



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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judicial Council Members
FROM: Staff
DATE: February 23, 2012
RE: Court Employee Survey Report

The court employee survey was mailed to all non-attorney court system employees. Of 668 surveys mailed, 286 were returned for a return rate of 43%. Of the 286 returned surveys, 21 had no ratings or comment on any judge and were not included in the analysis. Council staff entered data, ran descriptive statistics, and transcribed comments from the surveys. A sample survey page is included at the end of this memorandum.

Table 1 shows the basis for evaluation of each judge. In approximately 3% of the responses court employees did not identify the basis for their evaluation.

Some respondents had direct professional experience with the judges but only wrote comments and did not rate them on the specific variables. Thus, there may be more respondents shown on Table 1 with direct professional experience than appear on the judges' individual tables.

Table 1 Basis for Evaluation					
	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts	Rated Judge but No Basis Checked	Total Responses
Joel H. Bolger	33	11	4	0	48
William Barker Carey	32	5	1	0	38
Steve Cole	19	3	3	0	25
Patrick S. Hammers	35	5	1	2	43
J. Patrick Hanley	46	6	2	2	56
Gregory Louis Heath	17	3	2	0	22
Charles Huguelet	19	2	2	0	23
Michael I. Jeffery	38	6	1	3	48
Keith B. Levy	33	7	1	1	42
Paul Lyle	36	1	0	1	38
Michael P. McConahy	35	6	1	1	43
William F. Morse	55	6	4	2	67
Margaret L. Murphy	30	7	2	1	40
Thomas G. Nave	22	4	1	1	28
Frank A. Pfiffner	38	5	3	2	48
Daniel Schally	24	4	3	0	31
Eric Smith	44	11	0	1	56
John Suddock	41	11	1	3	56
Alex M. Swiderski	38	12	2	4	56
Sen K. Tan	63	17	4	4	88
Philip R. Volland	37	16	3	3	59
David R. Wallace	37	7	3	3	50
Pamela Scott Washington	35	6	1	2	44
Daniel Winfree	44	5	3	1	53
Michael L. Wolverson	45	10	3	3	61
David Zwink	27	5	2	1	35
	923	181	53	41	1,198

Table 2
Ratings Based on Direct Professional Experience

	Number of Responses	Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
Joel H. Bolger	33	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
William Barker Carey	32	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Steve Cole	19	4.5	4.4	4.3	3.8	4.2
Patrick S. Hammers	34	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
J. Patrick Hanley	46	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Gregory Louis Heath	16	4.5	4.3	4.6	3.9	4.3
Charles Huguelet	18	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Michael I. Jeffery	37	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.6
Keith B. Levy	33	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6
Paul Lyle	36	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.7	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	35	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2
William F. Morse	55	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.3
Margaret L. Murphy	27	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.0
Thomas G. Nave	22	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.9
Frank A. Pfiffner	38	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0
Daniel Schally	23	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3
Eric Smith	44	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6
John Suddock	41	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.6
Alex M. Swiderski	38	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
Sen K. Tan	62	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
Philip R. Volland	37	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5
David R. Wallace	37	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Pamela Scott Washington	34	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Daniel Winfree	43	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Michael L. Wolverton	45	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
David Zwink	27	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Joel H. Bolger							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	33	30	2	1	0	0	4.9
Integrity	32	30	1	1	0	0	4.9
Judicial Temperament	33	30	2	1	0	0	4.9
Diligence	32	28	3	1	0	0	4.8
Overall Evaluation	33	31	1	1	0	0	4.9

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation William Barker Carey							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	30	18	11	1	0	0	4.6
Integrity	30	20	8	1	1	0	4.6
Judicial Temperament	32	18	12	2	0	0	4.5
Diligence	31	19	9	2	0	1	4.5
Overall Evaluation	32	20	10	2	0	0	4.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Steve Cole							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	17	12	2	2	1	0	4.5
Integrity	16	10	3	2	1	0	4.4
Judicial Temperament	18	10	5	1	2	0	4.3
Diligence	18	6	6	3	3	0	3.8
Overall Evaluation	19	9	6	2	2	0	4.2

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Patrick S. Hammers							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	33	22	6	4	0	1	4.5
Integrity	35	25	6	2	1	1	4.5
Judicial Temperament	34	20	7	6	0	1	4.3
Diligence	32	18	9	3	0	2	4.3
Overall Evaluation	34	20	9	4	0	1	4.4

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation J. Patrick Hanley							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	46	39	5	2	0	0	4.8
Integrity	46	39	5	2	0	0	4.8
Judicial Temperament	46	39	5	2	0	0	4.8
Diligence	45	37	5	3	0	0	4.8
Overall Evaluation	46	39	5	2	0	0	4.8

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Gregory Louis Heath							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	15	8	6	1	0	0	4.5
Integrity	16	7	8	0	1	0	4.3
Judicial Temperament	16	9	7	0	0	0	4.6
Diligence	15	5	4	5	1	0	3.9
Overall Evaluation	16	8	6	1	1	0	4.3

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Charles Huguelet							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	18	10	4	2	2	0	4.2
Integrity	18	12	2	2	2	0	4.3
Judicial Temperament	18	11	2	3	2	0	4.2
Diligence	19	11	4	2	2	0	4.3
Overall Evaluation	18	12	3	0	3	0	4.3

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Michael I. Jeffery							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	33	23	7	3	0	0	4.6
Integrity	34	27	6	1	0	0	4.8
Judicial Temperament	37	29	7	1	0	0	4.8
Diligence	35	23	7	4	1	0	4.5
Overall Evaluation	37	24	11	2	0	0	4.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Keith B. Levy							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	30	17	12	1	0	0	4.5
Integrity	30	21	8	1	0	0	4.7
Judicial Temperament	31	20	8	2	0	1	4.5
Diligence	29	18	10	1	0	0	4.6
Overall Evaluation	33	21	11	0	1	0	4.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Paul Lyle							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	36	25	6	3	2	0	4.5
Integrity	36	26	5	4	1	0	4.6
Judicial Temperament	36	18	9	7	2	0	4.2
Diligence	36	28	5	2	1	0	4.7
Overall Evaluation	36	20	11	4	1	0	4.4

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Michael P. McConahy							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	32	18	9	3	1	1	4.3
Integrity	33	21	5	5	1	1	4.3
Judicial Temperament	35	18	8	4	3	2	4.1
Diligence	33	19	7	3	3	1	4.2
Overall Evaluation	35	18	10	5	1	1	4.2

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation William F. Morse							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	49	24	16	7	1	1	4.2
Integrity	53	31	17	4	0	1	4.5
Judicial Temperament	54	25	14	12	1	2	4.1
Diligence	51	29	11	9	1	1	4.3
Overall Evaluation	55	29	16	8	1	1	4.3

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Margaret L. Murphy							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	26	12	8	2	2	2	4.0
Integrity	26	13	8	2	2	1	4.2
Judicial Temperament	28	9	11	5	2	1	3.9
Diligence	26	11	9	3	2	1	4.0
Overall Evaluation	27	12	8	4	2	1	4.0

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Thomas G. Nave							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	21	19	2	0	0	0	4.9
Integrity	21	20	1	0	0	0	5.0
Judicial Temperament	20	18	2	0	0	0	4.9
Diligence	20	16	4	0	0	0	4.8
Overall Evaluation	22	20	2	0	0	0	4.9

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Frank A. Pfiffner							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	36	13	14	6	2	1	4.0
Integrity	38	13	17	6	1	1	4.1
Judicial Temperament	38	12	16	8	1	1	4.0
Diligence	37	15	13	7	1	1	4.1
Overall Evaluation	38	11	17	8	1	1	4.0

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Daniel Schally							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	22	8	11	3	0	0	4.2
Integrity	23	9	9	5	0	0	4.2
Judicial Temperament	24	10	8	6	0	0	4.2
Diligence	23	9	10	4	0	0	4.2
Overall Evaluation	23	9	11	3	0	0	4.3

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Eric Smith							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	41	27	8	5	0	1	4.5
Integrity	42	31	8	3	0	0	4.7
Judicial Temperament	44	28	12	3	0	1	4.5
Diligence	40	27	10	1	2	0	4.6
Overall Evaluation	44	32	8	2	2	0	4.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation John Suddock							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	41	10	12	14	3	2	3.6
Integrity	41	10	16	12	1	2	3.8
Judicial Temperament	41	8	13	15	3	2	3.5
Diligence	40	10	15	12	1	2	3.8
Overall Evaluation	41	8	16	12	3	2	3.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Alex M. Swiderski							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	38	20	12	4	0	2	4.3
Integrity	38	21	12	3	0	2	4.3
Judicial Temperament	38	17	13	5	1	2	4.1
Diligence	37	22	9	3	1	2	4.3
Overall Evaluation	38	21	10	5	0	2	4.3

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Sen K. Tan							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	60	43	13	3	0	1	4.6
Integrity	62	49	9	3	0	1	4.7
Judicial Temperament	62	46	12	2	1	1	4.6
Diligence	59	46	10	2	0	1	4.7
Overall Evaluation	62	49	9	3	0	1	4.7

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Philip R. Volland							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	35	18	15	2	0	0	4.5
Integrity	36	23	11	2	0	0	4.6
Judicial Temperament	37	20	13	2	2	0	4.4
Diligence	34	18	13	2	1	0	4.4
Overall Evaluation	37	21	13	2	1	0	4.5

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation David R. Wallace							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	37	23	9	4	0	1	4.4
Integrity	37	22	10	4	0	1	4.4
Judicial Temperament	37	21	11	4	0	1	4.4
Diligence	37	24	8	3	1	1	4.4
Overall Evaluation	37	21	11	4	0	1	4.4

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Pamela Scott Washington							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	34	17	11	4	2	0	4.3
Integrity	34	16	11	6	1	0	4.2
Judicial Temperament	34	17	10	5	2	0	4.2
Diligence	34	16	10	4	2	2	4.1
Overall Evaluation	34	15	12	3	4	0	4.1

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Daniel Winfree							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	41	33	5	2	1	0	4.7
Integrity	42	36	2	3	1	0	4.7
Judicial Temperament	43	36	4	2	1	0	4.7
Diligence	42	33	6	2	1	0	4.7
Overall Evaluation	43	35	5	2	1	0	4.7

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation Michael L. Wolverton							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	44	28	14	1	1	0	4.6
Integrity	44	27	13	3	1	0	4.5
Judicial Temperament	45	29	15	1	0	0	4.6
Diligence	43	27	11	4	1	0	4.5
Overall Evaluation	45	29	15	1	0	0	4.6

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Distribution of Court Employee Ratings* 2012 Retention Evaluation David Zwink							
Survey Category	Number of Responses						
	Total	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Deficient	Poor	Mean
Impartiality/Fairness	26	21	3	1	0	1	4.7
Integrity	27	21	5	0	0	1	4.7
Judicial Temperament	27	19	6	1	0	1	4.6
Diligence	27	20	6	0	0	1	4.6
Overall Evaluation	27	21	5	0	0	1	4.7

* Ratings are based on direct professional experience.

Sample Court Employee Survey

FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

ANCHORAGE SUPERIOR COURT

JUDGE SEN K. TAN

Basis for Evaluation

1. Which of the following best describes the basis for your evaluation of this judge? Direct professional experience is limited to direct contact with the judge's work as a judge. (Check one.)

<input type="checkbox"/> Direct professional experience	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional reputation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other personal contacts	<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient knowledge to evaluate this judge (Go to next judge.)
---	--	--	--

2. If you checked direct professional experience:
 - a. Does your experience with this judge include experience within the last five years?

	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------
 - b. Please describe the amount of your experience with this judge.

<input type="checkbox"/> Substantial	<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

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, page i, about the types of comments sought.

Please use the pages at the end or another sheet of paper for additional comments.

Print Name (Optional)

Anonymity

To promote a candid response, your comments remain anonymous to the judge whether or not you sign your name. Providing your name is optional but does give your comments added credibility with Council members. The Council does not consider unsigned comments unless they are corroborated, independently substantiated, or acknowledged by the applicant. Your name will not be given to the judge. Survey comments will be shared with a judge only after the comments have been edited to remove information that might identify the respondent. Survey comments are not released publicly.