

Behavioral Health Research and Services

Alaska Judicial Council Retention Survey

Judges Standing for Retention in 2004 Technical Report

April 30, 2004



Judicial Retention Survey: Judges Standing for Retention 2004

*Prepared by BHRS
April 30, 2004*

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 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 the calendar year 2004, the Alaska Judicial Council entered into a contract with Behavioral Health Research and Services (BHRS), a research workgroup administratively housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Alaska Anchorage. BHRS 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 2,927 current members of the Alaska Bar Association. The second target group consisted of 1,495 Peace and Probation Officers. The third target group consisted of 345 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) volunteers. Thus, a total of 4,767 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 eligible for retention in 2004. These survey booklets were individualized to three targeted respondent groups and thus differed slightly on the items and number of judges depending on who was asked to provide ratings. Specifically, the survey booklets targeted for members of the Alaska Bar Association contained 16 items and names of 10 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 10 superior and district court 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 10 superior and district court judges standing for retention in 2004

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 judges eligible to stand for retention in 2004. Please rate only those 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 judge”) under Question 1, and go on to the next judge.”

The survey booklet solicited detailed ratings about each judge 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 *poor* (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 judge in the performance of judicial duties. The first set of items on each page asks for your experience with each judge. Please circle the appropriate numbers. For remaining items, use the following rating scale.”

1.	Poor	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 26, 2004, the Alaska Judicial Council mailed a copy of the respective survey versions to all 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 BHRS by February 17, 2004, using an enclosed preaddressed, business reply envelope. On February 18, 2004, BHRS 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 postcard to these individuals on February 23, 2004, requesting their participation with a return date of March 19, 2004. 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 22, 2004. 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. Behavioral Health Research and Services (BHRS), an independent workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage, will conduct the analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Responses to the demographic questions also are confidential. Demographic data are critical to our analysis; strict guidelines are followed to protect the identities of all respondents.”

Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at BHRS 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, BHRS has instituted rigorous and explicit procedures and made use of established infrastructure that protects data. Specifically, for paper data, BHRS 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 BHRS, the DEC server is accessible only by BHRS 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. A total of 77 surveys were returned without signatures, with illegible signatures, or with a name not on the mailing list, thus, these surveys were excluded from data entry and analyses and are not reflected in the total number of surveys received.

Data Management

BHRS, 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

BHRS 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. 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.

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 are provided in a variety of ways, including by respondent subgroups.

Return Rates

The mailing of the survey took place on January 25, 2004, with a due date of February 17, 2004. A post card was then mailed to all non-respondents on February 23, 2004, with a due date of March 19, 2004. By the second due date, a total of 1,609 surveys was received, representing an overall return rate of 33.7%. It should be noted that 77 surveys were returned without signatures, with illegible signatures, or with names not on the mailing lists; these 77 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.

<i>Overall Return Rate for All Respondent Groups</i>	
Total mailed	4,767
Total responding	1,609
Response rate	33.7%
<i>Return Rate for Alaska Bar Association Members</i>	
Total mailed	2,927
Total responding	951
Response rate	32.5%
<i>Return Rate for Peace and Probation Officers</i>	
Total mailed	1,495
Total responding	571
Response rate	38.2%
<i>Return Rate for Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers</i>	
Total mailed	345
Total responding	87
Response rate	25.2%

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

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Private, solo	217	22.8
Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	179	18.8
Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	178	18.7
Private corporate employee	19	2.0
State judge or judicial officer	63	6.6
Government	197	20.7
Public Service Agency/Organization (not government)	23	2.4
Other	29	3.0
No response	46	4.8

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	113	11.9
6-10 Years	114	12.0
11-15 Years	118	12.4
16-20 Years	177	18.6
21 Years or more	382	40.2
No response	47	4.9
Mean		17.6
SD		10.3

Gender

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	625	65.7
Female	284	29.9
No response	42	4.4

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Prosecution	45	4.7
Mainly criminal	55	5.8
Mixed criminal and civil	182	19.1
Mainly civil	572	60.1
Other	52	5.5
No response	45	4.7

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	105	11.0
Second District	19	2.0
Third District	642	67.5
Fourth District	101	10.6
Not in Alaska	43	4.5
No response	41	4.3

Peace and Probation Officers

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
State law enforcement officer	232	40.6
Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer	229	40.1
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	16	2.8
Probation/parole officer	54	9.5
Other	23	4.0
No response	17	3.0

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	193	33.8
6-10 Years	153	26.8
11-15 Years	82	14.4
16-20 Years	80	14.0
21 Years or more	46	8.1
No response	17	3.0
Mean		9.5
SD		7.2

Gender

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	475	83.2
Female	80	14.0
No response	16	2.8

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	84	14.7
Second District	34	6.0
Third District	325	56.9
Fourth District	108	18.9
Outside	1	0.2
No response	19	3.3

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 2,000	55	9.6
Between 2,000 and 35,000	248	43.4
35,000 or over	251	44.0
No response	17	3.0

Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers

Type of Work: My current position is as follows:

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Social Worker	35	40.2
Guardian ad Litem	13	14.9
CASA Volunteer	32	36.8
Other	3	3.4
No response	4	4.6

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
5 Years or fewer	42	48.3
6-10 Years	20	23.0
11-15 Years	11	12.6
16-20 Years	8	9.2
21 Years or more	0	0.0
No response	6	6.9
Mean		6.3
SD		5.4

Gender

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	11	12.6
Female	72	82.8
No response	4	4.6

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
First District	18	20.7
Second District	4	4.6
Third District	50	57.5
Fourth District	8	9.2
Outside	0	0.0
No response	6	6.9

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

	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Under 2,000	3	3.4
Between 2,000 and 35,000	29	33.3
35,000 or over	49	56.3
No response	6	6.9

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, 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. This percentage is based on all respondents who rated the judge, 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.

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

<i>Judge Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 951 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>	11.5%	109	79.8%	14.7%	1.8%	3.7%
<i>Judge Michael I. Jeffery</i>	23.0%	219	78.1%	14.6%	5.0%	2.3%
<i>Judge Morgan Christen</i>	43.6%	415	82.4%	14.0%	0.7%	2.9%
<i>Judge Beverly Cutler</i>	46.7%	444	79.3%	15.3%	1.1%	4.3%
<i>Judge Sharon L. Gleason</i>	46.3%	440	80.7%	13.2%	1.6%	4.5%
<i>Judge Stephanie E. Joannides</i>	49.1%	467	82.9%	12.0%	1.1%	4.1%
<i>Judge Mark Rindner</i>	46.3%	440	86.8%	6.8%	0.5%	5.9%
<i>Judge Nancy J. Nolan</i>	26.0%	247	80.2%	9.7%	4.9%	5.3%
<i>Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger</i>	27.8%	264	83.7%	11.7%	0.8%	3.8%
<i>Judge Raymond Funk</i>	25.0%	238	82.8%	10.1%	2.1%	5.0%

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

<i>Judge Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 571 Peace & 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>	8.4%	48	77.1%	8.3%	2.1%	12.5%
<i>Judge Michael I. Jeffery</i>	7.2%	41	75.6%	7.3%	-	17.1%
<i>Judge Morgan Christen</i>	2.3%	13	46.2%	15.4%	-	38.5%
<i>Judge Beverly Cutler</i>	15.8%	90	66.7%	20.0%	-	13.3%
<i>Judge Sharon L. Gleason</i>	3.5%	20	65.0%	10.0%	-	25.0%
<i>Judge Stephanie E. Joannides</i>	13.7%	78	71.8%	14.1%	1.3%	12.8%
<i>Judge Mark Rindner</i>	2.5%	14	50.0%	21.4%	-	28.6%
<i>Judge Nancy J. Nolan</i>	9.5%	54	72.2%	9.3%	-	18.5%
<i>Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger</i>	13.3%	76	76.3%	10.5%	1.3%	11.8%
<i>Judge Raymond Funk</i>	10.5%	60	61.7%	15.0%	1.7%	21.7%

Social Worker/GAL/CASA volunteers' Level of Experience with Judges Standing for Retention in 2004

<i>Judge Standing for Retention</i>	<i>Percent of the 87 Social Worker /GAL/CASA volunteers 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>	6.9%	6	83.3%	16.7%	-	-
<i>Judge Michael I. Jeffery</i>	4.6%	4	100.0%	-	-	-
<i>Judge Morgan Christen</i>	11.5%	10	100.0%	-	-	-
<i>Judge Beverly Cutler</i>	8.0%	7	71.4%	28.6%	-	-
<i>Judge Sharon L. Gleason</i>	13.8%	12	83.3%	16.7%	-	-
<i>Judge Stephanie E. Joannides</i>	9.2%	8	87.5%	12.5%	-	-
<i>Judge Mark Rindner</i>	17.2%	15	80.0%	13.3%	-	6.7%
<i>Judge Nancy J. Nolan</i>	1.1%	1	-	-	100.0%	-
<i>Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger</i>	11.5%	10	100.0%	-	-	-
<i>Judge Raymond Funk</i>	4.6%	4	75.0%	25.0%	-	-

Rating of Candidates by Alaska Bar Association Members

The following two tables provide additional information on ratings by the Alaska Bar Association Members. The first table provides the mean scores on the *Overall Rating*, broken down by respondents' type of caseload. The second table provides mean scores on the *Overall Rating*, item broken down by respondents' type of practice. In addition, the table provides a total mean score for each type of practice. The total mean is calculated by summing the individual mean for each type of practice and dividing the result by the total number of judges for each practice type. As these two questions do not relate to Police and Probation Officers or Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA workers, data are not available for those groups.

***Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Caseload Handled
Alaska Bar Association Members***

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed		Civil		Other	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Judge Trevor Stephens	4.4	5	4.5	6	4.6	26	4.4	39	4.0	1
Judge Michael I. Jeffery	4.3	12	4.5	11	4.6	55	4.2	71	4.3	7
Judge Morgan Christen	4.7	6	4.6	10	4.2	69	4.4	226	4.6	8
Judge Beverly Cutler	3.9	18	4.2	22	3.9	83	4.0	195	4.1	7
Judge Sharon L. Gleason	4.0	9	4.3	11	4.2	71	4.3	224	4.4	10
Judge Stephanie E. Joannides	2.8	28	4.3	30	4.1	79	3.9	216	4.5	6
Judge Mark Rindner	3.7	7	4.3	15	4.2	69	4.2	261	4.7	7
Judge Nancy J. Nolan	4.4	18	4.4	21	4.4	63	4.4	76	4.0	5
Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger	3.8	12	4.2	12	4.1	56	4.1	108	4.3	12
Judge Raymond Funk	4.4	9	4.1	12	4.2	52	4.2	101	4.4	8

Note: Ratings for only those respondents with direct professional experience with the applicant

*Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Practice
Alaska Bar Association Members*

	Private, Solo		Private, 2-5		Private, 6+		Corporate		Judge/Judicial Officer		Government		Public Service		Other	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Judge Trevor Stephens	4.5	15	4.4	8	4.3	16	-	-	4.7	14	4.5	20	4.0	1	4.5	2
Judge Michael Jeffrey	4.5	42	4.0	21	4.2	20	4.0	1	4.8	30	4.2	34	4.3	7	4.7	3
Judge Morgan Christen	4.3	84	4.4	88	4.3	73	4.5	4	4.7	24	4.3	42	5.0	3	4.7	3
Judge Beverly Cutler	3.8	88	3.8	68	4.1	55	4.3	6	4.3	34	4.1	63	4.3	7	5.0	3
Judge Sharon Gleason	4.1	85	4.2	80	4.2	68	5.0	2	4.6	27	4.4	54	4.7	6	5.0	2
Judge Stephanie Joannides	4.2	94	4.1	78	3.8	66	3.5	2	3.9	31	3.4	82	4.5	4	5.0	2
Judge Mark Rindner	4.2	80	4.1	96	4.3	84	4.2	6	4.3	27	4.2	57	4.6	8	4.5	2
Judge Nancy Nolan	4.4	46	4.4	43	4.1	16	5.0	1	4.6	27	4.2	43	4.5	4	4.5	2
Judge Niesje Steinkruger	4.1	45	3.8	29	4.1	34	4.5	2	4.7	29	4.0	49	4.5	8	3.8	5
Judge Raymond Funk	4.3	32	3.9	39	4.1	30	4.3	3	4.7	27	4.1	43	4.5	4	4.5	2
Total Mean	4.2		4.1		4.2		4.4		4.5		4.1		4.5		4.6	

Note: Ratings for only those respondents with direct professional experience with the applicant

Ratings of Judges

In the tables that follow, the responses to the individual survey items for each judge are presented. These responses are shown in a variety of ways. For each individual judge, three tables and one graph are provided. Along with a brief summary of findings for the given judge, the first table provides a demographic description of the respondents who rated the given judge. 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 by respondent subgroups on each of the seven areas of performance (*Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation*).

A. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE TREVOR STEPHENS

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=105)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	17.1%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	9.5%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	21.0%
	Private corporate employee	0.0%
	State judge or judicial officer	15.2%
	Government	24.8%
	Public service agency or organization	2.9%
	Other	1.9%
	No Answer	7.6%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.5%
	6-10 Years	11.4%
	11-15 Years	7.6%
	16-20 Years	17.1%
	21 Years or more	47.6%
	No Answer	6.7%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	61.9%
	Female	31.4%
	No Answer	6.7%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	7.6%
	Mainly criminal	6.7%
	Mixed criminal and civil	29.5%
	Mainly civil	47.6%
	Other	1.9%
	No Answer	6.7%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	52.4%
	Second District	2.9%
	Third District	34.3%
	Fourth District	2.9%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	7.6%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Trevor Stephens was evaluated by 87 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 87 respondents, 43 (49.4%) had substantial and recent experience, 20 (23.0%) had moderate experience, 21 (24.1%) had limited experience, and 3 (3.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.6) and *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.4), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.4), *equal treatment of all parties* (4.4), *human understanding and compassion* (4.4), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.4). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	-	-	3	3.6	7	8.3	25	29.8	49	58.3	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law	-	-	-	-	8	10.3	26	33.3	44	56.4	4.5
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	-	-	1	1.3	9	11.8	25	32.9	41	53.9	4.4
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	1.2	3	3.6	5	6.0	26	31.3	48	57.8	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	1.3	1	1.3	4	5.1	27	34.6	45	57.7	4.5
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	1.2	1	1.2	4	4.8	19	22.9	58	69.9	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	1	1.3	4	5.3	27	36.0	43	57.3	4.5
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	4	4.8	6	7.2	17	20.5	56	67.5	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	1	1.3	8	10.5	25	32.9	42	55.3	4.4
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	1	1.3	5	6.5	29	37.7	42	54.5	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	5	6.8	22	29.7	47	63.5	4.6
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	1	1.5	-	-	6	9.1	21	31.8	38	57.6	4.4
Settlement skills	-	-	-	-	4	10.0	14	35.0	22	55.0	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	-	-	3	7.1	13	31.0	26	61.9	4.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	1	2.4	3	7.1	15	35.7	23	54.8	4.4
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1.2	2	2.4	4	4.8	29	34.5	48	57.1	4.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Direct Professional Experience	84	4.4	1.2	2.4	4.8	34.5	57.1
Professional Reputation	13	4.2	-	-	7.7	69.2	23.1
Social Contacts	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	8	4.4	-	-	12.5	37.5	50.0
Solo	15	4.5	-	6.7	-	33.3	60.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	8	4.4	-	12.5	12.5	-	75.0
6+ Attorneys	16	4.3	6.3	-	12.5	25.0	56.3
Corporate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or Judicial Officer	14	4.7	-	-	-	28.6	71.4
Government	20	4.5	-	-	-	55.0	45.0
Public Service	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Other	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
5 Years or fewer	10	4.4	-	-	10.0	40.0	50.0
6 – 10 Years	10	4.2	-	10.0	10.0	30.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	6	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
16 – 20 Years	11	4.4	-	9.1	-	36.4	54.5
21 Years or more	40	4.5	2.5	-	2.5	32.5	62.5
Gender							
No Answer	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Male	55	4.4	1.8	1.8	5.5	32.7	58.2
Female	22	4.5	-	4.5	-	36.4	59.1
Cases Handled							
No Answer	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Prosecution	5	4.4	-	-	-	60.0	40.0
Criminal	6	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Criminal and Civil	26	4.6	-	7.7	-	19.2	73.1
Civil	39	4.4	2.6	-	7.7	35.9	53.8
Other	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Location of Practice							
No Answer	8	4.1	-	-	25.0	37.5	37.5
First District	48	4.6	-	4.2	2.1	22.9	70.8
Second District	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Third District	23	4.3	4.3	-	4.3	47.8	43.5
Fourth District	3	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	3	4.3	-	-	33.3	-	66.7
Substantial	43	4.7	-	2.3	2.3	18.6	76.7
Moderate	20	4.3	5.0	-	5.0	45.0	45.0
Limited	18	4.1	-	5.6	5.6	66.7	22.2

A. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE TREVOR STEPHENS

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=42)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	35.7%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	35.7%
	Village Public Safety Officer	2.4%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	21.4%
	Other	4.8%
	No Answer	0.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	35.7%
	6-10 Years	33.3%
	11-15 Years	16.7%
	16-20 Years	14.3%
	21 Years or more	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	76.2%
	Female	23.8%
	No Answer	0.0%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	69.0%
	Second District	2.4%
	Third District	21.4%
	Fourth District	7.1%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	14.3%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	71.4%
	35,000 or over	11.9%
	No Answer	2.4%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Trevor Stephens 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, 15 (40.5%) had moderate experience, 9 (40.5%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.7. The highest mean score was obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.8). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.6), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.6), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.6). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	1	2.8	8	22.2	27	75.0	4.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	1	3.1	6	18.8	25	78.1	4.8
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	1	2.8	8	22.2	27	75.0	4.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	-	-	2	6.3	6	18.8	24	75.0	4.7
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	1	2.8	12	33.3	23	63.9	4.6
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	27.3	24	72.7	4.7
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	12	35.3	21	61.8	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	1	3.2	8	25.8	22	71.0	4.7
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	10	29.4	23	67.6	4.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	-	-	1	3.2	7	22.6	23	74.2	4.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	1	3.6	6	21.4	21	75.0	4.7
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	1	2.8	9	25.0	26	72.2	4.7

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Poor</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>
Demographics							
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	6	4.5	-	-	16.7	16.7	66.7
Direct Professional Experience	36	4.7	-	-	2.8	25.0	72.2
Professional Reputation	4	4.0	-	-	25.0	50.0	25.0
Social Contacts	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Officer	11	4.8	-	-	-	18.2	81.8
Municipal/Borough	15	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	8	4.5	-	-	12.5	25.0	62.5
Other	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	14	4.8	-	-	-	21.4	78.6
6 – 10 Years	11	4.6	-	-	9.1	18.2	72.7
11 – 15 Years	6	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	27	4.7	-	-	-	29.6	70.4
Female	9	4.7	-	-	11.1	11.1	77.8
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	27	4.7	-	-	3.7	22.2	74.1
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	7	4.6	-	-	-	42.9	57.1
Fourth District	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Under 2,000	5	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
2,000-35,000	26	4.7	-	-	3.8	26.9	69.2
Over 35,000	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	13	4.8	-	-	7.7	7.7	84.6
Moderate	14	4.6	-	-	-	42.9	57.1
Limited	9	4.8	-	-	-	22.2	77.8

A. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE TREVOR STEPHENS

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

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

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	83.3%
		Guardian ad Litem	16.7%
		CASA Volunteer	0.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	16.7%
		6-10 Years	33.3%
		11-15 Years	50.0%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	33.3%
		Female	66.7%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	100%
		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	83.3%
		35,000 or over	16.7%
		No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Trevor Stephens was evaluated by a total of 5 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 5 respondents, 3 (60.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 1 (20.0%) had moderate experience, 1 (20.0%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.8. The highest mean score was 4.8 and was obtained on all categories except *talent and ability for cases involving children and families*, in which he obtained a score of 4.6. Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers***

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

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Trevor Stephens:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Professional Reputation	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Guardian ad Litem	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
6 – 10 Years	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
11 – 15 Years	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Female	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Moderate	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Limited	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-

B. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=214)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.4%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	14.0%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	12.6%
	Private corporate employee	0.9%
	State judge or judicial officer	18.2%
	Government	21.0%
	Public service agency or organization	3.3%
	Other	3.3%
	No Answer	3.3%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.1%
	6-10 Years	6.1%
	11-15 Years	8.9%
	16-20 Years	16.8%
	21 Years or more	58.9%
	No Answer	3.3%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	65.4%
	Female	30.4%
	No Answer	4.2%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	6.5%
	Mainly criminal	7.9%
	Mixed criminal and civil	31.8%
	Mainly civil	44.4%
	Other	5.1%
	No Answer	4.2%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	6.5%
	Second District	6.5%
	Third District	59.8%
	Fourth District	23.4%
	Outside Alaska	0.5%
	No Answer	3.3%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Michael I. Jeffery was evaluated by 171 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 171 respondents, 57 (33.3%) had substantial and recent experience, 46 (26.9%) had moderate experience, 55 (32.2%) had limited experience, and 13 (7.6%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3. The highest mean score was obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.6). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.1) and *ability to control courtroom* (4.1). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	2	1.3	1	0.6	23	14.4	63	39.4	71	44.4	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law	1	0.7	1	0.7	21	14.0	61	40.7	66	44.0	4.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	1	0.7	2	1.4	20	13.5	62	41.9	63	42.6	4.2
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	1.2	5	3.1	13	8.0	41	25.2	102	62.6	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	0.6	3	1.9	12	7.7	41	26.5	98	63.2	4.5
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	1.2	3	1.9	10	6.2	44	27.2	103	63.6	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	1.4	7	4.7	15	10.1	46	31.1	78	52.7	4.3
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	3	1.8	-	-	14	8.4	38	22.8	112	67.1	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	1	0.6	2	1.3	14	8.9	30	19.0	111	70.3	4.6
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	3	2.1	5	3.4	27	18.6	49	33.8	61	42.1	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	0.7	1	0.7	22	14.9	47	31.8	77	52.0	4.3
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	2	1.5	4	2.9	23	16.8	54	39.4	54	39.4	4.1
Settlement skills	2	2.1	4	4.1	13	13.4	36	37.1	42	43.3	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	2.0	2	2.0	10	9.9	25	24.8	62	61.4	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	0.8	2	1.7	11	9.3	.0	25.4	74	62.7	4.5
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	1.2	1	0.6	20	12.2	57	34.8	84	51.2	4.3

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Direct Professional Experience	164	4.3	1.2	0.6	12.2	34.8	51.2
Professional Reputation	28	4.1	3.6	-	17.9	42.9	35.7
Social Contacts	6	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Type of Practice							
No Answer	6	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Solo	42	4.5	-	2.4	4.8	38.1	54.8
2 – 5 Attorneys	21	4.0	4.8	-	23.8	38.1	33.3
6+ Attorneys	20	4.2	5.0	-	15.0	35.0	45.0
Corporate	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Judge or Judicial Officer	30	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Government	34	4.2	-	-	20.6	38.2	41.2
Public Service	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Other	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Years of Experience							
No Answer	6	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
5 Years or fewer	9	4.2	-	-	11.1	55.6	33.3
6 – 10 Years	10	4.3	-	-	20.0	30.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	17	4.4	-	-	5.9	47.1	47.1
16 – 20 Years	26	4.2	3.8	-	11.5	42.3	42.3
21 Years or more	96	4.4	1.0	1.0	11.5	29.2	57.3
Gender							
No Answer	7	4.0	-	-	28.6	42.9	28.6
Male	106	4.3	1.9	0.9	12.3	30.2	54.7
Female	51	4.4	-	-	9.8	43.1	47.1
Cases Handled							
No Answer	8	4.1	-	-	25.0	37.5	37.5
Prosecution	12	4.3	-	-	25.0	25.0	50.0
Criminal	11	4.5	-	-	9.1	27.3	63.6
Criminal and Civil	55	4.6	-	1.8	7.3	20.0	70.9
Civil	71	4.2	2.8	-	12.7	47.9	36.6
Other	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Location of Practice							
No Answer	6	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
First District	6	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Second District	14	4.4	-	-	-	57.1	42.9
Third District	96	4.4	2.1	1.0	10.4	31.3	55.2
Fourth District	42	4.2	-	-	19	40.5	40.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	13	4.2	-	-	15.4	53.8	30.8
Substantial	55	4.6	1.8	-	5.5	21.8	70.9
Moderate	44	4.3	2.3	-	13.6	29.5	54.5
Limited	52	4.1	-	1.9	17.3	48.1	32.7

B. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=34)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	29.4%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	35.3%
	Village Public Safety Officer	2.9%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	17.6%
	Other	11.8%
	No Answer	2.9%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	17.6%
	6-10 Years	17.6%
	11-15 Years	26.5%
	16-20 Years	23.5%
	21 Years or more	11.8%
	No Answer	2.9%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	82.4%
	Female	14.7%
	No Answer	2.9%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	2.9%
	Second District	52.9%
	Third District	8.8%
	Fourth District	32.4%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	2.9%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	8.8%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	55.9%
	35,000 or over	32.4%
	No Answer	2.9%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Michael I. Jeffery was evaluated by 31 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 31 respondents, 13 (41.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 5 (16.1%) had moderate experience, 11 (35.5%) had limited experience, and 2 (6.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2. The highest mean score was obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.6). The lowest mean score was obtained on *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.0). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	3.3	1	3.3	2	6.7	12	40.0	14	46.7	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	2	6.5	4	12.9	9	29.0	16	51.6	4.3
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	4	12.9	10	32.3	17	54.8	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	3.3	-	-	7	23.3	11	36.7	11	36.7	4.0
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	3	9.7	9	29.0	19	61.3	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	2	6.7	7	23.3	21	70.0	4.6
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	1	3.2	3	9.7	14	45.2	13	41.9	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	1	3.3	2	6.7	10	33.3	17	56.7	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	5	16.1	13	41.9	13	41.9	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	2	6.5	5	16.1	10	32.3	14	45.2	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	1	3.8	4	15.4	7	26.9	14	53.8	4.3
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	1	3.2	4	12.9	13	41.9	13	41.9	4.2

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	7	3.4	-	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3
Direct Professional Experience	31	4.2	-	3.2	12.9	41.9	41.9
Professional Reputation	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
State Officer	9	3.7	-	11.1	22.2	55.6	11.1
Municipal/Borough	11	4.5	-	-	9.1	36.4	54.5
Village Public Safety Officer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Probation/Parole Officer	6	4.2	-	-	16.7	50.0	33.3
Other	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
5 Years or fewer	6	4.0	-	16.7	-	50.0	33.3
6 – 10 Years	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	8	4.4	-	-	12.5	37.5	50.0
16 – 20 Years	8	4.0	-	-	37.5	25.0	37.5
21 Years or more	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Gender							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	0.0
Male	26	4.0	-	-	15.4	42.3	42.3
Female	4	4.0	-	25.0	-	25.0	50.0
Location of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
First District	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Second District	17	4.4	-	5.9	5.9	29.4	58.8
Third District	3	3.3	-	-	66.7	33.3	-
Fourth District	9	4.2	-	-	11.1	55.6	33.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Under 2,000	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
2,000-35,000	18	4.2	-	5.6	16.7	27.8	50.0
Over 35,000	9	4.1	-	-	11.1	66.7	22.2
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Substantial	13	4.5	-	-	-	46.2	53.8
Moderate	5	4.2	-	20.0	-	20.0	60.0
Limited	11	3.9	-	-	27.3	54.5	18.2

B. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

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

Summary of Findings:

Judge Michael I. Jeffery was evaluated by a total of 4 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 4 respondents, 3 (75.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 0 (0.0%) had moderate experience, 1 (25.0%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (3.7). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	3.8
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50.0	2	50.0	4.5
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50.0	2	50.0	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	75.0	1	25.0	4.3
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	3.8
Settlement skills	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	2	66.7	-	-	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	-	-	3.8
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	4.0

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Michael I. Jeffery:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	4	4.0	-	-	25.0	50.0	25.0
Professional Reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Social Worker	2	3.5	-	-	50.0	50.0	-
Guardian ad Litem	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
5 Years or fewer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
6 – 10 Years	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
11 – 15 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 – 20 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Location of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Moderate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-

C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MORGAN CHRISTEN

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=403)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	22.8%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	24.3%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	22.6%
	Private corporate employee	1.2%
	State judge or judicial officer	6.9%
	Government	15.4%
	Public service agency or organization	1.5%
	Other	1.2%
	No Answer	4.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.4%
	6-10 Years	10.9%
	11-15 Years	12.7%
	16-20 Years	19.1%
	21 Years or more	44.9%
	No Answer	4.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	64.5%
	Female	32.3%
	No Answer	3.2%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	2.2%
	Mainly criminal	3.0%
	Mixed criminal and civil	19.4%
	Mainly civil	68.5%
	Other	2.7%
	No Answer	4.2%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2.5%
	Second District	0.5%
	Third District	91.3%
	Fourth District	1.7%
	Outside Alaska	0.5%
	No Answer	3.5%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Morgan Christen was evaluated by 342 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 342 respondents, 151 (44.2%) had substantial and recent experience, 71 (20.8%) had moderate experience, 85 (24.9%) had limited experience, and 35 (10.2%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.6). The lowest mean score was obtained on *knowledge of substantive laws* (4.2). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	2	0.6	15	4.5	35	10.5	115	34.5	166	49.8	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law	1	0.3	16	5.2	39	12.7	105	34.1	147	47.7	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	1	0.3	8	2.8	42	14.7	99	34.6	136	47.6	4.3
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	4	1.2	13	3.9	25	7.6	77	23.3	211	63.9	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	5	1.6	9	2.9	28	9.1	72	23.3	195	63.1	4.4
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	0.6	4	1.3	21	6.6	60	18.8	233	72.8	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	0.7	8	2.9	19	6.8	68	24.5	181	65.1	4.5
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	0.6	10	3.0	22	6.7	72	21.8	224	67.9	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	3	1.0	7	2.3	27	8.9	63	20.7	205	67.2	4.5
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	3	0.9	11	3.5	37	11.7	91	28.7	175	55.2	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	2	0.7	5	1.7	24	7.9	77	25.5	194	64.2	4.5
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	2	0.7	4	1.5	36	13.2	86	31.5	145	53.1	4.3
Settlement skills	1	0.4	10	4.3	26	11.3	63	27.4	130	56.5	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	0.9	4	3.6	10	9.1	22	20.0	73	66.4	4.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	4	2.1	7	3.7	14	7.4	37	19.7	126	67.0	4.5
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	4	1.2	11	3.3	31	9.4	97	29.3	188	56.8	4.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	11	4.2	-	9.1	9.1	36.4	45.5
Direct Professional Experience	331	4.4	1.2	3.3	9.4	29.3	56.8
Professional Reputation	55	4.0	1.8	3.6	18.2	45.5	30.9
Social Contacts	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Type of Practice							
No Answer	10	4.2	-	-	20.0	40.0	40.0
Solo	84	4.3	2.4	3.6	9.5	28.6	56.0
2 – 5 Attorneys	88	4.4	1.1	4.5	6.8	26.1	61.4
6+ Attorneys	73	4.3	1.4	2.7	9.6	39.7	46.6
Corporate	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	24	4.7	-	4.2	-	16.7	79.2
Government	42	4.3	-	2.4	19	23.8	54.8
Public Service	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Other	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Years of Experience							
No Answer	11	4.4	-	-	9.1	45.5	45.5
5 Years or fewer	21	4.1	4.8	4.8	14.3	28.6	47.6
6 – 10 Years	35	4.5	-	-	11.4	25.7	62.9
11 – 15 Years	44	4.4	-	2.3	11.4	29.5	56.8
16 – 20 Years	63	4.3	1.6	3.2	15.9	22.2	57.1
21 Years or more	157	4.4	1.3	4.5	5.1	31.8	57.3
Gender							
No Answer	9	4.3	-	-	11.1	44.4	44.4
Male	223	4.4	1.3	2.2	7.6	31.4	57.4
Female	99	4.3	1.0	6.1	13.1	23.2	56.6
Cases Handled							
No Answer	12	4.3	-	-	8.3	50.0	41.7
Prosecution	6	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Criminal	10	4.6	-	10.0	-	10.0	80.0
Criminal and Civil	69	4.2	-	8.7	15.9	23.2	52.2
Civil	226	4.4	1.8	1.8	8.4	30.5	57.5
Other	8	4.6	-	-	-	37.5	62.5
Location of Practice							
No Answer	10	4.2	-	-	20.0	40.0	40.0
First District	6	4.3	-	-	16.7	33.3	50.0
Second District	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Third District	306	4.4	1.3	3.3	9.2	29.1	57.2
Fourth District	7	4.4	-	14.3	-	14.3	71.4
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	35	4.4	-	-	8.6	42.9	48.6
Substantial	149	4.5	2.7	3.4	7.4	18.8	67.8
Moderate	69	4.3	-	5.8	10.1	36.2	47.8
Limited	78	4.3	-	2.6	12.8	37.2	47.4

C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MORGAN CHRISTEN

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=8)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	50.0%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	12.5%
	Village Public Safety Officer	12.5%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	12.5%
	Other	0.0%
	No Answer	12.5%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	37.5%
	6-10 Years	12.5%
	11-15 Years	12.5%
	16-20 Years	0.0%
	21 Years or more	25.0%
	No Answer	12.5%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	87.5%
	Female	0.0%
	No Answer	12.5%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
	Second District	0.0%
	Third District	87.5%
	Fourth District	0.0%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	12.5%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	12.5%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	0.0%
	35,000 or over	75.0%
	No Answer	12.5%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Morgan Christen was evaluated by 6 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 6 respondents, 1 (16.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 1 (16.7%) had moderate experience, 4 (66.7%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.8. The highest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (5.0). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.6) and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.6). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	4.8
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	4.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	3	75.0	4.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	100.0	5.0
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	4	80.0	4.8

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	5	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Professional Reputation	2	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
State Officer	4	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Municipal/Borough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
5 Years or fewer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
6 – 10 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 – 15 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Gender							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Male	4	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	4	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	4	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Moderate	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Limited	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7

C. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MORGAN CHRISTEN

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=10)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	60.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	20.0%
		CASA Volunteer	20.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	30.0%
		6-10 Years	30.0%
		11-15 Years	10.0%
		16-20 Years	30.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	10.0%
		Female	90.0%
		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	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Morgan Christen 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, 4 (40.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 2 (20.0%) had moderate experience, 3 (30.0%) had limited experience, and 1 (10.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3. The highest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.1), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (4.1), and *settlement skills* (4.1). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers***

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4.2
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	1	10.0	2	20.0	2	20.0	5	50.0	4.1
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	1	10.0	7	70.0	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	3	30.0	-	-	7	70.0	4.4
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	3	30.0	3	30.0	4	40.0	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	2	20.0	6	60.0	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4.2
Settlement skills	-	-	-	-	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0	4.2
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0	4.3

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Morgan Christen:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	10	4.3	-	-	20.0	30.0	50.0
Professional Reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	6	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Guardian ad Litem	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
CASA Volunteer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
6 – 10 Years	3	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
11 – 15 Years	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
16 – 20 Years	3	4.3	-	-	33.3	-	66.7
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Female	9	4.2	-	-	22.2	33.3	44.4
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	10	4.3	-	-	20.0	30.0	50.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	10	4.3	-	-	20.0	30.0	50.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Substantial	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Moderate	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Limited	3	3.3	-	-	66.7	33.3	-

D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY CUTLER

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=425)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	24.5%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.2%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	17.2%
	Private corporate employee	1.9%
	State judge or judicial officer	10.4%
	Government	18.1%
	Public service agency or organization	1.9%
	Other	1.6%
	No Answer	4.2%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	5.2%
	6-10 Years	10.4%
	11-15 Years	10.4%
	16-20 Years	19.8%
	21 Years or more	50.6%
	No Answer	3.8%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.3%
	Female	28.9%
	No Answer	3.8%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4.2%
	Mainly criminal	5.4%
	Mixed criminal and civil	24.0%
	Mainly civil	59.5%
	Other	2.6%
	No Answer	4.2%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.5%
	Second District	1.4%
	Third District	82.6%
	Fourth District	4.5%
	Outside Alaska	3.3%
	No Answer	3.8%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Beverly Cutler was evaluated by 352 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 352 respondents, 122 (36.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 100 (28.4%) had moderate experience, 99 (28.1%) had limited experience, and 31 (8.8%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.8) and *settlement skills* (3.8). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	5	1.4	15	4.3	78	22.6	141	40.9	106	30.7	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law	5	1.5	10	3.1	60	18.5	143	44.0	107	32.9	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	3	0.9	9	2.8	53	16.7	129	40.6	124	39.0	4.1
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	9	2.6	21	6.1	62	18.1	128	37.3	123	35.9	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	8	2.4	19	5.8	62	18.9	112	34.1	127	38.7	4.0
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	7	2.1	16	4.7	49	14.4	108	31.8	160	47.1	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	7	2.2	11	3.5	59	18.7	103	32.6	136	43.0	4.1
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	11	3.2	16	4.6	68	19.7	105	30.3	146	42.2	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	10	3.0	14	4.2	64	19.2	109	32.7	136	40.8	4.0
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	9	2.8	20	6.3	78	24.5	123	38.7	88	27.7	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	7	2.2	11	3.5	67	21.5	112	35.9	115	36.9	4.0
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	3	1.0	7	2.3	58	18.7	132	42.6	110	35.5	4.1
Settlement skills	7	3.3	13	6.2	51	24.3	79	37.6	60	28.6	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	6	3.1	5	2.6	38	19.9	73	38.2	69	36.1	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	8	3.9	12	5.8	41	19.8	69	33.3	77	37.2	3.9
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	10	2.9	18	5.3	68	20.0	131	38.5	113	33.2	3.9

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	19	3.7	5.3	10.5	26.3	26.3	31.6
Direct Professional Experience	340	3.9	2.9	5.3	20.0	38.5	33.2
Professional Reputation	65	4.0	3.1	4.6	16.9	36.9	38.5
Social Contacts	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	16	2.9	31.3	6.3	18.8	25.0	18.8
Solo	88	3.8	2.3	8.0	23.9	37.5	28.4
2 – 5 Attorneys	68	3.8	4.4	7.4	20.6	39.7	27.9
6+ Attorneys	55	4.1	-	3.6	16.4	49.1	30.9
Corporate	6	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	34	4.3	-	5.9	11.8	32.4	50.0
Government	63	4.1	-	1.6	25.4	34.9	38.1
Public Service	7	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Other	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	14	2.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	21.4	21.4
5 Years or fewer	18	4.1	-	-	27.8	33.3	38.9
6 – 10 Years	36	3.8	2.8	13.9	16.7	38.9	27.8
11 – 15 Years	38	3.8	2.6	7.9	21.1	44.7	23.7
16 – 20 Years	65	3.9	3.1	3.1	27.7	32.3	33.8
21 Years or more	169	4.1	1.2	3.6	17.2	41.4	36.7
Gender							
No Answer	13	3.0	30.8	7.7	15.4	23.1	23.1
Male	234	3.9	1.7	5.6	21.8	39.3	31.6
Female	93	4.1	2.2	4.3	16.1	38.7	38.7
Cases Handled							
No Answer	15	3.3	26.7	6.7	13.3	20.0	33.3
Prosecution	18	3.9	-	5.6	33.3	27.8	33.3
Criminal	22	4.2	-	9.1	4.5	45.5	40.9
Criminal and Civil	83	3.9	4.8	6	19.3	31.3	38.6
Civil	195	4.0	1.0	4.6	20.5	44.6	29.2
Other	7	4.1	-	-	42.9	-	57.1
Location of Practice							
No Answer	14	3.0	28.6	7.1	21.4	21.4	21.4
First District	11	4.0	9.1	-	18.2	27.3	45.5
Second District	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Third District	290	3.9	1.7	5.5	20.3	41.0	31.4
Fourth District	11	4.5	-	-	9.1	27.3	63.6
Outside Alaska	10	3.9	-	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	31	3.9	9.7	-	16.1	41.9	32.3
Substantial	120	3.8	5.8	10.0	17.5	31.7	35.0
Moderate	96	4.0	-	5.2	21.9	40.6	32.3
Limited	93	4.1	-	1.1	22.6	44.1	32.3

D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY CUTLER

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=78)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	46.2%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	24.4%
	Village Public Safety Officer	1.3%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	20.5%
	Other	5.1%
	No Answer	2.6%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	24.4%
	6-10 Years	25.6%
	11-15 Years	12.8%
	16-20 Years	17.9%
	21 Years or more	17.9%
	No Answer	1.3%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	75.6%
	Female	23.1%
	No Answer	1.3%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.3%
	Second District	0.0%
	Third District	93.6%
	Fourth District	3.8%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	1.3%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	2.6%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	32.1%
	35,000 or over	64.1%
	No Answer	1.3%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Beverly Cutler was evaluated by 60 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 60 respondents, 23 (38.3%) had substantial and recent experience, 13 (21.6%) had moderate experience, 19 (31.7%) had limited experience, and 5 (8.3%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.4. The highest mean score was obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (3.8). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (3.4), *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (3.4), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.4), and *ability to control courtroom* (3.4). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	4	6.9	6	10.3	20	34.5	16	27.6	12	20.7	3.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	3.6	4	7.1	23	41.1	14	25.0	13	23.2	3.6
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	1.8	6	10.7	22	39.3	14	25.0	13	23.2	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	4	7.1	3	5.4	25	44.6	13	23.2	11	19.6	3.4
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	1.7	4	6.8	19	32.2	20	33.9	15	25.4	3.7
Human understanding and compassion	1	1.7	3	5.1	17	28.8	23	39.0	15	25.4	3.8
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	1.7	8	13.8	23	39.7	16	27.6	10	17.2	3.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	1.9	7	13.5	20	38.5	12	23.1	12	23.1	3.5
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	3	5.3	7	12.3	23	40.4	12	21.1	12	21.1	3.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	1.8	11	19.3	20	35.1	11	19.3	14	24.6	3.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2.4	5	11.9	15	35.7	11	26.2	10	23.8	3.6
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	3	5.1	6	10.2	26	44.1	13	22.0	11	18.6	3.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Demographics							
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	12	3.6	-	8.3	41.7	33.3	16.7
Direct Professional Experience	59	3.4	5.1	10.2	44.1	22.0	18.6
Professional Reputation	17	4.3	-	-	17.6	35.3	47.1
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
State Officer	27	3.2	7.4	7.4	51.9	25.9	7.4
Municipal/Borough	14	3.6	-	14.3	42.9	14.3	28.6
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	13	3.4	7.7	15.4	30.8	23.1	23.1
Other	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Years of Experience							
No Answer	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
5 Years or fewer	17	3.6	5.9	5.9	41.2	17.6	29.4
6 – 10 Years	15	3.5	-	6.7	53.3	26.7	13.3
11 – 15 Years	6	3.8	-	16.7	33.3	-	50.0
16 – 20 Years	10	2.9	10.0	10.0	60.0	20.0	-
21 Years or more	10	3.2	10.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	10.0
Gender							
No Answer	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Male	43	3.4	2.3	11.6	48.8	20.9	16.3
Female	15	3.5	13.3	6.7	26.7	26.7	26.7
Location of Work							
No Answer	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	55	3.4	5.5	9.1	43.6	23.6	18.2
Fourth District	3	3.3	-	33.3	33.3	-	33.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Under 2,000	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
2,000-35,000	17	3.2	5.9	11.8	58.8	5.9	17.6
Over 35,000	40	3.5	5.0	10.0	35.0	30.0	20.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	5	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Substantial	23	3.3	13.0	13.0	30.4	17.4	26.1
Moderate	13	3.2	-	23.1	46.2	15.4	15.4
Limited	18	3.7	-	-	44.4	38.9	16.7

D. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY CUTLER

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=7)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	28.6%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	42.9%
		Other	28.6%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	28.6%
		6-10 Years	42.9%
		11-15 Years	28.6%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	28.6%
		Female	71.4%
		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	57.1%
		No Answer	14.3%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Beverly Cutler was evaluated by a total of 5 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 5 respondents, 2 (40.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 2 (40.0%) had moderate experience, 1 (20.0%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0. The highest mean score was obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.4). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (3.8), *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.8), *settlement skills* (3.8), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.8). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	-	-	3	60.0	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	-	-	3	60.0	4.0
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	-	-	3	60.0	4.0
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	-	-	2	40.0	3.8
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	4.0
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	2	40.0	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	-	-	3	60.0	4.2
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0	4.4
Settlement skills	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	2	40.0	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	3.8
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	-	-	3	60.0	4.0

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Beverly Cutler:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	5	4.0	-	20.0	20.0	-	60.0
Professional Reputation	2	3.0	50.0	-	-	-	50.0
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	1	2.0	-	100.0	-	-	-
Guardian ad Litem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Other	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
6 – 10 Years	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
11 – 15 Years	2	3.5	-	50.0	-	-	50.0
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	1	2.0	-	100.0	-	-	-
Female	4	4.5	-	-	25.0	-	75.0
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	5	4.0	-	20.0	20.0	-	60.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	1	2.0	-	100.0	-	-	-
Over 35,000	3	4.3	-	-	33.3	-	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Moderate	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Limited	1	2.0	-	100.0	-	-	-

E. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHARON L. GLEASON

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=420)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	23.6%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	23.6%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	19.0%
	Private corporate employee	1.4%
	State judge or judicial officer	7.4%
	Government	16.9%
	Public service agency or organization	2.1%
	Other	0.7%
	No Answer	5.2%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.6%
	6-10 Years	12.1%
	11-15 Years	12.4%
	16-20 Years	21.2%
	21 Years or more	40.7%
	No Answer	5.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	62.9%
	Female	32.6%
	No Answer	4.5%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	2.9%
	Mainly criminal	3.1%
	Mixed criminal and civil	19.5%
	Mainly civil	66.9%
	Other	2.4%
	No Answer	5.2%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	2.4%
	Second District	0.7%
	Third District	87.9%
	Fourth District	1.9%
	Outside Alaska	2.1%
	No Answer	5.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Sharon L. Gleason was evaluated by 355 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 355 respondents, 162 (45.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 77 (21.7%) had moderate experience, 76 (21.4%) had limited experience, and 40 (11.3%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.4) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.4). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.1), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.1), and *settlement skills* (4.1). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	7	2.0	22	6.3	48	13.8	118	33.9	153	44.0	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law	7	2.1	12	3.6	58	17.5	118	35.5	137	41.3	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	6	1.9	12	3.7	46	14.2	120	37.2	139	43.0	4.2
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	10	2.9	25	7.3	38	11.0	97	28.2	174	50.6	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	7	2.1	24	7.2	34	10.1	104	31.0	166	49.6	4.2
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	7	2.1	4	1.2	43	12.8	84	25.1	197	58.8	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	7	2.3	14	4.5	37	12.0	81	26.3	169	54.9	4.3
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	7	2.0	10	2.9	35	10.1	75	21.7	218	63.2	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	6	1.8	15	4.5	35	10.4	88	26.2	192	57.1	4.3
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	7	2.1	10	3.0	51	15.3	119	35.6	147	44.0	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	7	2.1	5	1.5	42	12.9	97	29.8	175	53.7	4.3
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	4	1.3	10	3.4	42	14.1	108	36.2	134	45.0	4.2
Settlement skills	5	2.2	9	4.0	46	20.4	71	31.4	95	42.0	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	3.4	5	4.3	17	14.7	31	26.7	59	50.9	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	6	3.0	6	3.0	28	13.9	48	23.9	113	56.2	4.3
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	6	1.8	16	4.7	45	13.2	103	30.1	172	50.3	4.2

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	18	4.6	-	-	-	44.4	55.6
Direct Professional Experience	342	4.2	1.8	4.7	13.2	30.1	50.3
Professional Reputation	53	4.0	-	1.9	26.4	39.6	32.1
Social Contacts	6	3.8	-	-	50.0	16.7	33.3
Type of Practice							
No Answer	18	3.7	11.1	-	27.8	33.3	27.8
Solo	85	4.1	-	4.7	22.4	31.8	41.2
2 – 5 Attorneys	80	4.2	3.8	6.3	11.3	28.8	50.0
6+ Attorneys	68	4.2	-	5.9	14.7	32.4	47.1
Corporate	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.6	3.7	-	3.7	14.8	77.8
Government	54	4.4	-	5.6	1.9	35.2	57.4
Public Service	6	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Other	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	15	3.5	13.3	-	26.7	40.0	20.0
5 Years or fewer	29	4.5	-	-	6.9	37.9	55.2
6 – 10 Years	42	4.3	2.4	-	19.0	23.8	54.8
11 – 15 Years	45	4.2	2.2	4.4	11.1	31.1	51.1
16 – 20 Years	74	4.2	1.4	6.8	12.2	27.0	52.7
21 Years or more	137	4.2	0.7	6.6	12.4	30.7	49.6
Gender							
No Answer	15	3.5	13.3	-	26.7	40.0	20.0
Male	222	4.3	0.9	3.6	13.5	32.4	49.5
Female	105	4.2	1.9	7.6	10.5	23.8	56.2
Cases Handled							
No Answer	17	3.6	11.8	-	23.5	41.2	23.5
Prosecution	9	4.0	-	22.2	-	33.3	44.4
Criminal	11	4.3	-	-	27.3	18.2	54.5
Criminal and Civil	71	4.2	4.2	2.8	12.7	26.8	53.5
Civil	224	4.3	0.4	5.4	12.1	31.3	50.9
Other	10	4.4	-	-	20.0	20.0	60.0
Location of Practice							
No Answer	17	3.5	11.8	-	29.4	41.2	17.6
First District	6	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Second District	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Third District	306	4.2	1.3	4.6	13.1	30.1	51.0
Fourth District	5	4.2	-	20.0	-	20.0	60.0
Outside Alaska	6	4.0	-	16.7	-	50.0	33.3
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	37	4.1	5.4	2.7	13.5	37.8	40.5
Substantial	159	4.4	1.9	5.0	11.3	19.5	62.3
Moderate	73	4.2	-	5.5	17.8	32.9	43.8
Limited	73	4.1	1.4	4.1	12.3	46.6	35.6

E. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHARON L. GLEASON

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=15)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	53.3%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	20.0%
	Village Public Safety Officer	6.7%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	13.3%
	Other	6.7%
	No Answer	0.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	20.0%
	6-10 Years	26.7%
	11-15 Years	20.0%
	16-20 Years	6.7%
	21 Years or more	26.7%
	No Answer	0.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	80.0%
	Female	20.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
	Second District	0.0%
	Third District	93.3%
	Fourth District	6.7%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	6.7%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	26.7%
	35,000 or over	66.7%
	No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Sharon L. Gleason was evaluated by 13 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 13 respondents, 2 (15.4%) had substantial and recent experience, 2 (15.4%) had moderate experience, 8 (61.5%) had limited experience, and 1 (7.8%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5), *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.5), *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.5), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.2) and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.2). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	1	7.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	8	61.5	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	1	7.7	1	7.7	3	23.1	8	61.5	4.4
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	1	9.1	1	9.1	1	9.1	8	72.7	4.5
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	1	7.7	2	15.4	2	15.4	8	61.5	4.3
Human understanding and compassion	1	8.3	-	-	2	16.7	2	16.7	7	58.3	4.2
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7	4.5
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	2	18.2	2	18.2	7	63.6	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	9.1	-	-	2	18.2	1	9.1	7	63.6	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	1	9.1	2	18.2	1	9.1	7	63.6	4.3
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	3	23.1	2	15.4	8	61.5	4.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:
Peace and Probation Officers**

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	5	3.4	-	-	60.0	40.0	-
Direct Professional Experience	13	4.4	-	-	23.1	15.4	61.5
Professional Reputation	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Officer	7	4.6	-	-	14.3	14.3	71.4
Municipal/Borough	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Other	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
6 – 10 Years	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
11 – 15 Years	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
16 – 20 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
21 Years or more	4	3.8	-	-	50.0	25.0	25.0
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	11	4.5	-	-	18.2	18.2	63.6
Female	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	12	4.5	-	-	16.7	16.7	66.7
Fourth District	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	4	4.3	-	-	25.0	25.0	50.0
Over 35,000	9	4.4	-	-	22.2	11.1	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Substantial	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Moderate	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Limited	8	4.0	-	-	37.5	25.0	37.5

E. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SHARON L. GLEASON

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=12)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	16.7%
		CASA Volunteer	33.3%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	66.6%
		6-10 Years	8.3%
		11-15 Years	8.3%
		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	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 Sharon L. Gleason 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, 4 (40.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 5 (50.0%) had moderate experience, 1 (10.0%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.6. The highest mean scores were obtained on *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.7) and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.7). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *settlement skills* (4.3) and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.3). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

***Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers***

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	1	10.0	3	30.0	6	60.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	4.7
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	44.4	5	55.6	4.6
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	4.7
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	4.6
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	2	20.0	6	60.0	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	1	12.5	3	37.5	4	50.0	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6	4.4
Settlement skills	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	-	-	5	62.5	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.6	4.3
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7	4.6

NOTE: Results on based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Sharon L. Gleason:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Poor</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>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	9	4.6	-	-	11.1	22.2	66.7
Professional Reputation	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Guardian ad Litem	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
CASA Volunteer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
6 – 10 Years	1	4	-	-	-	100.0	-
11 – 15 Years	1	5	-	-	-	-	100.0
16 – 20 Years	2	4	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	9	4.6	-	-	11.1	22.2	66.7
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	9	4.6	-	-	11.1	22.2	66.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	9	4.6	-	-	11.1	22.2	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	4	4.3	-	-	25.0	25.0	50.0
Moderate	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Limited	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0

F. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE E. JOANNIDES

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=448)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	24.6%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.1%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	17.6%
	Private corporate employee	1.3%
	State judge or judicial officer	8.3%
	Government	21.7%
	Public service agency or organization	1.1%
	Other	1.1%
	No Answer	4.2%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.3%
	6-10 Years	15.0%
	11-15 Years	12.5%
	16-20 Years	20.5%
	21 Years or more	42.2%
	No Answer	3.6%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	63.6%
	Female	32.8%
	No Answer	3.6%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	6.7%
	Mainly criminal	6.9%
	Mixed criminal and civil	21.0%
	Mainly civil	58.7%
	Other	2.5%
	No Answer	4.2%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	5.4%
	Second District	0.7%
	Third District	87.1%
	Fourth District	2.5%
	Outside Alaska	0.7%
	No Answer	3.8%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Stephanie E. Joannides was evaluated by 387 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 387 respondents, 153 (39.5%) had substantial and recent experience, 111 (28.7%) had moderate experience, 72 (18.6%) had limited experience, and 50 (12.9%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.7). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	10	2.6	38	10.0	78	20.6	148	39.1	105	27.7	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	11	3.0	35	9.7	79	21.9	129	35.7	107	29.6	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	13	3.7	27	7.6	75	21.2	127	35.9	112	31.6	3.8
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	14	3.7	28	7.5	53	14.1	112	29.9	168	44.8	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	6	1.6	23	6.3	60	16.3	107	29.1	172	46.7	4.1
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	9	2.4	16	4.3	63	16.8	106	28.2	182	48.4	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	10	2.9	27	7.8	52	15.0	107	30.8	151	43.5	4.0
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	10	2.7	17	4.5	50	13.3	92	24.4	208	55.2	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	6	1.6	16	4.4	49	13.4	106	29.0	189	51.6	4.2
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	21	5.9	36	10.1	66	18.5	125	35.1	108	30.3	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	15	4.3	26	7.4	56	16.0	119	34.0	134	38.3	3.9
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	18	5.3	26	7.7	64	18.9	114	33.7	116	34.3	3.8
Settlement skills	8	3.3	18	7.3	49	19.9	84	34.1	87	35.4	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	7	3.7	20	10.5	33	17.3	55	28.8	76	39.8	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	7	3.5	15	7.4	31	15.3	67	33.2	82	40.6	4.0
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	14	3.7	34	9.1	55	14.7	142	38	129	34.5	3.9

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	18	4.2	5.6	-	11.1	33.3	50.0
Direct Professional Experience	374	3.9	3.7	9.1	14.7	38.0	34.5
Professional Reputation	56	4.0	1.8	3.6	14.3	53.6	26.8
Social Contacts	3	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Type of Practice							
No Answer	15	4.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	40.0	40.0
Solo	94	4.2	1.1	3.2	12.8	40.4	42.6
2 – 5 Attorneys	78	4.1	2.6	5.1	15.4	37.2	39.7
6+ Attorneys	66	3.8	1.5	9.1	21.2	45.5	22.7
Corporate	2	3.5	-	-	50.0	50.0	-
Judge or Judicial Officer	31	3.9	6.5	9.7	3.2	45.2	35.5
Government	82	3.4	8.5	20.7	17.1	26.8	26.8
Public Service	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	12	4.1	8.3	8.3	-	33.3	50.0
5 Years or fewer	23	3.7	8.7	17.4	8.7	30.4	34.8
6 – 10 Years	53	3.7	5.7	15.1	13.2	34.0	32.1
11 – 15 Years	50	3.7	4.0	6.0	30.0	38.0	22.0
16 – 20 Years	82	4.1	1.2	6.1	11.0	45.1	36.6
21 Years or more	154	4.0	3.2	8.4	14.3	37.0	37.0
Gender							
No Answer	11	4.0	9.1	9.1	-	36.4	45.5
Male	247	3.9	3.6	8.1	15.8	38.1	34.4
Female	116	3.9	3.4	11.2	13.8	37.9	33.6
Cases Handled							
No Answer	15	4.0	6.7	6.7	-	53.3	33.3
Prosecution	28	2.8	10.7	39.3	25.0	7.1	17.9
Criminal	30	4.3	3.3	-	10.0	33.3	53.3
Criminal and Civil	79	4.1	3.8	3.8	12.7	41.8	38.0
Civil	216	3.9	2.8	8.8	15.7	40.7	31.9
Other	6	4.5	-	-	16.7	16.7	66.7
Location of Practice							
No Answer	13	4.0	7.7	7.7	7.7	30.8	46.2
First District	15	4.0	-	6.7	13.3	53.3	26.7
Second District	3	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Third District	332	3.9	3.9	9.3	15.4	37.7	33.7
Fourth District	8	4.1	-	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	48	4.2	2.1	4.2	12.5	35.4	45.8
Substantial	149	3.7	8.1	12.8	14.8	28.2	36.2
Moderate	109	4.1	0.9	8.3	10.1	45.0	35.8
Limited	67	3.9	-	6.0	22.4	50.7	20.9

F. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE E. JOANNIDES

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=68)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	32.4%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	39.7%
	Village Public Safety Officer	1.5%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	23.5%
	Other	1.5%
	No Answer	1.5%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	16.2%
	6-10 Years	35.3%
	11-15 Years	11.8%
	16-20 Years	17.6%
	21 Years or more	17.6%
	No Answer	1.5%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	72.1%
	Female	26.5%
	No Answer	1.5%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.5%
	Second District	0.0%
	Third District	94.1%
	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	8.8%
	35,000 or over	85.3%
	No Answer	2.9%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Stephanie E. Joannides was evaluated by 56 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 56 respondents, 16 (28.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 16 (28.6%) had moderate experience, 18 (32.1%) had limited experience, and 6 (10.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.9. The highest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (3.7). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	3.6	5	8.9	17	30.4	10	17.9	22	39.3	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	3.6	5	8.9	16	28.6	11	19.6	22	39.3	3.8
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	3.6	2	3.6	12	21.8	13	23.6	26	47.3	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	3	5.6	2	3.7	12	22.2	15	27.8	22	40.7	3.9
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	1.8	2	3.6	11	20.0	14	25.5	27	49.1	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	3	5.4	1	1.8	8	14.3	18	32.1	26	46.4	4.1
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	3	5.9	2	3.9	14	27.5	15	29.4	17	33.3	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	2	4.3	1	2.2	11	23.9	15	32.6	17	37.0	4.0
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	3	5.7	1	1.9	13	24.5	15	28.3	21	39.6	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	8.0	5	10.0	12	24.0	12	24.0	17	34.0	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	3	8.6	-	-	5	14.3	12	34.3	15	42.9	4.0
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	3.6	4	7.1	12	21.4	17	30.4	21	37.5	3.9

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Poor</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>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	9	3.7	-	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
Direct Professional Experience	56	3.9	3.6	7.1	21.4	30.4	37.5
Professional Reputation	11	3.6	27.3	-	9.1	9.1	54.5
Social Contacts	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
State Officer	18	4.4	5.6	-	5.6	27.8	61.1
Municipal/Borough	20	3.7	-	15.0	25.0	40.0	20.0
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	16	3.6	6.3	6.3	37.5	18.8	31.3
Other	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
5 Years or fewer	9	3.7	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	44.4
6 – 10 Years	22	3.8	-	4.5	36.4	31.8	27.3
11 – 15 Years	7	4.6	-	-	-	42.9	57.1
16 – 20 Years	7	4.4	-	-	14.3	28.6	57.1
21 Years or more	10	3.5	10.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	30.0
Gender							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Male	39	4.0	-	7.7	23.1	30.8	38.5
Female	16	3.7	12.5	6.3	18.8	25.0	37.5
Location of Work							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
First District	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	52	3.9	3.8	7.7	23.1	26.9	38.5
Fourth District	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Under 2,000	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
2,000-35,000	6	4.2	-	-	33.3	16.7	50.0
Over 35,000	47	3.9	4.3	8.5	21.3	29.8	36.2
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	6	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Substantial	16	3.9	6.3	12.5	12.5	18.8	50.0
Moderate	16	3.9	6.3	6.3	25.0	18.8	43.8
Limited	18	3.8	-	5.6	33.3	38.9	22.2

F. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE E. JOANNIDES

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=8)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	50.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	75.0%
		6-10 Years	12.5%
		11-15 Years	12.5%
		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	100.0%
		No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Stephanie E. Joannides was evaluated by a total of 7 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 7 respondents, 2 (28.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 3 (42.9%) had moderate experience, 1 (14.3%) had limited experience, and 1 (14.3%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.3. The highest mean scores were obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.0) and *ability to control courtroom* (4.0). The lowest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.0). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	14.3	2	28.6	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	14.3	2	28.6	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.3
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	14.3	2	28.6	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.3
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	3	42.9	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	3.3
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	4.0
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	14.3	2	28.6	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	20.0	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	2	40.0	3.8
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	1	20.0	-	-	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.0
Settlement skills	-	-	3	42.9	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7	-	-	2	33.3	3.0
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	14.3	2	28.6	-	-	2	28.6	2	28.6	3.3

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Stephanie E. Joannides:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	7	3.3	14.3	28.6	-	28.6	28.6
Professional Reputation	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	4	2.5	25.0	50.0	-	-	25.0
Guardian ad Litem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	3	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	5	3.4	-	40.0	-	40.0	20.0
6 – 10 Years	1	1.0	100.0	-	-	-	-
11 – 15 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	7	3.3	14.3	28.6	-	28.6	28.6
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	7	3.3	14.3	28.6	-	28.6	28.6
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	7	3.3	14.3	28.6	-	28.6	28.6
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Substantial	2	3.0	50.0	-	-	-	50.0
Moderate	3	2.7	-	66.7	-	33.3	-
Limited	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0

G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARK RINDNER

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=414)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	20.8%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	24.2%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	22.7%
	Private corporate employee	1.9%
	State judge or judicial officer	7.0%
	Government	16.7%
	Public service agency or organization	2.4%
	Other	1.0%
	No Answer	3.4%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.0%
	6-10 Years	10.9%
	11-15 Years	11.4%
	16-20 Years	20.8%
	21 Years or more	45.4%
	No Answer	3.6%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.1%
	Female	30.0%
	No Answer	2.9%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	1.9%
	Mainly criminal	4.1%
	Mixed criminal and civil	18.6%
	Mainly civil	69.3%
	Other	2.4%
	No Answer	3.6%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.9%
	Second District	1.0%
	Third District	88.2%
	Fourth District	2.2%
	Outside Alaska	1.4%
	No Answer	3.4%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Mark Rindner was evaluated by 382 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 382 respondents, 173 (45.3%) had substantial and recent experience, 77 (20.2%) had moderate experience, 71 (18.6%) had limited experience, and 61 (16.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2. The highest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.3), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.3), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.3), *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.3), *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (4.3), *ability to control courtroom* (4.3), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.3). The lowest mean score was obtained on *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.0). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	5	1.3	15	4.0	36	9.5	132	34.9	190	50.3	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law	5	1.4	12	3.3	33	9.0	140	38.4	175	47.9	4.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	6	1.7	6	1.7	33	9.2	144	40.0	171	47.5	4.3
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	8	2.1	17	4.5	49	13	127	33.7	176	46.7	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	6	1.6	16	4.3	45	12.2	124	33.5	179	48.4	4.2
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	5	1.4	9	2.4	41	11.1	109	29.6	204	55.4	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	1.4	12	3.5	33	9.5	108	31.1	189	54.5	4.3
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	16	4.2	20	5.3	68	18.0	112	29.7	161	42.7	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	5	1.4	16	4.4	69	19.0	120	33.0	154	42.3	4.1
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	5	1.4	8	2.3	53	15.1	118	33.5	168	47.7	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	6	1.7	3	0.8	43	12.2	118	33.4	183	51.8	4.3
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	4	1.2	5	1.5	44	13.4	107	32.6	168	51.2	4.3
Settlement skills	6	2.7	7	3.1	36	16.1	80	35.9	94	42.2	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	3.3	2	1.7	16	13.3	34	28.3	64	53.3	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	6	3.3	4	2.2	29	16.0	52	28.7	90	49.7	4.2
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	7	1.9	12	3.2	45	12.1	139	37.4	169	45.4	4.2

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	25	3.9	-	16.0	16.0	28.0	40.0
Direct Professional Experience	372	4.2	1.9	3.2	12.1	37.4	45.4
Professional Reputation	28	4.4	-	-	14.3	35.7	50.0
Social Contacts	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	12	4.3	8.3	-	8.3	25.0	58.3
Solo	80	4.2	-	5.0	12.5	41.3	41.3
2 – 5 Attorneys	96	4.1	4.2	1.0	14.6	36.5	43.8
6+ Attorneys	84	4.3	1.2	2.4	9.5	42.9	44.0
Corporate	6	4.2	16.7	-	-	16.7	66.7
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.3	-	3.7	14.8	33.3	48.1
Government	57	4.2	-	7.0	12.3	35.1	45.6
Public Service	8	4.6	-	-	12.5	12.5	75.0
Other	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	13	4.3	7.7	-	-	38.5	53.8
5 Years or fewer	29	4.4	3.4	-	3.4	34.5	58.6
6 – 10 Years	42	4.2	-	2.4	14.3	45.2	38.1
11 – 15 Years	43	4.2	2.3	2.3	9.3	44.2	41.9
16 – 20 Years	77	4.3	2.6	3.9	9.1	32.5	51.9
21 Years or more	168	4.1	1.2	4.2	16.1	36.3	42.3
Gender							
No Answer	10	4.3	10.0	-	-	30.0	60.0
Male	253	4.2	2.4	3.2	13.4	37.9	43.1
Female	109	4.3	-	3.7	10.1	36.7	49.5
Cases Handled							
No Answer	13	4.3	7.7	-	-	38.5	53.8
Prosecution	7	3.7	-	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6
Criminal	15	4.3	-	6.7	6.7	33.3	53.3
Criminal and Civil	69	4.2	1.4	2.9	14.5	36.2	44.9
Civil	261	4.2	1.9	3.1	12.3	38.3	44.4
Other	7	4.7	-	-	-	28.6	71.4
Location of Practice							
No Answer	12	4.3	8.3	-	8.3	25.0	58.3
First District	12	4.2	-	8.3	16.7	25.0	50.0
Second District	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Third District	334	4.2	1.8	3.3	11.7	38.9	44.3
Fourth District	8	4.1	-	-	25.0	37.5	37.5
Outside Alaska	3	4.3	-	-	33.3	-	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	60	4.3	3.3	1.7	10.0	28.3	56.7
Substantial	171	4.2	2.9	2.3	14.0	29.2	51.5
Moderate	75	4.2	-	2.7	14.7	46.7	36.0
Limited	66	4.1	-	7.6	6.1	56.1	30.3

G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARK RINDNER

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=10)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	30.0%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	20.0%
	Village Public Safety Officer	10.0%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	40.0%
	Other	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	40.0%
	6-10 Years	30.0%
	11-15 Years	20.0%
	16-20 Years	0.0%
	21 Years or more	10.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	70.0%
	Female	30.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
	Second District	20.0%
	Third District	80.0%
	Fourth District	0.0%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	10.0%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	40.0%
	35,000 or over	50.0%
	No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Mark Rindner was evaluated by 7 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 7 respondents, 0 (0.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 1 (14.3%) had moderate experience, 6 (85.7%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3. The highest mean scores were obtained on *ability to control courtroom* (4.6) and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.6). The lowest mean score was obtained on *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (3.8). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0	3	50.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0	3	50.0	4.5
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0	3	50.0	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	4.2
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0	3	50.0	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	50.0	3	50.0	4.5
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	1	20.0	-	-	2	40.0	2	40.0	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	1	20.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	2	40.0	3.8
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	40.0	3	60.0	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50.0	2	50.0	4.5
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	4.3

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	4	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	6	4.3	-	-	16.7	33.3	50.0
Professional Reputation	3	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Officer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Municipal/Borough	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
6 – 10 Years	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
11 – 15 Years	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Female	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Third District	5	4.6	-	-	-	40.0	60.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Over 35,000	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Limited	5	4.2	-	-	20.0	40.0	40.0

G. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MARK RINDNER

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=13)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	42.9%
		Guardian ad Litem	14.3%
		CASA Volunteer	35.7%
		Other	7.1%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	50.0%
		6-10 Years	14.3%
		11-15 Years	14.3%
		16-20 Years	21.4%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	7.1%
		Female	92.9%
		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	92.9%
		No Answer	7.1%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Mark Rindner was evaluated by a total of 12 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 12 respondents, 8 (66.7%) had substantial and recent experience, 1 (8.3%) had moderate experience, 1 (8.3%) had limited experience, and 2 (16.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.3. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *settlement skills* (4.1). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	2	16.7	7	58.3	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.4
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7	4.5
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	1	8.3	2	16.7	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.3
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.4
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	1	9.1	2	18.2	2	18.2	6	54.5	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	3	27.3	1	9.1	7	63.6	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	3	25.0	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.4
Settlement skills	-	-	2	18.2	1	9.1	2	18.2	6	54.5	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	1	8.3	1	8.3	2	16.7	8	66.7	4.4
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	1	8.3	2	16.7	1	8.3	8	66.7	4.3

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Mark Rindner:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Direct Professional Experience	12	4.3	-	8.3	16.7	8.3	66.7
Professional Reputation	2	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	5	4.4	-	-	20.0	20.0	60.0
Guardian ad Litem	2	3.5	-	50.0	-	-	50.0
CASA Volunteer	5	4.6	-	-	20.0	-	80.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	7	4.3	-	-	28.6	14.3	57.1
6 – 10 Years	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
11 – 15 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
16 – 20 Years	2	3.5	-	50.0	-	-	50.0
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Female	11	4.3	-	9.1	18.2	9.1	63.6
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	12	4.3	-	8.3	16.7	8.3	66.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	12	4.3	-	8.3	16.7	8.3	66.7
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Substantial	8	4.5	-	12.5	-	12.5	75.0
Moderate	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Limited	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0

H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NANCY J. NOLAN

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

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

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	20.9%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	20.9%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	9.4%
	Private corporate employee	0.9%
	State judge or judicial officer	12.4%
	Government	25.6%
	Public service agency or organization	1.7%
	Other	2.6%
	No Answer	5.6%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	7.3%
	6-10 Years	11.5%
	11-15 Years	11.1%
	16-20 Years	22.2%
	21 Years or more	43.2%
	No Answer	4.7%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	63.2%
	Female	32.5%
	No Answer	4.3%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	9.0%
	Mainly criminal	10.7%
	Mixed criminal and civil	29.5%
	Mainly civil	43.6%
	Other	2.1%
	No Answer	5.1%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	3.0%
	Second District	0.9%
	Third District	88.5%
	Fourth District	2.6%
	Outside Alaska	0.4%
	No Answer	4.7%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Nancy J. Nolan was evaluated by 198 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 198 respondents, 85 (42.9%) had substantial and recent experience, 49 (24.8%) had moderate experience, 36 (18.2%) had limited experience, and 28 (14.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4. The highest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.5), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.5), *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.5), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.5), and *human understanding and compassion* (4.5). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.3), *knowledge of substantive law* (4.3), *knowledge of evidence and procedure* (4.3), *ability to control courtroom* (4.3), and *settlement skills* (4.3). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	2	1.0	3	1.5	21	10.8	79	40.5	90	46.2	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law	1	0.5	3	1.6	23	12.0	74	38.7	90	47.1	4.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	1	0.5	3	1.6	23	12.4	66	35.7	92	49.7	4.3
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	2	1.0	5	2.6	18	9.4	46	24.0	121	63.0	4.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	0.5	5	2.6	14	7.4	49	25.9	120	63.5	4.5
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	2	1.0	4	2.1	12	6.3	48	25.0	126	65.6	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	1.1	4	2.2	12	6.5	62	33.7	104	56.5	4.4
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	1.0	5	2.6	14	7.2	46	23.6	128	65.6	4.5
Human understanding and compassion	1	0.5	3	1.6	14	7.3	53	27.5	122	63.2	4.5
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	1.1	1	0.6	20	11.1	64	35.6	93	51.7	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	0.5	6	3.3	13	7.1	66	36.1	97	53.0	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	2	1.1	3	1.7	22	12.4	66	37.3	84	47.5	4.3
Settlement skills	1	0.9	3	2.6	14	12.2	34	29.6	63	54.8	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	0.8	3	2.4	11	8.8	39	31.2	71	56.8	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	1.0	3	2.9	11	10.5	28	26.7	62	59.0	4.4
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	1.0	3	1.6	18	9.3	70	36.3	100	51.8	4.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	13	4.7	-	-	7.7	15.4	76.9
Direct Professional Experience	193	4.4	1.0	1.6	9.3	36.3	51.8
Professional Reputation	21	4.3	-	-	14.3	42.9	42.9
Social Contacts	8	4.3	-	-	25.0	25.0	50.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	11	4.1	9.1	-	18.2	18.2	54.5
Solo	46	4.4	-	2.2	8.7	32.6	56.5
2 – 5 Attorneys	43	4.4	-	2.3	11.6	25.6	60.5
6+ Attorneys	16	4.1	6.3	-	-	62.5	31.3
Corporate	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.6	-	-	7.4	29.6	63.0
Government	43	4.2	-	2.3	11.6	48.8	37.2
Public Service	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	9	4.0	11.1	-	22.2	11.1	55.6
5 Years or fewer	15	4.4	-	-	6.7	46.7	46.7
6 – 10 Years	22	4.3	-	-	13.6	45.5	40.9
11 – 15 Years	17	4.4	-	5.9	5.9	29.4	58.8
16 – 20 Years	46	4.4	-	-	13.0	32.6	54.3
21 Years or more	84	4.4	1.2	2.4	6.0	38.1	52.4
Gender							
No Answer	8	3.9	12.5	-	25.0	12.5	50.0
Male	127	4.4	0.8	1.6	6.3	35.4	55.9
Female	58	4.3	-	1.7	13.8	41.4	43.1
Cases Handled							
No Answer	10	4.1	10.0	-	20.0	10.0	60.0
Prosecution	18	4.4	-	-	5.6	50.0	44.4
Criminal	21	4.4	-	-	19.0	23.8	57.1
Criminal and Civil	63	4.4	-	3.2	7.9	38.1	50.8
Civil	76	4.4	1.3	-	7.9	38.2	52.6
Other	5	4.0	-	20.0	-	40.0	40.0
Location of Practice							
No Answer	9	3.9	11.1	-	22.2	22.2	44.4
First District	5	4.6	-	-	-	40.0	60.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	173	4.4	0.6	1.2	9.2	37.6	51.4
Fourth District	5	4.2	-	20.0	-	20.0	60.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	28	4.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	17.9	71.4
Substantial	83	4.4	1.2	1.2	10.8	33.7	53.0
Moderate	48	4.3	-	-	10.4	52.1	37.5
Limited	34	4.4	-	2.9	8.8	35.3	52.9

H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NANCY J. NOLAN

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	47.7%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	47.7%
	Village Public Safety Officer	2.3%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	2.3%
	Other	0.0%
	No Answer	0.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	9.1%
	6-10 Years	47.7%
	11-15 Years	13.6%
	16-20 Years	15.9%
	21 Years or more	13.6%
	No Answer	0.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	84.1%
	Female	15.9%
	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	2.3%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	6.8%
	35,000 or over	90.9%
	No Answer	0.0%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Nancy J. Nolan was evaluated by 39 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 39 respondents, 17 (43.6%) had substantial and recent experience, 11 (28.2%) had moderate experience, 8 (20.5%) had limited experience, and 3 (7.7%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.4. The highest mean score was obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.5). The lowest mean score was obtained on *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.3). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	5	13.5	12	32.4	20	54.1	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	5	13.9	11	30.6	20	55.6	4.4
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	5	13.2	11	28.9	22	57.9	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	-	-	7	20.0	8	22.9	20	57.1	4.4
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	1	2.6	5	13.2	8	21.1	24	63.2	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	5	13.5	9	24.3	23	62.2	4.5
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	6	16.7	10	27.8	20	55.6	4.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	5	16.7	7	23.3	18	60.0	4.4
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	6	17.6	8	23.5	20	58.8	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	1	3.1	5	15.6	7	21.9	19	59.4	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	6	22.2	7	25.9	14	51.9	4.3
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	5	13.2	13	34.2	20	52.6	4.4

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Nancy J. Nolan:
Peace and Probation Officers**

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Poor</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>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	10	4.4	-	-	20.0	20.0	60.0
Direct Professional Experience	38	4.4	-	-	13.2	34.2	52.6
Professional Reputation	5	4.2	-	-	20.0	40.0	40.0
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
State Officer	19	4.6	-	-	10.5	21.1	68.4
Municipal/Borough	18	4.2	-	-	16.7	44.4	38.9
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
6 – 10 Years	19	4.3	-	-	15.8	42.1	42.1
11 – 15 Years	5	4.6	-	-	-	40.0	60.0
16 – 20 Years	6	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
21 Years or more	6	4.2	-	-	33.3	16.7	50.0
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	31	4.5	-	-	9.7	32.3	58.1
Female	7	4.0	-	-	28.6	42.9	28.6
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	38	4.4	-	-	13.2	34.2	52.6
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Over 35,000	35	4.4	-	-	14.3	34.3	51.4
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	3	3.7	-	-	33.3	66.7	-
Substantial	16	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Moderate	11	4.4	-	-	18.2	27.3	54.5
Limited	8	4.0	-	-	25.0	50.0	25.0

H. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NANCY J. NOLAN

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=1)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	0.0%
		Other	100%
		No Answer	0.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	0.0%
		6-10 Years	0.0%
		11-15 Years	100%
		16-20 Years	0.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	0.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0.0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	100%
		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	0.0%
		No Answer	100%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Nancy J. Nolan was evaluated by one Social Worker, Guardian ad Litem, or CASA volunteers who reported not having direct professional experience with Judge Nolan. Given this limited data no tables are presented.

I. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=254)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	19.3%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	12.6%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	16.5%
	Private corporate employee	1.2%
	State judge or judicial officer	15.4%
	Government	23.2%
	Public service agency or organization	3.1%
	Other	3.9%
No Answer	4.7%	
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	6.7%
	6-10 Years	7.5%
	11-15 Years	12.6%
	16-20 Years	20.5%
	21 Years or more	48.0%
	No Answer	4.7%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	64.6%
	Female	29.5%
	No Answer	5.9%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	5.5%
	Mainly criminal	5.1%
	Mixed criminal and civil	26.8%
	Mainly civil	51.6%
	Other	5.9%
	No Answer	5.1%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.7%
	Second District	2.4%
	Third District	51.2%
	Fourth District	34.6%
	Outside Alaska	1.6%
	No Answer	5.5%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger was evaluated by 221 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 221 respondents, 106 (48.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 54 (24.4%) had moderate experience, 43 (19.5%) had limited experience, and 18 (8.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.0), *equal treatment of all parties* (4.0), and *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.0). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	4	1.9	15	7.1	31	14.6	90	42.5	72	34.0	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law	2	1.0	13	6.3	28	13.5	91	43.8	74	35.6	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	1.0	12	5.9	32	15.6	83	40.5	76	37.1	4.1
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	7	3.3	11	5.2	37	17.5	67	31.8	89	42.2	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	4	1.9	12	5.8	33	15.9	64	30.9	94	45.4	4.1
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	4	2.0	6	2.9	24	11.8	69	33.8	101	49.5	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	9	4.7	7	3.7	29	15.2	57	29.8	89	46.6	4.1
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	13	6.1	14	6.5	32	15.0	60	28.0	95	44.4	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	3	1.4	12	5.8	28	13.5	59	28.5	105	50.7	4.2
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	4	2.1	5	2.6	40	20.8	64	33.3	79	41.1	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	4	2.1	4	2.1	29	15.1	67	34.9	88	45.8	4.2
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	4	2.1	3	1.6	24	12.6	78	41.1	81	42.6	4.2
Settlement skills	4	3.3	4	3.3	23	18.9	39	32.0	52	42.6	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	0.9	9	8.1	15	13.5	34	30.6	52	46.8	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	3	2.2	3	2.2	15	11.0	34	25.0	81	59.6	4.1
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	2.4	9	4.2	34	16.0	75	35.4	89	42.0	4.1

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	9	3.9	11.1	-	11.1	44.4	33.3
Direct Professional Experience	212	4.1	2.4	4.2	16.0	35.4	42.0
Professional Reputation	31	4.2	3.2	3.2	12.9	35.5	45.2
Social Contacts	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	11	3.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	18.2	45.5
Solo	45	4.1	4.4	4.4	11.1	37.8	42.2
2 – 5 Attorneys	29	3.8	3.4	6.9	27.6	34.5	27.6
6+ Attorneys	34	4.1	2.9	2.9	17.6	32.4	44.1
Corporate	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Judge or Judicial Officer	29	4.7	-	-	-	27.6	72.4
Government	49	4.0	-	6.1	22.4	40.8	30.6
Public Service	8	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	5	3.8	-	-	40.0	40.0	20.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	11	3.8	9.1	9.1	18.2	18.2	45.5
5 Years or fewer	15	4.5	-	-	6.7	33.3	60.0
6 – 10 Years	19	4.0	-	5.3	26.3	31.6	36.8
11 – 15 Years	26	4.0	-	7.7	15.4	42.3	34.6
16 – 20 Years	43	3.8	4.7	4.7	25.6	39.5	25.6
21 Years or more	98	4.3	2.0	3.1	11.2	34.7	49.0
Gender							
No Answer	14	3.6	7.1	14.3	21.4	21.4	35.7
Male	142	4.1	2.8	4.2	16.2	33.1	43.7
Female	56	4.2	-	1.8	14.3	44.6	39.3
Cases Handled							
No Answer	12	3.8	8.3	8.3	16.7	25.0	41.7
Prosecution	12	3.8	-	8.3	25.0	50.0	16.7
Criminal	12	4.2	-	8.3	16.7	25.0	50.0
Criminal and Civil	56	4.1	5.4	5.4	12.5	26.8	50.0
Civil	108	4.1	0.9	1.9	17.6	40.7	38.9
Other	12	4.3	-	8.3	8.3	33.3	50.0
Location of Practice							
No Answer	13	3.9	7.7	7.7	15.4	23.1	46.2
First District	7	4.6	-	-	-	42.9	57.1
Second District	4	4.8	-	-	-	25.0	75.0
Third District	101	4.1	3.0	2.0	18.8	37.6	38.6
Fourth District	84	4.1	-	7.1	15.5	34.5	42.9
Outside Alaska	3	3.3	33.3	-	-	33.3	33.3
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	18	3.9	5.6	-	27.8	33.3	33.3
Substantial	103	4.2	1.9	6.8	10.7	29.1	51.5
Moderate	52	4.0	3.8	-	23.1	34.6	38.5
Limited	39	4.0	-	5.1	15.4	53.8	25.6

I. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=67)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	38.8%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	25.4%
	Village Public Safety Officer	1.5%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	19.4%
	Other	11.9%
	No Answer	3.0%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	19.4%
	6-10 Years	34.3%
	11-15 Years	20.9%
	16-20 Years	16.4%
	21 Years or more	6.0%
	No Answer	3.0%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	80.6%
	Female	16.4%
	No Answer	3.0%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	1.5%
	Second District	1.5%
	Third District	10.4%
	Fourth District	83.6%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	3.0%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	7.5%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	26.9%
	35,000 or over	61.2%
	No Answer	4.5%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger was evaluated by 58 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 58 respondents, 18 (31.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 14 (24.1%) had moderate experience, 24 (41.4%) had limited experience, and 2 (3.5%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.0. The highest mean scores were obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.1), and *ability to control courtroom* (4.1). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (3.8) and *sense of basic fairness and justice* (3.8). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</i>		<i>Deficient</i>		<i>Acceptable</i>		<i>Good</i>		<i>Excellent</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>	<i>Mean</i>
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	1.8	1	1.8	17	30.9	24	43.6	12	21.8	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	3.6	-	-	17	30.4	24	42.9	13	23.2	3.8
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	1	1.9	1	1.9	13	24.5	18	34.0	20	37.7	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	1.9	1	1.9	12	23.1	21	40.4	17	32.7	4.0
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	2	3.6	15	26.8	20	35.7	19	33.9	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	1	1.9	12	22.6	22	41.5	18	34.0	4.1
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	15	27.8	24	44.4	15	27.8	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	14	28.6	20	40.8	15	30.6	4.0
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	12	22.6	23	43.4	18	34.0	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	2.0	1	2.0	14	27.5	21	41.2	14	27.5	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	2	5.3	7	18.4	17	44.7	12	31.6	4.0
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	3	5.3	11	19.3	27	47.4	16	28.1	4.0

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:
Peace and Probation Officers**

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	9	4.2	-	-	22.2	33.3	44.4
Direct Professional Experience	57	4.0	-	5.3	19.3	47.4	28.1
Professional Reputation	8	4.3	-	-	12.5	50.0	37.5
Social Contacts	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
State Officer	21	3.9	-	-	33.3	42.9	23.8
Municipal/Borough	16	3.7	-	12.5	18.8	56.3	12.5
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	12	4.3	-	-	8.3	50.0	41.7
Other	6	4.2	-	16.7	-	33.3	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	11	4.0	-	9.1	27.3	18.2	45.5
6 – 10 Years	17	4.1	-	-	23.5	47.1	29.4
11 – 15 Years	13	3.9	-	7.7	15.4	53.8	23.1
16 – 20 Years	10	3.8	-	10.0	20.0	50.0	20.0
21 Years or more	4	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Gender							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Male	46	3.9	-	6.5	19.6	47.8	26.1
Female	9	4.1	-	-	22.2	44.4	33.3
Location of Work							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Third District	6	4.2	-	-	-	83.3	16.7
Fourth District	48	3.9	-	6.3	22.9	41.7	29.2
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Under 2,000	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
2,000-35,000	15	3.8	-	6.7	20.0	60.0	13.3
Over 35,000	36	3.9	-	5.6	22.2	47.2	25.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	2	3.5	-	-	50.0	50.0	-
Substantial	18	4.4	-	5.6	5.6	33.3	55.6
Moderate	14	3.8	-	7.1	21.4	57.1	14.3
Limited	23	3.8	-	4.3	26.1	52.2	17.4

I. SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

3. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIANS AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

Demographic Description of all Social Workers/GAL/CASA Respondents (N=10)

a.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	60.0%
		Guardian ad Litem	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	20.0%
		Other	0.0%
		No Answer	20.0%
b.	<u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	40.0%
		6-10 Years	30.0%
		11-15 Years	0.0%
		16-20 Years	10.0%
		21 Years or more	0.0%
		No Answer	20.0%
c.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	10.0%
		Female	70.0%
		No Answer	20.0%
d.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0.0%
		Second District	10.0%
		Third District	0.0%
		Fourth District	60.0%
		Outside Alaska	0.0%
		No Answer	30.0%
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 Niesje J. Steinkruger 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, 4 (40.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 2 (20.0%) had moderate experience, 4 (40.0%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.6. The highest mean scores were obtained on *human understanding and compassion* (4.7) and *ability to control courtroom* (4.7). The lowest mean score was obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.4). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	-	-	1	10.0	4	40.0	5	50.0	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	4.6
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	40.0	6	60.0	4.6
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	-	-	2	20.0	-	-	8	80.0	4.6
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	-	-	1	10.0	1	10.0	8	80.0	4.7
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	40.0	6	60.0	4.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	40.0	6	60.0	4.6
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	6	66.7	4.7
Settlement skills	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	42.9	4	57.1	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	-	-	7	77.8	4.6
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	-	-	1	10.0	2	20.0	7	70.0	4.6

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for Superior Court Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	10	4.6	-	-	10.0	20.0	70.0
Professional Reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Social Worker	6	4.5	-	-	16.7	16.7	66.7
Guardian ad Litem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	2	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	4	4.5	-	-	25.0	-	75.0
6 – 10 Years	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
11 – 15 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 – 20 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Male	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Female	7	4.6	-	-	14.3	14.3	71.4
Location of Work							
No Answer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	6	4.7	-	-	16.7	-	83.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Over 35,000	6	4.7	-	-	16.7	-	83.3
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	4	4.3	-	-	25.0	25.0	50.0
Moderate	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Limited	4	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0

J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

1. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

Demographic Description of all Alaska Bar Association Respondents (N=226)

a. <u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo	16.8%
	Private, office of 2-5 attorneys	18.6%
	Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	14.2%
	Private corporate employee	1.3%
	State judge or judicial officer	14.2%
	Government	24.8%
	Public service agency or organization	2.2%
	Other	2.2%
	No Answer	5.8%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	8.4%
	6-10 Years	6.6%
	11-15 Years	13.7%
	16-20 Years	20.4%
	21 Years or more	45.6%
	No Answer	5.3%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	67.3%
	Female	26.5%
	No Answer	6.2%
d. <u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution	4.0%
	Mainly criminal	6.2%
	Mixed criminal and civil	26.5%
	Mainly civil	53.1%
	Other	5.3%
	No Answer	4.9%
e. <u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District	4.0%
	Second District	2.2%
	Third District	51.8%
	Fourth District	34.5%
	Outside Alaska	1.3%
	No Answer	6.2%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Raymond Funk was evaluated by 197 Alaska Bar Association members who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 197 respondents, 89 (45.2%) had substantial and recent experience, 38 (19.3%) had moderate experience, 52 (26.4%) had limited experience, and 18 (9.1%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.2. The highest mean score was obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.3). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *legal and factual analysis* (4.1), *equal treatment of all parties* (4.1), *ability to control courtroom* (4.1), *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.1), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (4.1). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Legal Ability											
Legal and factual analysis	4	2.1	4	2.1	29	15.3	76	40.0	77	40.5	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law	3	1.6	5	2.7	23	12.6	78	42.6	74	40.4	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	3	1.7	6	3.4	17	9.6	80	45.2	71	40.1	4.2
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	5	2.7	9	4.9	22	11.9	68	36.8	81	43.8	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	3	1.6	8	4.4	20	10.9	64	35.0	88	48.1	4.2
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	3	1.6	5	2.7	17	9.2	67	36.2	93	50.3	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	3.0	5	3.0	16	9.6	66	39.5	75	44.9	4.2
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	8	4.2	9	4.7	21	11.0	60	31.4	93	48.7	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	5	2.7	7	3.8	20	10.8	64	34.6	89	48.1	4.2
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	3	1.9	4	2.5	23	14.3	65	40.4	66	41.0	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	4	2.3	6	3.4	21	12.0	67	38.3	77	44.0	4.2
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	4	2.5	2	1.2	22	13.5	78	47.9	57	35.0	4.1
Settlement skills	4	2.9	3	2.2	17	12.5	44	32.4	68	50.0	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	4.0	3	3.0	11	11.0	41	41.0	41	41.0	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	3	4.3	3	4.3	6	8.6	29	41.4	29	41.4	4.1
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	3	1.6	8	4.2	22	11.5	73	38.0	86	44.8	4.2

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	12	4.3	8.3	-	8.3	16.7	66.7
Direct Professional Experience	192	4.2	1.6	4.2	11.5	38.0	44.8
Professional Reputation	22	4.3	-	4.5	13.6	31.8	50.0
Social Contacts	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Type of Practice							
No Answer	12	4.3	-	8.3	8.3	33.3	50.0
Solo	32	4.3	-	-	18.8	37.5	43.8
2 – 5 Attorneys	39	3.9	2.6	7.7	12.8	48.7	28.2
6+ Attorneys	30	4.1	-	6.7	16.7	36.7	40.0
Corporate	3	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
Judge or Judicial Officer	27	4.7	-	-	3.7	22.2	74.1
Government	43	4.1	4.7	4.7	9.3	37.2	44.2
Public Service	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Other	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	11	4.2	-	9.1	9.1	36.4	45.5
5 Years or fewer	18	4.2	-	11.1	5.6	38.9	44.4
6 – 10 Years	15	4.1	-	-	20.0	46.7	33.3
11 – 15 Years	24	4.0	4.2	-	20.8	41.7	33.3
16 – 20 Years	38	4.3	-	7.9	5.3	39.5	47.4
21 Years or more	86	4.3	2.3	2.3	11.6	34.9	48.8
Gender							
No Answer	13	4.0	-	7.7	23.1	30.8	38.5
Male	131	4.2	2.3	3.8	9.2	37.4	47.3
Female	48	4.2	-	4.2	14.6	41.7	39.6
Cases Handled							
No Answer	10	4.2	-	10.0	10.0	30.0	50.0
Prosecution	9	4.4	-	-	11.1	33.3	55.6
Criminal	12	4.1	16.7	-	-	25.0	58.3
Criminal and Civil	52	4.2	1.9	5.8	13.5	32.7	46.2
Civil	101	4.2	-	4.0	11.9	43.6	40.6
Other	8	4.4	-	-	12.5	37.5	50.0
Location of Practice							
No Answer	13	4.2	-	7.7	7.7	38.5	46.2
First District	5	4.8	-	-	-	20.0	80.0
Second District	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Third District	98	4.3	2.0	4.1	7.1	36.7	50.0
Fourth District	72	4.0	1.4	4.2	19.4	43.1	31.9
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	17	4.1	5.9	-	11.8	47.1	35.3
Substantial	88	4.1	2.3	6.8	12.5	30.7	47.7
Moderate	38	4.3	-	-	10.5	47.4	42.1
Limited	49	4.3	-	4.1	10.2	40.8	44.9

J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

2. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Demographic Description of all Peace and Probation Officer Respondents (N=47)

a. <u>Type of Work:</u>	State Law Enforcement Officer	38.3%
	Municipal/Borough Law Enforcement Officer	27.7%
	Village Public Safety Officer	2.1%
	Probation-Patrol Officer	8.5%
	Other	19.1%
	No Answer	4.3%
b. <u>Years of Experience:</u>	5 Years or fewer	25.5%
	6-10 Years	34.0%
	11-15 Years	14.9%
	16-20 Years	12.8%
	21 Years or more	8.5%
	No Answer	4.3%
c. <u>Gender:</u>	Male	78.7%
	Female	17.0%
	No Answer	4.3%
d. <u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	2.1%
	Second District	2.1%
	Third District	10.6%
	Fourth District	78.7%
	Outside Alaska	0.0%
	No Answer	6.4%
e. <u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	10.6%
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	25.5%
	35,000 or over	59.6%
	No Answer	4.3%

Summary of Findings:

Judge Raymond Funk was evaluated by 37 Peace and Probation Officers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 37 respondents, 15 (40.5%) had substantial and recent experience, 8 (21.6%) had moderate experience, 12 (32.3%) had limited experience, and 2 (5.4%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 4.1. The highest mean scores were obtained on *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.2), *ability to control courtroom* (4.2), and *consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing* (4.2). The lowest mean score was obtained on *makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism* (4.0). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

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

	<i>Poor</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>	
Impartiality											
Equal treatment of all parties	-	-	1	2.8	9	25.0	10	27.8	16	44.4	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	-	-	-	-	10	27.8	11	30.6	15	41.7	4.1
Integrity											
Conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety	-	-	1	2.7	9	24.3	10	27.0	17	45.9	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	-	-	2	5.6	9	25.0	12	33.3	13	36.1	4.0
Judicial Temperament											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	-	-	3	8.1	8	21.6	9	24.3	17	45.9	4.1
Human understanding and compassion	-	-	1	2.8	7	19.4	14	38.9	14	38.9	4.1
Diligence											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	3	-	-	9	27.3	9	27.3	14	42.4	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	-	-	1	3.2	7	22.6	11	35.5	12	38.7	4.1
Special Skills											
Ability to control courtroom	-	-	-	-	9	25.7	11	31.4	15	42.9	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	-	-	-	-	8	26.7	9	30.0	13	43.3	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	-	-	1	4.0	6	24.0	8	32.0	10	40.0	4.1
Overall Evaluation											
Overall evaluation of judge	-	-	1	2.8	8	22.2	14	38.9	13	36.1	4.1

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

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

	<i>Total</i>		<i>Poor</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>
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	13	3.8	-	7.7	38.5	15.4	38.5
Direct Professional Experience	36	4.1	-	2.8	22.2	38.9	36.1
Professional Reputation	9	4.0	-	-	22.2	55.6	22.2
Social Contacts	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
Type of Work							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
State Officer	14	4.1	-	-	21.4	42.9	35.7
Municipal/Borough	12	3.9	-	-	33.3	41.7	25.0
Village Public Safety Officer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probation/Parole Officer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
Other	5	3.8	-	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0
Years of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
5 Years or fewer	11	4.4	-	-	9.1	45.5	45.5
6 – 10 Years	11	3.8	-	9.1	18.2	54.5	18.2
11 – 15 Years	5	3.6	-	-	60.0	20.0	20.0
16 – 20 Years	4	4.5	-	-	25.0	-	75.0
21 Years or more	3	4.0	-	-	33.3	33.3	33.3
Gender							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Male	27	4.1	-	3.7	18.5	44.4	33.3
Female	7	4.0	-	-	42.9	14.3	42.9
Location of Work							
No Answer	3	4.7	-	-	-	33.3	66.7
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	4	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Fourth District	29	4.0	-	3.4	27.6	37.9	31.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population in Community							
No Answer	2	4.5	-	-	-	50.0	50.0
Under 2,000	3	4.3	-	-	-	66.7	33.3
2,000-35,000	8	4.1	-	-	25.0	37.5	37.5
Over 35,000	23	4.0	-	4.3	26.1	34.8	34.8
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	2	4.0	-	-	-	100.0	-
Substantial	15	4.1	-	6.7	20.0	33.3	40.0
Moderate	8	4.0	-	-	37.5	25.0	37.5
Limited	11	4.2	-	-	18.2	45.5	36.4

J. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RAYMOND FUNK

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	0.0%
		CASA Volunteer	50.0%
		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	0.0%
		Second District	0.0%
		Third District	25.0%
		Fourth District	75.0%
		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 Raymond Funk was evaluated by a total of 3 Social Workers, Guardians ad Litem, and CASA volunteers who reported having direct professional experience with this judge. Of these 3 respondents, 0 (0.0%) had substantial and recent experience, 0 (0.0%) had moderate experience, 3 (100%) had limited experience, and 0 (0.0%) did not indicate level of experience. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was 3.7. The highest mean scores were obtained on *equal treatment of all parties* (4.0), *sense of basic fairness and justice* (4.0), *conduct free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety* (4.0), *courtesy, freedom from arrogance* (4.0), *ability to control courtroom* (4.0), and *settlement skills* (4.0). The lowest mean scores were obtained on *reasonable promptness in making decisions* (3.5), *willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings* (3.5), and *talent and ability for cases involving children and families* (3.5). Details are presented in the two tables that follow.

**Evaluation of District Court Judge Raymond Funk:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

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

NOTE: Results are based on respondents who reported having direct professional experience with this judge.

**Ratings on the “Overall Evaluation” Item for District Court Judge Raymond Funk:
Social Workers/Guardians ad Litem/CASA Volunteers**

<i>Demographics</i>	Total		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	%	%	%	%	%
Basis for Evaluation							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Direct Professional Experience	3	3.7	-	-	66.7	-	33.3
Professional Reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Worker	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Guardian ad Litem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Years of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Years or fewer	2	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
6 – 10 Years	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	100.0
11 – 15 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 – 20 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21 Years or more	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	3.7	-	-	66.7	-	33.3
Location of Work							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	1	3.0	-	-	100.0	-	-
Fourth District	2	4.0	-	-	50.0	-	50.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Population of Community							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2,000-35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	3	3.7	-	-	66.7	-	33.3
Amount of Experience							
No Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited	3	3.7	-	-	66.7	-	33.3