



alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>

(907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
E-mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Eleanor Andrews
Bill Gordon
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Douglas Baily
James H. Cannon
Susan Orlansky

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Alexander O. Bryner
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council Members

FROM: Staff

DATE: April 17, 2006

RE: Court Employee Survey Report

The Judicial Council began surveying court system employees in 1996. This is the sixth time the Council has asked court system staff to evaluate the performance of judges standing for retention election.

The court employee survey was mailed to all court system employees except judges and attorneys. Each employee received one survey booklet, with no followup mailings. Of 606 surveys mailed, 239 were returned for a return rate of 39%. Of the 239 returned surveys, 12 had no ratings or comment on any judge and were not included in the analysis. Council staff entered data, produced descriptive statistics, and transcribed comments from the surveys. The court employee ratings were shared with judges and published on the Council's website. Comments were seen only by Judicial Council members and the individual judges. A sample survey page is included at the end of this memorandum.

Table 1 shows the basis for evaluation of each judge. In approximately 31% of the responses court employees did not identify the basis for their evaluation. The survey analysis includes all of the ratings for each judge, whether the basis for evaluation was direct professional experience, professional reputation, social contacts, or “no basis checked.”

Table 1: Basis for Evaluation 2006 Alaska Judicial Council Retention Court Employee Survey					
Judge	Direct professional experience	Professional reputation	Social contacts	Rated judge but no basis checked	Total responses
Bolger	21	2	0	11	34
Brown	13	2	1	9	25
Burbank	24	2	1	9	36
Clark	30	2	0	14	46
Devaney	21	2	0	11	34
Erlich	20	3	0	7	30
Esch	21	4	0	14	39
Estelle	12	0	0	9	21
Heath	11	0	0	6	17
Huguelet	13	0	0	9	22
Kauvar	29	2	0	15	46
Landry	13	2	0	4	19
Lohff	39	3	0	25	67
Michalski	50	12	1	28	91
Miller	30	1	0	3	34
Morse	37	10	0	14	61
Motyka	33	3	1	25	62
Murphy, Sigurd	52	4	1	22	79
Olsen	29	1	1	6	37
Rhoades	45	8	0	25	78
Smith, Eric	21	3	0	14	38
Smith, Jack	27	2	0	13	42
Suddock	31	3	0	21	55
Tan	50	6	1	27	84
Torrisi	19	2	0	16	37
Volland	30	3	0	20	53
Weeks	43	4	1	10	58
Wolfe	11	3	1	9	24
Wolverton	38	2	0	30	70
Wood	29	1	1	11	42
Zervos	34	2	2	7	45

Survey Results

This memorandum summarizes the data from individual responses to the Court Employee Survey and is distributed to Council members and judges. Confidential comments from the court employee surveys are only distributed to Judicial Council members.

The survey results appear in the following tables. Court employees used a five point scale, with *excellent* scored as five, and *poor* scored as one. The closer the employees' scores were to five, the higher that judge's evaluation by the employees. The mean score and number of responses appear for each variable. Mean scores for the overall performance rating fell between 3.3 and 4.8. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

- 5.0 = Excellent
- 4.0 = Good
- 3.0 = Acceptable
- 2.0 = Deficient
- 1.0 = Poor

Table 2: Mean Score for Each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge Retention 2006 Court Employee Survey						
	Impartiality	Integrity	Temperament	Diligence	Overall Performance	
					Mean	Total
Bolger	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	34
Brown	4.0	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.0	25
Burbank	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	36
Clark	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	46
Devaney	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	34
Erlich	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.6	30
Esch	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.4	39
Estelle	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.3	21
Heath	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5	17
Huguelet	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	22
Kauvar	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	46
Landry	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.7	19
Lohff	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	67
Michalski	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.4	91
Miller	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	34
Morse	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.3	61
Motyka	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	62
Murphy, Sigurd	3.7	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.7	79
Olsen	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	37
Rhoades	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.2	78
Smith, Eric	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	38
Smith, Jack	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	42
Suddock	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	55
Tan	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	84
Torrise	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	37
Volland	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	53
Weeks	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	58
Wolfe	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	24
Wolverton	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	70
Wood	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	42
Zervos	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	45

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Joel Bolger</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 34</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>59% 20</p>	<p>32% 11</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>65% 22</p>	<p>24% 8</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>33</p>				
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>50% 17</p>	<p>29% 10</p>	<p>9% 3</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>31</p>				
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>62% 21</p>	<p>24% 8</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>32</p>				
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>59% 20</p>	<p>29% 10</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>33</p>				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Harold M. Brown												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 25					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.0	28% 7	44% 11	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	23					
Integrity	4.2	48% 12	32% 8	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	25					
Judicial Temperament	3.7	20% 5	48% 12	24% 6	0% 0	8% 2	25					
Diligence	4.1	36% 9	44% 11	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	25					
Overall Evaluation	4.0	36% 9	36% 9	20% 5	0% 0	4% 1	24					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Winston S. Burbank</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p align="center">Survey Category</p>	<p align="center">Mean</p>	<p align="center">Excellent % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Good % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Deficient % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Poor % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Total Returned = 36</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>78% 28</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>81% 29</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>81% 29</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>75% 27</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>33</p>				
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.8</p>	<p>83% 30</p>	<p>14% 5</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Brian K. Clark</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 46</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>50% 23</p>	<p>46% 21</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>44</p>				
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>52% 24</p>	<p>46% 21</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>45</p>				
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.6</p>	<p>63% 29</p>	<p>30% 14</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>45</p>				
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>54% 25</p>	<p>35% 16</p>	<p>7% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>44</p>				
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.6</p>	<p>59% 27</p>	<p>39% 18</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>46</p>				

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Leonard R. Devaney</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 34				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.4	53% 18	29% 10	18% 6	0% 0	0% 0	34				
Integrity	4.4	50% 17	38% 13	12% 4	0% 0	0% 0	34				
Judicial Temperament	4.4	53% 18	32% 11	15% 5	0% 0	0% 0	34				
Diligence	4.3	44% 15	32% 11	15% 5	3% 1	0% 0	32				
Overall Evaluation	4.4	56% 19	32% 11	12% 4	0% 0	0% 0	34				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Richard H. Erlich											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 30				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.4	60% 18	13% 4	17% 5	3% 1	0% 0	28				
Integrity	4.6	70% 21	13% 4	13% 4	0% 0	0% 0	29				
Judicial Temperament	4.3	53% 16	30% 9	10% 3	7% 2	0% 0	30				
Diligence	4.4	60% 18	20% 6	17% 5	3% 1	0% 0	30				
Overall Evaluation	4.6	67% 20	17% 5	13% 4	0% 0	0% 0	29				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Ben Esch											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 39				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.6	59% 23	26% 10	8% 3	0% 0	0% 0	36				
Integrity	4.4	56% 22	31% 12	8% 3	3% 1	0% 0	38				
Judicial Temperament	4.2	39% 15	44% 17	13% 5	3% 1	0% 0	38				
Diligence	4.5	64% 25	26% 10	8% 3	3% 1	0% 0	39				
Overall Evaluation	4.4	49% 19	33% 13	10% 4	10% 4	0% 0	36				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation William Estelle											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 21				
Impartiality/Fairness	3.5	19% 4	29% 6	24% 5	24% 5	0% 0	20				
Integrity	3.4	24% 5	29% 6	24% 5	14% 3	10% 2	21				
Judicial Temperament	3.2	19% 4	33% 7	14% 3	5% 1	24% 5	20				
Diligence	3.0	24% 5	19% 4	10% 2	24% 5	24% 5	21				
Overall Evaluation	3.3	29% 6	24% 5	19% 4	10% 2	19% 4	21				

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Gregory Heath</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 17</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>47% 8</p>	<p>41% 7</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>65% 11</p>	<p>24% 4</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.3</p>	<p>41% 7</p>	<p>35% 6</p>	<p>12% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.3</p>	<p>47% 8</p>	<p>41% 7</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>53% 9</p>	<p>35% 6</p>	<p>6% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Charles Huguelet											
		Distribution of Ratings									
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 22				
Impartiality/Fairness	4.0	27% 6	41% 9	27% 6	0% 0	0% 0	21				
Integrity	4.1	41% 9	32% 7	27% 6	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Judicial Temperament	4.2	41% 9	36% 8	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	21				
Diligence	4.2	36% 8	46% 10	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	22				
Overall Evaluation	4.2	41% 9	36% 8	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	21				

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Jane F. Kauvar</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 46</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>59% 27</p>	<p>26% 12</p>	<p>9% 4</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.6</p>	<p>61% 28</p>	<p>30% 14</p>	<p>7% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>50% 23</p>	<p>30% 14</p>	<p>15% 7</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>57% 26</p>	<p>24% 11</p>	<p>15% 7</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>65% 30</p>	<p>24% 11</p>	<p>11% 5</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation David S. Landry</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p align="center">Survey Category</p>	<p align="center">Mean</p>	<p align="center">Excellent % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Good % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Deficient % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Poor % (n)</p>	<p align="center">Total Returned = 19</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>3.5</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>37% 7</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p align="center">19</p>				
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>3.6</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p align="center">18</p>				
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>3.8</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>42% 8</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p align="center">18</p>				
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>3.5</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>11% 2</p>	<p align="center">19</p>				
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>3.7</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>21% 4</p>	<p>11% 2</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p align="center">19</p>				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John R. Lohff												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 67					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.3	48% 32	31% 21	19% 13	0% 0	0% 0	66					
Integrity	4.4	48% 32	36% 24	13% 9	0% 0	0% 0	65					
Judicial Temperament	4.3	49% 33	30% 20	16% 11	3% 2	0% 0	66					
Diligence	4.3	46% 31	33% 22	16% 11	0% 0	0% 0	64					
Overall Evaluation	4.4	49% 33	33% 22	13% 9	0% 0	0% 0	64					

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Peter A. Michalski												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)		Good % (n)		Acceptable % (n)		Deficient % (n)		Poor % (n)		Total Returned = 91
Impartiality/Fairness	4.2	44%	40	34%	31	13%	12	4%	4	0%	0	87
Integrity	4.5	62%	56	24%	22	11%	10	0%	0	0%	0	88
Judicial Temperament	4.2	48%	44	28%	25	14%	13	3%	3	2%	2	87
Diligence	4.4	50%	45	33%	30	9%	8	2%	2	0%	0	85
Overall Evaluation	4.4	55%	50	26%	24	10%	9	3%	3	0%	0	86

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Kevin G. Miller												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 34					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.8	79% 27	15% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0						
Integrity	4.8	82% 28	15% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0						
Judicial Temperament	4.8	85% 29	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0						
Diligence	4.8	82% 28	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0						
Overall Evaluation	4.8	85% 29	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0						

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation William F. Morse												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)		Good % (n)		Acceptable % (n)		Deficient % (n)		Poor % (n)		Total Returned = 61
Impartiality/Fairness	4.3	36%	22	34%	21	12%	7	2%	1	0%	0	51
Integrity	4.4	44%	27	39%	24	5%	3	0%	0	0%	0	54
Judicial Temperament	4.1	34%	21	39%	24	15%	9	3%	2	2%	1	57
Diligence	4.5	46%	28	39%	24	2%	1	2%	1	0%	0	54
Overall Evaluation	4.3	46%	28	36%	22	7%	4	2%	1	2%	1	56

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Gregory Motyka												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 62					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.2	39% 24	39% 24	13% 8	3% 2	0% 0	58					
Integrity	4.3	42% 26	36% 22	13% 8	2% 1	0% 0	57					
Judicial Temperament	4.2	42% 26	32% 20	18% 11	0% 0	2% 1	58					
Diligence	4.1	39% 24	31% 19	19% 12	3% 2	0% 0	57					
Overall Evaluation	4.2	44% 27	31% 19	15% 9	3% 2	0% 0	57					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Sigurd E. Murphy</p>												
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total Returned = 79
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Impartiality/Fairness	3.7	25%	20	35%	28	25%	20	9%	7	3%	2	77
Integrity	3.7	33%	26	28%	22	23%	18	6%	5	8%	6	77
Judicial Temperament	3.5	30%	24	25%	20	15%	12	15%	12	11%	9	77
Diligence	4.0	35%	28	30%	24	19%	15	8%	6	1%	1	74
Overall Evaluation	3.7	30%	24	27%	21	22%	17	11%	9	5%	4	75

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Randy M. Olsen</p>																		
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>																
<p align="center">Survey Category</p>	<p align="center">Mean</p>	<p align="center">Excellent</p>	<p align="center">%</p>	<p align="center">(n)</p>	<p align="center">Good</p>	<p align="center">%</p>	<p align="center">(n)</p>	<p align="center">Acceptable</p>	<p align="center">%</p>	<p align="center">(n)</p>	<p align="center">Deficient</p>	<p align="center">%</p>	<p align="center">(n)</p>	<p align="center">Poor</p>	<p align="center">%</p>	<p align="center">(n)</p>	<p align="center">Total</p>	<p align="center">Returned = 37</p>
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>57%</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>35</p>						
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.6</p>	<p>65%</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>22%</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>11%</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0%</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>36</p>						
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>65%</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>22%</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>35</p>						
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>51%</p>	<p>19</p>	<p>30%</p>	<p>11</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>34</p>						
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>60%</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>24%</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>8%</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>36</p>						

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 78					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.2	42% 33	37% 29	13% 10	4% 3	0% 0	75					
Integrity	4.3	50% 39	32% 25	12% 9	3% 2	0% 0	75					
Judicial Temperament	4.0	39% 30	32% 25	17% 13	8% 6	3% 2	76					
Diligence	4.3	47% 37	32% 25	12% 9	3% 2	1% 1	74					
Overall Evaluation	4.2	44% 34	37% 29	10% 8	5% 4	0% 0	75					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Eric Smith</p>												
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 38
Impartiality/Fairness	4.4	61%	23	26%	10	11%	4	3%	1	0%	0	38
Integrity	4.5	58%	22	29%	11	8%	3	3%	1	0%	0	37
Judicial Temperament	4.4	55%	21	29%	11	8%	3	5%	2	0%	0	37
Diligence	4.4	53%	20	32%	12	11%	4	3%	1	0%	0	37
Overall Evaluation	4.4	58%	22	29%	11	8%	3	5%	2	0%	0	38

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Jack Smith												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 42
Impartiality/Fairness	4.4	43%	18	45%	19	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	39
Integrity	4.5	50%	21	36%	15	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	38
Judicial Temperament	4.4	50%	21	36%	15	10%	4	0%	0	0%	0	40
Diligence	4.5	52%	22	33%	14	5%	2	2%	1	0%	0	39
Overall Evaluation	4.5	50%	21	36%	15	7%	3	0%	0	0%	0	39

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John Suddock</p>											
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>									
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 55</p>				
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>3.8</p>	<p>20% 11</p>	<p>38% 21</p>	<p>29% 16</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>50</p>				
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>3.9</p>	<p>24% 13</p>	<p>40% 22</p>	<p>18% 10</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>49</p>				
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>3.8</p>	<p>24% 13</p>	<p>42% 23</p>	<p>20% 11</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>52</p>				
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.0</p>	<p>29% 16</p>	<p>38% 21</p>	<p>18% 10</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>50</p>				
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.0</p>	<p>31% 17</p>	<p>36% 20</p>	<p>26% 14</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>53</p>				

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Sen K. Tan												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 84					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.6	66% 55	30% 25	1% 1	1% 1	0% 0	82					
Integrity	4.8	75% 63	21% 18	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	82					
Judicial Temperament	4.7	67% 56	27% 23	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	80					
Diligence	4.7	69% 58	25% 21	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	81					
Overall Evaluation	4.7	75% 63	20% 17	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	82					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Fred Torrisi</p>												
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent		Good		Acceptable		Deficient		Poor		Total
		%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	Returned = 37
Impartiality/Fairness	4.4	46%	17	46%	17	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	36
Integrity	4.4	46%	17	46%	17	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	36
Judicial Temperament	4.5	54%	20	41%	15	0%	0	3%	1	0%	0	36
Diligence	4.4	43%	16	46%	17	8%	3	0%	0	0%	0	36
Overall Evaluation	4.4	43%	16	51%	19	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	36

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Philip Volland												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 53					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.5	59% 31	28% 15	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	50					
Integrity	4.5	59% 31	28% 15	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	50					
Judicial Temperament	4.6	64% 34	26% 14	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	51					
Diligence	4.6	62% 33	30% 16	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	50					
Overall Evaluation	4.6	64% 34	28% 15	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	51					

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Larry Weeks												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 58					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	74% 43	16% 9	3% 2	3% 2	0% 0	56					
Integrity	4.7	79% 46	12% 7	5% 3	2% 1	0% 0	57					
Judicial Temperament	4.6	64% 37	19% 11	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0	53					
Diligence	4.7	71% 41	17% 10	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0	53					
Overall Evaluation	4.8	81% 47	12% 7	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0	56					

<p align="center">Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John W. Wolfe</p>												
		<p align="center">Distribution of Ratings</p>										
<p>Survey Category</p>	<p>Mean</p>	<p>Excellent % (n)</p>	<p>Good % (n)</p>	<p>Acceptable % (n)</p>	<p>Deficient % (n)</p>	<p>Poor % (n)</p>	<p>Total Returned = 24</p>					
<p>Impartiality/Fairness</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>42% 10</p>	<p>38% 9</p>	<p>8% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>21</p>					
<p>Integrity</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>46% 11</p>	<p>38% 9</p>	<p>8% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>22</p>					
<p>Judicial Temperament</p>	<p>4.4</p>	<p>42% 10</p>	<p>42% 10</p>	<p>4% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>21</p>					
<p>Diligence</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>54% 13</p>	<p>33% 8</p>	<p>4% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>22</p>					
<p>Overall Evaluation</p>	<p>4.5</p>	<p>54% 13</p>	<p>33% 8</p>	<p>4% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>22</p>					

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Michael L. Wolverton												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)		Good % (n)		Acceptable % (n)		Deficient % (n)		Poor % (n)		Total Returned = 70
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	69%	48	24%	17	4%	3	0%	0	0%	0	68
Integrity	4.7	73%	51	20%	14	4%	3	0%	0	0%	0	68
Judicial Temperament	4.7	74%	52	17%	12	6%	4	0%	0	0%	0	68
Diligence	4.6	69%	48	23%	16	6%	4	0%	0	0%	0	68
Overall Evaluation	4.7	74%	52	19%	13	4%	3	0%	0	0%	0	68

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Mark I. Wood												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 42					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.6	67% 28	21% 9	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	40					
Integrity	4.7	71% 30	21% 9	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0	41					
Judicial Temperament	4.6	62% 26	26% 11	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	40					
Diligence	4.7	71% 30	19% 8	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	39					
Overall Evaluation	4.6	69% 29	24% 10	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	42					

Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Larry C. Zervos												
		Distribution of Ratings										
Survey Category	Mean	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Poor % (n)	Total Returned = 45					
Impartiality/Fairness	4.7	71% 32	24% 11	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	44					
Integrity	4.8	78% 35	20% 9	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	45					
Judicial Temperament	4.6	62% 28	29% 13	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	44					
Diligence	4.6	67% 30	24% 11	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	44					
Overall Evaluation	4.7	71% 32	27% 12	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	45					

Sample Court Employee Survey Page

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DISTRICT COURT

JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

Basis for Evaluation: Which of the following describes the basis for your evaluation of this judge? (Circle one or more.)

- 1 Direct professional experience
- 2 Professional reputation
- 3 Social contacts
- 9 Insufficient knowledge to evaluate this judge (Go on to next judge.)

To rate this judge, circle one number for each criterion. If you lack sufficient knowledge to rate the judge for any one of the criteria, circle 9. (See Page ii for definitions of the rating criteria and rating scale.)

		Poor	Deficient	Acceptable	Good	Excellent	Insufficient Knowledge
1	Impartiality/Fairness	1	2	3	4	5	9
2	Integrity	1	2	3	4	5	9
3	Judicial Temperament	1	2	3	4	5	9
4	Diligence	1	2	3	4	5	9
5	Overall evaluation of judge	1	2	3	4	5	9

Comments See Introduction about the types of comments sought and to review Council policy on anonymity.

Add any additional comments on pages 32 ff.

Print Name (Optional)