%
		16-20 Years	22.7%
		21 Years or more	42.3%
		No Answer	4.6%
d.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.1%
		Female	24.7%
		No Answer	4.1%
e.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.7%
		Mainly criminal	9.8%
		Mixed criminal and civil	28.9%
		Mainly civil	46.4%
		Other	4.6%
		No Answer	4.6%
f.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	51.6%
		Second District	0.5%
		Third District	35.6%
		Fourth District	6.2%
		Outside Alaska	2.6%
		No Answer	3.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Michael Thompson was evaluated by 172 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 172 respondents, 69 (40.1%) had substantial and recent experience, 41 (23.9%) had moderate experience, 48 (27.9%) had limited experience, and 14 (8.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.3) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were *legal and factual analysis* (3.8), and *knowledge of substantive law* (3.8); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	2	1.2	12	7.1	42	25.0	79	47.0	33	19.6	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	1	0.6	9	5.4	46	27.7	72	43.4	38	22.9	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	1.2	6	3.7	41	25.2	70	42.9	44	27.0	3.9
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	0.6	8	4.7	24	14.1	64	37.6	73	42.9	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	0.6	9	5.5	19	11.5	59	35.8	77	46.7	4.2
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	0.6	3	1.9	23	14.3	54	33.5	80	49.7	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	0.7	3	2.0	27	17.6	52	34.0	70	45.8	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	0.6	7	4.2	24	14.4	50	29.9	85	50.9	4.3
Human understanding and compassion	1	0.6	6	3.7	23	14.1	57	35.0	76	46.6	4.2
Ability to control courtroom	2	1.4	7	4.8	26	17.9	49	33.8	61	42.1	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	1.4	4	2.7	32	21.8	59	40.1	50	34.0	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	0.7	9	6.1	34	23.0	65	43.9	39	26.4	3.9
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	1.6	1	1.6	16	25.4	27	42.9	18	28.6	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	1.1	4	4.3	16	17.4	34	37.0	37	40.2	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	1.3	5	6.4	17	21.8	30	38.5	25	32.1	3.9
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	0.6	8	4.8	31	18.5	78	46.4	50	29.8	4.0

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Private-Solo	40	4.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	45.0	25.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	29	4.1	3.5	3.5	13.8	37.9	41.4
6+ Attorneys	18	3.8	0.0	0.0	33.3	50.0	16.7
Corporate	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	25	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	48.0
Government	39	3.5	0.0	18.0	23.1	48.7	10.3
Public Service	6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Other	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	8	4.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	75.0	12.5
5 Years or fewer	13	4.2	0.0	0.0	15.4	53.9	30.8
6 – 10 Years	18	4.2	0.0	0.0	22.2	33.3	44.4
11 – 15 Years	21	3.7	0.0	9.5	28.6	42.9	19.1
16 – 20 Years	37	3.8	2.7	5.4	24.3	43.2	24.3
21 Years or more	71	4.1	0.0	5.6	12.7	47.9	33.8
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	8	4.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	25.0
Male	122	4.0	0.8	4.9	18.0	44.3	32.0
Female	38	3.9	0.0	2.6	23.7	50.0	23.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	9	3.7	0.0	22.2	0.0	66.7	11.1
Prosecution	11	2.9	0.0	36.4	36.4	27.3	0.0
Criminal	16	4.2	0.0	0.0	12.5	56.3	31.2
Criminal and Civil	48	4.2	0.0	4.2	16.7	37.5	41.7
Civil	77	4.0	1.3	0.0	20.8	52.0	26.0
Other	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	7	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
First District	91	3.9	0.0	5.5	20.9	47.3	26.4
Second District	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	59	4.1	1.7	3.4	17.0	42.4	35.6
Fourth District	8	3.9	0.0	12.5	12.5	50.0	25.0
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	14	4.0	0.0	0.0	35.7	28.6	35.7
Substantial	68	4.0	1.5	4.4	16.2	44.1	33.8
Moderate	41	4.1	0.0	4.9	14.6	43.9	36.6
Limited	45	3.8	0.0	6.7	20.0	57.8	15.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	168	4.0	0.6	4.8	18.5	46.4	29.8
Professional Reputation	17	4.1	0.0	5.9	5.9	58.8	29.4
Social Contacts	3	3.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0

**D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=37)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	40.5%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	27.0%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.7%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	21.6%
		Other	2.7%
		No Answer	5.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.1%
		6-10 Years	37.8%
		11-15 Years	27.0%
		16-20 Years	16.2%
		21 Years or more	5.4%
		No Answer	5.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	75.7%
		Female	18.9%
		No Answer	5.4%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	64.9%
		Second District	2.7%
		Third District	21.6%
		Fourth District	5.4%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	5.4%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	13.5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	64.9%
		35,000 or over	16.2%
		No Answer	5.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Michael Thompson was evaluated by 34 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 34 respondents, 20 (58.8%) had substantial and recent experience, six (17.6%) had moderate experience, and eight (23.5%) had limited experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (3.9), and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.9). The lowest mean score was *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (3.5); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.



**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	2.9	6	17.6	7	20.6	13	38.2	7	20.6	3.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	3.1	4	12.5	9	28.1	9	28.1	9	28.1	3.7
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	4	12.5	6	18.8	11	34.4	11	34.4	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	3.3	3	10.0	8	26.7	12	40.0	6	20.0	3.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	2	6.1	8	24.2	14	42.4	9	27.3	3.9
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	4	12.1	5	15.2	16	48.5	8	24.2	3.8
Ability to control courtroom	1	3.2	2	6.5	7	22.6	10	32.3	11	35.5	3.9
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	3	9.1	9	27.3	13	39.4	8	24.2	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	5	17.2	11	37.9	5	17.2	8	27.6	3.6
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	3	9.7	5	16.1	6	19.4	8	25.8	9	29.0	3.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	3.8	3	11.5	7	26.9	10	38.5	5	19.2	3.6
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	3.0	5	15.2	6	18.2	15	45.5	6	18.2	3.6

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	2	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
State Officer	13	3.7	7.7	7.7	15.4	46.2	23.1
Municipal/Borough	10	3.7	0.0	10.0	20.0	60.0	10.0
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	7	3.9	0.0	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
Other	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	2	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	3	3.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
6 – 10 Years	12	3.8	8.3	8.3	0.0	66.7	16.7
11 – 15 Years	8	3.6	0.0	25.0	0.0	62.5	12.5
16 – 20 Years	6	3.8	0.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	33.3
21 Years or more	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	2	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Male	25	3.8	0.0	12.0	12.0	56.0	20.0
Female	6	3.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	16.7	16.7
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	2	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
First District	22	3.8	0.0	13.6	9.1	59.1	18.2
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	7	3.3	14.3	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6
Fourth District	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	2	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
2,000-35,000	23	3.7	0.0	17.4	13.0	52.2	17.4
Over 35,000	4	3.3	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substantial	19	3.5	0.0	21.1	15.8	52.6	10.5
Moderate	6	3.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	33.3
Limited	8	3.8	0.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	33	3.6	3.0	15.2	18.2	45.5	18.2
Professional Reputation	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Social Contacts	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

**D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=6)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	33.3%
		CASA Volunteer	16.7%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	50.0%
		6-10 Years	16.7%
		11-15 Years	16.7%
		16-20 Years	16.7%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	83.3%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	16.7%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	83.3%
		35,000 or over	16.7%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Michael Thompson was evaluated by five Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these five respondents, four (80.0%) had substantial and recent experience and one (20.0%) had moderate experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was *ability to control courtroom* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were *sense of basic fairness* (4.0), *human understanding and compassion* (4.0), and *settlement skills* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Michael A. Thompson:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	10.0	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.2
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.2





**E. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=200)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25.5%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	10.5%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.0%
		Private corporate employee	2.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	13.0%
		Government	28.0%
		Public service agency or organization	2.5%
		Other	1.5%
		No Answer	6.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.0%
		6-10 Years	11.0%
		11-15 Years	10.5%
		16-20 Years	22.0%
		21 Years or more	46.0%
		No Answer	4.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.5%
		Female	27.5%
		No Answer	7.0%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3.5%
		Mainly criminal	8.0%
		Mixed criminal and civil	25.5%
		Mainly civil	53.0%
		Other	3.5%
		No Answer	6.5%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	46.5%
		Second District	1.0%
		Third District	41.0%
		Fourth District	5.0%
		Outside Alaska	1.5%
		No Answer	5.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Peter Froehlich was evaluated by 154 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 154 respondents, 58 (37.7%) of the respondents had substantial and recent experience, 42 (27.3%) had moderate experience, 40 (26.0%) had limited experience, and 14 (9.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.5, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.0). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (3.4), *knowledge of substantive law* (3.4), and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.4); these scores fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Peter Froehlich:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	2.7	17	11.6	56	38.1	52	35.4	18	12.2	3.4
Knowledge of substantive law	4	2.8	15	10.6	54	38.3	50	35.5	18	12.8	3.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	4	2.9	11	7.9	51	36.7	53	38.1	20	14.4	3.5
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	8	5.4	23	15.5	39	26.4	47	31.8	31	20.9	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	7	4.8	18	12.4	33	22.8	51	35.2	36	24.8	3.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	3	2.0	13	8.6	32	21.2	52	34.4	51	33.8	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	3	2.2	9	6.5	39	28.3	43	31.2	44	31.9	3.8
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	15	9.9	20	13.2	41	27.2	45	29.8	30	19.9	3.4
Human understanding and compassion	12	8.1	17	11.5	35	23.6	51	34.5	33	22.3	3.5
Ability to control courtroom	6	4.4	7	5.1	27	19.7	54	39.4	43	31.4	3.9
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	0.7	4	3.0	32	23.9	56	41.8	41	30.6	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	4	3.1	6	4.7	32	24.8	51	39.5	36	27.9	3.8
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	5	8.2	5	8.2	13	21.3	27	44.3	11	18.0	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	3	3.3	8	8.8	25	27.5	36	39.6	19	20.9	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	4	6.0	6	9.0	18	26.9	25	37.3	14	20.9	3.6
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	7	4.8	15	10.3	41	28.1	59	40.4	24	16.4	3.5



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Peter Froehlich:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	3.6	0.0	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0
Private-Solo	40	3.7	7.5	7.5	22.5	35.0	27.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	14	3.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	14.3
6+ Attorneys	18	3.7	0.0	5.6	27.8	55.6	11.1
Corporate	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	17	3.7	5.9	5.9	23.5	41.2	23.5
Government	41	3.2	4.9	17.1	34.2	41.5	2.4
Public Service	5	3.2	20.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
Other	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	5	3.4	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
5 Years or fewer	9	3.8	0.0	0.0	33.3	55.6	11.1
6 – 10 Years	18	3.5	5.6	5.6	27.8	55.6	5.6
11 – 15 Years	15	3.7	0.0	0.0	53.3	26.7	20.0
16 – 20 Years	34	3.1	8.8	17.7	32.4	32.4	8.8
21 Years or more	65	3.7	4.6	10.8	18.5	43.1	23.1
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	10	2.9	10.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	10.0
Male	96	3.6	5.2	7.3	27.1	40.6	19.8
Female	40	3.5	2.5	12.5	30.0	45.0	10.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	8	3.1	0.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5
Prosecution	5	3.2	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	0.0
Criminal	12	3.4	8.3	0.0	41.7	41.7	8.3
Criminal and Civil	41	3.3	12.2	12.2	26.8	29.3	19.5
Civil	76	3.7	1.3	7.9	23.7	50.0	17.1
Other	4	3.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	6	3.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3
First District	74	3.5	4.1	9.5	33.8	39.2	13.5
Second District	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Third District	57	3.5	7.0	10.5	22.8	42.1	17.5
Fourth District	4	4.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	13	3.8	7.7	7.7	15.4	30.8	38.5
Substantial	57	3.3	7.0	15.8	28.1	36.8	12.3
Moderate	40	3.5	2.5	10.0	32.5	42.5	12.5
Limited	36	3.8	2.8	2.8	27.8	47.2	19.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	146	3.5	4.8	10.3	28.1	40.4	16.4
Professional Reputation	37	3.8	0.0	5.4	35.1	35.1	24.3
Social Contacts	6	3.7	0.0	16.7	33.3	16.7	33.3

**E. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officers (N=56)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	16.1%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	58.9%
		Village Public Safety Officer	5.4%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	12.5%
		Other	7.1%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	28.6%
		6-10 Years	26.8%
		11-15 Years	16.1%
		16-20 Years	19.6%
		21 Years or more	8.9%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	91.1%
		Female	8.9%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	83.9%
		Second District	3.6%
		Third District	5.4%
		Fourth District	3.6%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	3.6%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	17.9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	66.1%
		35,000 or over	16.1%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Peter Froehlich was evaluated by 49 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 49 respondents, 21 (42.9%) of the respondents had substantial and recent experience, 12 (24.5%) had moderate experience, 13 (26.5%) had limited experience, and three (6.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.4), and *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.4). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.6); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Peter Froehlich:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>	
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>		
<b>Impartiality</b>												
Equal treatment of all parties	1	2.1	2	4.2	14	29.2	14	29.2	17	35.4	3.9	
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	2.1	3	6.4	8	17.0	17	36.2	18	38.3	4.0	
<b>Integrity</b>												
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	2.2	5	10.9	4	8.7	15	32.6	21	45.7	4.1	
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	3	6.4	7	14.9	16	34.0	21	44.7	4.2	
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>												
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	4	8.5	8	17.0	8	17.0	12	25.5	15	31.9	3.6	
Human understanding and compassion	1	2.2	4	8.7	9	19.6	18	39.1	14	30.4	3.9	
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	13.3	13	28.9	26	57.8	4.4	
<b>Diligence</b>												
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	12.8	15	31.9	26	55.3	4.4	
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	19.6	17	37.0	20	43.5	4.2	
<b>Special Skills</b>												
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	2.2	5	10.9	6	13.0	14	30.4	20	43.5	4.0	
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2.9	1	2.9	4	11.8	12	35.3	16	47.1	4.2	
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>												
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	5	10.4	7	14.6	19	39.6	17	35.4	4.0	

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” for District Court Judge Peter Froehlich:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
State Officer	9	3.9	0.0	22.2	0.0	44.4	33.3
Municipal/Borough	30	3.9	0.0	10.0	23.3	33.3	33.3
Village Public Safety Officer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Probation/parole officer	6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Other	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	14	4.2	0.0	0.0	14.3	50.0	35.7
6 – 10 Years	15	3.9	0.0	6.7	26.7	40.0	26.7
11 – 15 Years	8	4.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5
16 – 20 Years	8	3.9	0.0	25.0	0.0	37.5	37.5
21 Years or more	3	4.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	44	4.0	0.0	9.1	15.9	41.0	34.1
Female	4	4.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	42	4.0	0.0	7.1	16.7	42.9	33.3
Second District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	2	3.5	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Fourth District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	8	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
2,000-35,000	33	3.8	0.0	12.1	21.2	42.4	24.2
Over 35,000	7	4.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	57.1
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Substantial	21	3.8	0.0	14.3	28.6	23.8	33.3
Moderate	12	3.8	0.0	16.7	8.3	58.3	16.7
Limited	12	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	48	4.0	0.0	10.4	14.6	39.6	35.4
Professional Reputation	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
Social Contacts	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0

**E. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=5)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	80.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	20.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	60.0%
		6-10 Years	0.0%
		11-15 Years	20.0%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	20.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	60.0%
		Female	40.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	100.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	0.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	100.0%
		35,000 or over	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Peter Froehlich was evaluated by three Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these three respondents, three (100.0%) had limited experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (5.0), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (5.0), and *willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings* (5.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (2.0); this score fell within the “unacceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Peter Froehlich:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	5.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	4.0







**F. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE KEVIN G. MILLER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=63)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	22.2%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	22.2%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	4.8%
		Private corporate employee	0.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	22.2%
		Government	17.5%
		Public service agency or organization	1.6%
		Other	1.6%
		No Answer	7.9%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.4%
		6-10 Years	6.4%
		11-15 Years	12.7%
		16-20 Years	25.4%
		21 Years or more	41.3%
		No Answer	7.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.4%
		Female	20.6%
		No Answer	7.9%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.9%
		Mainly criminal	9.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	47.6%
		Mainly civil	23.8%
		Other	3.2%
		No Answer	7.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	73.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	17.5%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	1.6%
		No Answer	7.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Kevin G. Miller was evaluated by 54 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience. Of these 54 respondents, 30 (55.6%) had substantial and recent experience, six (11.1%) had moderate experience, 17 (31.5%) had limited experience, and one (1.9%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.5), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.0); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	24.5	17	34.7	20	40.8	4.2
Knowledge of substantive law	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	24.5	21	42.9	16	32.7	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	0	0.0	1	2.0	11	22.4	22	44.9	15	30.6	4.0
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	1.9	6	11.3	20	37.7	26	49.1	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	2.0	0	0.0	6	12.2	16	32.7	26	53.1	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	9.8	15	29.4	31	60.8	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	1	2.2	6	13.0	20	43.5	19	41.3	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	9.6	14	26.9	33	63.5	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.4	19	39.6	24	50.0	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	2	4.2	6	12.5	19	39.6	21	43.8	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.2	23	46.9	21	42.9	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.6	19	39.6	22	45.8	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	6	23.1	16	61.5	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.3	15	41.7	18	50.0	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	6	31.6	11	57.9	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	11.5	24	46.2	22	42.3	4.3

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Private-Solo	12	4.1	0.0	0.0	25.0	41.7	33.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	54.6
6+ Attorneys	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Corporate	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.6
Government	11	4.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	63.7	18.2
Public Service	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
6 – 10 Years	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
11 – 15 Years	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
16 – 20 Years	14	4.1	0.0	0.0	21.4	42.9	35.7
21 Years or more	20	4.3	0.0	0.0	15.0	40.0	45.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Male	38	4.3	0.0	0.0	7.9	52.6	39.5
Female	10	4.3	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Prosecution	5	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Criminal	6	4.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Criminal and Civil	23	4.3	0.0	0.0	17.4	39.1	43.5
Civil	13	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.2	53.9
Other	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
First District	39	4.3	0.0	0.0	12.8	43.6	43.6
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	8	4.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substantial	30	4.5	0.0	0.0	6.7	33.3	60.0
Moderate	6	3.8	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	0.0
Limited	16	4.1	0.0	0.0	18.8	56.3	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	52	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.5	46.2	42.3
Professional Reputation	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
Social Contacts	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

**F. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE KEVIN G. MILLER**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=27)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	40.7%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	40.7%
		Village Public Safety Officer	7.4%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	3.7%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	7.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	22.2%
		6-10 Years	37.0%
		11-15 Years	22.2%
		16-20 Years	7.4%
		21 Years or more	3.7%
		No Answer	7.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	85.2%
		Female	7.4%
		No Answer	7.4%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	81.5%
		Second District	3.7%
		Third District	7.4%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	7.4%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	22.2%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	63.0%
		35,000 or over	7.4%
		No Answer	7.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Kevin Miller was evaluated by 24 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience. Of these 24 respondents, nine (37.5%) had substantial and recent experience, seven (29.2%) had moderate experience, seven (29.2%) had limited experience, and one (4.2%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.8, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy*, *freedom from arrogance* (4.9), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.9). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.6) and *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.6), however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	5	21.7	17	73.9	4.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0	4	18.2	18	81.8	4.8
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	17.4	19	82.6	4.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	27.3	16	72.7	4.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.0	20	87.0	4.9
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	20	90.9	4.9
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	4	18.2	16	72.7	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	40.9	13	59.1	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	35.0	13	65.0	4.7
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	5	23.8	15	71.4	4.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	26.7	11	73.3	4.7
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	21.7	18	78.3	4.8



**F. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE KEVIN G. MILLER**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=4)*

a.	<u>Type of Work</u>	Social Worker	50.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	50.0%
		CASA Volunteer	0.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	75.0%
		6-10 Years	25.0%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	100.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	0.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	100.0%
		35,000 or over	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Kevin G. Miller was evaluated by four Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience. Of these four respondents, one (25.0%) had substantial and recent experience, two (50.0%) had moderate experience, and one (25.0%) had limited experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.5), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.5), and *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.3); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Kevin G. Miller  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4.5
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	4.3
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	3.3
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4.5







**G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=471)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.8%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	17.4%
		Private corporate employee	1.7%
		State judge or judicial officer	10.2%
		Government	18.3%
		Public service agency or organization	1.3%
		Other	2.6%
		No Answer	3.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.6%
		6-10 Years	11.7%
		11-15 Years	12.7%
		16-20 Years	21.7%
		21 Years or more	41.8%
		No Answer	2.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	68.6%
		Female	28.0%
		No Answer	3.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.7%
		Mainly criminal	8.7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	24.4%
		Mainly civil	53.3%
		Other	4.9%
		No Answer	3.0%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	1.7%
		Second District	1.1%
		Third District	90.9%
		Fourth District	2.8%
		Outside Alaska	1.3%
		No Answer	2.3%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Larry D. Card was evaluated by 354 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 354 respondents, 140 (38.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 95 (25.8%) had moderate experience, 88 (23.9%) had limited experience, and 46 (12.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.4), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.4), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.4). The lowest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (3.9); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	10	2.8	22	6.1	98	27.1	143	39.6	88	24.4	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	8	2.3	17	4.8	98	27.8	140	39.7	90	25.5	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	8	2.3	19	5.4	84	24.1	143	41.0	95	27.2	3.9
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	10	2.8	8	2.2	49	13.5	111	30.6	185	51.0	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	8	2.3	4	1.1	41	11.6	112	31.6	189	53.4	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	9	2.5	5	1.4	38	10.5	99	27.3	211	58.3	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	10	2.9	7	2.0	48	14.0	108	31.4	171	49.7	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	6	1.7	5	1.4	36	10.0	91	25.3	221	61.6	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	5	1.4	4	1.1	42	11.9	85	24.1	217	61.5	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	6	1.8	9	2.7	50	14.8	120	35.6	152	45.1	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	8	2.5	15	4.7	62	19.4	124	38.9	110	34.5	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	7	2.1	16	4.9	60	18.4	118	36.2	125	38.3	4.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	5	3.0	7	4.2	43	26.1	50	30.3	60	36.4	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	8	3.4	7	3.0	41	17.7	77	33.2	99	42.7	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	7	3.3	12	5.7	39	18.4	67	31.6	87	41.0	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	8	2.2	18	5.0	60	16.6	139	38.4	137	37.8	4.0

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.7	27.3
Private-Solo	99	4.2	2.0	2.0	17.2	29.3	49.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	80	3.9	3.8	6.3	17.5	38.8	33.8
6+ Attorneys	43	3.9	2.3	2.3	25.6	44.2	25.6
Corporate	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	41	4.4	0.0	2.4	4.9	43.9	48.8
Government	70	3.8	2.9	10.0	20.0	41.4	25.7
Public Service	3	3.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
Other	10	4.2	0.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	50.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	9	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.8	22.2
5 Years or fewer	31	3.9	3.2	9.7	16.1	38.7	32.3
6 – 10 Years	39	3.9	2.6	5.1	25.6	30.8	35.9
11 – 15 Years	51	4.0	0.0	9.8	15.7	37.3	37.3
16 – 20 Years	79	3.9	3.8	2.5	22.8	39.2	31.7
21 Years or more	153	4.2	2.0	3.9	12.4	37.9	43.8
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.6	45.5
Male	250	4.0	2.8	5.6	16.0	38.8	36.8
Female	101	4.1	1.0	4.0	19.8	35.6	39.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	10	4.2	0.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
Prosecution	23	4.0	0.0	4.4	13.0	56.5	26.1
Criminal	40	4.0	2.5	7.5	17.5	35.0	37.5
Criminal and Civil	103	4.2	1.9	2.9	14.6	31.1	49.5
Civil	173	3.9	2.9	5.8	17.9	40.5	33.0
Other	13	4.0	0.0	5.6	5.0	2.9	3.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
First District	5	3.8	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0
Second District	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	332	4.1	2.4	5.1	16.3	37.1	39.2
Fourth District	10	3.8	0.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
Outside Alaska	5	4.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	46	4.0	0.0	4.4	26.1	32.6	37.0
Substantial	139	4.1	4.3	5.0	15.1	28.8	46.8
Moderate	93	4.0	2.2	7.5	15.1	41.9	33.3
Limited	82	4.1	0.0	2.4	15.9	54.9	26.8
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	362	4.0	2.2	5.0	16.6	38.4	37.9
Professional Reputation	81	4.1	0.0	2.5	22.2	39.5	35.8
Social Contacts	11	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.7	27.3

**G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace And Probation Officer Respondents (N=92)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	23.9%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	35.0%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.17%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	25.0%
		Other	10.9%
		No Answer	1.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	22.8%
		6-10 Years	23.9%
		11-15 Years	18.5%
		16-20 Years	16.3%
		21 Years or more	16.3%
		No Answer	2.2%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	77.2%
		Female	21.7%
		No Answer	1.1%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	4.4%
		Second District	4.4%
		Third District	88.0%
		Fourth District	1.1%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.2%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	6.5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	16.3%
		35,000 or over	76.1%
		No Answer	1.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Larry D. Card was evaluated by 76 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 76 respondents, 34 (44.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 21 (27.6%) had moderate experience, 19 (25.0%) had limited experience, and two (2.6%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.7). The lowest mean scores were obtained in the categories of *Diligence* (4.4) and *Special Skills* (4.4); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation Of Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	4	5.4	2	2.7	20	27.0	48	64.9	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	4	5.5	2	2.7	15	20.5	52	71.2	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	2	2.7	2	2.7	18	24.3	52	70.3	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	4	5.6	2	2.8	22	30.6	44	61.1	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	3	4.0	3	4.0	15	20.0	54	72.0	4.6
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.4	20	27.4	51	69.9	4.7
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	2	2.9	3	4.3	20	29.0	44	63.8	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making Decisions	0	0.0	2	2.9	5	7.4	28	41.2	33	48.5	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	2	3.2	4	6.5	21	33.9	35	56.5	4.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	1.4	4	5.8	3	4.3	17	24.6	44	63.8	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	3	7.0	2	4.7	13	30.2	25	58.1	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	4	5.3	2	2.6	20	26.3	50	65.8	4.5

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
State Officer	18	4.6	0.0	0.0	5.6	33.3	61.1
Municipal/Borough	27	4.6	0.0	3.7	0.0	25.9	70.4
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	23	4.4	0.0	8.7	4.4	26.1	60.9
Other	7	4.4	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	71.4
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	17	4.5	0.0	11.8	0.0	17.7	70.6
6 – 10 Years	21	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
11 – 15 Years	13	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.5	61.5
16 – 20 Years	12	4.5	0.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	75.0
21 Years or more	11	4.3	0.0	9.1	9.1	27.3	54.6
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Male	58	4.6	0.0	3.5	3.5	25.9	67.2
Female	17	4.4	0.0	11.8	0.0	29.4	58.8
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
First District	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Second District	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	69	4.5	0.0	5.8	2.9	27.5	63.8
Fourth District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Under 2,000	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
2,000-35,000	11	4.1	0.0	9.1	9.1	45.5	36.4
Over 35,000	60	4.6	0.0	5.0	1.7	21.7	71.7
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Substantial	34	4.6	0.0	8.8	0.0	14.7	76.5
Moderate	21	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.1	61.9
Limited	19	4.4	0.0	5.3	5.3	31.6	57.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	76	4.5	0.0	5.3	2.6	26.3	65.8
Professional Reputation	14	4.1	0.0	7.1	14.3	35.7	42.9
Social Contacts	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0



**G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=16)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	18.8%
		Guardian ad Litem	31.3%
		CASA Volunteer	50.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or more	31.3%
		6-10 Years	31.3%
		11-15 Years	6.3%
		16-20 Years	25.0%
		21 Years or more	6.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	6.3%
		Female	93.8%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	93.8%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	6.3%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	6.3%
		35,000 or over	81.3%
		No Answer	12.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Larry D. Card was evaluated by 12 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 12 respondents, four (33.3%) had substantial and recent experience, four (33.3%) had moderate experience, and four (33.3%) had limited experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.8), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.8). The lowest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (4.0); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Larry D. Card:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7	4.8
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	10	83.3	4.8
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	16.7	3	25.0	6	50.0	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	8.3	5	41.7	5	41.7	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; reparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	1	11.1	2	22.2	2	22.2	4	44.4	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	36.4	5	45.4	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	6	50.0	5	41.7	4.3





**H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SAMUEL D. ADAMS**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=315)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25.1%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21.0%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	10.8%
		Private corporate employee	1.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	10.2%
		Government	25.4%
		Public service agency or organization	1.9%
		Other	1.6%
		No Answer	3.2%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	14.0%
		6-10 Years	13.3%
		11-15 Years	15.6%
		16-20 Years	21.9%
		21 Years or more	32.7%
		No Answer	2.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.3%
		Female	29.2%
		No Answer	3.5%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	11.8%
		Mainly criminal	11.1%
		Mixed criminal and civil	29.8%
		Mainly civil	41.6%
		Other	2.9%
		No Answer	2.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	1.9%
		Second District	1.6%
		Third District	90.5%
		Fourth District	3.2%
		Outside Alaska	0.3%
		No Answer	2.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Samuel D. Adams was evaluated by 260 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 260 respondents, 122 (46.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 66 (25.4%) had moderate experience, 50 (19.2%) had limited experience, and 22 (8.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.4). The lowest mean score of 4.0 was obtained on seven items; however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	1	0.4	9	3.6	54	21.5	116	46.2	71	28.3	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law	2	0.8	9	3.7	50	20.4	120	49.0	64	26.1	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	0.8	7	2.9	51	21.2	110	45.6	71	29.5	4.0
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	6	2.4	15	5.9	40	15.7	93	36.6	100	39.4	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	4	1.6	12	4.8	42	16.8	89	35.6	103	41.2	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	3	1.2	10	4.0	39	15.7	89	35.9	107	43.1	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	0.9	9	3.9	41	17.7	85	36.6	95	40.9	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	8	3.1	17	6.6	39	15.1	96	37.2	98	38.0	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	6	2.4	15	6.0	45	17.9	95	37.8	90	35.9	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	4	1.7	33	13.8	86	35.8	117	48.8	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making Decisions	0	0.0	1	0.5	40	18.1	96	43.4	84	38.0	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	4	1.8	41	18.3	96	42.9	83	37.1	4.2
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	0.9	2	1.8	22	19.6	44	39.3	43	38.4	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	2.4	6	3.5	29	17.1	71	41.8	60	35.3	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	0.9	1	0.9	23	21.3	44	40.7	39	36.1	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	0.8	11	4.3	42	16.4	115	44.9	86	33.6	4.1

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6
Private-Solo	72	4.1	0.0	5.6	19.4	34.7	40.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	53	3.8	1.9	7.6	20.8	47.2	22.6
6+ Attorneys	23	4.1	0.0	4.4	17.4	43.5	34.8
Corporate	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	26	4.4	0.0	0.0	3.9	53.9	42.3
Government	64	4.2	0.0	1.6	14.1	51.6	32.8
Public Service	3	2.3	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
Other	4	3.5	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
5 Years or fewer	40	4.1	2.5	5.0	12.5	45.0	35.0
6 – 10 Years	35	4.0	2.9	8.6	17.1	31.4	40.0
11 – 15 Years	34	3.9	0.0	2.9	26.5	47.1	23.5
16 – 20 Years	55	4.1	0.0	3.6	16.4	50.9	29.1
21 Years or more	84	4.1	0.0	3.6	15.5	47.6	33.3
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	10	4.5	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
Male	175	4.1	1.1	3.4	14.9	49.7	30.9
Female	71	4.0	0.0	7.0	21.1	35.2	36.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	9	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6
Prosecution	34	4.4	0.0	0.0	2.9	58.8	38.2
Criminal	31	3.6	0.0	12.9	32.3	35.5	19.4
Criminal and Civil	85	4.0	0.0	5.9	17.7	47.1	29.4
Civil	91	4.1	2.2	2.2	15.4	41.8	38.5
Other	6	4.2	0.0	0.0	16.7	50.0	33.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
First District	4	3.8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Second District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Third District	231	4.0	0.9	4.8	17.3	43.3	33.8
Fourth District	10	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	22	4.0	0.0	4.6	13.6	36.4	45.5
Substantial	121	4.0	1.7	6.6	15.7	39.7	36.4
Moderate	65	4.1	0.0	3.1	15.4	52.3	29.2
Limited	48	4.1	0.0	0.0	20.8	52.1	27.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	256	4.1	0.8	4.3	16.4	44.9	33.6
Professional Reputation	38	4.1	0.0	2.6	15.8	50.0	31.6
Social Contacts	11	3.8	0.0	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2

**H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SAMUEL D. ADAMS**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=94)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	46.8%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	42.4%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.1%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	0.0%
		Other	7.4%
		No Answer	1.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or more	22.3%
		6-10 Years	23.4%
		11-15 Years	16.0%
		16-20 Years	20.2%
		21 Years or more	16.0%
		No Answer	2.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	91.5%
		Female	7.5%
		No Answer	1.1%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	8.5%
		Second District	2.1%
		Third District	87.2%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.1%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	4.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	28.7%
		35,000 or over	66.0%
		No Answer	1.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Samuel D. Adams was evaluated by 79 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 79 respondents, 29 (36.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 17 (21.5%) had moderate experience, 26 (32.9%) had limited experience, and eight (8.9%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.6, falling within the “excellent” range. Eight of the eleven items had a mean score of 4.6, with the remaining three items receiving a mean score of 4.5. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.



**Evaluation of District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	10.7	22	29.3	45	60.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.9	20	27.8	47	65.3	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.4	19	24.4	54	69.2	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	10.7	17	22.7	50	66.7	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	9.0	20	25.6	51	65.4	4.6
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.0	19	25.3	50	66.7	4.6
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	8.6	13	18.6	51	72.9	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	7.0	19	26.8	47	66.2	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	1.6	3	4.8	20	32.3	38	61.3	4.5
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	7.6	16	24.2	45	68.2	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	2.3	3	7.0	11	25.6	28	65.1	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	7.8	20	26.0	51	66.2	4.6



**H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SAMUEL D. ADAMS**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=3)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	100.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	66.7%
		6-10 Years	33.3%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
		35,000 or over	66.7%
		No Answer	33.3%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Samuel D. Adams was evaluated by a total of two Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these two respondents, one (50.0%) had substantial and recent experience and one (50.0%) had limited experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 5.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (5.0), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (5.0), *ability to control courtroom* (5.0), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (5.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.0); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation Of District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	5.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	4.5
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0		
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Samuel D. Adams  
Social Worker/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Social Worker	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guardian ad Litem	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CASA Volunteer	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
6 – 10 Years	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 – 15 Years	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
16 – 20 Years	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 Years or more	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population of Community</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 35,000	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substantial	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Moderate	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Limited	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Professional Reputation	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Social Contacts	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0



**I. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=346)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	29.5%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	13.3%
		Private corporate employee	0.9%
		State judge or judicial officer	10.4%
		Government	17.9%
		Public service agency or organization	1.2%
		Other	2.0%
		No Answer	3.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	11.9%
		6-10 Years	10.7%
		11-15 Years	13.0%
		16-20 Years	19.9%
		21 Years or more	41.9%
		No Answer	2.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	69.9%
		Female	26.9%
		No Answer	3.2%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	8.1%
		Mainly criminal	8.7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	26.9%
		Mainly civil	48.3%
		Other	4.9%
		No Answer	3.2%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	1.7%
		Second District	0.6%
		Third District	90.5%
		Fourth District	3.8%
		Outside Alaska	0.9%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge John R. Lohff was evaluated by 314 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 314 respondents, 140 (44.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 79 (25.2%) had moderate experience, 56 (20.7%) had limited experience, and 30 (9.6%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual ability* (3.8), *knowledge of substantive law* (3.8), and *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (3.8); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge John R. Lohff:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	5	1.6	26	8.5	73	23.8	130	42.3	73	23.8	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	5	1.7	23	7.7	70	23.6	129	43.4	70	23.6	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	5	1.7	21	7.1	67	22.8	131	44.6	70	23.8	3.8
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	6	1.9	16	5.1	57	18.3	120	38.5	113	36.2	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	6	2.0	14	4.6	52	17.2	120	39.7	110	36.4	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	4	1.3	7	2.3	46	15.1	114	37.5	133	43.8	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	4	1.4	11	3.9	48	16.9	107	37.7	114	40.1	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	6	1.9	8	2.6	50	16.1	115	37.1	131	42.3	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	6	2.0	9	3.1	60	20.3	104	35.3	116	39.3	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	4	1.4	7	2.4	75	25.8	114	39.2	91	31.3	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	0.7	12	4.2	64	22.5	118	41.5	88	31.0	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	3	1.1	13	4.6	55	19.4	111	39.1	102	35.9	4.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	4	2.9	4	2.9	34	24.6	55	39.9	41	29.7	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	5	2.6	7	3.7	47	24.9	69	36.5	61	32.3	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	2	1.5	6	4.4	29	21.3	51	37.5	48	35.3	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	1.6	12	3.8	76	24.3	122	39.0	98	31.3	4.0



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge John R. Lohff:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.0	9.1	0.0	18.2	27.3	45.5
Solo	92	3.9	3.3	2.2	27.2	31.5	35.9
2 – 5 Attorneys	66	3.9	1.5	6.1	21.2	43.9	27.3
6+ Attorneys	42	3.9	0.0	7.1	21.4	47.6	23.8
Corporate	3	3.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	31	4.1	0.0	3.3	12.9	58.1	25.8
Government	59	3.9	0.0	3.4	35.6	30.5	30.5
Public Service	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	9	3.9	11.1	0.0	22.2	22.2	44.4
5 Years or fewer	39	4.0	0.0	5.1	25.6	33.3	35.9
6 – 10 Years	37	3.9	0.0	5.4	29.7	35.1	29.7
11 – 15 Years	42	3.8	2.4	4.8	31.0	35.7	26.2
16 – 20 Years	65	3.9	0.0	4.6	29.2	36.9	29.2
21 Years or more	121	4.0	2.5	2.5	17.4	45.5	32.2
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	11	3.9	9.1	0.0	27.3	18.2	45.5
Male	213	4.0	1.9	2.8	21.6	40.4	33.3
Female	89	3.8	0.0	6.7	30.3	38.2	24.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	11	3.8	9.1	0.0	27.3	27.3	36.4
Prosecution	28	4.1	0.0	7.1	17.9	35.7	39.3
Criminal	29	3.3	0.0	13.8	51.7	24.1	10.3
Criminal and Civil	85	3.9	3.5	1.2	24.7	42.4	28.2
Civil	147	4.0	1.0	3.4	20.4	42.2	33.3
Other	13	4.4	0.0	0.0	15.4	30.8	53.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	3.9	11.1	0.0	22.2	22.2	44.4
First District	4	3.8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Second District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	284	4.0	1.4	3.9	23.9	38.0	32.8
Fourth District	11	3.5	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.6	0.0
Outside Alaska	3	3.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	30	3.9	3.3	3.3	26.7	36.7	30.0
Substantial	140	3.9	2.1	5.7	22.9	34.3	35.0
Moderate	79	4.1	1.3	1.3	24.1	36.7	36.7
Limited	64	3.8	0.0	3.1	26.6	53.1	17.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	313	3.9	1.6	3.8	24.3	39.0	31.3
Professional Reputation	23	4.1	0.0	4.4	17.4	43.5	34.8
Social Contacts	8	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0

**I. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=41)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	24.4%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	48.8%
		Village Public Safety Officer	4.9%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	12.2%
		Other	9.8%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	19.5%
		6-10 Years	31.7%
		11-15 Years	9.8%
		16-20 Years	26.8%
		21 Years or more	9.8%
		No Answer	2.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	87.8%
		Female	12.2%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	4.9%
		Second District	2.4%
		Third District	90.2%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.4%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	9.8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	2.4%
		35,000 or over	87.8%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge John R. Lohff was evaluated by 37 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 37 respondents, 13 (35.1%) had substantial and recent experience, 12 (32.4%) had moderate experience, 10 (27.0%) had limited experience, and two (5.4%) did not indicate level of experience. The overall evaluation mean score was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.5), *human understanding and compassion* (4.5), *ability to control courtroom* (4.5), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *makes decision without regard to possible public criticism* (4.3), and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.3); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge John R. Lohff:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	2.8	0	0.0	3	8.3	12	33.3	20	55.6	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	2.8	0	0.0	1	2.8	15	41.7	19	52.8	4.4
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	2.7	0	0.0	4	10.8	10	27.0	22	59.5	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	1	2.8	5	13.9	12	33.3	18	50.0	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	2.8	0	0.0	2	5.6	10	27.8	23	63.9	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	1	2.8	0	0.0	2	5.6	11	30.6	22	61.1	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.1	10	27.8	22	61.1	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.8	13	38.2	17	50.0	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	2.9	0	0.0	4	11.8	9	26.5	20	58.8	4.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	3.1	1	3.1	4	12.5	8	25.0	18	56.3	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	4.0	0	0.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	16	64.0	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	2.8	1	2.8	2	5.6	13	36.1	19	52.8	4.3

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for John R. Lohff:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
State Officer	8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Municipal/Borough	19	4.1	5.3	5.3	10.5	36.8	42.1
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Other	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	6	4.2	0.0	0.0	16.7	50.0	33.3
6 – 10 Years	13	4.4	7.7	7.7	0.0	7.7	76.9
11 – 15 Years	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
16 – 20 Years	10	4.2	0.0	0.0	10.0	60.0	30.0
21 Years or more	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	33	4.3	3.0	3.0	6.1	39.4	48.5
Female	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	34	4.3	2.9	2.9	5.9	35.3	52.9
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Over 35,000	33	4.4	3.0	3.0	6.1	30.3	57.6
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Substantial	13	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.8	69.2
Moderate	12	4.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	25.0
Limited	9	4.1	0.0	11.1	22.2	11.1	55.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	36	4.3	2.8	2.8	5.6	36.1	52.8
Professional Reputation	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Social Contacts	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

**I. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA RESPONDENTS

*Demographic Description of Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=9)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	11.1%
		Guardian ad Litem	44.4%
		CASA Volunteer	44.4%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or more	33.3%
		6-10 Years	33.3%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	33.3%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
		35,000 or over	88.9%
		No Answer	11.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge John R. Lohff was evaluated by a total of six Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these six respondents, one (16.7%) had substantial and recent experience, three (50.0%) had limited experience, and two (3.3%) did not indicate level of experience. The overall evaluation mean score was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.7). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.0), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge John R. Lohff:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	4.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	4.5
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	4.2







**J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=293)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	27.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	24.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	14.3%
		Private corporate employee	1.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	9.2%
		Government	17.1%
		Public service agency or organization	1.4%
		Other	2.7%
		No Answer	2.7%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	11.6%
		6-10 Years	14.0%
		11-15 Years	11.3%
		16-20 Years	23.6%
		21 Years or more	37.5%
		No Answer	2.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.0%
		Female	26.6%
		No Answer	2.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	8.2%
		Mainly criminal	10.9%
		Mixed criminal and civil	25.9%
		Mainly civil	49.2%
		Other	3.4%
		No Answer	2.4%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	0.7%
		Second District	1.4%
		Third District	92.2%
		Fourth District	2.7%
		Outside Alaska	1.0%
		No Answer	2.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Gregory Motyka was evaluated by 270 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 270 respondents, 118 (43.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 73 (27.1%) had moderate experience, 49 (18.2%) had limited experience, and 30 (11.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2), *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.2), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *Legal and factual ability* (4.0), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.0), and *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Gregory Motyka:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	1.5	6	2.3	51	19.4	125	47.5	77	29.3	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law	4	1.5	5	1.9	51	19.7	122	47.1	77	29.7	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	3	1.2	7	2.7	52	20.4	122	47.8	71	27.8	4.0
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	3	1.1	15	5.7	40	15.1	105	39.6	102	38.5	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	3	1.1	11	4.2	48	18.2	102	38.6	100	37.9	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	3	1.1	4	1.5	40	15.2	99	37.6	117	44.5	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	2.0	5	2.0	39	15.7	95	38.2	105	42.2	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	3	1.1	10	3.7	49	18.4	94	35.2	111	41.6	4.1
Human understanding and compassion	3	1.1	8	3.0	57	21.4	100	37.6	98	36.8	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	2	0.8	5	2.0	37	14.7	105	41.7	103	40.9	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	0.8	3	1.3	44	18.6	100	42.4	87	36.9	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	3	1.3	4	1.7	42	17.6	108	45.2	82	34.3	4.1
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	0.7	3	2.2	24	17.4	64	46.4	46	33.3	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	1.2	4	2.4	26	15.9	74	45.1	58	35.4	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	2	1.9	1	0.9	15	14.0	48	44.9	41	38.3	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	3	1.1	7	2.7	48	18.2	114	43.2	92	34.8	4.1

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Gregory Motyka:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	3.8	12.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5
Private-Solo	76	4.3	0.0	0.0	15.8	43.4	40.8
2 – 5 Attorneys	65	4.0	1.5	6.2	16.9	44.6	30.8
6+ Attorneys	34	4.1	0.0	0.0	20.6	52.9	26.5
Corporate	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	23	4.0	0.0	4.4	30.4	30.4	34.8
Government	47	4.2	0.0	2.1	17.0	42.6	38.3
Public Service	3	2.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3
Other	6	4.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	66.7	16.7
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	6	3.8	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0
5 Years or fewer	32	4.4	0.0	3.1	3.1	40.6	53.1
6 – 10 Years	40	4.1	2.5	0.0	25.0	30.0	42.5
11 – 15 Years	27	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	51.9	22.2
16 – 20 Years	63	3.9	1.6	3.2	17.5	55.6	22.2
21 Years or more	96	4.1	0.0	4.2	18.8	40.6	36.5
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	7	3.7	14.3	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9
Male	189	4.1	1.1	1.6	16.9	46.6	33.9
Female	68	4.0	0.0	5.9	20.6	36.8	36.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	7	3.9	14.3	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9
Prosecution	24	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.2	41.7	54.2
Criminal	30	3.7	0.0	3.3	33.3	56.7	6.7
Criminal and Civil	71	4.1	0.0	4.2	21.1	35.2	39.4
Civil	123	4.1	1.6	2.4	17.1	45.5	33.3
Other	9	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	55.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	6	3.8	16.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0
First District	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Second District	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Third District	245	4.1	1.0	2.9	18.0	44.1	34.3
Fourth District	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
Outside Alaska	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	29	4.1	0.0	6.9	10.3	51.7	31.0
Substantial	117	4.0	2.6	3.4	21.4	36.8	35.9
Moderate	71	4.2	0.0	1.4	15.5	40.9	42.3
Limited	47	4.0	0.0	0.0	19.2	57.5	23.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	64	4.1	1.1	2.7	18.2	43.2	34.9
Professional Reputation	20	3.9	0.0	0.0	25.0	65.0	10.0
Social Contacts	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

**J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA**

2 PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=44)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	20.5%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	61.4%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	6.8%
		Other	11.4%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	13.6%
		6-10 Years	36.4%
		11-15 Years	6.8%
		16-20 Years	27.3%
		21 Years or more	15.9%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	86.4%
		Female	13.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	6.8%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	93.2%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	6.8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	4.5%
		35,000 or over	88.6%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Gregory Motyka was evaluated by 40 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 40 respondents, 12 (30.0%) had substantial and recent experience, seven (17.5%) had moderate experience, 17 (42.5%) had limited experience, and four (10.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. Eight of the eleven items obtained a mean score of 4.4, with the remaining three items obtaining a mean score of 4.3. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Gregory Motyka:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	2.7	7	18.9	8	21.6	21	56.8	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	1	2.5	7	17.5	12	30.0	20	50.0	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	1	2.6	6	15.8	9	23.7	22	57.9	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	1	2.7	6	16.2	9	24.3	21	56.8	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	2.6	1	2.6	3	7.9	9	23.7	24	63.2	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	1	2.6	5	13.2	9	23.7	23	60.5	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	1	3.0	5	15.2	7	21.2	20	60.6	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	1	2.8	7	19.4	6	16.7	22	61.1	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	3.2	5	16.1	6	19.4	19	61.3	4.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	2	5.9	6	17.6	6	17.6	20	58.8	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	4.0	4	16.0	5	20.0	15	60.0	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	2	5.1	5	12.8	10	25.6	22	56.4	4.3



**J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA RESPONDENTS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=3)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	100.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or more	33.3%
		6-10 Years	33.3%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	33.3%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
		35,000 or over	66.7%
		No Answer	33.3%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Gregory Motyka was evaluated by a total of three Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these three respondents, one (33.3%) had substantial and recent experience, one (33.3%) had limited experience, and one (33.3%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.3), *ability to control courtroom* (4.3), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.3), and *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (3.7), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (3.7), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.7); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation Of District Court Judge Gregory Motyka:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; reparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0







**K. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=547)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25.1%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.7%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	18.8%
		Private corporate employee	2.6%
		State judge or judicial officer	8.8%
		Government	17.0%
		Public service agency or organization	1.7%
		Other	1.8%
		No Answer	3.7%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	11.7%		
11-15 Years	10.1%		
16-20 Years	22.7%		
21 Years or more	43.9%		
No Answer	3.1%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	70.0%
		Female	25.6%
		No Answer	4.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.3%
		Mainly criminal	6.2%
		Mixed criminal and civil	22.7%
		Mainly civil	58.0%
		Other	4.4%
		No Answer	3.5%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.2%
		Second District	0.7%
		Third District	83.6%
		Fourth District	6.8%
		Outside Alaska	1.8%
		No Answer	2.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Sigurd E. Murphy was evaluated by 475 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with the judge. Of these 475 respondents, 200 (42.1%) had substantial and recent experience, 113 (23.8%) had moderate experience, 91 (19.2%) had limited experience, and 71 (15.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings* (4.3). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal and factual ability* (3.9); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Sigurd E. Murphy:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	9	1.9	36	7.7	94	20.0	167	35.5	164	34.9	3.9
Knowledge of substantive law	9	2.0	33	7.2	92	20.1	156	34.1	168	36.7	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	8	1.8	21	4.7	91	20.5	158	35.7	165	37.2	4.0
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	13	2.8	32	6.9	73	15.8	145	31.4	199	43.1	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	13	2.9	30	6.6	73	16.2	128	28.3	208	46.0	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	12	2.6	27	5.9	60	13.2	129	28.3	228	50.0	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	12	2.8	24	5.6	84	19.4	113	26.2	199	46.1	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	12	2.6	43	9.3	87	18.8	130	28.1	191	41.3	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	13	2.9	27	6.1	92	20.7	139	31.2	174	39.1	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	7	1.7	14	3.3	61	14.4	136	32.1	206	48.6	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	6	1.4	6	1.4	68	16.0	160	37.6	185	43.5	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	6	1.4	9	2.1	48	11.1	152	35.0	219	50.5	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	6	2.5	8	3.3	39	16.3	65	27.2	121	50.6	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	5	2.1	9	3.8	43	18.0	75	31.4	107	44.8	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	7	3.9	14	7.9	31	17.4	46	25.8	80	44.9	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	11	2.4	32	6.9	76	16.4	159	34.3	186	40.1	4.0

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Sigurd E. Murphy:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	18	4.3	0.0	11.1	0.0	38.9	50.0
Solo	118	4.2	1.7	5.9	10.2	30.5	51.7
2 – 5 Attorneys	99	4.1	3.0	6.1	14.1	29.3	47.5
6+ Attorneys	88	4.0	1.1	5.7	19.3	36.4	37.5
Corporate	6	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	43	3.9	2.3	4.7	23.3	39.5	30.2
Government	82	3.6	4.9	12.2	24.4	37.8	20.7
Public Service	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Other	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	15	4.3	0.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	46.7
5 Years or fewer	43	4.0	2.3	2.3	18.6	44.2	32.6
6 – 10 Years	54	4.2	1.9	3.7	16.7	31.5	46.3
11 – 15 Years	46	3.9	2.2	2.2	23.9	45.7	26.1
16 – 20 Years	99	4.0	2.0	10.1	13.1	38.4	36.4
21 Years or more	207	4.0	2.9	8.2	16.4	28.0	44.4
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	20	4.3	0.0	5.0	5.0	45.0	45.0
Male	328	4.1	3.1	5.2	16.2	32.3	43.3
Female	116	3.8	1.0	12.1	19.0	37.9	30.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	17	4.1	0.0	11.8	11.8	35.3	41.2
Prosecution	26	3.7	0.0	11.5	26.9	42.3	19.2
Criminal	33	3.8	6.1	0.0	15.2	66.7	12.1
Criminal and Civil	109	4.1	1.8	6.4	18.4	27.5	45.9
Civil	265	4.1	2.3	7.2	15.9	31.3	43.4
Other	14	4.0	7.1	7.1	0.0	50.0	35.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	14	4.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	42.9	50.0
First District	16	3.7	0.0	12.5	25.0	43.8	18.8
Second District	3	3.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
Third District	400	4.0	2.8	6.0	16.8	34.0	40.5
Fourth District	25	3.9	0.0	16.0	16.0	28.0	40.0
Outside Alaska	6	4.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	66.7
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	70	4.2	1.4	7.1	11.4	32.9	47.1
Substantial	197	4.0	4.6	6.6	14.7	32.0	42.1
Moderate	110	4.0	1.0	8.2	20.9	33.6	36.4
Limited	86	4.0	0.0	5.8	18.6	41.9	33.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	464	4.0	2.4	6.9	16.4	34.3	40.1
Professional Reputation	60	3.6	6.7	6.7	30.0	30.0	26.7
Social Contacts	7	4.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	71.4	14.3

**K. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=77)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	29.9%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	45.5%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	15.6%
		Other	6.5%
		No Answer	2.6%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	20.8%
		6-10 Years	24.7%
		11-15 Years	15.6%
		16-20 Years	22.1%
		21 Years or more	13.0%
		No Answer	3.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.4%
		Female	26.0%
		No Answer	2.6%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	5.2%
		Second District	1.3%
		Third District	88.3%
		Fourth District	2.6%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.6%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	6.5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	11.7%
		35,000 or over	79.2%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Sigurd E. Murphy was evaluated by 68 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience. Of these 68 respondents, 19 (27.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 16 (23.5%) had moderate experience, 27 (39.7%) had limited experience, and 6 (8.8%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Sigurd E. Murphy:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	3.1	0	0.0	10	15.4	18	27.7	35	53.8	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	3.2	0	0.0	10	16.1	12	19.4	38	61.3	4.4
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	3.1	2	3.1	7	10.9	15	23.4	38	59.4	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	2	3.2	10	15.9	19	30.2	32	50.8	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	3.0	2	3.0	9	13.6	18	27.3	35	53.0	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	1	1.5	1	1.5	10	15.2	18	27.3	36	54.5	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	15.8	12	21.1	36	63.2	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	1.7	0	0.0	10	17.2	12	20.7	35	60.3	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	2.0	0	0.0	7	13.7	11	21.6	32	62.7	4.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	3	6.0	6	12.0	12	24.0	29	58.0	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2.6	0	0.0	4	10.3	12	30.8	22	56.4	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1.5	3	4.6	8	12.3	17	26.2	36	55.4	4.3





**K. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=6)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	100.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	33.3%
		6-10 Years	33.3%
		11-15 Years	16.7%
		16-20 Years	16.7%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	16.7%
		Female	83.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
		35,000 or over	83.3%
		No Answer	16.7%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Sigurd E. Murphy was evaluated by a total of five Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience. Of these five respondents, three (60.0%) had substantial and recent experience, one (20.0%) had limited experience, and one (20.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings* (4.8). The lowest mean score were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.2), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.2), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2), and *settlement skills* (4.2); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation Of District Court Judge Sigurd E. Murphy:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.2
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0	4.6
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.2





**L. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=124)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.4%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	18.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	12.1%
		Private corporate employee	2.4%
		State judge or judicial officer	16.9%
		Government	17.7%
		Public service agency or organization	0.8%
		Other	1.6%
		No Answer	6.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	4.8%
		6-10 Years	6.5%
		11-15 Years	13.7%
		16-20 Years	24.2%
		21 Years or more	46.0%
		No Answer	4.8%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	70.2%
		Female	24.2%
		No Answer	5.7%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4.0%
		Mainly criminal	4.0%
		Mixed criminal and civil	32.3%
		Mainly civil	48.4%
		Other	6.5%
		No Answer	4.8%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.0%
		Second District	1.6%
		Third District	83.1%
		Fourth District	2.4%
		Outside Alaska	3.2%
		No Answer	5.7%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge M. Francis Neville was evaluated by 106 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 106 respondents, 39 (36.8%) had substantial and recent experience, 27 (25.5%) had moderate experience, 31 (29.3%) had limited experience, and nine (8.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2), and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were *legal and factual ability* (3.9), *knowledge of substantive law* (3.9), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (3.9), and *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.9); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	1	1.0	7	6.7	24	22.9	43	41.0	30	28.6	3.9
Knowledge of substantive law	1	1.0	8	7.8	21	20.4	43	41.7	30	29.1	3.9
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	2.0	5	5.1	23	23.2	43	43.4	26	26.3	3.9
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	1.9	9	8.7	20	19.4	31	30.1	41	39.8	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	3	3.0	6	6.1	14	14.1	36	36.4	40	40.4	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	2.0	2	2.0	18	17.6	33	32.4	47	46.1	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	1.1	5	5.4	15	16.1	37	39.8	35	37.6	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	1.9	4	3.8	19	18.1	30	28.6	50	47.6	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	2	2.0	2	2.0	21	21.4	28	28.6	45	45.9	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	2	2.1	2	2.1	20	21.3	37	39.4	33	35.1	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	3	3.2	8	8.5	17	18.1	32	34.0	34	36.2	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	3	3.3	5	5.4	14	15.2	36	39.1	34	37.0	4.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	1.8	2	3.6	12	21.4	15	26.8	26	46.4	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	3.1	4	6.2	13	20.0	22	33.8	24	36.9	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	1.7	3	5.0	10	16.7	19	31.7	27	45.0	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	2.0	9	8.8	18	17.6	37	36.3	36	35.3	3.9

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
Solo	24	3.3	8.3	16.7	25.0	33.3	16.7
2 – 5 Attorneys	21	3.6	0.0	14.3	33.3	28.6	23.8
6+ Attorneys	12	4.1	0.0	16.7	0.0	41.7	41.7
Corporate	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	18	4.4	0.0	0.0	16.7	27.8	55.6
Government	17	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.8	47.1	41.2
Public Service	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3
5 Years of fewer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
6 – 10 Years	7	4.1	0.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	57.1
11 – 15 Years	14	3.9	0.0	7.1	21.4	42.9	28.6
16 – 20 Years	23	3.7	8.7	4.4	17.4	43.5	26.1
21 Years or more	48	3.9	0.0	12.5	20.8	35.4	31.3
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
Male	73	3.8	2.7	12.3	19.2	38.4	27.4
Female	22	4.3	0.0	0.0	18.2	31.8	50.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3
Prosecution	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Criminal	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Criminal and Civil	36	3.9	2.8	13.9	16.7	27.8	38.9
Civil	47	3.8	2.1	8.5	19.2	46.8	23.4
Other	6	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
First District	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Second District	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	87	3.9	2.3	10.3	20.7	33.3	33.3
Fourth District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	8	3.9	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	37.5
Substantial	38	4.0	5.3	10.5	15.8	15.8	52.6
Moderate	26	3.9	0.0	11.5	11.5	50.0	26.9
Limited	30	3.9	0.0	3.3	23.3	53.3	20.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	102	3.9	2.0	8.8	17.7	36.3	35.3
Professional Reputation	13	3.9	0.0	0.0	38.5	30.8	30.8
Social Contacts	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3

**L. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=39)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	56.4%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	30.8%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.6%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	7.7%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	2.6%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	28.2%
		6-10 Years	20.5%
		11-15 Years	33.3%
		16-20 Years	10.3%
		21 Years or more	5.1%
		No Answer	2.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	84.6%
		Female	10.3%
		No Answer	5.1%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	7.7%
		Second District	2.6%
		Third District	76.9%
		Fourth District	10.3%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.6%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	5.1%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	74.4%
		35,000 or over	18.0%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge M. Francis Neville was evaluated by 36 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 36 respondents, 18 (50.0%) had substantial and recent experience, nine (25.0%) had moderate experience, eight (22.2%) had limited experience, and one (2.8%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5) and *human understanding and compassion* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.1); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.



**Evaluation of District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	17.1	15	42.9	14	40.0	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	3.1	16	50.0	14	43.8	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6	12	34.3	20	57.1	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	2.9	1	2.9	5	14.7	12	35.3	15	44.1	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	1	2.8	3	8.3	14	38.9	18	50.0	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.8	10	29.4	20	58.8	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	1	3.0	5	15.2	12	36.4	15	45.5	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	1	2.9	5	14.3	16	45.7	13	37.1	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	3.1	4	12.5	14	43.8	13	40.6	4.2
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	1	2.9	3	8.8	17	50.0	13	38.2	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	13.6	7	31.8	12	54.5	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	11.1	15	41.7	17	47.2	4.4

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Demographics</b>							
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
State Officer	20	4.4	0.0	0.0	15.0	35.0	50.0
Municipal/Borough	12	4.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	58.3	33.3
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/Parole Officer	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Other			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5 Years or fewer	11	4.4	0.0	0.0	9.1	45.5	45.5
6 – 10 Years	8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	10	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
16 – 20 Years	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
21 Years or more	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Male	31	4.3	0.0	0.0	12.9	48.4	38.7
Female	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
First District	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	28	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.7	46.4	42.9
Fourth District	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Under 2,000	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	29	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.3	44.8	44.8
Over 35,000	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Substantial	18	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6
Moderate	9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	44.4
Limited	8	4.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	36	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	41.7	47.2
Professional Reputation	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Social Contacts	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

**L. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCES NEVILLE**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=5)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	40.0%
		CASA Volunteer	60.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	20.0%
		6-10 Years	20.0%
		11-15 Years	20.0%
		16-20 Years	20.0%
		21 Years or more	20.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20.0%
		35,000 or over	60.0%
		No Answer	20.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge M. Francis Neville was evaluated by a total of two Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these two respondents, one (50.0%) had substantial and recent experience, and one (50.0%) had moderate experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 5.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The rating of 5.0 was obtained on all items. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Willingness to work diligently; reparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	100.0	5.0

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge M. Francis Neville:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Social Worker	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guardian ad Litem	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
CASA Volunteer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6 – 10 Years	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 – 15 Years	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
16 – 20 Years	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21 Years or more	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population of Community</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Over 35,000	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Substantial	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Moderate	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Limited	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Professional Reputation	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Social Contacts	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0



**M. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=389)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.7%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21.3%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	15.9%
		Private corporate employee	2.3%
		State judge or judicial officer	9.8%
		Government	19.3%
		Public service agency or organization	2.3%
		Other	2.3%
		No Answer	3.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	10.0%
		6-10 Years	13.6%
		11-15 Years	15.7%
		16-20 Years	20.1%
		21 Years or more	37.8%
		No Answer	2.8%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.9%
		Female	29.3%
		No Answer	2.8%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	6.4%
		Mainly criminal	9.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	24.4%
		Mainly civil	52.2%
		Other	4.4%
		No Answer	3.1%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.1%
		Second District	0.8%
		Third District	89.0%
		Fourth District	4.1%
		Outside Alaska	0.5%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Stephanie Rhoades was evaluated by 345 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 345 respondents, 141 (40.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 86 (24.9%) had moderate experience, 62 (18.0%) had limited experience, and 56 (16.2%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (3.9) and *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.9). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.1); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	14	4.1	31	9.1	89	26.3	126	37.2	79	23.3	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	14	4.2	29	8.7	89	26.6	121	36.1	82	24.5	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	9	2.7	26	7.9	85	25.7	128	38.7	83	25.1	3.8
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	26	7.7	50	14.7	79	23.3	106	31.3	78	23.0	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	27	8.0	45	13.4	79	23.4	93	27.6	93	27.6	3.5
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	20	6.0	25	7.5	77	23.2	107	32.2	103	31.0	3.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	20	6.3	24	7.5	75	23.6	100	31.4	99	31.1	3.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	53	15.4	70	20.3	80	23.3	79	23.0	62	18.0	3.1
Human understanding and compassion	36	10.8	57	17.1	80	24.0	79	23.7	81	24.3	3.3
Ability to control courtroom	11	3.4	21	6.5	75	23.1	112	34.5	106	32.6	3.9
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	10	3.2	12	3.9	84	27.0	111	35.7	94	30.2	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	15	4.8	16	5.1	75	23.9	109	34.7	99	31.5	3.8
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	11	7.9	11	7.9	33	23.7	40	28.8	44	31.7	3.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	11	5.4	12	5.9	56	27.6	61	30.0	63	31.0	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	12	8.4	9	6.3	29	20.3	38	26.6	55	38.5	3.8
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	23	6.8	41	12.1	83	24.4	112	32.9	81	23.8	3.6



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	10	3.5	10.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	30.0
Solo	83	3.6	7.2	15.7	16.9	28.9	31.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	77	3.3	10.4	11.7	32.5	32.5	13.0
6+ Attorneys	53	3.6	11.3	5.7	20.8	37.7	24.5
Corporate	8	3.5	0.0	12.5	37.5	37.5	12.5
Judge or Judicial Officer	32	3.8	3.1	9.4	18.8	40.6	28.1
Government	63	3.6	1.6	12.7	31.8	31.8	22.2
Public Service	6	3.5	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	33.3
Other	8	4.1	0.0	12.5	0.0	50.0	37.5
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	9	3.7	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	44.4
5 Years or fewer	35	3.5	0.0	22.9	22.9	34.3	20.0
6 – 10 Years	49	3.6	8.2	10.2	22.5	30.6	28.6
11 – 15 Years	48	3.5	10.4	6.3	22.9	39.6	20.8
16 – 20 Years	71	3.5	5.6	9.9	31.0	33.8	19.7
21 Years or more	128	3.5	7.0	13.3	22.7	32.0	25.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	8	3.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5
Male	236	3.5	8.1	11.0	24.6	35.6	20.8
Female	96	3.7	3.1	14.6	24.0	28.1	30.2
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	10	3.4	10.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	30.0
Prosecution	24	3.3	4.2	20.8	25.0	37.5	12.5
Criminal	35	3.6	5.7	11.4	22.9	37.1	22.9
Criminal and Civil	85	3.5	7.1	15.3	23.5	29.4	24.7
Civil	172	3.6	7.0	9.9	25.0	34.9	23.3
Other	14	3.9	7.1	7.1	14.3	28.6	42.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	3.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5
First District	9	3.4	11.1	0.0	33.3	44.4	11.1
Second District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	306	3.5	6.9	12.1	24.8	32.0	24.2
Fourth District	13	3.6	0.0	23.1	7.7	53.9	15.4
Outside Alaska	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	54	3.5	7.4	14.8	20.4	35.2	22.2
Substantial	140	3.4	11.4	15.0	24.3	25.0	24.3
Moderate	83	3.8	2.4	9.6	26.5	32.5	28.9
Limited	62	3.7	1.6	6.5	25.8	50.0	16.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	340	3.6	6.8	12.1	24.4	32.9	23.8
Professional Reputation	39	3.7	0.0	15.4	28.2	23.1	33.3
Social Contacts	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

**M. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=70)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	31.4%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	51.4%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	5.7%
		Other	10.0%
		No Answer	1.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	17.1%
		6-10 Years	25.7%
		11-15 Years	11.4%
		16-20 Years	24.3%
		21 Years or more	18.6%
		No Answer	2.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	82.9%
		Female	15.7%
		No Answer	1.4%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	5.7%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	92.9%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	1.4%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	1.4%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	14.3%
		35,000 or over	82.9%
		No Answer	1.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Stephanie Rhoades was evaluated by 57 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 57 respondents, 20 (35.1%) had substantial and recent experience, 14 (24.6%) had moderate experience, 18 (31.6%) had limited experience, and five (8.8%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on eight items across several categories (4.3); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	1.8	1	1.8	5	9.1	22	40.0	26	47.3	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	1.9	1	1.9	5	9.3	22	40.7	25	46.3	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	1.9	1	1.9	6	11.3	16	30.2	29	54.7	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	2.0	0	0.0	8	15.7	15	29.4	27	52.9	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	1.8	1	1.8	10	18.2	14	25.5	29	52.7	4.3
Human understanding and compassion	1	1.8	0	0.0	9	16.4	15	27.3	30	54.5	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	16	13	26.0	29	58.0	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	1	2.0	4	8.2	15	30.6	29	59.2	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	9.3	16	37.2	23	53.5	4.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	2.2	2	4.4	4	8.9	14	31.1	24	53.3	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2.7	0	0.0	2	5.4	13	35.1	21	56.8	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1.9	1	1.9	6	11.1	20	37.0	26	48.1	4.3



**M. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Worker/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=14)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	21.4%
		Guardian ad Litem	7.1%
		CASA Volunteer	71.4%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	50.0%
		6-10 Years	21.4%
		11-15 Years	14.3%
		16-20 Years	7.1%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	7.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	14.3%
		Female	85.7%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	7.1%
		Third District	92.9%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7.1%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	7.1%
		35,000 or over	78.6%
		No Answer	7.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Stephanie Rhoades was evaluated by a total of 11 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 11 respondents, three (27.3%) had substantial and recent experience, four (36.4%) had limited experience, and four (36.4%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.4); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades:  
Social Worker/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	4	36.4	0	0.0	2	18.2	5	45.4	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	2	18.2	1	9.1	4	36.4	4	36.4	3.9
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	3.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	18.2	3	27.3	0	0.0	1	9.1	5	45.4	3.4
Human understanding and compassion	2	18.2	0	0.0	2	18.2	2	18.2	5	45.4	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	2	18.2	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	18.2	6	54.5	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; reparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	5	50.0	4.1
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	10.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	3.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	2	2.2	2	22.2	1	11.1	4	44.4	3.8
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	9.1	1	9.1	3	27.3	2	18.2	4	36.4	3.6

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Stephanie Rhoades:  
Social Worker/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Social Worker	2	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Guardian ad Litem	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
CASA Volunteer	8	3.6	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	37.5
Other	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	6	3.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	33.3
6 – 10 Years	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
21 Years or more	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Female	9	3.6	11.1	11.1	22.2	22.2	33.3
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	11	3.6	9.1	9.1	27.3	18.2	36.4
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population of Community</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Over 35,000	10	3.7	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	40.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Substantial	3	2.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Moderate	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Limited	4	3.2	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	11	3.6	9.1	9.1	27.3	18.2	36.4
Professional Reputation	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Social Contacts	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0





**N. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CHARLES R. PENGILLY**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=234)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.2%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	13.7%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	17.5%
		Private corporate employee	2.6%
		State judge or judicial officer	12.0%
		Government	20.9%
		Public service agency or organization	3.9%
		Other	2.1%
		No Answer	8.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.4%
		6-10 Years	8.6%
		11-15 Years	13.7%
		16-20 Years	19.7%
		21 Years or more	41.9%
		No Answer	6.8%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.4%
		Female	26.9%
		No Answer	7.7%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3.9%
		Mainly criminal	8.6%
		Mixed criminal and civil	25.6%
		Mainly civil	52.1%
		Other	2.1%
		No Answer	7.7%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.9%
		Second District	1.3%
		Third District	48.3%
		Fourth District	37.6%
		Outside Alaska	3.0%
		No Answer	6.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Charles R. Pengilly was evaluated by 205 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 205 respondents, 96 (46.8%) had substantial and recent experience, 46 (22.4%) had moderate experience, 42 (20.5%) had limited experience, and 21 (10.2%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *knowledge of substantive law* (4.2), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.2), *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2), and *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.5); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Charles R. Pengilly:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	1.9	13	6.3	28	13.6	71	34.5	90	43.7	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law	3	1.5	12	6.1	22	11.2	73	37.1	87	44.2	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	3	1.6	8	4.2	19	9.9	76	39.6	86	44.8	4.2
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	9	4.5	17	8.4	35	17.3	73	36.1	68	33.7	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice	7	3.6	16	8.2	37	18.9	71	36.2	65	33.2	3.9
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	4	2.0	9	4.5	25	12.6	68	34.2	93	46.7	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	8	4.3	10	5.3	25	13.4	64	34.2	80	42.8	4.1
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	16	8.0	24	12.0	40	20.0	57	28.5	63	31.5	3.6
Human understanding and compassion	9	4.6	20	10.3	49	25.3	61	31.4	55	28.4	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	3	1.6	4	2.2	34	18.6	76	41.5	66	36.1	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	4	2.1	9	4.6	30	15.4	71	36.4	81	41.5	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	3	1.5	11	5.7	24	12.4	71	36.6	85	43.8	4.2
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	6	5.7	7	6.6	22	20.8	30	28.3	41	38.7	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	3	3.1	5	5.1	13	13.3	39	39.8	38	38.8	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	10	10.1	14	14.1	22	22.2	22	22.2	31	31.3	3.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	2.5	15	7.5	34	16.9	83	41.3	64	31.8	3.9

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Charles R. Pengilly:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	15	3.9	0.0	0.0	20.0	66.7	13.3
Solo	39	4.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	48.7	28.2
2 – 5 Attorneys	28	3.8	3.6	10.7	21.4	28.6	35.7
6+ Attorneys	35	3.9	2.9	11.4	14.3	37.1	34.3
Corporate	4	3.8	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	24	4.3	0.0	0.0	8.3	50.0	41.7
Government	44	3.8	6.8	4.6	22.7	34.1	31.8
Public Service	8	3.9	0.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	50.0
Other	4	3.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	13	3.9	0.0	0.0	23.1	61.5	15.4
5 Years or fewer	16	3.6	6.3	25.0	12.5	12.5	43.8
6 – 10 Years	17	3.9	0.0	17.7	17.7	23.5	41.2
11 – 15 Years	28	3.9	3.6	3.6	17.9	50.0	25.0
16 – 20 Years	38	3.9	5.3	2.6	15.8	47.4	29.0
21 Years or more	89	4.0	1.1	6.7	16.9	41.6	33.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	15	3.8	6.7	0.0	20.0	53.3	20.0
Male	134	4.0	3.0	8.2	14.1	39.6	35.1
Female	52	3.9	0.0	7.7	23.1	42.3	26.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	13	4.0	0.0	0.0	23.1	53.9	23.1
Prosecution	9	3.2	11.1	11.1	44.4	11.1	22.2
Criminal	18	3.9	5.6	11.1	11.1	33.3	38.9
Criminal and Civil	53	4.0	1.9	7.6	15.1	41.5	34.0
Civil	104	4.0	1.0	7.7	15.4	44.2	31.7
Other	4	3.3	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2
First District	7	4.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9
Second District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Third District	93	4.0	2.2	6.5	14.0	39.8	37.6
Fourth District	82	3.7	3.7	9.8	22.0	39.0	25.6
Outside Alaska	5	4.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	21	4.2	0.0	9.5	4.8	38.1	47.6
Substantial	96	3.9	3.1	6.3	20.8	35.4	34.4
Moderate	43	3.9	0.0	4.7	23.3	51.2	20.9
Limited	41	3.8	4.9	12.2	7.3	46.3	29.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	201	3.9	2.5	7.5	16.9	41.3	31.8
Professional Reputation	24	4.2	0.0	4.2	16.7	33.3	45.8
Social Contacts	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3

**N. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CHARLES R. PENGILLY**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=59)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	17.0%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	25.4%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	28.8%
		Other	20.3%
		No Answer	8.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	30.5%
		6-10 Years	18.6%
		11-15 Years	17.0%
		16-20 Years	22.0%
		21 Years or more	3.4%
		No Answer	8.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	69.5%
		Female	23.7%
		No Answer	6.8%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.7%
		Second District	1.7%
		Third District	3.4%
		Fourth District	86.4%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	6.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	10.2%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	15.3%
		35,000 or over	67.8%
		No Answer	6.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Charles R. Pengilly was evaluated by 50 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 50 respondents, 22 (44.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 15 (30.0%) had moderate experience, 11 (22.0%) had limited experience, and two (4.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.3) and *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.1) and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.1); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Charles R. Pengilly:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	4	8.0	12	24.0	15	30.0	19	38.0	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	24.5	19	38.8	18	36.7	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	2.0	1	2.0	8	16.3	14	28.6	25	51.0	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	25.5	13	27.7	22	46.8	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	2	4.0	9	18.0	16	32.0	23	46.0	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	2	4.1	9	18.4	15	30.6	23	46.9	4.2
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	20.8	15	31.3	23	47.9	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	1	2.0	9	18.0	17	34.0	23	46.0	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	2.1	10	21.3	13	27.7	23	48.9	4.2
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0.0	2	4.3	12	26.1	17	37.0	15	32.6	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2.7	2	5.4	8	21.6	9	24.3	17	45.9	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	1	2.0	9	18.0	20	40.0	20	40.0	4.2



**N. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE CHARLES R. PENGILLY**

3. SOCIAL WORKER/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=16)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	56.3%
		Guardian ad Litem	6.3%
		CASA Volunteer	37.5%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	56.3%
		6-10 Years	18.8%
		11-15 Years	12.5%
		16-20 Years	12.5%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	6.3%
		Female	93.8%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	25.0%
		Fourth District	68.8%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	6.3%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	6.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	12.5%
		35,000 or over	81.3%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Charles R. Pengilly was evaluated by a total of 10 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 10 respondents, four (40.0%) had substantial and recent experience, two (20.0%) had moderate experience, two (20.0%) had limited experience, and two (20.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.7, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.2); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Charles R. Pengilly:  
Social Worker/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	20	1	10.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	5	50.0	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	3	30.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	5	50.0	3.9
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	10.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	1	10.0	5	50.0	3.8
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	1	10.0	4	40.0	3.7
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	3	30.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	3.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	1	10.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	4	40.0	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	20.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	3	30.0	4	40.0	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	2	22.2	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	22.2	4	44.4	3.6
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	1	11.1	2	22.2	0	0.0	3	33.3	3.0	33.3	3.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	2	20.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	4	40.0	3.2
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	10.0	2	20.0	0	0.0	3	30.0	4	40.0	3.7







**O. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=265)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.6%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	17.0%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	12.8%
		Private corporate employee	3.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	11.3%
		Government	23.4%
		Public service agency or organization	2.6%
		Other	3.8%
		No Answer	6.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	7.9%
		6-10 Years	9.4%
		11-15 Years	12.1%
		16-20 Years	19.3%
		21 Years or more	45.7%
		No Answer	5.7%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.6%
		Female	26.0%
		No Answer	6.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.3%
		Mainly criminal	7.9%
		Mixed criminal and civil	24.2%
		Mainly civil	52.8%
		Other	3.8%
		No Answer	6.0%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.2%
		Second District	1.1%
		Third District	53.2%
		Fourth District	35.5%
		Outside Alaska	1.1%
		No Answer	4.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Richard D. Savell was evaluated by 231 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 231 respondents, 99 (42.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 57 (24.7%) had moderate experience, 48 (20.6%) had limited experience, and 27 (11.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.1), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.1), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.1), *ability to control courtroom* (4.1), and *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.1). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.5); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Richard D. Savell:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<b>Unacceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Mean</b>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	5	2.2	10	4.4	37	16.2	93	40.6	84	36.7	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law	5	2.3	6	2.8	37	17.0	89	40.8	81	37.2	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	4	1.9	9	4.2	36	16.8	80	37.4	85	39.7	4.1
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	15	6.7	21	9.3	47	20.9	69	30.7	73	32.4	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	13	6.0	14	6.5	41	18.9	78	35.9	71	32.7	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	9	4.0	22	9.8	35	15.6	82	36.6	76	33.9	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	7	3.4	17	8.3	38	18.4	68	33.0	76	36.9	3.9
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	18	7.9	32	14.0	54	23.7	72	31.6	52	22.8	3.5
Human understanding and compassion	7	3.3	24	11.2	51	23.7	69	32.1	64	29.8	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	5	2.4	6	2.8	34	16.1	79	37.4	87	41.2	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	4	1.9	7	3.3	40	19.1	90	43.1	68	32.5	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	4	2.0	8	3.9	27	13.3	86	42.4	78	38.4	4.1
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	3	2.9	7	6.7	25	24.0	33	31.7	36	34.6	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	3.2	7	5.6	25	20.2	45	36.3	43	34.7	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	4	3.4	6	5.0	24	20.2	41	34.5	44	37.0	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	8	3.6	12	5.4	45	20.1	90	40.2	69	30.8	3.9

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Richard D. Savell:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	15	4.1	0.0	0.0	26.7	33.3	40.0
Solo	49	3.6	6.1	10.2	24.5	36.7	22.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	39	3.7	10.3	5.1	15.4	46.2	23.1
6+ Attorneys	27	4.0	0.0	3.7	11.1	63.0	22.2
Corporate	3	3.7	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.3	0.0	0.0	18.5	29.6	51.9
Government	51	3.9	2.0	7.8	21.6	33.3	35.3
Public Service	6	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Other	7	4.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	42.9	28.6
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	13	4.2	0.0	0.0	23.1	30.8	46.2
5 Years or fewer	17	4.4	5.9	0.0	5.9	23.5	64.7
6 – 10 Years	23	4.0	0.0	8.7	17.4	39.1	34.8
11 – 15 Years	28	3.7	0.0	3.6	28.6	60.7	7.1
16 – 20 Years	40	3.9	2.5	0.0	25.0	55.0	17.5
21 Years or more	103	3.8	5.8	8.7	18.5	33.0	34.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	15	4.0	0.0	6.7	26.7	26.7	40.0
Male	152	3.8	4.6	5.3	20.4	40.8	29.0
Female	57	4.0	1.8	5.3	17.5	42.1	33.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	14	4.4	0.0	0.0	21.4	21.4	57.1
Prosecution	14	3.7	7.1	7.1	21.4	35.7	28.6
Criminal	21	4.1	0.0	4.8	14.3	47.6	33.3
Criminal and Civil	58	3.8	5.2	8.6	22.4	32.8	31.0
Civil	114	3.9	3.5	4.4	19.3	46.5	26.3
Other	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	63.6
First District	8	4.4	0.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
Second District	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	115	3.8	6.1	5.2	19.1	40.0	29.6
Fourth District	86	3.9	1.2	7.0	8.5	16.5	10.3
Outside Alaska	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
<b>Amount of Experience</b>							
No Answer	26	3.5	11.5	11.5	19.2	30.8	26.9
Substantial	97	4.0	1.0	6.2	18.6	36.1	38.1
Moderate	56	3.8	3.6	1.8	26.8	44.6	23.2
Limited	44	3.9	4.6	4.6	15.9	47.7	27.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	224	3.9	3.6	5.4	20.1	40.2	30.8
Professional Reputation	27	4.0	0.0	3.7	18.5	51.9	25.9
Social Contacts	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0

**O. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=69)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	21.7%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	18.8%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	31.9%
		Other	20.3%
		No Answer	7.3%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	27.5%
		6-10 Years	20.3%
		11-15 Years	20.3%
		16-20 Years	14.5%
		21 Years or more	10.1%
		No Answer	7.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	68.1%
		Female	26.1%
		No Answer	5.8%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	2.9%
		Second District	4.4%
		Third District	10.1%
		Fourth District	76.8%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	5.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	27.5%
		35,000 or over	59.4%
		No Answer	5.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Richard D. Savell was evaluated by 58 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with the judge. Of these 58 respondents, 26 (44.8%) had substantial and recent experience, 12 (20.7%) had moderate experience, 15 (25.9%) had limited experience, and five (8.6%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.4). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.1) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.1); however, these scores still fall within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Richard D. Savell:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	1	1.8	10	17.5	22	38.6	24	42.1	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	3.5	0	0.0	11	19.3	19	33.3	25	43.9	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	1.8	1	1.8	10	17.9	17	30.4	27	48.2	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	1.7	0	0.0	10	17.2	19	32.8	28	48.3	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	1.7	5	8.6	8	13.8	17	29.3	27	46.6	4.1
Human understanding and compassion	1	1.8	0	0.0	10	17.5	18	31.6	28	49.1	4.3
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	14.8	18	33.3	28	51.9	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	16.1	23	41.1	24	42.9	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	16.7	18	33.3	27	50.0	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	1.8	1	1.8	10	18.2	18	32.7	25	45.5	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	19.0	15	35.7	19	45.2	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1.8	1	1.8	9	15.8	18	31.6	28	49.1	4.2





**O. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=17)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	76.5%
		Guardian ad Litem	5.9%
		CASA Volunteer	17.7%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	35.3%
		6-10 Years	35.3%
		11-15 Years	17.7%
		16-20 Years	11.7%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	17.7%
		Female	82.4%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	11.8%
		Fourth District	76.5%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	11.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	17.7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	11.8%
		35,000 or over	64.7%
		No Answer	5.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Richard D. Savell was evaluated by a total of 11 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with the judge. Of these 11 respondents, two (18.2%) had substantial and recent experience, five (45.5%) had moderate experience, two (18.2%) had limited experience, and two (18.2%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.3), and *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.3); however, these scores still fall within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Richard D. Savell:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	44.4	5	55.6	4.6
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	6	54.6	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	6	54.6	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	54.6	5	45.5	4.5
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	45.5	6	54.6	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	66.7	3	33.3	4.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	57.1	3	42.9	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	50.0	5	50.0	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	63.6	4	36.4	4.4





**P. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=163)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	16.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	14.1%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	5.5%
		Private corporate employee	3.1%
		State judge or judicial officer	16.6%
		Government	27.6%
		Public service agency or organization	2.5%
		Other	3.7%
		No Answer	11.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.6%
		6-10 Years	10.4%
		11-15 Years	11.0%
		16-20 Years	15.3%
		21 Years or more	45.4%
		No Answer	9.2%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	55.8%
		Female	32.5%
		No Answer	11.7%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.5%
		Mainly criminal	12.3%
		Mixed criminal and civil	29.5%
		Mainly civil	38.7%
		Other	3.1%
		No Answer	11.0%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.7%
		Second District	1.8%
		Third District	37.4%
		Fourth District	46.0%
		Outside Alaska	1.2%
		No Answer	9.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Jane F. Kauver was evaluated by 145 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 145 respondents, 57 (39.3%) had substantial and recent experience, 33 (22.8%) had moderate experience, 37 (25.5%) had limited experience, and 18 (12.4%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (3.9). The lowest mean score was obtained on *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (3.4); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Jane F. Kauvar:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	2.8	11	7.7	45	31.7	61	43.0	21	14.8	3.6
Knowledge of substantive law	4	2.9	11	7.9	43	30.7	60	42.9	22	15.7	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	4	2.9	6	4.3	46	33.1	59	42.4	24	17.3	3.7
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	4	2.9	10	7.1	36	25.7	57	40.7	33	23.6	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	5	3.6	7	5.1	33	24.1	61	44.5	31	22.6	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	5	3.6	5	3.6	33	23.9	54	39.1	41	29.7	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	3.8	5	3.8	42	32.3	49	37.7	29	22.3	3.7
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	5	3.6	8	5.8	35	25.2	56	40.3	35	25.2	3.8
Human understanding and compassion	5	3.7	3	2.2	38	27.9	59	43.4	31	22.8	3.8
Ability to control courtroom	4	3.1	5	3.8	38	29.0	56	42.7	28	21.4	3.8
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	6	4.6	9	6.9	45	34.4	48	36.6	23	17.6	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	8	6.2	19	14.6	40	30.8	36	27.7	27	20.8	3.4
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	5	7.8	2	3.1	19	29.7	24	37.5	14	21.9	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	5	5.6	0	0.0	28	31.5	35	39.3	21	23.6	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	5	8.2	3	4.9	15	24.6	21	34.4	17	27.9	3.7
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	3.6	7	5.0	47	33.6	58	41.4	23	16.4	3.6



**P. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=56)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	33.9%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	23.2%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	16.1%
		Other	14.3%
		No Answer	12.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	26.8%
		6-10 Years	19.6%
		11-15 Years	12.5%
		16-20 Years	21.4%
		21 Years or more	8.9%
		No Answer	10.7%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	64.3%
		Female	25.0%
		No Answer	10.7%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.8%
		Second District	7.1%
		Third District	8.9%
		Fourth District	71.4%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	10.7%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	12.5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	21.4%
		35,000 or over	55.4%
		No Answer	10.7%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Jane F. Kauvar was evaluated by 50 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 50 respondents, 13 (26.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 15 (30.0%) had moderate experience, 14 (28.0%) had limited experience, and eight (16.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.1) and *human understanding and compassion* (4.1). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.9), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.9), and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (3.9); however, these scores still fall within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.



**Evaluation of District Court Judge Jane F. Kauvar:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	2.0	1	2.0	13	26.0	16	32.0	19	38.0	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	4.2	1	2.1	9	18.8	18	37.5	18	37.5	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	3	6.1	8	16.3	17	34.7	21	42.9	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	2.1	2	4.2	11	22.9	18	37.5	16	33.3	4.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	4.0	2	4.0	11	22.0	17	34.0	18	36.0	3.9
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	27.1	16	33.3	19	39.6	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	1	2.0	14	28.6	16	32.7	18	36.7	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	2.0	1	2.0	13	26.5	21	42.9	13	26.5	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	1	2.2	11	24.4	19	42.2	14	31.1	4.0
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	4.5	2	4.5	10	22.7	15	34.1	15	34.1	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	1	3.0	10	30.3	9	27.3	13	39.4	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	2.0	1	2.0	11	22.0	21	42.0	16	32.0	4.0



**P. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR**

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

*Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=5)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	40.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	60.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	40.0%
		6-10 Years	20.0%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	40.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	20.0%
		Female	80.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	40.0%
		Fourth District	40.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	20.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	20.0%
		35,000 or over	80.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Jane F. Kauvar was evaluated by a total of three Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA Volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these three respondents, one (33.3%) had substantial and recent experience, and two (66.7%) had limited experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.7, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.0), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.0), and *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (3.3); this score falls within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Jane F. Kauvar:  
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality</b>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	4.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
Human understanding and compassion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
<b>Diligence</b>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0	3.3
<b>Special Skills</b>											
Settlement skills	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	3.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0	3.7





**A. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE TREVOR STEPHENS**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=91)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	17.6%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	19.8%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	12.1%
		Private corporate employee	1.1%
		State judge or judicial officer	13.2%
		Government	24.2%
		Public service agency or organization	1.1%
		Other	3.3%
		No Answer	7.7%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	4.4%
		6-10 Years	12.1%
		11-15 Years	12.1%
		16-20 Years	27.5%
		21 Years or more	37.4%
		No Answer	6.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	73.6%
		Female	22.0%
		No Answer	4.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.7%
		Mainly criminal	4.4%
		Mixed criminal and civil	36.3%
		Mainly civil	41.8%
		Other	3.3%
		No Answer	6.6%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	64.8%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	25.3%
		Fourth District	2.2%
		Outside Alaska	2.2%
		No Answer	5.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Trevor Stephens was evaluated by 73 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.6), and *diligence* (4.6). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.3); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5	7.0	27	38.0	39	54.9	4.5
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	1.4	3	4.2	6	8.5	24	33.8	37	52.1	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	1	1.4	0.0	0.0	4	5.7	17	24.3	48	68.6	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0.0	0.0	3	4.2	6	8.5	22	31.0	40	56.3	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>	0.0	0.0	1	1.4	4	5.7	19	27.1	46	65.7	4.6
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	1.4	0.0	0.0	6	8.3	22	30.6	43	59.7	4.5



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Private-Solo	14	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	15	4.1	6.7	0.0	20.0	26.7	46.7
6+ Attorneys	8	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
Corporate	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	9	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	77.8
Government	19	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.5	36.8	52.6
Public Service	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
5 Years or fewer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
6 – 10 Years	9	4.6	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	77.8
11 – 15 Years	8	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
16 – 20 Years	18	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	38.9	50.0
21 Years or more	28	4.5	3.6	0.0	3.6	32.1	60.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Male	51	4.5	2.0	0.0	5.9	29.4	62.8
Female	18	4.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Prosecution	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Criminal	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Criminal and Civil	29	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.9	27.6	65.5
Civil	28	4.4	3.6	0.0	7.1	32.1	57.1
Other	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
First District	50	4.5	2.0	0.0	10.0	24.0	64.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	16	4.4	0.0	0.0	6.3	50.0	43.8
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	72	4.5	1.4	0.0	8.3	30.6	59.7
Professional Reputation	16	4.3	0.0	6.3	12.5	25.0	56.3
Social Contacts	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE TREVOR STEPHENS**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=28)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	39.3%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	39.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	14.3%
		Other	3.6%
		No Answer	3.6%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	21.4%
		6-10 Years	39.3%
		11-15 Years	17.9%
		16-20 Years	10.7%
		21 Years or more	7.1%
		No Answer	3.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	82.1%
		Female	14.3%
		No Answer	3.6%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	78.6%
		Second District	3.6%
		Third District	14.3%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	3.6%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	14.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	75.0%
		35,000 or over	7.14%
		No Answer	3.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Trevor Stephens was evaluated by 26 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.9, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *diligence* (4.9). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.8), *integrity* (4.8), and *judicial temperament* (4.8); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	22	84.6	4.8
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	15.4	22	84.6	4.8
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	16.0	21	84.0	4.8
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	12.0	22	88.0	4.9
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.5	23	88.5	4.9







**B. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=194)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	21.1%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	12.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.9%
		Private corporate employee	0.5%
		State judge or judicial officer	18.0%
		Government	22.7%
		Public service agency or organization	4.6%
		Other	4.6%
		No Answer	4.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	3.6%
		6-10 Years	12.4%
		11-15 Years	11.9%
		16-20 Years	18.6%
		21 Years or more	50.5%
		No Answer	3.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.5%
		Female	30.9%
		No Answer	3.6%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.2%
		Mainly criminal	7.7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	35.1%
		Mainly civil	43.3%
		Other	5.2%
		No Answer	3.6%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	7.2%
		Second District	5.7%
		Third District	59.8%
		Fourth District	22.2%
		Outside Alaska	2.6%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Michael I. Jeffery was evaluated by 166 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal ability* (4.3), and *impartiality and fairness* (4.3); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	2	1.2	3	1.8	18	11.0	63	38.7	77	47.2	4.3
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	0.6	7	4.3	22	13.4	42	25.6	92	56.1	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	1	0.6	0.0	0.0	18	11.1	32	19.8	111	68.5	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	0.6	2	1.2	16	9.8	41	25.2	103	63.2	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>	2	1.3	1	0.6	21	13.1	48	30.0	88	55.0	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	0.6	2	1.3	15	9.4	56	35.0	86	53.8	4.4



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Private-Solo	36	4.4	0.0	2.8	5.6	41.7	50.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	17	4.2	5.9	0.0	17.7	23.5	52.9
6+ Attorneys	14	4.5	0.0	0.0	14.3	21.4	64.3
Corporate	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	30	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.3	23.3	73.3
Government	39	4.3	0.0	0.0	12.8	48.7	38.5
Public Service	9	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9
Other	6	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
6 – 10 Years	23	4.6	0.0	0.0	8.7	26.1	65.2
11 – 15 Years	18	4.4	0.0	0.0	5.6	44.4	50.0
16 – 20 Years	28	4.4	3.6	0.0	3.6	42.9	50.0
21 Years of more	78	4.3	0.0	2.6	12.8	32.1	52.6
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1
Male	103	4.3	1.0	1.9	9.7	36.9	50.5
Female	50	4.5	0.0	0.0	8.0	32.0	60.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Prosecution	10	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
Criminal	13	4.6	0.0	0.0	7.7	23.1	69.2
Criminal and Civil	59	4.5	0.0	1.7	6.8	30.5	61.0
Civil	64	4.2	1.6	1.6	14.1	39.1	43.8
Other	8	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
First District	7	4.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9
Second District	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.5	54.6
Third District	94	4.5	1.1	2.1	8.5	25.5	62.8
Fourth District	39	4.2	0.0	0.0	15.4	48.7	35.9
Outside Alaska	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	160	4.4	0.6	1.3	9.4	35.0	53.8
Professional Reputation	23	4.6	0.0	0.0	8.7	12.7	69.6
Social Contacts	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3

**B. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL JEFFERY**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=40)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	17.5%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	42.5%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	27.5%
		Other	10.0%
		No Answer	2.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	25.0%
		6-10 Years	17.5%
		11-15 Years	35.0%
		16-20 Years	7.5%
		21 Years or more	12.5%
		No Answer	2.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	75.0%
		Female	22.5%
		No Answer	2.5%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	10.0%
		Second District	47.5%
		Third District	10.0%
		Fourth District	27.5%
		Outside Alaska	2.5%
		No Answer	2.5%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	10.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	60.0%
		35,000 or over	27.5%
		No Answer	2.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Michael I. Jeffery was evaluated by 37 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.8, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.8); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	2	5.4	4	10.8	6	16.2	12	32.4	13	35.1	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	3	8.1	4	10.8	11	29.7	19	51.4	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	1	2.8	12	33.3	5	13.9	18	50.0	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>	1	2.7	3	8.1	9	24.3	6	16.2	18	48.6	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	3	8.1	2	5.4	7	18.9	11	29.7	14	37.8	3.8

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
State Officer	5	3.6	0.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	20.0
Municipal/Borough	16	3.8	12.5	6.3	18.8	12.5	50.0
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	11	4.2	0.0	0.0	18.2	45.5	36.4
Other	4	3.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5 Years or fewer	10	3.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	30.0	10.0
6 – 10 Years	7	4.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	57.1	28.6
11 – 15 Years	11	3.9	9.1	0.0	27.3	18.2	45.5
16 – 20 Years	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
21 Years or more	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Male	27	3.9	7.4	7.4	18.5	25.9	40.7
Female	9	3.7	11.1	0.0	22.2	44.4	22.2
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
First District	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Second District	18	4.1	0.0	5.6	22.2	27.8	44.4
Third District	3	2.3	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0
Fourth District	10	3.6	10.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	20.0
Outside Alaska	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Under 2,000	4	2.5	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	00.0
2,000-35,000	22	3.8	9.1	4.6	22.7	22.7	40.9
Over 35,000	10	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	37	3.8	8.1	5.4	18.9	29.7	37.8
Professional Reputation	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Social Contacts	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0





**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MORGAN CHRISTEN**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=173)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	22.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	23.1%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	24.3%
		Private corporate employee	3.5%
		State judge or judicial officer	5.2%
		Government	13.3%
		Public service agency or organization	0.6%
		Other	3.5%
		No Answer	4.6%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.3%
		6-10 Years	8.7%
		11-15 Years	14.5%
		16-20 Years	22.0%
		21 Years or more	41.0%
		No Answer	4.6%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	66.5%
		Female	28.9%
		No Answer	4.6%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	1.7%
		Mainly criminal	3.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	18.5%
		Mainly civil	66.5%
		Other	5.2%
		No Answer	4.6%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	1.7%
		Second District	0.6%
		Third District	90.2%
		Fourth District	1.2%
		Outside Alaska	2.3%
		No Answer	4.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Morgan Christen was evaluated by 125 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.3), and *diligence* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal ability* (4.2), and *impartiality and fairness* (4.2); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	2	1.7	4	3.4	15	12.7	48	40.7	49	41.5	4.2
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	3	2.6	3	2.6	16	13.9	37	32.2	56	48.7	4.2
<b>Integrity</b>	3	2.6	2	1.7	14	12.0	32	27.4	66	56.4	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	3	2.7	3	2.7	15	13.6	37	33.6	52	47.3	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>	3	2.6	0.0	0.0	10	8.7	43	37.4	59	51.3	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	2	1.7	3	2.6	14	12.2	45	39.1	51	44.3	4.2



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Private-Solo	25	3.9	0.0	8.0	16.0	52.0	24.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	28	4.3	3.6	3.6	7.1	35.7	50.0
6+ Attorneys	30	4.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	40.0	46.7
Corporate	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	7	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Government	13	3.8	7.7	0.0	23.1	38.5	30.8
Public Service	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	9	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
6 – 10 Years	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
11 – 15 Years	18	4.4	0.0	0.0	5.6	50.0	44.4
16 – 20 Years	26	3.8	3.9	7.7	19.2	38.5	30.8
21 Years or more	51	4.3	2.0	2.0	11.8	37.3	47.1
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
Male	84	4.2	2.4	2.4	11.9	41.7	41.7
Female	26	4.3	0.0	3.9	11.5	34.6	50.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
Prosecution	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Criminal	5	4.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	20.0
Criminal and Civil	24	4.5	4.2	0.0	4.2	29.2	62.5
Civil	76	4.2	1.3	2.6	13.2	43.4	39.5
Other	3	3.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
First District	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	107	4.2	1.9	2.8	11.2	40.2	43.9
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	115	4.2	1.7	2.6	12.2	39.1	44.4
Professional Reputation	37	4.0	2.7	5.4	18.9	32.4	40.5
Social Contacts	6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7

**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MORGAN CHRISTEN**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=3)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	0.0%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	33.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	33.3%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	0.0%
		Other	33.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	33.3%
		6-10 Years	0.0%
		11-15 Years	33.3%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	33.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	100.0%
		Female	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	33.3%
		Second District	33.3%
		Third District	33.3%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	33.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	33.3%
		35,000 or over	33.3%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Morgan Christen was evaluated by one Peace and Probation Officer who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 5.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (5.0), and *diligence* (5.0). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.0), and *judicial temperament* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	5.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	5.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	5.0







**D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY CUTLER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=449)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	24.1%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	23.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	17.6%
		Private corporate employee	2.2%
		State judge or judicial officer	8.5%
		Government	16.7%
		Public service agency or organization	0.7%
		Other	2.9%
		No Answer	4.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.7%
		6-10 Years	9.8%
		11-15 Years	11.4%
		16-20 Years	22.3%
		21 Years or more	46.8%
		No Answer	3.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.9%
		Female	24.3%
		No Answer	3.8%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	2.9%
		Mainly criminal	6.0%
		Mixed criminal and civil	23.6%
		Mainly civil	59.2%
		Other	5.1%
		No Answer	3.1%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.2%
		Second District	1.3%
		Third District	87.3%
		Fourth District	2.9%
		Outside Alaska	1.6%
		No Answer	2.7%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Beverly Cutler was evaluated by 353 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.8); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	6	1.7	21	6.0	69	19.7	124	35.4	130	37.1	4.0
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	15	4.3	27	7.8	77	22.1	108	31.0	121	34.8	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>	9	2.6	11	3.2	59	17.0	108	31.0	161	46.3	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	14	4.0	13	3.7	83	23.9	109	31.3	129	37.1	3.9
<b>Diligence</b>	9	2.7	24	7.1	78	23.1	97	28.7	130	38.5	3.9
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	13	3.8	19	5.5	73	21.1	118	34.1	123	35.5	3.9



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.2	0.0	9.1	9.1	36.4	45.5
Private-Solo	93	3.8	7.5	5.4	20.4	33.3	33.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	86	3.9	2.3	11.6	19.8	29.1	37.2
6+ Attorneys	59	3.9	3.4	3.4	28.8	32.2	32.2
Corporate	7	3.7	14.3	0.0	14.3	42.9	28.6
Judge or Judicial Officer	31	4.4	0.0	0.0	9.7	41.9	48.4
Government	47	3.9	2.1	0.0	29.8	40.4	27.7
Public Service	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	10	4.1	0.0	10.0	10.0	40.0	40.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	7	3.9	0.0	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
5 Years or fewer	22	4.0	4.6	4.6	18.2	27.3	45.5
6 – 10 Years	31	3.6	6.5	12.9	16.1	45.2	19.4
11 – 15 Years	38	3.9	0.0	7.9	23.7	34.2	34.2
16 – 20 Years	83	4.0	3.6	1.2	24.1	33.7	37.4
21 Years or more	165	3.9	4.2	5.5	20.6	32.7	37.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	11	3.6	0.0	18.2	18.2	45.5	18.2
Male	260	3.9	4.2	5.4	20.8	31.9	37.7
Female	75	3.9	2.7	4.0	22.7	40.0	30.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	8	3.9	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	37.5
Prosecution	12	3.7	0.0	0.0	41.7	50.0	8.3
Criminal	25	3.7	8.0	0.0	24.0	48.0	20.0
Criminal and Civil	93	4.1	2.2	3.2	20.4	35.5	38.7
Civil	194	3.9	4.6	7.7	21.1	29.9	36.6
Other	14	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	6	3.8	0.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3
First District	10	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Second District	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	317	3.9	3.8	5.4	22.4	34.1	34.4
Fourth District	7	3.9	14.3	14.3	0.0	14.3	57.1
Outside Alaska	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	346	3.9	3.8	5.5	21.1	34.1	35.6
Professional Reputation	90	4.2	1.1	4.4	13.3	34.4	46.7
Social Contacts	5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

**D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY CUTLER**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=72)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	48.6%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	16.7%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	22.2%
		Other	9.7%
		No Answer	2.8%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	15.3%
		6-10 Years	19.4%
		11-15 Years	16.7%
		16-20 Years	26.4%
		21 Years or more	19.4%
		No Answer	2.8%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	76.4%
		Female	20.8%
		No Answer	2.8%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	8.3%
		Second District	2.8%
		Third District	81.9%
		Fourth District	4.2%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	5.6%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	29.2%
		35,000 or over	62.5%
		No Answer	2.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Beverly Cutler was evaluated by 56 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.4, falling within the “acceptable” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (3.6), and *diligence* (3.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.4) and *judicial temperament* (3.4); these scores fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	7	12.5	6	10.7	12	21.4	19	33.9	12	21.4	3.4
<b>Integrity</b>	2	3.6	8	14.3	16	28.6	14	25.0	16	28.6	3.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	2	3.6	11	19.6	14	25.0	21	37.5	8	14.3	3.4
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	10	18.9	13	24.5	17	32.1	13	24.5	3.6
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	3	5.4	11	19.6	14	25.0	15	26.8	13	23.2	3.4

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
State Officer	31	3.4	6.5	19.4	22.6	32.3	19.4
Municipal/Borough	8	3.1	0.0	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	13	3.9	0.0	7.7	30.8	23.1	38.5
Other	3	3.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 Years or fewer	10	3.8	0.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	30.0
6 – 10 Years	12	3.6	0.0	8.3	50.0	16.7	25.0
11 – 15 Years	10	3.5	0.0	10.0	50.0	20.0	20.0
16 – 20 Years	12	3.3	0.0	33.3	8.3	50.0	8.3
21 Years or more	11	3.2	18.2	27.3	9.1	9.1	36.4
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Male	41	3.4	4.9	24.4	17.1	31.7	22.0
Female	14	3.6	0.0	7.1	50.0	14.3	28.6
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
First District	6	3.8	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	50.0
Second District	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	46	3.4	4.4	17.4	30.4	28.3	19.6
Fourth District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Under 2,000	4	3.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
2,000-35,000	16	3.4	0.0	31.3	12.5	43.8	12.5
Over 35,000	35	3.6	5.7	14.3	28.6	20.0	31.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	56	3.4	5.4	19.6	25.0	26.8	23.2
Professional Reputation	15	2.9	0.0	40.0	33.3	26.7	0.0
Social Contacts	1	2.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0





**E. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHARON L. GLEASON**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=312)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25.3%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	23.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	19.6%
		Private corporate employee	1.6%
		State judge or judicial officer	6.7%
		Government	16.7%
		Public service agency or organization	1.9%
		Other	2.6%
		No Answer	2.2%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	12.2%		
11-15 Years	14.7%		
16-20 Years	23.4%		
21 Years or more	36.9%		
No Answer	1.9%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	64.1%
		Female	34.0%
		No Answer	1.9%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	1.9%
		Mainly criminal	3.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	20.2%
		Mainly civil	65.7%
		Other	6.7%
		No Answer	1.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2.6%
		Second District	0.6%
		Third District	94.6%
		Fourth District	0.3%
		Outside Alaska	0.3%
		No Answer	1.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Sharon L. Gleason was evaluated by 251 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.4), and *diligence* (4.4). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (4.2); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	4	1.6	14	5.7	26	10.6	81	32.9	121	49.2	4.2
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	6	2.4	9	3.7	29	11.8	72	29.4	129	52.7	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	4	1.6	5	2.1	27	11.1	60	24.7	147	60.5	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	4	1.7	8	3.3	24	9.9	77	31.8	129	53.3	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	4	1.7	8	3.3	24	9.9	68	28.1	138	57.0	4.4
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	7	2.9	7	2.9	27	11.0	77	31.4	127	51.8	4.3



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	6	4.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	50.0	33.3
Private-Solo	63	4.3	3.2	1.6	7.9	34.9	52.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	58	4.2	1.7	1.7	13.8	36.2	46.6
6+ Attorneys	45	4.1	6.7	4.4	13.3	26.7	48.9
Corporate	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Judge or Judicial Officer	19	4.6	5.3	0.0	0.0	15.8	79.0
Government	40	4.2	0.0	2.5	17.5	35.0	45.0
Public Service	4	4.3	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
Other	7	4.6	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	3.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0
5 Years or fewer	29	4.5	0.0	3.5	13.8	10.3	72.4
6 – 10 Years	33	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	30.3	60.6
11 – 15 Years	40	4.3	2.5	2.5	10.0	35.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	53	4.3	1.9	1.9	9.4	34.0	52.8
21 Years or more	86	4.1	5.8	3.5	12.8	34.9	43.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	5	4.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
Male	159	4.2	4.4	1.9	12.0	35.2	46.5
Female	81	4.5	0.0	3.7	9.9	23.5	63.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	5	4.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
Prosecution	6	4.2	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	50.0
Criminal	9	4.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
Criminal and Civil	58	4.4	1.7	1.7	8.6	29.3	58.6
Civil	156	4.2	3.2	3.2	12.2	30.8	50.6
Other	11	4.3	9.1	0.0	0.0	36.4	54.6
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	3.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0
First District	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
Second District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	234	4.3	3.0	2.6	11.5	30.8	52.1
Fourth District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	245	4.3	2.9	2.9	11.0	31.4	51.8
Professional Reputation	55	4.2	0.0	1.8	16.4	41.8	40.0
Social Contacts	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7

**E. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHARON L. GLEASON**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=7)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	57.1%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	28.6%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	0.0%
		Other	14.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	42.9%
		6-10 Years	0.0%
		11-15 Years	28.6%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	28.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	85.7%
		Female	14.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	28.6%
		35,000 or over	71.4%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Sharon Gleason was evaluated by four Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.8, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.0), and *diligence* (4.0). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.8) and *judicial temperament* (3.8); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	3.8
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	3.8







**F. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE E. JOANNIDES**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=460)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	24.4%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.4%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	15.4%
		Private corporate employee	2.2%
		State judge or judicial officer	8.3%
		Government	20.2%
		Public service agency or organization	2.2%
		Other	3.5%
		No Answer	3.5%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	12.2%		
11-15 Years	12.6%		
16-20 Years	22.8%		
21 Years or more	39.1%		
No Answer	3.0%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.4%
		Female	31.7%
		No Answer	2.8%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4.1%
		Mainly criminal	7.4%
		Mixed criminal and civil	20.4%
		Mainly civil	59.4%
		Other	5.4%
		No Answer	3.3%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	5.9%
		Second District	1.1%
		Third District	85.9%
		Fourth District	3.3%
		Outside Alaska	1.3%
		No Answer	2.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Stephanie E. Joannides was evaluated by 404 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.3). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (3.8); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	8	2.0	21	5.2	99	24.6	174	43.2	101	25.1	3.8
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	10	2.5	20	5.0	75	18.7	129	32.1	168	41.8	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>	7	1.8	9	2.3	55	13.8	126	31.5	203	50.8	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	7	1.7	20	5.0	67	16.6	125	30.9	185	45.8	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>	11	2.8	23	5.8	76	19.0	133	33.3	157	39.3	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	9	2.2	22	5.5	75	18.7	145	36.2	150	37.4	4.0



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	14	4.0	0.0	7.1	21.4	35.7	35.7
Private-Solo	102	4.2	1.0	3.9	21.6	25.5	48.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	87	3.9	3.5	4.6	18.4	41.4	32.2
6+ Attorneys	61	4.0	1.6	9.8	18.0	32.8	37.7
Corporate	9	4.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
Judge or Judicial Officer	34	4.0	2.9	5.9	17.7	32.4	41.2
Government	75	3.9	4.0	5.3	18.7	44.0	28.0
Public Service	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
Other	12	4.0	0.0	8.3	8.3	58.3	25.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	12	4.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	41.7	33.3
5 Years or fewer	38	4.1	2.6	2.6	13.2	44.7	36.8
6 – 10 Years	51	4.2	2.0	3.9	13.7	35.3	45.1
11 – 15 Years	50	3.9	4.0	4.0	24.0	38.0	30.0
16 – 20 Years	92	4.0	3.3	4.4	19.6	33.7	39.1
21 Years or more	158	4.0	1.3	7.6	19.6	34.8	36.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	12	3.9	0.0	8.3	25.0	33.3	33.3
Male	269	4.0	2.2	4.8	18.6	37.2	37.2
Female	120	4.0	2.5	6.7	18.3	34.2	38.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	13	3.9	0.0	7.7	23.1	38.5	30.8
Prosecution	18	3.5	5.6	5.6	33.3	44.4	11.1
Criminal	33	4.0	3.0	0.0	24.2	36.4	36.4
Criminal and Civil	86	4.0	0.0	5.8	22.1	33.7	38.4
Civil	231	4.0	3.0	6.5	16.5	35.5	38.5
Other	20	4.5	0.0	0.0	5.0	45.0	50.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4
First District	17	4.1	0.0	5.9	17.7	35.3	41.2
Second District	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Third District	357	4.0	2.5	5.6	19.3	35.6	37.0
Fourth District	9	4.2	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	33.3
Outside Alaska	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	401	4.0	2.2	5.5	18.7	36.2	37.4
Professional Reputation	50	4.3	2.0	2.0	12.0	36.0	48.0
Social Contacts	6	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7

**C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE E. JOANNIDES**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=51)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	35.3%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	43.1%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	11.8%
		Other	7.8%
		No Answer	2.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	17.7%
		6-10 Years	19.6%
		11-15 Years	7.8%
		16-20 Years	31.4%
		21 Years or more	19.6%
		No Answer	3.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	82.4%
		Female	15.7%
		No Answer	2.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	7.8%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	88.2%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	3.9%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	3.9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	17.7%
		35,000 or over	76.5%
		No Answer	2.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Stephanie E. Joannides was evaluated by 42 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.2), *judicial temperament* (4.2), and *diligence* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.1); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	2.4	5	12.2	3	7.3	12	29.3	20	48.8	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>	1	2.4	3	7.1	4	9.5	12	28.6	22	52.4	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	2.4	2	4.9	5	12.2	13	31.7	20	48.8	4.2
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	4	10.0	5	12.5	10	25.0	21	52.5	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	2.4	5	11.9	3	7.1	14	33.3	19	45.2	4.1







**G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=589)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.9%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	21.9%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	20.0%
		Private corporate employee	2.4%
		State judge or judicial officer	7.3%
		Government	16.3%
		Public service agency or organization	2.2%
		Other	2.2%
		No Answer	3.7%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	11.2%		
11-15 Years	13.8%		
16-20 Years	21.6%		
21 Years or more	43.1%		
No Answer	3.2%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>		
		Female	26.0%
		No Answer	3.6%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	2.2%
		Mainly criminal	4.8%
		Mixed criminal and civil	20.2%
		Mainly civil	63.8%
		Other	6.1%
		No Answer	2.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.6%
		Second District	1.4%
		Third District	87.1%
		Fourth District	3.7%
		Outside Alaska	1.5%
		No Answer	2.7%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge John Reese was evaluated by 523 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *diligence* (3.4); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge John Reese:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	17	3.3	38	7.3	124	23.8	206	39.6	135	26.0	3.8
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	33	6.4	77	14.9	124	23.9	150	29.0	134	25.9	3.5
<b>Integrity</b>	20	3.9	17	3.3	107	20.9	156	30.4	213	41.5	4.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	39	7.5	71	13.7	115	22.2	163	31.5	130	25.1	3.5
<b>Diligence</b>	44	8.6	86	16.9	124	24.4	137	26.9	118	23.2	3.4
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	26	5.1	64	12.5	120	23.5	172	33.7	128	25.1	3.6



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge John Reese:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	16	3.6	0.0	18.8	18.8	43.8	18.8
Private-Solo	124	3.7	4.0	12.1	28.2	24.2	31.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	114	3.6	7.9	8.8	21.9	39.5	21.9
6+ Attorney	107	3.1	9.4	21.5	29.0	25.2	15.0
Corporate	11	3.5	0.0	27.3	18.2	36.4	18.2
Judge or Judicial Officer	37	4.1	0.0	2.7	13.5	51.4	32.4
Government	83	3.9	2.4	8.4	16.9	41.0	31.3
Public Service	10	3.9	0.0	10.0	20.0	40.0	30.0
Other	8	3.6	0.0	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	13	3.6	0.0	15.4	23.1	46.2	15.4
5 Years or fewer	37	3.8	5.4	5.4	27.0	29.7	32.4
6 – 10 Years	57	3.6	5.3	17.5	14.0	33.3	29.8
11 – 15 Years	68	3.9	2.9	5.9	19.1	44.1	27.9
16 – 20 Years	111	3.3	8.1	15.3	30.6	28.8	17.1
21 Years or more	224	3.6	4.5	13.0	23.2	33.0	26.3
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	16	3.5	0.0	18.8	25.0	43.8	12.5
Male	366	3.5	6.3	13.4	23.5	33.3	23.5
Female	128	3.8	2.3	9.4	23.4	33.6	31.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	12	3.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7
Prosecution	12	3.8	0.0	16.7	25.0	25.0	33.3
Criminal	24	3.8	8.3	4.2	12.5	54.2	20.8
Criminal and Civil	105	3.7	6.7	7.6	24.8	31.4	29.5
Civil	330	3.6	5.2	13.9	24.9	31.5	24.6
Other	27	3.7	0.0	18.5	14.8	48.2	18.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	3.6	0.0	18.2	18.2	45.5	18.2
First District	12	3.8	8.3	0.0	8.3	66.7	16.7
Second District	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
Third District	459	3.6	5.5	12.9	24.0	32.2	25.5
Fourth District	16	3.5	0.0	18.8	25.0	43.8	12.5
Outside Alaska	7	4.1	0.0	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	510	3.6	5.1	12.6	23.5	33.7	25.1
Professional Reputation	57	3.9	0.0	10.5	28.1	19.3	42.1
Social Contacts	7	3.9	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	0.0

**G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=36)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	16.7%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	50.0%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.8%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	13.9%
		Other	16.7%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	13.9%
		6-10 Years	22.2%
		11-15 Years	25.0%
		16-20 Years	33.3%
		21 Years or more	5.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	86.1%
		Female	13.9%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	2.8%
		Third District	97.2%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	5.6%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	13.9%
		35,000 or over	80.6%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge John Reese was evaluated by 27 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.3, falling within the “acceptable” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (3.5), and *diligence* (3.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.3); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge John Reese:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	6	22.2	2	7.4	3	11.1	9	33.3	7	25.9	3.3
<b>Integrity</b>	5	19.2	2	7.7	2	7.7	10	38.5	7	26.9	3.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	5	18.5	2	7.4	5	18.5	8	29.6	7	25.9	3.4
<b>Diligence</b>	4	15.4	2	7.7	4	15.4	9	34.6	7	26.9	3.5
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	6	22.2	2	7.4	3	11.1	9	33.3	7	25.9	3.3







**H. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARK RINDNER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=354)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	21.8%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	22.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	23.5%
		Private corporate employee	2.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	7.3%
		Government	15.5%
		Public service agency or organization	2.3%
		Other	1.1%
		No Answer	4.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.8%
		6-10 Years	11.3%
		11-15 Years	11.0%
		16-20 Years	24.0%
		21 Years or more	43.8%
		No Answer	3.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.5%
		Female	29.1%
		No Answer	3.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	0.6%
		Mainly criminal	3.4%
		Mixed criminal and civil	18.6%
		Mainly civil	67.8%
		Other	6.5%
		No Answer	3.1%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.0%
		Second District	1.7%
		Third District	88.1%
		Fourth District	2.3%
		Outside Alaska	1.1%
		No Answer	2.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Mark Rindner was evaluated by 308 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. All items rated obtained either a mean of 4.5 or 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	4	1.3	4	1.3	21	7.0	87	28.8	186	61.6	4.5
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	4	1.3	7	2.3	27	9.0	88	29.3	174	58.0	4.4
<b>Integrity</b>	4	1.3	5	1.7	18	6.0	84	27.8	191	63.2	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	5	1.7	5	1.7	30	9.9	96	31.8	166	55.0	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>	4	1.3	3	1.0	20	6.6	85	28.2	189	62.8	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	4	1.3	4	1.3	22	7.3	91	30.1	181	59.9	4.5



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	13	4.5	0.0	0.0	7.7	30.8	61.5
Private-Solo	69	4.4	1.5	1.5	7.3	33.3	56.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	69	4.3	2.9	1.5	14.5	29.0	52.2
6+ Attorneys	71	4.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	28.2	69.0
Corporate	5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	21	4.4	0.0	9.5	0.0	28.6	61.9
Government	46	4.4	2.2	0.0	8.7	37.0	52.2
Public Service	5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	10	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	20	4.5	5.0	0.0	5.0	25.0	65.0
6 – 10 Years	36	4.3	2.8	2.8	8.3	36.1	50.0
11 – 15 Years	34	4.6	0.0	0.0	5.9	23.5	70.6
16 – 20 Years	72	4.4	2.8	1.4	5.6	31.9	58.3
21 Years or more	130	4.5	0.0	1.5	8.5	29.2	60.8
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	11	4.4	0.0	0.0	9.1	45.5	45.5
Male	207	4.5	1.5	1.5	7.3	28.0	61.8
Female	84	4.4	1.2	1.2	7.1	33.3	57.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	10	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
Prosecution	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Criminal	9	4.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	66.7
Criminal and Civil	56	4.4	1.8	1.8	8.9	30.4	57.1
Civil	205	4.5	1.0	1.5	6.8	29.8	61.0
Other	20	4.6	0.0	0.0	5.0	30.0	65.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
First District	11	4.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7
Second District	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	268	4.5	1.5	0.8	7.5	31.0	59.3
Fourth District	7	3.9	0.0	28.6	0.0	28.6	42.9
Outside Alaska	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	302	4.5	1.3	1.3	7.3	30.1	59.9
Professional Reputation	39	4.5	0.0	0.0	7.7	35.9	56.4
Social Contacts	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

**H. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARK RINDER**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=7)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	42.9%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	14.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	14.3%
		Other	28.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	57.1%
		6-10 Years	14.3%
		11-15 Years	14.3%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	14.3%
		No Answer	0.0 %
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	85.7%
		Female	14.3%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100.0%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
		35,000 or over	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Mark Rindner was evaluated by four Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. All items rated obtained a mean score of 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3







**I. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=356)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.5%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.5%
		Private corporate employee	1.1%
		State judge or judicial officer	11.8%
		Government	22.8%
		Public service agency or organization	2.3%
		Other	2.8%
		No Answer	4.2%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	12.1%
		6-10 Years	12.1%
		11-15 Years	12.6%
		16-20 Years	22.2%
		21 Years or more	37.9%
		No Answer	3.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	66.0%
		Female	30.6%
		No Answer	3.6%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.6%
		Mainly criminal	9.0%
		Mixed criminal and civil	29.8%
		Mainly civil	45.2%
		Other	4.8%
		No Answer	3.7%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.1%
		Second District	2.0%
		Third District	87.4%
		Fourth District	3.4%
		Outside Alaska	1.4%
		No Answer	2.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Peter G. Ashman was evaluated by 297 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.8) and *judicial temperament* (3.8); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Peter G. Ashman:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	9	3.0	8	2.7	55	18.6	109	36.8	115	38.9	4.1
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	18	6.1	27	9.1	52	17.5	88	29.6	112	37.7	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>	9	3.1	12	4.1	38	12.9	96	32.5	140	47.5	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	20	6.8	33	11.2	43	14.6	91	30.8	108	36.6	3.8
<b>Diligence</b>	7	2.4	16	5.5	44	15.0	112	38.2	114	38.9	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	8	2.7	23	7.8	50	17.0	107	36.4	106	36.1	4.0



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Peter G. Ashman:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<b>Total</b>		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Deficient</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	9	3.8	0.0	11.1	22.2	44.4	22.2
Private-Solo	73	4.0	1.4	6.9	17.8	35.6	38.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	63	3.9	3.2	7.9	15.9	44.4	28.6
6+ Attorneys	33	4.1	3.0	6.1	15.2	30.3	45.5
Corporate	4	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	36	4.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	55.6
Government	63	3.6	6.4	14.3	20.6	34.9	23.8
Public Service	6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3
Other	7	4.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	8	3.4	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	12.5
5 Years or fewer	37	3.6	8.1	16.2	16.2	24.3	35.1
6 – 10 Years	37	4.0	2.7	10.8	10.8	32.4	43.2
11 – 15 Years	35	4.0	2.9	5.7	17.1	37.1	37.1
16 – 20 Years	72	3.9	2.8	5.6	20.8	41.7	29.2
21 Years or more	105	4.1	1.0	4.8	16.2	38.1	40.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	9	3.7	0.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
Male	198	4.0	2.5	7.6	16.7	33.3	39.9
Female	87	3.9	3.5	8.1	16.1	43.7	28.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	9	3.7	0.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
Prosecution	26	3.2	7.7	23.1	19.2	42.3	7.7
Criminal	32	3.8	3.1	12.5	15.6	34.4	34.4
Criminal and Civil	94	4.1	3.2	4.3	18.1	27.7	46.8
Civil	119	4.0	1.7	6.7	16.0	42.0	33.6
Other	14	4.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	42.9	50.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	7	3.6	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	14.3
First District	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	71.4
Second District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Third District	265	3.9	2.6	7.9	17.7	36.6	35.1
Fourth District	8	3.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	25.0
Outside Alaska	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	294	4.0	2.7	7.8	17.0	36.4	36.1
Professional Reputation	48	4.3	2.1	0.0	12.5	37.5	47.9
Social Contacts	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0

**I. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=75)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	44.0%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	37.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	8.0%
		Other	6.7%
		No Answer	4.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	12.0%
		6-10 Years	22.7%
		11-15 Years	16.0%
		16-20 Years	25.3%
		21 Years or more	18.7%
		No Answer	5.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	77.3%
		Female	18.7%
		No Answer	4.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	9.3%
		Second District	1.3%
		Third District	80.0%
		Fourth District	4.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	5.3%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	8.0%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	24.0%
		35,000 or over	64.0%
		No Answer	4.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Peter G. Ashman was evaluated by 67 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.3), and *diligence* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.0), and *judicial temperament* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Peter G. Ashman:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	7	10.6	12	18.2	19	28.8	28	42.4	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	1	1.5	0	0.0	15	22.7	14	21.2	36	54.5	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	5	7.6	16	24.2	16	24.2	29	43.9	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	3	4.8	8	12.9	19	30.6	32	51.6	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	1.5	5	7.7	13	20.0	14	21.5	32	49.2	4.1

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Peter G. Ashman:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	3	4.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7
State Officer	31	4.3	3.2	3.2	9.7	25.8	58.1
Municipal/Borough	21	3.7	0.0	14.3	33.3	23.8	28.6
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	5	3.6	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
Other	5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	4.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	7	4.7	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	85.7
6 – 10 Years	16	3.8	0.0	6.3	43.8	12.5	37.5
11 – 15 Years	10	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	16	3.9	0.0	18.8	12.5	31.3	37.5
21 Years or more	12	4.2	8.3	0.0	16.7	16.7	58.3
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	3	4.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7
Male	51	4.1	2.0	7.8	19.6	21.6	49.0
Female	11	4.2	0.0	0.0	27.3	27.3	45.5
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	4	4.3	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
First District	7	4.3	0.0	14.3	0.0	28.6	57.1
Second District	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	50	4.0	2.0	6.0	24.0	22.0	46.0
Fourth District	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	3	4.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7
Under 2,000	6	3.7	0.0	16.7	16.7	50.0	16.7
2,000-35,000	14	4.4	0.0	0.0	21.4	21.4	57.1
Over 35,000	42	4.1	2.4	7.1	21.4	19.1	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	65	4.1	1.5	7.7	20.0	21.5	49.2
Professional Reputation	7	3.6	0.0	0.0	57.1	28.6	14.3
Social Contacts	1	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0





**J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=131)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	20.6%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	19.9%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	9.2%
		Private corporate employee	0.8%
		State judge or judicial officer	23.0%
		Government	17.6%
		Public service agency or organization	1.5%
		Other	2.3%
		No Answer	5.3%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.9%
		6-10 Years	8.4%
		11-15 Years	17.6%
		16-20 Years	25.2%
		21 Years or more	39.7%
		No Answer	2.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	76.3%
		Female	20.6%
		No Answer	3.1%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4.6%
		Mainly criminal	9.2%
		Mixed criminal and civil	42.0%
		Mainly civil	38.2%
		Other	3.1%
		No Answer	3.1%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.6%
		Second District	3.1%
		Third District	79.4%
		Fourth District	8.4%
		Outside Alaska	2.3%
		No Answer	2.3%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Joel H. Bolger was evaluated by 113 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.5, falling within the “excellent” range. All items rated obtained either a mean of 4.5 or 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Joel H. Bolger:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	1	0.9	2	1.8	13	11.6	34	30.4	62	55.4	4.4
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	0.9	5	4.5	9	8.1	30	27.0	66	59.5	4.4
<b>Integrity</b>	1	0.9	1	0.9	9	8.3	25	22.9	73	67.0	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	0.9	1	0.9	11	10.2	26	24.1	69	63.9	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>	1	0.9	0.0	0.0	10	9.3	29	27.1	67	62.6	4.5
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	0.9	1	0.9	11	10.0	31	28.2	66	60.0	4.5



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Joel H. Bolger:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
Private-Solo	26	4.3	0.0	0.0	19.2	34.6	46.2
2 – 5 Attorneys	20	4.2	5.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	45.0
6+ Attorneys	10	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	40.0	50.0
Corporate	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	81.5
Government	18	4.6	0.0	5.6	5.6	16.7	72.2
Public Service	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Other	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5 Years or fewer	9	4.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	33.3	55.6
6 – 10 Years	11	4.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	36.4	54.6
11 – 15 Years	16	4.1	0.0	0.0	37.5	12.5	50.0
16 – 20 Years	30	4.5	0.0	3.3	3.3	30.0	63.3
21 Years or more	41	4.5	0.0	0.0	7.3	31.7	61.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Male	82	4.5	0.0	0.0	8.5	32.9	58.5
Female	24	4.2	4.2	4.2	16.7	16.7	58.3
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Prosecution	5	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
Criminal	10	4.1	0.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	50.0
Criminal and Civil	48	4.5	2.1	0.0	12.5	18.8	66.7
Civil	40	4.4	0.0	0.0	7.5	47.5	45.0
Other	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
First District	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Second District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	90	4.4	1.1	1.1	11.1	27.8	58.9
Fourth District	8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	110	4.5	0.9	0.9	10.0	28.2	60.0
Professional Reputation	15	4.3	0.0	0.0	6.7	53.3	40.0
Social Contacts	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0

**J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOEL H. BOLGER**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=28)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	35.7%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	32.1%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	28.6%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	3.6%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	39.3%
		6-10 Years	14.3%
		11-15 Years	17.9%
		16-20 Years	14.3%
		21 Years or more	7.1%
		No Answer	7.1%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.9%
		Female	25.0%
		No Answer	7.1%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	3.6%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	89.3%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	7.1%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7.1%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	60.7%
		35,000 or over	25.0%
		No Answer	7.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Joel H. Bolger was evaluated by 25 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.8, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.9), and *diligence* (4.9). The lowest mean score was obtained on *judicial temperament* (4.7); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Joel H. Bolger:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	12.0	22	88.0	4.9
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	12.0	22	88.0	4.9
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	32.0	17	68.0	4.7
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	20.0	20	80.0	4.8
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	16.0	21	84.0	4.8







**K. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=357)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	26.3%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	19.9%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.8%
		Private corporate employee	2.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	10.1%
		Government	21.9%
		Public service agency or organization	1.7%
		Other	3.1%
		No Answer	3.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	10.9%
		6-10 Years	10.4%
		11-15 Years	12.3%
		16-20 Years	20.8%
		21 Years or more	43.1%
		No Answer	2.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.5%
		Female	29.7%
		No Answer	2.8%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.8%
		Mainly criminal	9.5%
		Mixed criminal and civil	28.3%
		Mainly civil	48.5%
		Other	3.1%
		No Answer	2.8%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.9%
		Second District	1.4%
		Third District	85.2%
		Fourth District	5.3%
		Outside Alaska	2.0%
		No Answer	2.2%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Natalie K. Finn was evaluated by 322 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.0), and *judicial temperament* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Natalie K. Finn:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	4	1.3	10	3.1	50	15.6	140	43.8	116	36.3	4.1
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	4	1.3	23	7.2	59	18.4	113	35.3	121	37.8	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	3	0.9	9	2.8	42	13.2	110	34.6	154	48.4	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	8	2.5	25	7.8	62	19.3	116	36.1	110	34.3	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>	3	1.0	9	2.9	62	19.7	117	37.1	124	39.4	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	4	1.2	16	5.0	57	17.8	125	38.9	119	37.1	4.1



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Natalie K. Finn:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	36.4	45.5
Private-Solo	86	4.0	1.2	5.8	17.4	44.2	31.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	65	3.9	0.0	7.7	26.2	35.4	30.8
6+ Attorneys	38	4.1	0.0	2.6	18.4	44.7	34.2
Corporate	7	4.1	0.0	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.9
Judge or Judicial Officer	31	4.5	3.2	0.0	3.2	29.0	64.5
Government	69	4.0	1.5	2.9	18.8	43.5	33.3
Public Service	5	3.4	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	40.0
Other	9	4.4	0.0	11.1	0.0	22.2	66.7
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	9	4.0	11.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	44.4
5 Years or fewer	38	4.1	0.0	5.3	18.4	39.5	36.8
6 – 10 Years	35	3.8	2.9	8.6	28.6	22.9	37.1
11 – 15 Years	41	4.1	0.0	4.9	19.5	36.6	39.0
16 – 20 Years	69	4.1	0.0	1.5	18.8	49.3	30.4
21 Years or more	129	4.1	1.6	6.2	14.0	38.8	39.5
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	9	4.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	2.2	55.6
Male	221	4.1	0.9	4.5	16.7	43.4	34.4
Female	91	4.0	1.1	6.6	20.9	29.7	41.8
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	9	4.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	22.2	55.6
Prosecution	27	4.3	0.0	0.0	7.4	59.3	33.3
Criminal	31	3.5	3.2	12.9	35.5	29.0	19.4
Criminal and Civil	92	4.1	1.1	6.5	15.2	35.9	41.3
Civil	152	4.1	0.7	4.0	19.1	40.1	36.2
Other	10	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	8	4.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	50.0
First District	10	4.1	0.0	0.0	10.0	70.0	20.0
Second District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Third District	284	4.0	1.1	5.6	18.7	37.0	37.7
Fourth District	12	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.3	66.7	25.0
Outside Alaska	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	321	4.1	1.3	5.0	17.8	38.9	37.1
Professional Reputation	31	4.3	0.0	0.0	9.7	48.4	41.9
Social Contacts	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0

**K. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=69)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	40.6%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	46.4%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	4.4%
		Other	7.3%
		No Answer	1.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	18.8%
		6-10 Years	20.3%
		11-15 Years	15.9%
		16-20 Years	24.6%
		21 Years or more	17.4%
		No Answer	2.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	84.1%
		Female	14.5%
		No Answer	1.5%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	2.9%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	92.8%
		Fourth District	2.9%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	1.5%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	2.9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	8.7%
		35,000 or over	87.0%
		No Answer	1.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Natalie K. Finn was evaluated by 62 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.6, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.6), and *diligence* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.5), and *judicial temperament* (4.5); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Natalie K. Finn:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	1	1.6	8	13.1	12	19.7	40	65.6	4.5
<b>Integrity</b>	1	1.7	1	1.7	7	11.7	6	10.0	45	75.0	4.6
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	2	3.3	6	9.8	13	21.3	40	65.6	4.5
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	12.3	11	19.3	39	68.4	4.6
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	1.6	2	3.3	6	9.8	12	19.7	40	65.6	4.4







**L. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=206)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	25.2%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	22.8%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	7.3%
		Private corporate employee	2.9%
		State judge or judicial officer	10.7%
		Government	22.3%
		Public service agency or organization	1.5%
		Other	3.4%
		No Answer	3.9%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	14.6%
		6-10 Years	11.7%
		11-15 Years	15.1%
		16-20 Years	24.3%
		21 Years or more	31.6%
		No Answer	2.9%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.5%
		Female	31.6%
		No Answer	2.9%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	8.3%
		Mainly criminal	10.2%
		Mixed criminal and civil	35.9%
		Mainly civil	38.4%
		Other	3.9%
		No Answer	3.4%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2.4%
		Second District	1.5%
		Third District	89.3%
		Fourth District	2.9%
		Outside Alaska	1.5%
		No Answer	2.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Suzanne Lombardi was evaluated by 176 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.6, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (3.8). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (3.4); this score fell within the “acceptable” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Suzanne Lombardi:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	12	7.0	19	11.1	59	34.5	44	25.7	37	21.6	3.4
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	16	9.2	15	8.7	39	22.5	53	30.6	50	28.9	3.6
<b>Integrity</b>	11	6.6	6	3.6	40	24.0	52	31.1	58	34.7	3.8
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	11	6.4	13	7.5	44	25.4	47	27.2	58	33.5	3.7
<b>Diligence</b>	9	5.5	13	7.9	51	30.9	45	27.3	47	28.5	3.7
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	15	8.6	16	9.2	47	27.0	50	28.7	46	26.4	3.6



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Suzanne Lombardi:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
Private-Solo	49	3.6	4.1	12.2	22.5	38.8	22.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	43	3.3	14.0	7.0	34.9	25.6	18.6
6+ Attorneys	10	3.8	10.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	50.0
Corporate	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	18	4.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	33.3	38.9
Government	37	3.4	13.5	10.8	29.7	18.9	27.0
Public Service	3	2.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0
Other	6	4.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	50.0	33.3
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	5	3.8	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
5 Years or fewer	26	3.2	19.2	15.4	15.4	23.1	26.9
6 – 10 Years	22	3.8	9.1	4.6	22.7	22.7	40.9
11 – 15 Years	22	3.4	18.2	0.0	40.9	4.6	36.4
16 – 20 Years	44	3.5	4.6	9.1	34.1	31.8	20.5
21 Years or more	55	3.6	3.6	12.7	21.8	40.0	21.8
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	5	3.8	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
Male	113	3.5	8.0	8.9	27.4	32.7	23.0
Female	56	3.6	10.7	10.7	25.0	19.6	33.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
Prosecution	16	3.6	6.3	0.0	37.5	43.8	12.5
Criminal	20	2.9	15.0	15.0	45.0	15.0	10.0
Criminal and Civil	66	3.7	9.1	6.1	19.7	36.4	28.8
Civil	63	3.6	7.9	14.3	22.2	22.2	33.3
Other	5	3.4	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.00	20.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
First District	4	2.3	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
Second District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
Third District	158	3.5	8.2	8.9	29.1	27.9	26.0
Fourth District	4	3.8	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	25.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	174	3.6	8.6	9.2	27.0	28.7	26.4
Professional Reputation	19	3.8	0.0	0.0	42.1	36.8	21.1
Social Contacts	8	3.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	62.5	12.5

**L. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SUZANNE LOMBARDI**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=41)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	58.5%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	17.1%
		Village Public Safety Officer	2.4%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	12.2%
		Other	7.3%
		No Answer	2.4%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	22.0%
		6-10 Years	19.5%
		11-15 Years	24.4%
		16-20 Years	17.1%
		21 Years or more	14.6%
		No Answer	2.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.9%
		Female	31.7%
		No Answer	2.4%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	4.9%
		Second District	2.4%
		Third District	87.8%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	4.9%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	4.9%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	36.6%
		35,000 or over	56.1%
		No Answer	2.4%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Suzanne Lombardi was evaluated by 34 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.4). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.2), and *diligence* (4.2); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Suzanne Lombardi:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	1	2.9	4	11.8	15	44.1	14	41.2	4.2
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	14.7	12	35.3	17	50.0	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	1	2.9	3	8.8	16	47.1	14	41.2	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	1	2.9	4	11.8	16	47.1	13	38.2	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	1	2.9	4	11.8	16	47.1	13	38.2	4.2







**M. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NANCY J. NOLAN**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=205)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	21.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	19.5%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	13.2%
		Private corporate employee	0.5%
		State judge or judicial officer	8.8%
		Government	29.8%
		Public service agency or organization	1.0%
		Other	2.4%
		No Answer	3.9%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	10.7%
		6-10 Years	10.7%
		11-15 Years	16.1%
		16-20 Years	26.3%
		21 Years or more	32.7%
		No Answer	3.4%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.3%
		Female	29.3%
		No Answer	3.4%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	9.3%
		Mainly criminal	9.3%
		Mixed criminal and civil	28.3%
		Mainly civil	46.8%
		Other	2.9%
		No Answer	3.4%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2.9%
		Second District	1.5%
		Third District	89.8%
		Fourth District	1.0%
		Outside Alaska	2.0%
		No Answer	2.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Nancy J. Nolan was evaluated by 167 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.4). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (4.1); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Nancy J. Nolan:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	1	0.6	5	3.0	27	16.4	70	42.4	62	37.6	4.1
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	0.6	2	1.2	25	15.2	52	31.7	84	51.2	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	1	0.6	1	0.6	25	15.3	44	27.0	92	56.4	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	0.6	3	1.8	22	13.5	57	35.0	80	49.1	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	1	0.6	3	1.9	25	15.6	54	33.8	77	48.1	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	0.6	3	1.8	28	17.2	53	32.5	78	47.9	4.3



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Nancy J. Nolan:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	5	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0
Private-Solo	38	4.2	0.0	7.9	10.5	34.2	47.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	34	4.0	2.9	0.0	29.4	32.4	35.3
6+ Attorneys	16	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.3	31.3	62.5
Corporate	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	15	4.8	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	86.7
Government	49	4.2	0.0	0.0	20.4	40.8	38.8
Public Service	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
5 Years or fewer	18	3.9	5.6	5.6	16.7	33.3	38.9
6 – 10 Years	15	4.3	0.0	0.0	20.0	26.7	53.3
11 – 15 Years	28	4.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	39.3	46.4
16 – 20 Years	44	4.1	0.0	2.3	20.5	43.2	34.1
21 Years or more	53	4.4	0.0	1.9	17.0	20.8	60.4
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Male	114	4.3	0.0	1.8	17.5	33.3	47.4
Female	44	4.2	2.3	2.3	18.2	29.6	47.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Prosecution	17	4.4	0.0	0.0	5.9	52.9	41.2
Criminal	16	4.1	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5
Criminal and Civil	52	4.4	1.9	1.9	13.5	23.1	59.6
Civil	70	4.2	0.0	2.9	22.9	30.0	44.3
Other	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
First District	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0
Second District	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	152	4.3	0.7	2.0	17.1	32.2	48.0
Fourth District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	163	4.3	0.6	1.8	17.2	32.5	47.9
Professional Reputation	28	4.4	0.0	3.6	3.6	46.4	46.4
Social Contacts	7	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9

**M. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NANCY J. NOLAN**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=36)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	33.3%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	58.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	0.0%
		Other	5.6%
		No Answer	2.8%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	30.6%
		6-10 Years	30.6%
		11-15 Years	5.6%
		16-20 Years	22.2%
		21 Years or more	8.3%
		No Answer	2.8%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	88.9%
		Female	8.33%
		No Answer	2.8%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	2.8%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	94.4%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	2.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	2.8%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	8.3%
		35,000 or over	86.1%
		No Answer	2.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Nancy J. Nolan was evaluated by 35 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.3), and *diligence* (4.3); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Nancy J. Nolan:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	2	5.7	0	0.0	4	11.4	9	25.7	20	57.1	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	1	3.0	0	0.0	4	12.1	6	18.2	22	66.7	4.5
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	2.9	0	0.0	5	14.3	8	22.9	21	60.0	4.4
<b>Diligence</b>	1	3.1	1	3.1	5	15.6	6	18.8	19	59.4	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	2.9	2	5.7	3	8.6	8	22.9	21	60.0	4.3







**N. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=346)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	27.5%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.9%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	11.9%
		Private corporate employee	0.9%
		State judge or judicial officer	9.8%
		Government	21.4%
		Public service agency or organization	2.0%
		Other	2.9%
		No Answer	2.9%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	10.7%		
11-15 Years	11.3%		
16-20 Years	19.9%		
21 Years or more	46.0%		
No Answer	2.0%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.4%
		Female	25.4%
		No Answer	3.2%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	6.7%
		Mainly criminal	9.0%
		Mixed criminal and civil	28.7%
		Mainly civil	48.6%
		Other	4.3%
		No Answer	2.9%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.2%
		Second District	1.2%
		Third District	89.3%
		Fourth District	3.2%
		Outside Alaska	1.2%
		No Answer	2.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge James N. Wanamaker was evaluated by 299 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.3). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (3.8); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge James N. Wanamaker:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	8	2.7	24	8.0	74	24.7	116	38.8	77	25.8	3.8
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	9	3.0	20	6.7	56	18.8	93	31.2	120	40.3	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	7	2.4	8	2.7	44	14.9	77	26.0	160	54.1	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	8	2.7	11	3.7	60	20.3	90	30.5	126	42.7	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>	8	2.7	17	5.8	59	20.3	96	33.0	111	38.1	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	6	2.0	21	7.1	54	18.2	111	37.4	105	35.4	4.0



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge James N. Wanamaker:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	7	4.1	14.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1
Private-Solo	80	4.1	1.3	7.5	15.0	31.3	45.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	65	4.1	3.1	1.5	13.9	46.2	35.4
6+ Attorneys	33	3.8	3.0	3.0	33.3	30.3	30.3
Corporate	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	30	4.2	0.0	10.0	6.7	33.3	50.0
Government	68	3.6	1.5	14.7	27.9	36.8	19.1
Public Service	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
Other	7	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	5	3.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
5 Years or fewer	31	3.7	0.0	16.1	22.6	38.7	22.6
6 – 10 Years	36	3.9	0.0	5.6	25.0	47.2	22.2
11 – 15 Years	33	4.1	0.0	3.0	24.2	30.3	42.4
16 – 20 Years	60	3.8	3.3	3.3	26.7	43.3	23.3
21 Years or more	132	4.1	2.3	8.3	10.6	33.3	45.5
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	8	3.8	12.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5
Male	217	4.1	2.3	5.5	15.7	37.8	38.7
Female	72	3.8	0.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	8	4.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	25.0	50.0
Prosecution	22	3.5	0.0	13.6	27.3	54.6	4.6
Criminal	29	3.6	6.9	10.3	27.6	24.1	31.0
Criminal and Civil	89	4.0	1.1	7.9	16.9	36.0	38.2
Civil	139	4.1	1.4	5.8	17.3	37.4	38.1
Other	10	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	40.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	5	3.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0
First District	7	3.9	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9
Second District	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Third District	268	4.0	1.5	6.7	18.3	36.9	36.6
Fourth District	10	3.2	10.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	10.0
Outside Alaska	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	297	4.0	2.0	7.1	18.2	37.4	35.4
Professional Reputation	44	4.4	0.0	2.3	13.6	22.7	61.4
Social Contacts	2	3.5	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0

**N. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=53)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	32.1%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	45.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	1.9%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	11.3%
		Other	9.4%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	34.0%
		6-10 Years	26.4%
		11-15 Years	11.3%
		16-20 Years	18.9%
		21 Years or more	9.4%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	77.4%
		Female	22.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	5.7%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	94.3%
		Fourth District	0.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	5.7%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	17.0%
		35,000 or over	77.4%
		No Answer	0.0%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge James N. Wanamaker was evaluated by 46 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9, falling within the “good” range. The highest mean scores were obtained on *integrity* (4.0), and *diligence* (4.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (3.8); however, this score still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge James N. Wanamaker:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	2.2	3	6.5	13	28.3	14	30.4	15	32.6	3.8
<b>Integrity</b>	1	2.3	2	4.5	9	20.5	16	36.4	16	36.4	4.0
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	2.3	2	4.5	11	25.0	17	38.6	13	29.5	3.9
<b>Diligence</b>	1	2.4	3	7.3	10	24.4	10	24.4	17	41.5	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	2.2	3	6.7	10	22.2	16	35.6	15	33.3	3.9







**O. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=246)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.9%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	13.8%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	15.9%
		Private corporate employee	2.9%
		State judge or judicial officer	13.8%
		Government	20.3%
		Public service agency or organization	2.9%
		Other	4.0%
		No Answer	6.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.1%
		6-10 Years	9.4%
		11-15 Years	12.6%
		16-20 Years	20.7%
		21 Years or more	43.9%
		No Answer	5.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	63.0%
		Female	30.1%
		No Answer	6.9%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3.3%
		Mainly criminal	5.9%
		Mixed criminal and civil	25.2%
		Mainly civil	56.9%
		Other	3.7%
		No Answer	5.7%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.5%
		Second District	2.4%
		Third District	51.2%
		Fourth District	35.4%
		Outside Alaska	1.6%
		No Answer	4.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger was evaluated by 208 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal ability* (3.9), and *impartiality and fairness* (3.9); however, these scores still fell within the “good” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	3	1.4	13	6.3	51	24.5	80	38.5	61	29.3	3.9
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	4	1.9	14	6.8	43	20.9	75	36.4	70	34.0	3.9
<b>Integrity</b>	1	0.5	2	1.0	34	16.7	64	31.5	102	50.2	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	3	1.5	19	9.3	37	18.0	72	35.1	74	36.1	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>	5	2.5	7	3.4	41	20.2	70	34.5	80	39.4	4.0
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	2	1.0	14	6.8	41	20.0	75	36.6	73	35.6	4.0



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	15	3.9	0.0	6.7	33.3	26.7	33.3
Private-Solo	44	3.9	0.0	11.4	22.7	29.6	36.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	28	3.8	3.6	10.7	17.9	42.9	25.0
6+ Attorneys	33	4.1	0.0	6.1	18.2	33.3	42.4
Corporate	3	3.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	30	4.4	0.0	0.0	10.0	43.3	46.7
Government	39	3.8	2.6	5.1	23.1	43.6	25.6
Public Service	5	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
Other	8	4.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	12	3.9	0.0	0.0	33.3	41.7	25.0
5 Years or fewer	18	4.3	5.6	0.0	5.6	38.9	50.0
6 – 10 Years	20	3.9	0.0	15.0	20.0	30.0	35.0
11 – 15 Years	25	3.7	0.0	12.0	32.0	28.0	28.0
16 – 20 Years	42	4.0	2.4	2.4	21.4	42.9	31.0
21 Years or more	88	4.1	0.0	8.0	17.1	36.4	38.6
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	16	3.8	0.0	12.5	31.3	25.0	31.3
Male	132	4.0	1.5	7.6	18.2	34.9	37.9
Female	57	4.0	0.0	3.5	21.1	43.9	31.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	13	4.0	0.0	0.0	38.5	23.1	38.5
Prosecution	7	3.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	28.6	14.3
Criminal	13	3.6	0.0	7.7	38.5	38.5	15.4
Criminal and Civil	53	4.0	1.9	11.3	13.2	34.0	39.6
Civil	114	4.1	0.0	4.4	19.3	40.4	36.0
Other	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	10	3.9	0.0	0.0	40.0	30.0	30.0
First District	6	4.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Second District	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	98	4.2	1.0	4.1	17.4	31.6	45.9
Fourth District	83	3.7	1.2	12.1	21.7	42.2	22.9
Outside Alaska	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	205	4.0	1.0	6.8	20.0	36.6	35.6
Professional Reputation	33	3.8	3.0	9.1	21.2	33.3	33.3
Social Contacts	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0

**O. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER**

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=57)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	21.1%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	22.8%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	26.3%
		Other	26.3%
		No Answer	3.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	33.3%
		6-10 Years	17.5%
		11-15 Years	14.0%
		16-20 Years	21.1%
		21 Years or more	10.5%
		No Answer	3.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	71.9%
		Female	26.3%
		No Answer	1.8%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.8%
		Second District	1.8%
		Third District	3.5%
		Fourth District	91.2%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	1.8%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	10.5%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	14.0%
		35,000 or over	73.7%
		No Answer	1.8%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger was evaluated by 49 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *diligence* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.0), and *judicial temperament* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	2	4.1	2	4.1	10	20.4	14	28.6	21	42.9	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	1	2.1	3	6.4	6	12.8	11	23.4	26	55.3	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	2.1	2	4.3	9	19.1	18	38.3	17	36.2	4.0
<b>Diligence</b>	1	2.2	2	4.3	6	13.0	12	26.1	25	54.3	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	2	4.2	2	4.2	10	20.8	11	22.9	23	47.9	4.1







**P. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=198)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	17.2%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	12.6%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	14.1%
		Private corporate employee	1.0%
		State judge or judicial officer	14.7%
		Government	29.3%
		Public service agency or organization	2.0%
		Other	2.0%
		No Answer	7.1%
		b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>
6-10 Years	8.6%		
11-15 Years	16.2%		
16-20 Years	19.7%		
21 Years or more	40.4%		
No Answer	6.1%		
c.	<u>Gender:</u>		
		Female	28.8%
		No Answer	8.1%
d.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	3.5%
		Mainly criminal	8.1%
		Mixed criminal and civil	25.8%
		Mainly civil	52.5%
		Other	3.0%
		No Answer	7.1%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.6%
		Second District	1.0%
		Third District	49.0%
		Fourth District	38.4%
		Outside Alaska	1.0%
		No Answer	6.1%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Raymond Funk was evaluated by 169 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.4). The lowest mean score was obtained on *legal ability* (4.0); however, this score still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Raymond Funk:  
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	1	0.6	11	6.6	28	16.9	74	44.6	52	31.3	4.0
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	4	2.4	10	6.0	22	13.3	56	33.7	74	44.6	4.1
<b>Integrity</b>	3	1.8	2	1.2	19	11.4	51	30.5	92	55.1	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	4	2.4	8	4.7	27	16.0	62	36.7	68	40.2	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>	2	1.2	4	2.5	29	17.9	66	40.7	61	37.7	4.1
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	4	2.4	6	3.6	26	15.4	68	40.2	65	38.5	4.1



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Raymond Funk:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	13	4.2	0.0	7.7	7.7	46.2	38.5
Private-Solo	30	4.0	3.3	3.3	10.0	60.0	23.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	25	4.0	4.0	4.0	12.0	44.0	36.0
6+ Attorneys	26	4.0	0.0	0.0	26.9	42.3	30.8
Corporate	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	21	4.3	0.0	0.0	19.1	28.6	52.4
Government	50	4.1	4.0	6.0	16.0	28.0	46.0
Public Service	2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	11	4.2	0.0	9.1	9.1	36.4	45.5
5 Years or fewer	18	3.8	11.1	0.0	27.8	16.7	44.4
6 – 10 Years	14	3.9	7.1	0.0	7.1	71.4	14.3
11 – 15 Years	27	4.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3
16 – 20 Years	33	4.2	3.0	3.0	9.1	45.5	39.4
21 Years or more	66	4.2	0.0	6.1	15.2	36.4	42.4
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	15	3.8	0.0	20.0	13.3	33.3	33.3
Male	104	4.1	3.9	1.9	13.5	43.3	37.5
Female	50	4.2	0.0	2.0	20.0	36.0	42.0
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	12	4.3	0.0	8.3	8.3	33.3	50.0
Prosecution	7	3.0	14.3	14.3	42.9	14.3	14.3
Criminal	14	3.9	0.0	7.1	21.4	50.0	21.4
Criminal and Civil	42	4.0	2.4	7.1	14.3	42.9	33.3
Civil	90	4.2	2.2	0.0	14.4	42.2	41.1
Other	4	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	11	4.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	36.4	36.4
First District	5	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0
Second District	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	80	4.4	2.5	0.0	7.5	40.0	50.0
Fourth District	70	3.8	2.9	7.1	24.3	41.4	24.3
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	169	4.1	2.4	3.6	15.4	40.2	38.5
Professional Reputation	23	4.5	0.0	0.0	13.0	26.1	60.9
Social Contacts	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7

**P. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

*Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=55)*

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	36.4%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	25.5%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	14.6%
		Other	18.2%
		No Answer	5.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	34.6%
		6-10 Years	21.8%
		11-15 Years	12.7%
		16-20 Years	10.9%
		21 Years or more	12.7%
		No Answer	7.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	80.0%
		Female	14.6%
		No Answer	5.5%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	14.6%
		Fourth District	80.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	5.5%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7.3%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	21.8%
		35,000 or over	65.5%
		No Answer	5.5%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Raymond Funk was evaluated by 44 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. All items rated obtained a mean score of 4.3, falling within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Raymond Funk:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	0	0.0	2	4.5	6	13.6	15	34.1	21	47.7	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	0	0.0	1	2.4	6	14.3	13	31.0	22	52.4	4.3
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	0	0.0	1	2.4	6	14.3	15	35.7	20	47.6	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	17.1	16	39.0	18	43.9	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	18.2	14	31.8	22	50.0	4.3

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Raymond Funk:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No Answer	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
State Officer	18	4.3	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	55.6
Municipal/Borough	12	4.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	41.7	41.7
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	7	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
Other	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	4	4.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0
5 Years or fewer	15	4.1	0.0	0.0	20.0	53.3	26.7
6 – 10 Years	10	4.5	0.0	0.0	10.0	30.0	60.0
11 – 15 Years	4	4.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	5	4.4	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0
21 Years or more	6	4.5	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Male	34	4.5	0.0	0.0	11.8	29.4	58.8
Female	7	3.6	0.0	0.0	42.9	57.1	0.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
First District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Second District	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Third District	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
Fourth District	37	4.3	0.0	0.0	18.9	35.1	46.0
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Under 2,000	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
2,000-35,000	10	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
Over 35,000	28	4.3	0.0	0.0	21.4	25.0	53.6
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	44	4.3	0.0	0.0	18.2	31.8	50.0
Professional Reputation	9	4.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4
Social Contacts	2	4.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0





**Q. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD**

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

*Demographic Description of All Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=165)*

a.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	17.0%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	11.5%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	7.9%
		Private corporate employee	1.8%
		State judge or judicial officer	15.8%
		Government	30.9%
		Public service agency or organization	2.4%
		Other	3.6%
		No Answer	9.1%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	10.9%
		6-10 Years	9.1%
		11-15 Years	15.1%
		16-20 Years	15.8%
		21 Years or more	41.8%
		No Answer	7.3%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	58.8%
		Female	32.1%
		No Answer	9.1%
d.	<u>Cases handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.9%
		Mainly criminal	9.7%
		Mixed criminal and civil	26.7%
		Mainly civil	42.4%
		Other	3.6%
		No Answer	9.7%
e.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.0%
		Second District	3.6%
		Third District	40.0%
		Fourth District	44.9%
		Outside Alaska	0.6%
		No Answer	7.9%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Mark I. Wood was evaluated by 144 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal ability* (4.0), and *impartiality and fairness* (4.0); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Mark I. Wood:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Legal Ability</b>	2	1.4	1	0.7	28	19.9	71	50.4	39	27.7	4.0
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	3	2.1	6	4.2	23	16.1	61	42.7	50	35.0	4.0
<b>Integrity</b>	2	1.4	4	2.8	20	14.1	50	35.2	66	46.5	4.2
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	2	1.4	5	3.5	23	16.1	56	39.2	57	39.9	4.1
<b>Diligence</b>	2	1.4	0.0	0.0	19	13.7	65	46.8	53	38.1	4.2
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	2	1.4	3	2.1	26	18.3	58	40.8	53	37.3	4.1



**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Mark I. Wood:  
Alaska Bar Association Members**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Demographics</b>							
<b>Type of Practice</b>							
No Answer	14	4.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	42.9	28.6
Private-Solo	24	4.1	0.0	8.3	16.7	29.2	45.8
2 – 5 Attorneys	16	4.3	6.3	0.0	6.3	37.5	50.0
6+ Attorneys	10	4.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	80.0	10.0
Corporate	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	21	4.4	0.0	0.0	19.1	23.8	57.1
Government	47	4.0	2.1	2.1	23.4	42.6	29.8
Public Service	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
Other	4	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	11	4.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	54.6	27.3
5 Years or fewer	16	4.1	12.5	0.0	12.5	18.8	56.3
6 – 10 Years	14	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6
11 – 15 Years	22	4.2	0.0	0.0	22.7	36.4	40.9
16 – 20 Years	23	4.2	0.0	4.4	13.0	43.5	39.1
21 Years or more	56	4.1	0.0	3.6	21.4	41.1	33.9
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	14	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.3	64.3	21.4
Male	82	4.2	2.4	2.4	14.6	36.6	43.9
Female	46	4.0	0.0	2.2	26.1	41.3	30.4
<b>Cases Handled</b>							
No Answer	15	4.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	46.7	40.0
Prosecution	11	3.7	9.1	0.0	36.4	18.2	36.4
Criminal	15	4.1	0.0	0.0	20.0	46.7	33.3
Criminal and Civil	38	3.9	2.6	5.3	23.7	31.6	36.8
Civil	59	4.2	0.0	1.7	13.6	49.2	35.6
Other	4	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0
<b>Location of Practice</b>							
No Answer	12	4.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0
First District	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7
Second District	6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Third District	50	4.4	0.0	0.0	8.0	46.0	46.0
Fourth District	70	3.9	2.9	4.3	24.3	37.1	31.4
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	142	4.2	1.4	2.1	18.3	40.9	37.3
Professional Reputation	18	4.2	0.0	5.6	16.7	33.3	44.4
Social Contacts	1	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

**Q. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD**

**2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS**

***Demographic Description of All Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=55)***

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	34.6%
		Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	27.3%
		Village Public Safety Officer	0.0%
		Probation-Patrol Officer	18.2%
		Other	14.6%
		No Answer	5.5%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	29.1%
		6-10 Years	21.8%
		11-15 Years	16.4%
		16-20 Years	16.4%
		21 Years or more	10.9%
		No Answer	5.5%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	78.2%
		Female	18.2%
		No Answer	3.6%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.8%
		Second District	3.6%
		Third District	12.7%
		Fourth District	76.4%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	5.5%
e.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	9.1%
		Between 2,000 and 35,000	27.3%
		35,000 or over	60.0%
		No Answer	3.6%

**Summary of Findings:**

Judge Mark I. Wood was evaluated by 47 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4, falling within the “excellent” range. The highest mean score was obtained on *integrity* (4.4). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *impartiality and fairness* (4.3), *judicial temperament* (4.3), and *diligence* (4.3); however, these scores still fell within the “excellent” range. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of District Court Judge Mark I. Wood:  
Peace and Probation Officers***

	<i>Unacceptable</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</i>		<i>Mean</i>
	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Num</i>	<i>%</i>	
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	1	2.1	1	2.1	7	14.9	14	29.8	24	51.1	4.3
<b>Integrity</b>	1	2.2	0	0.0	6	13.3	12	26.7	26	57.8	4.4
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	1	2.2	0	0.0	7	15.2	14	30.4	24	52.2	4.3
<b>Diligence</b>	1	2.2	0	0.0	7	15.6	12	26.7	25	55.6	4.3
<b>Overall Evaluation of Judge</b>	1	2.1	0	0.0	5	10.6	16	34.0	25	53.2	4.4

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Mark I. Wood:  
Peace and Probation Officers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Deficient</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Type of Work</b>							
No answer	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
State Officer	16	4.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
Municipal/Borough	13	3.9	7.7	0.0	15.4	46.2	30.8
Village Public Safety Officer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation/parole officer	10	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	50.0	40.0
Other	5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<b>Years of Experience</b>							
No Answer	3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7
5 Years or fewer	13	4.2	0.0	0.0	15.4	53.9	30.8
6 – 10 Years	11	4.6	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	72.7
11 – 15 Years	8	4.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	62.5
16 – 20 Years	8	4.4	0.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	50.0
21 Years or more	4	3.8	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0
<b>Gender</b>							
No Answer	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Male	35	4.5	2.9	0.0	5.7	31.4	60.0
Female	10	4.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	40.0	30.0
<b>Location of Work</b>							
No Answer	3	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
First District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Second District	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Third District	6	4.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Fourth District	36	4.3	2.8	0.0	11.1	33.3	52.8
Outside Alaska	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Population in Community</b>							
No Answer	2	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Under 2,000	3	4.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
2,000-35,000	14	4.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	42.9	50.0
Over 35,000	28	4.4	3.6	0.0	10.7	28.6	57.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
No Answer	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Direct Professional Experience	47	4.4	2.1	0.0	10.6	34.0	53.2
Professional Reputation	7	4.0	0.0	0.0	42.9	14.3	42.9
Social Contacts	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0



