



UAA Center for Behavioral
Health Research & Services
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Technical Report

Maia Wen, B.A., Research Professional
Katelyn Saft, Undergraduate Research Assistant
Stacy Tanner, B.A., Graduate Research Assistant
Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Associate Professor

April 10, 2018

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs/index.php

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Instrumentation.....	4
Confidentiality and Data Safety	4
Results.....	5
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 2: Level of Experience with Judges	6
Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings	7
Table 4: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	8
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 5: William B. Carey: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	10
Table 6: William B. Carey: Detailed Responses	10
Table 7: Kevin G. Miller: Description of Respondents' Experience	11
Table 8: Kevin G. Miller: Detailed Responses	11
Table 9: Kirsten Swanson: Description of Respondents' Experience	12
Table 10: Kirsten Swanson: Detailed Responses	12
Table 11: Angela M. Greene: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	13
Table 12: Angela M. Greene: Detailed Responses.....	13
Table 13: Steve W. Cole: Description of Respondents' Experience	14
Table 14: Steve W. Cole: Detailed Responses	14
Table 15: Michael D. Corey: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	15
Table 16: Michael D. Corey: Detailed Responses.....	15
Table 17: William F. Morse: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 18: William F. Morse: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 19: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Description of Respondents' Experience	17
Table 20: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Detailed Responses	17
Table 21: Michael L. Wolverton: Description of Respondents' Experience	18
Table 22: Michael L. Wolverton: Detailed Responses	18
Table 23: Jo-Ann Chung: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	19
Table 24: Jo-Ann Chung: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 25: Brian K. Clark: Description of Respondents' Experience	20
Table 26: Brian K. Clark: Detailed Responses	20
Table 27: William L. Estelle: Description of Respondents' Experience	21
Table 28: William L. Estelle: Detailed Responses	21
Table 29: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Description of Respondents' Experience	22
Table 30: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Detailed Responses	22
Table 31: John W. Wolfe: Description of Respondents' Experience	23
Table 32: John W. Wolfe: Detailed Responses	23
Table 33: Paul R. Lyle: Description of Respondents' Experience	24
Table 34: Paul R. Lyle: Detailed Responses	24
Table 35: Michael P. McConahy: Description of Respondents' Experience	25
Table 36: Michael P. McConahy: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 37: Benjamin A. Seekins: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	26
Table 38: Benjamin A. Seekins: Detailed Responses.....	26

Executive Summary

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska court employees to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2018 survey included 17 trial court judges eligible for retention.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked court employees to evaluate the judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, and Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each judge by respondents with direct professional experience on all five characteristics. Within each district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Judges

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
<u>First Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
William B. Carey	26	4.4	4.6	4.2	3.9	4.4
<i>District Court</i>						
Kevin G. Miller	24	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Kirsten Swanson	15	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
<u>Second Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Angela M. Greene	19	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.2
<u>Third Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Steve W. Cole	13	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.2	3.8
Michael D. Corey	31	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
William F. Morse	51	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	29	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Michael L. Wolverton	35	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
<i>District Court</i>						
Jo-Ann Chung	28	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Brian K. Clark	29	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
William L. Estelle	20	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.2
Sharon A. S. Illsley	18	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.3
John W. Wolfe	21	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Paul R. Lyle	38	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.7
Michael P. McConahy	35	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
<i>District Court</i>						
Benjamin A. Seekins	36	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.8

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

2018 Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Introduction

Alaska statutes require that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate judges standing for retention in an election year. The Council makes a recommendation to the State's voters to either retain or not retain each judge. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska court employees and asked them to rate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, and Overall*.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Center for Behavioral Health Research and Services (CBHRS), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. CBHRS was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection for the survey as well as data analysis. CBHRS prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

The 2018 retention survey for court employees included 17 trial court judges eligible for retention.

Methodology

Alaska court employees, including law clerks, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of the 610 total employees invited to participate, 260 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 42.6%. Of the 260 returned surveys, 64 did not rate any of the judges; 196 (75.4%) respondents evaluated one or more judges.

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the judges eligible for retention, five evaluation items for each judge, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each judge.

Respondents evaluated judges in five areas of performance. Detailed instructions for each domain were provided:

Impartiality/Fairness: Please evaluate the judge’s sense of basic fairness and justice and whether the judge treats all parties equally.

Integrity: Please evaluate whether the judge’s conduct is free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety and whether the judge makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.

Judicial Temperament: Please evaluate the judge’s courtesy and freedom from arrogance and whether the judge manifests human understanding and compassion.

Diligence: Please evaluate whether the judge is prepared for court proceedings, works diligently, and is reasonably prompt in making decisions.

Overall Evaluation: Please provide your overall assessment of the judge’s performance.

Respondents assigned ratings for each domain using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided:

(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court	Meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court	Consistently exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at CBHRS and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial retention survey are of a sensitive nature, CBHRS has rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. All data are maintained on a secure server.

Each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis.

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents' level of experience with each judge is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the judges. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.

In the tables, judges appear in order based on district. Within each district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges.

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Judge

All respondents were asked to describe the basis of their evaluation for each judge they rated, with options of direct professional experience, professional reputation, and other personal contacts.

Table 2 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

Ratings of Judges

Table 3 presents results on the *Overall* item by comparing all respondents to those with direct professional experience; the table presents the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*) as well as the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*). Table 4 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item among respondents who indicated direct professional experience.

For each individual judge, Tables 5-38 provide a summary of respondents' experience with each judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience.

Table 2
Respondents' Level of Experience with Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<u>First Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
William B. Carey	29	11.2	89.7	3.4	6.9
<i>District Court</i>					
Kevin G. Miller	25	9.6	96.0	4.0	-
Kirsten Swanson	21	8.1	71.4	19.0	9.5
<u>Second Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Angela M. Greene	24	9.2	79.2	16.7	4.2
<u>Third Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Steve W. Cole	17	6.5	76.5	17.6	5.9
Michael D. Corey	35	13.5	88.6	5.7	5.7
William F. Morse	64	24.6	79.7	12.5	7.8
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	35	13.5	82.9	8.6	8.6
Michael L. Wolverton	40	15.4	87.5	5.0	7.5
<i>District Court</i>					
Jo-Ann Chung	32	12.3	87.5	6.3	6.3
Brian K. Clark	35	13.5	82.9	2.9	14.3
William L. Estelle	21	8.1	95.2	4.8	-
Sharon A. S. Illsley	19	7.3	94.7	5.3	-
John W. Wolfe	22	8.5	95.5	4.5	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Paul R. Lyle	40	15.4	95.0	2.5	2.5
Michael P. McConahy	39	15.0	89.7	7.7	2.6
<i>District Court</i>					
Benjamin A. Seekins	43	16.5	83.7	9.3	7.0

Table 3
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience				
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	
<u>First Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
William B. Carey	27	4.4	4.0	0.7	25	4.4	4.0	0.7	
<i>District Court</i>									
Kevin G. Miller	22	4.8	5.0	0.5	22	4.8	5.0	0.5	
Kirsten Swanson	19	4.8	5.0	0.4	15	4.8	5.0	0.4	
<u>Second Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Angela M. Greene	21	3.1	3.0	1.4	17	3.2	3.0	1.4	
<u>Third Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Steve W. Cole	14	3.9	4.0	1.2	12	3.8	4.0	1.2	
Michael D. Corey	30	4.9	5.0	0.3	28	4.9	5.0	0.3	
William F. Morse	59	4.7	5.0	0.5	47	4.7	5.0	0.5	
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	32	4.4	5.0	0.8	28	4.5	5.0	0.8	
Michael L. Wolverton	40	4.7	5.0	0.6	35	4.8	5.0	0.5	
<i>District Court</i>									
Jo-Ann Chung	28	4.5	5.0	0.6	26	4.6	5.0	0.6	
Brian K. Clark	32	4.8	5.0	0.4	28	4.8	5.0	0.4	
William L. Estelle	18	4.2	4.5	1.0	18	4.2	4.5	1.0	
Sharon A. S. Illsley	16	4.3	5.0	1.1	16	4.3	5.0	1.1	
John W. Wolfe	20	4.3	5.0	1.0	20	4.3	5.0	1.0	
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Paul R. Lyle	37	4.7	5.0	0.5	36	4.7	5.0	0.5	
Michael P. McConahy	36	4.4	5.0	0.7	33	4.4	5.0	0.7	
<i>District Court</i>									
Benjamin A. Seekins	39	4.7	5.0	0.6	34	4.8	5.0	0.6	

Table 4
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<u>First Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
William B. Carey	25	-	-	-	-	3	12.0	10	40.0	12	48.0
<i>District Court</i>											
Kevin G. Miller	22	-	-	-	-	1	4.5	3	13.6	18	81.8
Kirsten Swanson	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	20.0	12	80.0
<u>Second Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Angela M. Greene	17	2	11.8	5	29.4	2	11.8	4	23.5	4	23.5
<u>Third Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Steve W. Cole	12	-	-	2	16.7	3	25.0	2	16.7	5	41.7
Michael D. Corey	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7.1	26	92.9
William F. Morse	47	-	-	-	-	1	2.1	12	25.5	34	72.3
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	28	-	-	-	-	5	17.9	4	14.3	19	67.9
Michael L. Wolverton	35	-	-	-	-	2	5.7	3	8.6	30	85.7
<i>District Court</i>											
Jo-Ann Chung	26	-	-	-	-	1	3.8	9	34.6	16	61.5
Brian K. Clark	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	17.9	23	82.1
William L. Estelle	18	-	-	1	5.6	4	22.2	4	22.2	9	50.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	16	1	6.3			1	6.3	5	31.3	9	56.3
John W. Wolfe	20	-	-	1	5.0	4	20.0	4	20.0	11	55.0

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 4 (cont.)
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Paul R. Lyle	36	-	-	-	-	1	2.8	9	25.0	26	72.2
Michael P. McConahy	33	-	-	-	-	5	15.2	10	30.3	18	54.5
<i>District Court</i>											
Benjamin A. Seekins	34	-	-	-	-	2	5.9	4	11.8	28	82.4

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

Table 5
William B. Carey
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	26	89.7
Professional reputation	1	3.4
Other personal contacts	2	6.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	46.2
Moderate amount of experience	7	26.9
Limited amount of experience	7	26.9

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 6
William B. Carey
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	29	4.5	4.6	4.3	3.9	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	26	4.4	4.6	4.2	3.9	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.4	4.6	4.2	3.9	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.1	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.3
Limited amount of experience	7	4.0	4.5	3.8	3.3	3.8
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5

Table 7
Kevin G. Miller
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	25	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	24	96.0
Professional reputation	1	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	95.8
Substantial amount of experience	15	62.5
Moderate amount of experience	4	16.7
Limited amount of experience	5	20.8

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 8
Kevin G. Miller
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	25	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	24	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5
Limited amount of experience	5	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 9
Kirsten Swanson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	21	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	15	71.4
Professional reputation	4	19.0
Other personal contacts	2	9.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	14	93.3
Substantial amount of experience	5	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	9	60.0
Limited amount of experience	1	6.7

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 10
Kirsten Swanson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	15	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	14	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	4	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

Table 11
Angela M. Greene
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	24	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	19	79.2
Professional reputation	4	16.7
Other personal contacts	1	4.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	89.5
Substantial amount of experience	5	26.3
Moderate amount of experience	6	31.6
Limited amount of experience	8	42.1

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 12
Angela M. Greene
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	24	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.1
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	19	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.2
Experience within last 5 years	17	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.1
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	3.0	2.6	2.6	1.8	2.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.5	4.0	3.6	4.3	3.4
Limited amount of experience	8	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.9
Professional reputation	4	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	2.0	-	2.0

Table 13
Steve W. Cole
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	17	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	13	76.5
Professional reputation	3	17.6
Other personal contacts	1	5.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	13	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	23.1
Moderate amount of experience	6	46.2
Limited amount of experience	4	30.8

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 14
Steve W. Cole
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	17	4.2	3.9	4.2	3.3	3.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	13	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.2	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	13	4.3	3.8	4.3	3.2	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	4.0	3.0	4.3	2.7	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.0	4.7
Limited amount of experience	4	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.7
Professional reputation	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 15
Michael D. Corey
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	35	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	31	88.6
Professional reputation	2	5.7
Other personal contacts	2	5.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	31	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	16.1
Moderate amount of experience	15	48.4
Limited amount of experience	11	35.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 16
Michael D. Corey
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	35	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	31	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	31	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	11	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.9
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 17
William F. Morse
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	64	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	51	79.7
Professional reputation	8	12.5
Other personal contacts	5	7.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	47	92.2
Substantial amount of experience	8	15.7
Moderate amount of experience	31	60.8
Limited amount of experience	12	23.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 18
William F. Morse
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	64	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	51	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	47	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	31	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.7
Limited amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7
Professional reputation	8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6
Other personal contacts	5	4.3	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0

Table 19
Herman G. Walker, Jr.
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	35	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	82.9
Professional reputation	3	8.6
Other personal contacts	3	8.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	28	96.6
Substantial amount of experience	3	10.3
Moderate amount of experience	16	55.2
Limited amount of experience	10	34.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 20
Herman G. Walker, Jr.
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	35	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	28	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6
Limited amount of experience	10	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Professional reputation	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	4.0	4.7	4.5	4.5

Table 21
Michael L. Wolverson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	40	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	35	87.5
Professional reputation	2	5.0
Other personal contacts	3	7.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	97.1
Substantial amount of experience	6	17.1
Moderate amount of experience	16	45.7
Limited amount of experience	12	34.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 22
Michael L. Wolverson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	40	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	35	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	12	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.6
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	5.0	4.7	4.5	4.7

Table 23
Jo-Ann Chung
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	32	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	28	87.5
Professional reputation	2	6.3
Other personal contacts	2	6.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	96.4
Substantial amount of experience	10	35.7
Moderate amount of experience	10	35.7
Limited amount of experience	8	28.6

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 24
Jo-Ann Chung
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	32	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	28	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Limited amount of experience	8	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0

Table 25
Brian K. Clark
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	35	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	82.9
Professional reputation	1	2.9
Other personal contacts	5	14.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	26	89.7
Substantial amount of experience	7	24.1
Moderate amount of experience	12	41.4
Limited amount of experience	10	34.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 26
Brian K. Clark
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	35	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	26	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.7
Limited amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	5	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.8	5.0

Table 27
William L. Estelle
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	21	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	20	95.2
Professional reputation	1	4.8
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	45.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	40.0
Limited amount of experience	3	15.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 28
William L. Estelle
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	20	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.4	3.8
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 29
Sharon A. S. Illsley
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	19	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	94.7
Professional reputation	1	5.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	6	33.3
Limited amount of experience	6	33.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 30
Sharon A. S. Illsley
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	19	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.3
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.5
Limited amount of experience	6	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.4
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 31
John W. Wolfe
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	22	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	21	95.5
Professional reputation	1	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	47.6
Moderate amount of experience	8	38.1
Limited amount of experience	3	14.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 32
John W. Wolfe
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	22	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	21	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.5	4.1
Limited amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 33
Paul R. Lyle
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	40	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	38	95.0
Professional reputation	1	2.5
Other personal contacts	1	2.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	38	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	26.3
Moderate amount of experience	16	42.1
Limited amount of experience	12	31.6

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 34
Paul R. Lyle
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	40	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	38	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	38	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.8	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.9	4.9	4.2	4.9	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	12	4.6	4.8	4.2	4.7	4.6
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 35
Michael P. McConahy
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	39	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	35	89.7
Professional reputation	3	7.7
Other personal contacts	1	2.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	33	94.3
Substantial amount of experience	5	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	17	48.6
Limited amount of experience	12	34.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 36
Michael P. McConahy
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	39	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	35	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	33	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.4	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	17	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	12	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 37
Benjamin A. Seekins
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	43	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	36	83.7
Professional reputation	4	9.3
Other personal contacts	3	7.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	94.4
Substantial amount of experience	11	30.6
Moderate amount of experience	12	33.3
Limited amount of experience	12	33.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 38
Benjamin A. Seekins
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	43	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	36	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	12	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Professional reputation	4	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0