



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Social Service Professionals

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 (draft)

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
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics	4
Instrumentation.....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety	5
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Judges	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	9
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Work.....	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Experience	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Community Population.....	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Work	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 11: William B. Carey: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: William B. Carey: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Kevin G. Miller: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Kevin G. Miller: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Kirsten Swanson: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Kirsten Swanson: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Angela M. Greene: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Angela M. Greene: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Steve W. Cole: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Steve W. Cole: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Michael D. Corey: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Michael D. Corey: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 23: William F. Morse: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: William F. Morse: Detailed Responses	29
Table 25: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents	30
Table 26: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Detailed Responses	31
Table 27: Michael L. Wolverton: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	32
Table 28: Michael L. Wolverton: Detailed Responses	33
Table 29: Jo-Ann Chung: Demographic Description of Respondents	34
Table 30: Jo-Ann Chung: Detailed Responses.....	35
Table 31: Brian K. Clark: Demographic Description of Respondents	36
Table 32: Brian K. Clark: Detailed Responses	37
Table 33: William L. Estelle: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	38
Table 34: William L. Estelle: Detailed Responses	39
Table 35: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	40
Table 36: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Detailed Responses	41
Table 37: John W. Wolfe: Demographic Description of Respondents	42
Table 38: John W. Wolfe: Detailed Responses	43
Table 39: Paul R. Lyle: Demographic Description of Respondents	44
Table 40: Paul R. Lyle: Detailed Responses	45
Table 41: Michael P. McConahy: Demographic Description of Respondents	46
Table 42: Michael P. McConahy: Detailed Responses.....	47

Table 43: Benjamin A. Seekins: Demographic Description of Respondents 48
Table 44: Benjamin A. Seekins: Detailed Responses..... 49

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 social service professionals 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 social service professionals 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	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
<i>District Court</i>						
Kevin G. Miller	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Steve W. Cole	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
William F. Morse	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
<i>District Court</i>						
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
<i>District Court</i>						
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

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

2018 Judicial Retention Survey: Social Service Professionals

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 social service professionals and asked them to rate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, and Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of work, length of experience, community population, location of work, and gender.

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 social service professionals included 17 trial court judges eligible for retention.

Methodology

State of Alaska social service professionals, specifically Office of Children's Services protective service specialists and managers (also known as social workers), guardians ad litem, and court appointed special advocate (CASA) volunteers, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of the 492 social service professionals invited via email to participate, 120 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 24.4%. Of the 120 returned surveys, 77 did not rate any judges; 43 (35.8%) respondents evaluated one or more judges. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

		All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Judge	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents		120	100.0	43	100.0
Type of Work					
	No response	1	0.8	1	2.3
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	74	61.7	31	72.1
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	19	15.8	6	14.0
	CASA Volunteer	24	20.0	5	11.6
	Other	2	1.7	-	-
Length of Experience					
	No response	1	0.8	-	-
	5 years or fewer	63	52.5	21	48.8
	6 to 10 years	30	25.0	12	27.9
	11 to 15 years	10	8.3	5	11.6
	16 to 20 years	12	10.0	4	9.3
	More than 20 years	4	3.3	1	2.3
Community Population					
	No response	8	6.7	-	-
	Under 2,000	4	3.3	3	7.0
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	41	34.2	16	37.2
	Over 35,000	67	55.8	24	55.8
Location of Work					
	No response	10	8.3	1	2.3
	First District	17	14.2	9	20.9
	Second District	5	4.2	3	7.0
	Third District	67	55.8	19	44.2
	Fourth District	21	17.5	11	25.6
	Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-
Gender					
	No response	-	-	-	-
	Male	19	15.8	6	14.0
	Female	101	84.2	37	86.0

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the judges eligible for retention, questions about demographic information for each respondent, 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 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

Ratings of Judges

In the tables that follow, responses to the rating questions are shown in a variety of ways. Most tables show the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*). Tables 4-10 present details on the *Overall* item. Table 4 compares all ratings to those from respondents with direct professional experience and includes the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*) in addition to number of respondents and average. Tables 5-10 present data only from those respondents who indicated direct professional experience. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item. Table 6 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' type of work. Table 7 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' length of experience. Table 8 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' community population. Table 9 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' location of work. Table 10 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' gender.

For each individual judge, Tables 11-44 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
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	7	5.8	100.0	-	-
<i>District Court</i>					
Kevin G. Miller	4	3.3	75.0	25.0	-
Kirsten Swanson	1	0.8	-	100.0	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Angela M. Greene	3	2.5	100.0	-	-
<u>Third Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Steve W. Cole	2	1.7	100.0	-	-
Michael D. Corey	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
William F. Morse	18	15.0	100.0	-	-
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	7	5.8	57.1	28.6	14.3
<i>District Court</i>					
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	2	1.7	50.0	-	50.0
William L. Estelle	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.2	100.0	-	-
Michael P. McConahy	9	7.5	100.0	-	-
<i>District Court</i>					
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	0.8	100.0	-	-

Table 4
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	7	4.7	5.0	0.5	7	4.7	5.0	0.5
<i>District Court</i>								
Kevin G. Miller	4	4.5	4.5	0.6	3	4.7	5.0	0.6
Kirsten Swanson	1	5.0	5.0	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	2.0	1.5	3	2.3	2.0	1.5
<u>Third Judicial District</u>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Steve W. Cole	2	3.5	3.5	0.7	2	3.5	3.5	0.7
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	5.0	-	1	5.0	5.0	-
William F. Morse	17	4.2	5.0	1.0	17	4.2	5.0	1.0
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	7	3.9	4.0	1.5	4	4.3	4.5	1.0
<i>District Court</i>								
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	2	3.5	3.5	2.1	1	5.0	5.0	-
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	5.0	-	1	5.0	5.0	-
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	4.0	-	1	4.0	4.0	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.4	4.0	0.5	5	4.4	4.0	0.5
Michael P. McConahy	9	4.1	4.0	1.1	9	4.1	4.0	1.1
<i>District Court</i>								
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	4.0	-	1	4.0	4.0	-

Table 5
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	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	28.6	5	71.4
<i>District Court</i>											
Kevin G. Miller	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	33.3	1	66.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Angela M. Greene	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	-	-	1	33.3	-	-
<u>Third Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Steve W. Cole	2	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	1	50.0	-	-
Michael D. Corey	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
William F. Morse	17	-	-	1	5.9	3	17.6	4	23.5	9	52.9
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
<i>District Court</i>											
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
William L. Estelle	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Sharon A.S. Illsley	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

*Table 5 (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	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	2	40.0
Michael P. McConahy	9	-	-	1	11.1	1	11.1	3	33.3	4	44.4
<i>District Court</i>											
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Work

	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)		Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)		CASA Volunteer		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	
<u>First Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
William B. Carey	6	4.8	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>							
Kevin G. Miller	2	5.0	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	1	4.0	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	13	4.2	2	4.0	2	4.5	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	2	4.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	4.3
<i>District Court</i>							
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Paul R. Lyle	3	4.3	1	4.0	1	5.0	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	6	4.5	1	4.0	1	2.0	4.1
<i>District Court</i>							
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	4.0

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Experience

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		More than 20 years		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	
<u>First Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
William B. Carey	1	4.0	4	4.8	1	5.0	-	-	1	5.0	4.7
<i>District Court</i>											
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	2	5.0	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Angela M. Greene	2	3.0	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	6	4.0	6	4.3	3	4.0	2	5.0	-	-	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3
<i>District Court</i>											
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Paul R. Lyle	4	4.5	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	7	4.4	2	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.1
<i>District Court</i>											
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Community Population

	Under 2,000		Between 2,000 and 35,000		Over 35,000		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<u>First Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
William B. Carey	-	-	7	4.7	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>							
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	3	4.7	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Angela M. Greene	2	2.5	1	2.0	-	-	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Steve W. Cole	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	3.5
Michael D. Corey	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	-	-	-	-	17	4.2	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	-	-	-	-	4	4.3	4.3
<i>District Court</i>							
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Paul R. Lyle	1	4.0	1	4.0	3	4.7	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	2	5.0	4	4.0	3	3.7	4.1
<i>District Court</i>							
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Work

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	
<u>First Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
William B. Carey	7	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>									
Kevin G. Miller	3	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Angela M. Greene	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	2	3.0	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Steve W. Cole	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	-	-	-	-	16	4.2	-	-	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	-	-	-	-	4	4.3	-	-	4.3
<i>District Court</i>									
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Paul R. Lyle	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4.4	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	4.1	4.1
<i>District Court</i>									
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	4.0

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<u>First Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
William B. Carey	1	4.0	6	4.8	4.7
<i>District Court</i>					
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	3	4.7	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Second Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Angela M. Greene	-	-	3	2.3	2.3
<u>Third Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	1	4.0	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	3	3.7	14	4.4	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverson	1	3.0	3	4.7	4.3
<i>District Court</i>					
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	1	4.0	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Fourth Judicial District</u>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Paul R. Lyle	-	-	5	4.4	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	1	5.0	8	4.0	4.1
<i>District Court</i>					
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	4.0

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

Table 11
William B. Carey
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	7	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	7	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	7	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	5	71.4
Limited amount of experience	1	14.3
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	85.7
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	14.3
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	14.3
6 to 10 years	4	57.1
11 to 15 years	1	14.3
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	1	14.3
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	7	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	7	100.0
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	1	14.3
Female	6	85.7

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

Table 12
William B. Carey
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.6
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.8
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8
11 to 15 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Female	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 13
Kevin G. Miller
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	4	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	3	75.0
Professional reputation	1	25.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	3	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	33.3
Limited amount of experience	2	66.7
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	50.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	50.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	-	-
6 to 10 years	3	75.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	25.0
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	4	100.0
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	4	100.0

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

Table 14
Kevin G. Miller
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 15
Kirsten Swanson
Demographic Description of Respondents

		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
	All respondents	1	100.0
Experience with Judge			
	Direct professional experience	-	-
	Professional reputation	1	100.0
	Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	-	-
	Substantial amount of experience	-	-
	Moderate amount of experience	-	-
	Limited amount of experience	-	-
Type of Work			
	No response	-	-
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
	CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	1	100.0
	6 to 10 years	-	-
	11 to 15 years	-	-
	16 to 20 years	-	-
	More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population			
	No response	-	-
	Under 2,000	-	-
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
	Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work			
	No response	-	-
	First District	1	100.0
	Second District	-	-
	Third District	-	-
	Fourth District	-	-
Gender			
	No response	-	-
	Male	-	-
	Female	1	100.0

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

Table 16
Kirsten Swanson
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 17
Angela M. Greene
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	3	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	3	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	3	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	2	66.7
Limited amount of experience	-	-
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	2	66.7
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	33.3
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	2	66.7
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	33.3
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	33.3
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	2	66.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	3	100.0

Table 18
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	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Experience within last 5 years	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	2	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.5
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	2	2.5	2.5	4.0	2.0	2.5
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3

Table 19
Steve W. Cole
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	2	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	2	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	2	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	50.0
Limited amount of experience	1	50.0
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	50.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	50.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	50.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	50.0
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	2	100.0
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	2	100.0
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	1	50.0
Female	1	50.0

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

Table 20
Steve W. Cole
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 21
Michael D. Corey
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	1	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	100.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	100.0
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	1	100.0
Female	-	-

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

Table 22
Michael D. Corey
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 23
William F. Morse
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	18	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	88.9
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	50.0
Limited amount of experience	7	38.9
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	14	77.8
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	11.1
CASA Volunteer	2	11.1
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	6	33.3
6 to 10 years	6	33.3
11 to 15 years	4	22.2
16 to 20 years	2	11.1
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	18	100.0
Location of Work		
No response	1	5.6
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	17	94.4
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	3	16.7
Female	15	83.3

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

Table 24
William F. Morse
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.9
Limited amount of experience	7	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	14	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
CASA Volunteer	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	6	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	6	4.3	4.2	3.7	4.5	4.3
11 to 15 years	4	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7	4.0
16 to 20 years	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	17	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Female	15	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.4

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 25
Herman G. Walker, Jr.
Demographic Description of Respondents

No Respondents

Table 26
Herman G. Walker, Jr.
Detailed Responses

No Respondents

Table 27
Michael L. Wolverton
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	7	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	4	57.1
Professional reputation	2	28.6
Other personal contacts	1	14.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	4	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	25.0
Limited amount of experience	3	75.0
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	4	57.1
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	14.3
CASA Volunteer	2	28.6
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	6	85.7
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	14.3
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	7	100.0
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	14.3
Third District	6	85.7
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	1	14.3
Female	6	85.7

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

Table 28
Michael L. Wolverton
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	7	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
CASA Volunteer	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Female	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 29
Jo-Ann Chung
Demographic Description of Respondents

No Respondents

Table 30
Jo-Ann Chung
Detailed Responses

No Respondents

Table 31
Brian K. Clark
Demographic Description of Respondents

		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents		2	100.0
Experience with Judge			
	Direct professional experience	1	50.0
	Professional reputation	-	-
	Other personal contacts	1	50.0
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
	Substantial amount of experience	-	-
	Moderate amount of experience	1	100.0
	Limited amount of experience	-	-
Type of Work			
	No response	-	-
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	50.0
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
	CASA Volunteer	1	50.0
Length of Experience			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	2	100.0
	6 to 10 years	-	-
	11 to 15 years	-	-
	16 to 20 years	-	-
	More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population			
	No response	-	-
	Under 2,000	-	-
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
	Over 35,000	2	100.0
Location of Work			
	No response	-	-
	First District	-	-
	Second District	-	-
	Third District	2	100.0
	Fourth District	-	-
Gender			
	No response	-	-
	Male	-	-
	Female	2	100.0

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

Table 32
Brian K. Clark
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	2	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 33
William L. Estelle
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	1	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	100.0
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	100.0
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	1	100.0
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	100.0
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

Table 34
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	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 35
Sharon A.S. Illsley
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	1	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	100.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	1	100.0
Fourth District	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

Table 36
Sharon A.S. Illsley
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 37
John W. Wolfe
Demographic Description of Respondents

No Respondents

Table 38
John W. Wolfe
Detailed Responses

No Respondents

Table 39
Paul R. Lyle
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	5	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	5	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	5	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	80.0
Limited amount of experience	1	20.0
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	60.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	20.0
CASA Volunteer	1	20.0
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	4	80.0
6 to 10 years	1	20.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	1	20.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	20.0
Over 35,000	3	60.0
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	5	100.0
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	5	100.0

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

Table 40
Paul R. Lyle
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.8	3.8	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	4.3	4.7	3.3	4.3	4.3
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	4	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.5
6 to 10 years	1	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	1	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.7
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 41
Michael P. McConahy
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	9	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	9	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	9	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	4	44.4
Limited amount of experience	2	22.2
Type of Work		
No response	1	11.1
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	66.7
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	11.1
CASA Volunteer	1	11.1
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	7	77.8
6 to 10 years	2	22.2
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	2	22.2
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	44.4
Over 35,000	3	33.3
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	9	100.0
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	1	11.1
Female	8	88.9

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

Table
Michael P. McConahy
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3
Limited amount of experience	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	1	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	7	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.4
6 to 10 years	2	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.0
Over 35,000	3	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Gender*						
Male	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Female	8	4.0	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 43
Benjamin A. Seekins
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	1	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	100.0
Type of Work		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
Length of Experience		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	-	-
6 to 10 years	1	100.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
Community Population		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
Location of Work		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	1	100.0
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

Table 44
Benjamin A. Seekins
Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Work*						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Experience*						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community Population*						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Work*						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Gender*						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.