

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION SURVEY:
JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION ELECTION IN 1998**

**PREPARED FOR
THE ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL**

MAY 1998

JC# 9812.01

**JUSTICE CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>BAR</u>	<u>PPO</u>	<u>SW/GAL/ CASA</u>
Supreme Court			
Justice Robert L. Eastaugh	17		
First Judicial District			
Judge Patricia Collins	21	25	29
Judge Peter Froehlich.....	33	37	41
Second Judicial District			
Judge Michael I. Jeffery.....	45	49	53
Third Judicial District			
Judge Beverly W. Cutler.....	57	61	65
Judge John Reese	69	73	77
Judge John R. Lohff.....	81	85	89
Judge Gregory Motyka	93	97	101
Judge Sigurd E. Murphy.....	105	109	113
Judge M. Francis Neville.....	117	121	125
Judge Stephanie Rhoades	129	133	137
Fourth Judicial District			
Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger.....	141	145	149
Judge Jane F. Kauvar	153	157	161

I. BACKGROUND

The Constitution and laws of the State of Alaska require that each justice and judge be subject to approval or rejection on a non-partisan ballot at the general election. By law, the Alaska Judicial Council evaluates each justice and judge and makes its recommendations to the voters prior to the election. In making its evaluation, the Council surveys Peace and Probation Officers, social workers, Guardians Ad Litem, CASA volunteers, and active members of the Alaska Bar Association regarding their ratings of the judges and justices eligible to stand for retention.¹ The following report contains the results of those surveys.

¹ In addition, the Council evaluated judges and justices not standing for retention until 2000, in order to give them an opportunity to assess their performance in mid-term. Those results are reported separately.

II. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire booklets containing the names of thirteen judges eligible to stand for retention in 1998 and thirty-four judges and justices eligible to stand for retention in 2000 were sent to active members of the Alaska Bar Association, social workers, Guardians Ad Litem, CASA volunteers, and all Alaska Peace and Probation Officers. The portion of the questionnaire regarding those eligible to stand for retention in 1998 contained a more extensive series of evaluation items than did the portion regarding those eligible to stand in 2000.

The initial mailing took place on February 2, 1998 with a follow-up mailing to non-respondents on March 4, 1998.

A. CONFIDENTIALITY

The Council assured all respondents to the questionnaire of confidentiality:

All responses will be aggregated solely for statistical analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Responses to the demographic questions also are confidential. Demographic data are critical to our analysis; strict guidelines are followed to protect the identities of all respondents.

B. VALIDATION

To guarantee a fair evaluation and avoid duplications, all returns were validated by comparing the mailing lists with signatures on the return envelopes.* Respondents were instructed to take the following steps to assure validity:

A self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluation. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked "Confidential" and seal the envelope. Place the "Confidential" envelope in the return envelope and sign in the space provided. The return envelope **MUST BE SIGNED** in order for your survey to be counted. Also, please print your name and address on the return envelope.

*Note: A total of 81 surveys were returned without signatures, and therefore were not tallied or analyzed.

C. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Each questionnaire booklet contained detailed information about how to evaluate the judges:

In this survey booklet you will evaluate justices and judges eligible to stand for retention in 1998 and 2000. ***Please rate only those justices and judges for whom you have a sufficient basis for evaluation.*** Your evaluation may be based upon direct professional experience, social contacts, or professional reputation. If you lack sufficient knowledge to evaluate, circle the number 9 ("insufficient knowledge to evaluate this justice or judge") under Question 1, and go on to the next justice or judge.

All questions relate only to the qualities of the justice or judge in the performance of judicial duties. The first set of items on each page asks for your experience with each justice or judge. Please circle the appropriate numbers. For remaining items, use the following rating scale.

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. Unacceptable | Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 2. Deficient | Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 3. Acceptable | Meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 4. Good | Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 5. Excellent | Consistently exceeds minimum standards for this court. |

D. DESCRIPTIVE RATINGS

This report contains detailed breakdowns of each candidate's evaluation scores on a series of traits, and tables displaying the mean scores of seven composite scales derived from those traits: Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation. (The Peace and Probation Officers' and the Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers' questionnaire did not contain the items comprising the Legal Ability scale). The survey instrument defines each trait, and specifies the meaning of each number on the five-point scale (see Appendix I for a copy of the actual survey form). **Unless otherwise noted, mean ratings are tabulated only from replies by respondents based on direct professional experience with the applicant.** The responses each applicant received on the five scales (each with a range from 1 (unacceptable) to 5 (excellent)) were summarized into arithmetic means. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

Mean Score	Range Description
4.0-5.0	Excellent
3.5-3.9	Good
3.0-3.4	Acceptable
2.5-2.9	Deficient
1.0-2.4	Unacceptable

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

III. RESPONSE RATE

By the final cut-off date, a total of 1728 questionnaire booklets were returned as described below:

A.	PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS	
	Total mailed	1338
	Total responding	556
	Response rate	42%
B.	ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION MEMBERS	
	Total mailed	2662
	Total responding	1080
	Response rate	41%
C.	SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS	
	Total mailed	298
	Total responding	92
	Response rate	31%
D.	COMBINED RESULTS	
	Total mailed	4298
	Total responding	1728
	Response rate	40%

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS

A. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

1. Type of Practice

Which of the following best describes your practice?

	<u>1989 Membership Survey Results*</u>
Private, solo.....	22% 16%
Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	19% 28%
Private, office of 6 or more attorneys	20% 23%
Private corporate employee.....	2% 2%
State judge or judicial officer	6% 4%
Government	20% 21%
Public service agency organization (not government)	2% 4%
Other.....	1% 2%
No response.....	8% --

2. Length of Alaska Practice

How many years have you practiced law in Alaska?

5 years or less (1-3 yrs.).....	14%	(12%)
6-10 years (4-9 yrs.).....	14%	(31%)
11-15 years (10-15 yrs.)	18%	(34%)
16-20 years (16-19 yrs.)	22%	(9%)
21 or more years (20+ yrs.)	24%	(14%)
No response.....	8%	--
 Mean.....	 15.4	 11.6

* The 1989 Alaska Bar Membership Survey, the first and only general survey of the legal profession in Alaska, contains baseline information about Bar members' economic and professional characteristics, experience, and professional activities.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

1989
Membership
Survey
Results

3. Gender

Male.....	66%	75%
Female	26%	25%
No response.....	8%	--

4. Cases Handled

The majority of your practice consists of:

Prosecution.....	5%	5%
Mainly criminal	6%	4%
Mixed criminal and civil	18%	15%
Mainly civil.....	59%	71%
Other.....	4%	5%
No response.....	8%	--

5. Location of Practice

In which judicial district is most of your work conducted?

First District	13%	14%
Second District.....	2%	2%
Third District.....	66%	73%
Fourth District.....	9%	11%
Not in Alaska	3%	--
No response.....	8%	

B. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

1. Type of Work

My current position in law enforcement is:

State law enforcement officer	39%
Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	42%
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	3%
Probation/parole officer.....	7%
Other	3%
No response	7%

2. Length of Time as Alaska Officer

How many years have you been a peace or probation officer in Alaska?

Less than 5 years	27%
6-10 years.....	19%
11-15 years.....	17%
16-20 years.....	21%
Over 21 years.....	9%
No response	7%
Mean	11.1

3. Gender

Male	82%
Female.....	11%
No response	7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

4. Location of Work

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

First District	13%
Second District	5%
Third District	57%
Fourth District.....	17%
Outside	1%
No response	7%

5. Community Population

What is the population of the community in which you work?

Under 2,000	9%
Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	36%
31,000 or over.....	47%
No response	7%

C. SOCIAL WORKERS/GUARDIAN AD LITEM/CASA VOLUNTEERS

1. Type of Work

My current position is:

Social Worker	38%
GAL	27%
CASA Volunteer	32%
Other	0%
No response	3%

2. Length of Experience

How many years have you been a social worker, GAL or CASA volunteer in Alaska?

Less than 5 years	57%
6-10 years.....	26%
11-15 years.....	5%
16-20 years.....	4%
Over 21 years.....	1%
No response	7%
Mean	5.58

3. Gender

Male	22%
Female.....	75%
No response	3%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

4. Location of Work

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

First District	28%
Second District	3%
Third District	52%
Fourth District.....	8%
Outside	0%
No response	9%

5. Community Population

What is the population of the community in which you work?

Under 2,000	4%
Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	36%
31,000 or over.....	54%
No response	5%

D. ALASKA BAR MEMBERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Justice Robert L. Eastaugh.....	71%	24%	2%	4%	543	36%
Judge Patricia Collins.....	76%	18%	4%	3%	187	13%
Judge Peter Froelich.....	77%	14%	2%	7%	179	13%
Judge Michael I. Jeffery.....	83%	14%	1%	2%	210	16%
Judge Beverly W. Cutler.....	78%	19%	1%	2%	497	36%
Judge John Reese.....	85%	11%	1%	4%	615	48%
Judge John R. Lohff.....	93%	4%	1%	2%	296	25%
Judge Gregory Motyka.....	88%	8%	1%	3%	259	21%
Judge Sigurd E. Murphy.....	86%	9%	1%	5%	502	40%
Judge M. Francis Neville.....	81%	13%	3%	3%	132	10%
Judge Stephanie Rhoades.....	82%	12%	1%	5%	349	27%
Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger.....	86%	11%	1%	2%	258	21%
Judge Jane F. Kauvar.....	84%	8%	2%	6%	176	14%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

E. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Judge Patricia Collins	78%	13%	0%	9%	45	6%
Judge Peter Froelich	79%	12%	0%	9%	43	8%
Judge Michael I. Jeffery	70%	11%	4%	15%	27	3%
Judge Beverly W. Cutler	81%	14%	0%	5%	104	15%
Judge John Reese.....	69%	24%	0%	7%	54	7%
Judge John R. Lohff	84%	8%	0%	8%	49	7%
Judge Gregory Motyka.....	77%	13%	0%	9%	53	4%
Judge Sigurd E. Murphy	83%	12%	2%	3%	99	15%
Judge M. Francis Neville	81%	13%	0%	6%	53	8%
Judge Stephanie Rhoades	81%	15%	0%	5%	89	13%
Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger	86%	13%	0%	2%	64	10%
Judge Jane F. Kauvar	81%	3%	0%	16%	93	13%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

F. SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA VOLUNTEERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*</u>
Judge Patricia Collins	73%	27%	0%	0%	11	7%
Judge Peter Froelich	86%	14%	0%	0%	7	10%
Judge Michael I. Jeffery	83%	0%	0%	17%	6	5%
Judge Beverly W. Cutler	56%	33%	0%	11%	9	5%
Judge John Reese.....	77%	18%	0%	6%	17	14%
Judge John R. Lohff	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	1%
Judge Gregory Motyka.....	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	1%
Judge Sigurd E. Murphy	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	1%
Judge M. Francis Neville	67%	33%	0%	0%	3	2%
Judge Stephanie Rhoades	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	1%
Judge Niesje J. Steinkruger	100%	0%	0%	0%	4	4%
Judge Jane F. Kauvar	75%	0%	25%	0%	4	3%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ROBERT L. EASTAUGH

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 19%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 17%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 26%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 10%
		Government 17%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 7%
		6-10 years 7%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 26%
		20+ years 40%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 74%
		Female 19%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 3%
		Mainly criminal 3%
		Mixed criminal and civil 21%
		Mainly civil 64%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 9%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 76%
		Fourth District 8%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 6%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ROBERT L. EASTAUGH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	1%	10	3%	35	9%	119	31%	214	56%	4.4
Writing clarity and precision.....	3	1%	7	2%	36	10%	108	31%	192	55%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	5	1%	13	3%	42	11%	127	34%	185	50%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	7	2%	13	4%	43	12%	112	32%	172	50%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	5	1%	34	9%	81	22%	253	67%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	1%	8	2%	32	9%	102	30%	197	57%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	3	1%	9	2%	42	11%	104	27%	221	58%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	5	1%	17	5%	48	14%	105	31%	169	49%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Preparation for appeals and attentiveness to oral argument.....	14	1%	4	1%	33	10%	98	28%	207	60%	4.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	1%	11	3%	38	10%	116	30%	217	56%	4.4

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 387 Alaska Bar members evaluated Justice Eastaugh based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 32% had a substantial amount of experience, 33% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.4). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.5), while the lowest scored items were sense of basic fairness and justice (4.2) and human understanding and compassion (4.2).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPREME COURT JUSTICE ROBERT L. EASTAUGH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	13%	42%	42%	24	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	4%	18%	24%	54%	72	4.3
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	1%	7%	13%	34%	43%	67	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	3%	0%	5%	26%	66%	102	4.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	8%	33%	59%	39	4.5
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	2%	6%	29%	62%	66	4.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	13%	13%	38%	38%	8	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	10%	38%	48%	21	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	31%	50%	26	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	11%	15%	22%	52%	27	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	0%	9%	36%	53%	58	4.4
16-20 YEARS.....	3%	3%	7%	34%	53%	99	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	1%	3%	10%	25%	62%	156	4.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	8%	42%	42%	24	4.2
MALE.....	2%	2%	11%	29%	56%	287	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	7%	29%	62%	76	4.5
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	13%	35%	48%	23	4.3
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	12	4.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	18%	36%	45%	11	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	4%	5%	14%	33%	45%	80	4.1
CIVIL.....	1%	2%	7%	28%	62%	251	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	10	4.4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	14%	36%	45%	22	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	6%	15%	21%	59%	34	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	2%	9%	30%	58%	293	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	16%	42%	39%	31	4.2
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	8%	31%	58%	26	4.4
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	3%	10%	25%	58%	125	4.3
MODERATE.....	1%	3%	9%	32%	55%	127	4.4
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	11%	33%	54%	109	4.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	5%	26%	63%	19	4.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	3%	10%	30%	56%	387	4.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	1%	2%	13%	38%	47%	128	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	11%	11%	11%	67%	9	4.3

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 11%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 18%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 12%
		Government 24%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 11%
		6-10 years 14%
		11-15 years 19%
		16-20 years 26%
		20+ years 26%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 67%
		Female 27%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 6%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 32%
		Mainly civil 45%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 7%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 55%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 36%
		Fourth District 1%
		Not in Alaska %
		No Answer 7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	0	0%	4	3%	6	4%	55	39%	77	54%	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law	0	0%	3	2%	5	4%	61	45%	66	49%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	0	0%	2	2%	6	5%	53	40%	72	54%	4.5
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	1%	3	2%	8	6%	32	23%	98	69%	4.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	1%	3	2%	8	6%	30	22%	95	69%	4.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	0	0%	2	1%	6	4%	21	15%	112	79%	4.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	1	1%	1	1%	9	7%	27	21%	88	70%	4.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	2	1%	3	2%	27	19%	110	77%	4.7
Human understanding and compassion	0	0%	3	2%	6	4%	33	24%	95	69%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	3	2%	6	5%	39	32%	73	60%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	0	0%	1	1%	6	5%	47	39%	68	56%	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	0	0%	1	1%	4	3%	41	31%	87	65%	4.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	15	16%	72	78%	4.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	3	4%	8	10%	15	19%	55	68%	4.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	0	0%	1	1%	5	7%	16	23%	48	69%	4.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	1%	7	5%	38	26%	99	68%	4.6

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 145 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Collins based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 39% had a substantial amount of experience, 31% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.6). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.7), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.7), and settlement skills (4.7). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (4.4) and knowledge of substantive law (4.4).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	10%	90%	10	4.9
SOLO.....	0%	0%	11%	14%	74%	35	4.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	0%	35%	59%	17	4.5
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	0%	32%	68%	25	4.7
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	18	4.7
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	9%	32%	59%	34	4.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	14%	86%	7	4.9
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	7%	7%	20%	67%	15	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	5%	24%	71%	21	4.7
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	8%	27%	65%	26	4.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	38	4.7
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	8%	29%	63%	38	4.6
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	11%	89%	9	4.9
MALE.....	0%	1%	5%	25%	69%	100	4.6
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	6%	33%	61%	36	4.6
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	10%	90%	10	4.9
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	9	4.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	9%	45%	45%	11	4.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	0%	4%	23%	72%	47	4.7
CIVIL.....	0%	2%	3%	28%	67%	64	4.6
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	10%	90%	10	4.9
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	3%	26%	72%	78	4.7
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	9%	32%	57%	53	4.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	0%	29%	64%	14	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	2%	16%	82%	56	4.8
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	7%	18%	76%	45	4.7
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	10%	57%	33%	30	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	0%	60%	5	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	1%	5%	26%	68%	145	4.6
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	0%	9%	32%	56%	34	4.4
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	8	4.5

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	39%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	50%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	5%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	45%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	18%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	84%
		Female.....	16%
		No Answer.....	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	76%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	13%
		Fourth District.....	8%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	21%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	66%
		31,000 or over.....	13%
		No Answer.....	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	12	32%	21	55%	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%	11	33%	17	52%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	11	30%	24	65%	4.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%	9	26%	20	59%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	6	16%	27	73%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	7	21%	23	70%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%	8	24%	20	61%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	14%	9	26%	21	60%	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	8	24%	22	67%	4.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	5	19%	10	37%	12	44%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	6	18%	11	32%	17	50%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	11%	10	37%	14	52%	4.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	11	31%	21	60%	4.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 35 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Collins from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 54% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 23% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range with the highest score going to the items involving: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.6), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.6), human understanding and compassion (4.6), and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.6). The lowest scored items were: settlement skills (4.3) and consideration of all relevant factors during sentencing (4.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	7%	20%	73%	15	4.7
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	39%	50%	18	4.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	12%	29%	59%	17	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%	6	4.8
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%	6	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	10%	30%	60%	30	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	40%	60%	5	4.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	4%	39%	57%	28	4.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	29%	14%	57%	7	4.3
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	4%	38%	58%	24	4.5
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	21%	79%	19	4.8
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	9%	31%	60%	35	4.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	17%	0%	17%	50%	17%	6	3.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	38%
		Guardian Ad Litem	38%
		CASA Volunteer	13%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	50%
		6-10 years	38%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	38%
		Female	63%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	88%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	13%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	88%
		31,000 or over	13%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	6	75%	4.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	4.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	4.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	5.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 8 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Collins from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 63% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 13% had a moderate amount, and 13% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PATRICIA COLLINS

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7	5.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	7	5.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	8	5.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.7
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 27%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 13%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 16%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 13%
		Government 22%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 9%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 26%
		20+ years 33%
		No Answer 6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 71%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 3%
		Mainly criminal 6%
		Mixed criminal and civil 30%
		Mainly civil 50%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 7%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 53%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 37%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 6%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	9	7%	19	14%	37	27%	48	36%	22	16%	3.4
Knowledge of substantive law	8	6%	19	15%	35	28%	45	35%	20	16%	3.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	8	7%	18	15%	35	28%	46	37%	16	13%	3.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	11	8%	16	12%	32	24%	36	27%	36	27%	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice	12	10%	13	10%	31	25%	35	28%	34	27%	3.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	7	5%	10	8%	32	25%	31	24%	50	38%	3.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	5	4%	14	12%	21	18%	37	32%	37	32%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	16	12%	24	18%	28	21%	30	23%	35	26%	3.3
Human understanding and compassion	13	10%	21	16%	27	21%	34	27%	33	26%	3.4
Ability to control courtroom	7	6%	11	9%	26	21%	41	33%	38	31%	3.7
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	4	3%	8	7%	29	24%	43	36%	35	29%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	7	6%	8	7%	35	30%	38	32%	30	25%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	5	11%	4	9%	12	26%	12	26%	13	28%	3.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	5	6%	10	13%	23	29%	21	27%	19	24%	3.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	5	8%	8	13%	19	30%	16	25%	15	24%	3.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	11	8%	18	13%	32	23%	49	36%	28	20%	3.5

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 138 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Froehlich based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 28% had a substantial amount of experience, 33% had a moderate amount, and 31% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.8), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.8), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8). The lowest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	25%	38%	25%	8	3.8
SOLO.....	6%	19%	19%	19%	36%	36	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	6%	6%	28%	50%	11%	18	3.6
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	5%	0%	41%	50%	5%	22	3.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	17%	17%	11%	28%	28%	18	3.3
GOVERNMENT.....	3%	20%	23%	47%	7%	30	3.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	1.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	25%	25%	38%	8	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	7%	14%	36%	43%	0%	14	3.1
6-10 YEARS.....	8%	17%	17%	33%	25%	12	3.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	14%	27%	50%	9%	22	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	19%	19%	14%	31%	17%	36	3.1
21+ YEARS.....	4%	7%	26%	33%	30%	46	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	11%	11%	22%	33%	22%	9	3.4
MALE.....	8%	14%	25%	31%	22%	97	3.4
FEMALE.....	6%	9%	19%	50%	16%	32	3.6
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	10	3.6
PROSECUTION.....	25%	25%	25%	25%	0%	4	2.5
CRIMINAL.....	0%	22%	33%	22%	22%	9	3.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	10%	22%	20%	22%	27%	41	3.3
CIVIL.....	9%	4%	26%	43%	19%	70	3.6
OTHER.....	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%	4	3.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	22%	11%	44%	22%	9	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	7%	14%	28%	35%	17%	72	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	12%	12%	22%	31%	24%	51	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	17%	17%	17%	25%	25%	12	3.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	18%	21%	24%	24%	13%	38	2.9
MODERATE.....	4%	11%	27%	36%	22%	45	3.6
LIMITED.....	0%	7%	21%	49%	23%	43	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	23%	15%	46%	8%	13	3.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	8%	13%	23%	36%	20%	138	3.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	8%	36%	44%	12%	25	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	25%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	56%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	6%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	11%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	17%
		6-10 years.....	19%
		11-15 years.....	28%
		16-20 years.....	19%
		20+ years.....	6%
		No Answer.....	11%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	6%
		No Answer.....	11%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	64%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	14%
		Fourth District.....	6%
		Outside Alaska.....	%
		No Answer.....	14%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	3%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	39%
		31,000 or over.....	47%
		No Answer.....	11%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	1	3%	6	17%	8	23%	11	31%	9	26%	3.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	3%	6	18%	9	26%	11	32%	7	21%	3.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	3	9%	9	26%	12	35%	10	29%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	3%	1	3%	9	26%	11	32%	12	35%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	6%	6	17%	8	23%	10	29%	9	26%	3.5
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	3%	2	6%	12	35%	10	29%	9	26%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom.....	2	6%	2	6%	6	18%	7	21%	17	50%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	2	6%	10	29%	10	29%	13	37%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	3%	1	3%	9	28%	9	28%	12	38%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	3	12%	8	32%	9	36%	5	20%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	4	12%	12	36%	6	18%	10	30%	3.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	4%	0	0%	7	27%	13	50%	5	19%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	3%	5	15%	8	24%	13	38%	7	21%	3.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 34 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Froehlich from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 41% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 32% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.6). The highest scored items were: ability to control courtroom (4.0) and reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0). The items regarding sense of basic fairness and justice (3.5) and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.5) received the lowest mean scores.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	33%	44%	22%	9	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	6%	22%	17%	33%	22%	18	3.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	33%	17%	33%	17%	6	3.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	11%	22%	11%	33%	22%	9	3.3
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	43%	43%	14%	7	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
MALE.....	4%	14%	25%	36%	21%	28	3.6
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	5	3.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	5%	18%	18%	41%	18%	22	3.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	8%	46%	15%	31%	13	3.7
OVER 30,000.....	6%	19%	6%	50%	19%	16	3.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	21%	7%	50%	14%	14	3.4
MODERATE.....	0%	18%	27%	27%	27%	11	3.6
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	15%	24%	38%	21%	34	3.6
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	40%	0%	20%	20%	20%	5	2.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	38%
		Guardian Ad Litem	38%
		CASA Volunteer	13%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	13%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	50%
		6-10 years	38%
		11-15 years	13%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	38%
		Female	63%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	88%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	13%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	88%
		31,000 or over	13%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
Human understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	6	75%	4.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	5	83%	4.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	4.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	100%	5.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 6 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Froehlich from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 4 had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 1 had a moderate amount, and 1 had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER FROEHLICH

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	2	2.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	4	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
FEMALE.....	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%	5	3.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%	5	3.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%	5	3.6
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
MODERATE.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
LIMITED.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	33%	0%	17%	50%	6	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 21%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 17%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 10%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 19%
		Government 18%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 3%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 8%
		6-10 years 11%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 23%
		20+ years 33%
		No Answer 6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 64%
		Female 28%
		No Answer 7%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 8%
		Mainly criminal 7%
		Mixed criminal and civil 33%
		Mainly civil 42%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 7%
		Second District 6%
		Third District 62%
		Fourth District 18%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	0	0%	7	4%	27	16%	72	42%	65	38%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law	0	0%	7	4%	29	18%	68	41%	60	37%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	0	0%	6	4%	24	16%	66	44%	55	36%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	3	2%	9	5%	20	12%	54	32%	85	50%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	3	2%	8	5%	22	13%	47	28%	85	52%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	6	3%	16	9%	50	29%	100	58%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	2%	8	5%	26	16%	45	28%	76	48%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	4	2%	20	11%	46	26%	104	60%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion	0	0%	4	2%	19	11%	48	29%	96	57%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	6	4%	31	22%	47	33%	57	40%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	12	8%	37	24%	54	34%	54	34%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	7	5%	23	15%	48	32%	71	48%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	5	6%	17	21%	30	37%	30	37%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	4	4%	17	17%	39	40%	38	39%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	3	3%	18	16%	43	38%	48	43%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	1%	7	4%	21	12%	67	39%	78	45%	4.2

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 174 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Jeffery based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 29% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. Mean score on all of the items were in the "excellent" range. The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.4), and human understanding and compassion (4.4). The lowest scored items were: reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.0), and settlement skills (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	33%	42%	12	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	0%	6%	44%	50%	36	4.4
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	14%	21%	28%	34%	29	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	18%	47%	29%	17	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	9%	32%	59%	34	4.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	6%	9%	47%	38%	32	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	27%	27%	45%	11	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	47%	53%	15	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	5%	5%	47%	42%	19	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	3%	14%	41%	41%	29	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	7%	20%	32%	41%	41	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	2%	3%	8%	39%	47%	59	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	23%	23%	46%	13	4.1
MALE.....	1%	3%	13%	41%	42%	112	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	6%	6%	37%	51%	49	4.3
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	27%	27%	45%	11	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	7%	64%	29%	14	4.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	8%	8%	31%	54%	13	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	7%	7%	33%	52%	60	4.3
CIVIL.....	0%	3%	17%	40%	40%	70	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	12	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	9%	9%	55%	27%	11	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	9%	0%	27%	64%	11	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	4%	13%	37%	45%	107	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	10%	48%	39%	31	4.2
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	8%	54%	38%	13	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	6%	8%	30%	56%	50	4.4
MODERATE.....	2%	2%	13%	38%	45%	47	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	16%	42%	38%	64	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	20%	60%	5	4.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	4%	12%	39%	45%	174	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	14%	38%	48%	29	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	24%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	57%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	5%
		Other.....	10%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	14%
		6-10 years.....	33%
		11-15 years.....	10%
		16-20 years.....	29%
		20+ years.....	10%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	95%
		Female.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	43%
		Third District.....	29%
		Fourth District.....	24%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	19%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	48%
		31,000 or over.....	29%
		No Answer.....	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	3	14%	1	5%	5	24%	9	43%	3	14%	3.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice	1	5%	3	15%	5	25%	8	40%	3	15%	3.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	5%	2	10%	6	29%	8	38%	4	19%	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	3	16%	4	21%	6	32%	4	21%	2	11%	2.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	5%	2	10%	4	19%	7	33%	7	33%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	10%	1	5%	4	19%	9	43%	5	24%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	1	5%	1	5%	6	29%	7	33%	6	29%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	5%	2	10%	8	38%	7	33%	3	14%	3.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	5%	1	5%	5	25%	8	40%	5	25%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	6%	1	6%	7	44%	6	38%	1	6%	3.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	19%	1	5%	6	29%	7	33%	3	14%	3.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	5%	1	5%	6	30%	7	35%	5	25%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	1	5%	3	16%	4	21%	8	42%	3	16%	3.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 19 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Jeffery from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 42% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 32% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest mean scores were: courtesy and freedom from arrogance (3.8), ability to control courtroom (3.8), and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (3.8). The item regarding consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing scored lowest (3.2).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
MUNI/BOROUGH							
OFFICER.....	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	12	3.7
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OTHER.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
1-5 YEARS.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	7	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	6	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
MALE.....	6%	11%	22%	44%	17%	18	3.6
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	11%	67%	22%	9	4.1
THIRD DISTRICT.....	20%	0%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	4	2.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
2,000-30,000.....	0%	22%	0%	44%	33%	9	3.9
OVER 30,000.....	20%	0%	60%	20%	0%	5	2.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	13%	13%	25%	25%	25%	8	3.4
MODERATE.....	0%	33%	17%	33%	17%	6	3.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	5	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL							
EXPERIENCE.....	5%	16%	21%	42%	16%	19	3.5
PROFESSIONAL							
REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	20%
		Guardian Ad Litem	40%
		CASA Volunteer	40%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	40%
		6-10 years	40%
		11-15 years	20%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	40%
		Female	60%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	20%
		Third District	60%
		Fourth District	20%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	20%
		31,000 or over	80%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL L. JEFFERY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	4.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	4.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	3	75%	4.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	3.7
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	5.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	2	40%	2	40%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	4.5
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	3	60%	4.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	4	80%	4.6

OVERVIEW: In all, 5 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Jeffery from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 4 had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, and 1 had a limited amount. Mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.6). The highest scored items were: courtesy, freedom from arrogance (5.0), and human understanding and compassion (5.0). The lowest scored item concerned reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL I. JEFFERY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	3.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	3.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.6
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 28%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 16%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 10%
		Government 16%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 6%
		6-10 years 10%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 27%
		20+ years 36%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 75%
		Female 20%
		No Answer 5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 6%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 28%
		Mainly civil 55%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 4%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 86%
		Fourth District 5%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	1%	22	6%	82	21%	159	41%	122	31%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law	3	1%	14	4%	76	21%	160	43%	117	32%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	1%	12	3%	69	19%	154	42%	126	35%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	9	2%	34	9%	70	18%	140	36%	134	35%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice	8	2%	23	6%	68	18%	129	35%	145	39%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	5	1%	16	4%	59	15%	135	35%	169	44%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	7	2%	16	4%	66	18%	134	37%	139	38%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	6	2%	25	6%	55	14%	136	35%	164	42%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion	5	1%	20	5%	67	18%	128	34%	155	41%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	6	2%	14	4%	72	20%	133	37%	133	37%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	8	2%	22	6%	91	25%	137	38%	103	29%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	7	2%	17	5%	68	19%	141	40%	122	34%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	4	2%	16	8%	44	23%	76	39%	53	27%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	2%	14	6%	45	21%	74	34%	79	37%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	5	2%	9	4%	44	21%	79	38%	73	35%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	5	1%	24	6%	74	19%	150	39%	133	34%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 386 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Cutler based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience, 28% had a moderate amount, and 31% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2). The lowest scored items were: reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8), and settlement skills (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	16%	53%	21%	19	3.8
SOLO.....	1%	6%	22%	38%	33%	109	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	8%	18%	33%	37%	87	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	3%	15%	48%	32%	60	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	13%	38%	50%	8	4.4
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	16%	35%	49%	37	4.3
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	10%	23%	42%	25%	60	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	27%	60%	13%	15	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	4%	20%	36%	40%	25	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	3%	8%	14%	50%	25%	36	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	7%	23%	39%	29%	69	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	8%	17%	32%	41%	102	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	1%	5%	19%	39%	36%	139	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	32%	47%	21%	19	3.9
MALE.....	1%	8%	17%	40%	34%	290	4.0
FEMALE.....	3%	1%	25%	32%	39%	77	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	57%	21%	14	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	8%	29%	42%	21%	24	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	5%	5%	30%	20%	40%	20	3.9
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	10%	16%	38%	35%	109	3.9
CIVIL.....	1%	4%	18%	41%	36%	211	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	13%	25%	13%	50%	8	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	57%	21%	14	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	21%	43%	36%	14	4.1
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	7%	17%	38%	35%	333	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	47%	35%	18%	17	3.7
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	24%	35%	41%	37	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	11%	18%	28%	40%	120	3.9
MODERATE.....	0%	7%	18%	43%	32%	110	4.0
LIMITED.....	1%	3%	20%	47%	29%	119	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	10%	0%	60%	30%	10	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	6%	19%	39%	34%	386	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	5%	18%	41%	36%	96	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	54%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	31%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	10%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	13%
		6-10 years.....	18%
		11-15 years.....	13%
		16-20 years.....	37%
		20+ years.....	15%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	79%
		Female.....	16%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District.....	2%
		Third District.....	85%
		Fourth District.....	6%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	3%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	36%
		31,000 or over.....	56%
		No Answer.....	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	9	11%	13	15%	24	28%	18	21%	21	25%	3.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	7	8%	14	17%	26	31%	18	22%	18	22%	3.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	3	4%	10	12%	26	31%	17	20%	27	33%	3.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	5%	11	13%	26	32%	19	23%	22	27%	3.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	6	7%	29	35%	23	28%	24	29%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	3%	3	4%	28	35%	19	24%	27	34%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom.....	3	4%	9	11%	32	41%	16	20%	19	24%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	8	10%	33	41%	20	25%	18	23%	3.6
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	1%	2	3%	28	41%	23	33%	15	22%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	3%	8	13%	25	40%	12	19%	15	24%	3.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	7	9%	14	19%	19	25%	16	21%	19	25%	3.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	10	19%	20	38%	11	21%	11	21%	3.4
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	5	6%	15	18%	24	29%	20	24%	20	24%	3.4

OVERVIEW: In all, 84 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Cutler from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 36% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 29% had a moderate amount, and 30% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "acceptable" range (3.4). The highest scored items were: courtesy and freedom from arrogance (3.8), and human understanding and compassion (3.8). The items scored lowest were: equal treatment of all parties (3.3), sense of basic fairness and justice (3.3) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.3).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
STATE OFFICER.....	7%	22%	28%	22%	22%	46	3.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	8%	15%	31%	23%	23%	26	3.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	8	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
1-5 YEARS.....	9%	27%	18%	27%	18%	11	3.2
6-10 YEARS.....	7%	29%	29%	14%	21%	14	3.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	55%	36%	9%	11	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	6%	13%	26%	26%	29%	31	3.6
21+ YEARS.....	8%	23%	23%	8%	38%	13	3.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
MALE.....	8%	18%	29%	24%	21%	66	3.3
FEMALE.....	0%	14%	29%	14%	43%	14	3.9
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	7%	18%	28%	21%	25%	71	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	5	3.2
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	13%	17%	30%	23%	17%	30	3.1
OVER 30,000.....	2%	19%	30%	17%	32%	47	3.6
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	17%	17%	50%	6	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	10%	20%	27%	17%	27%	30	3.3
MODERATE.....	9%	22%	30%	17%	22%	23	3.2
LIMITED.....	0%	12%	32%	40%	16%	25	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	20%	40%	0%	20%	20%	5	2.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	6%	18%	29%	24%	24%	84	3.4
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	20%	20%	40%	13%	15	3.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	33%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	67%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	67%
		6-10 years	33%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	33%
		Female	67%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	17%
		31,000 or over	83%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	67%	2	33%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	3	50%	4.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	3	60%	1	20%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	2	40%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	0	0%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 5 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Cutler from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 4 had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, and 1 had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range. The highest score came on the sense of basic fairness and justice item (4.5). The lowest scored items were: makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.8), reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.8), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BEVERLY W. CUTLER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	5	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	5	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 24%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 8%
		Government 15%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 11%
		6-10 years 12%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 25%
		20+ years 29%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 71%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 4%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 21%
		Mainly civil 63%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 3%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 88%
		Fourth District 3%
		Not in Alaska 0%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

	<u>Unacceptable</u>		<u>Deficient</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Good</u>		<u>Excellent</u>		<u>Mean</u>
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	14	3%	53	10%	133	25%	205	39%	118	23%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	11	2%	45	9%	130	26%	204	40%	116	23%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	11	2%	37	8%	126	26%	201	41%	118	24%	3.8
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	28	5%	66	13%	106	20%	169	32%	152	29%	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice	29	6%	48	10%	100	20%	157	31%	171	34%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	13	3%	37	7%	104	20%	149	29%	213	41%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	12	3%	28	6%	95	20%	143	30%	200	42%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	33	6%	66	13%	98	19%	140	27%	186	36%	3.7
Human understanding and compassion	19	4%	46	9%	114	22%	143	28%	187	37%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom	9	2%	31	6%	101	21%	174	36%	169	35%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	85	17%	101	21%	115	23%	109	22%	82	17%	3.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	52	11%	59	12%	129	27%	132	28%	104	22%	3.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	15	5%	27	8%	90	27%	109	33%	89	27%	3.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	7	4%	11	6%	53	27%	64	33%	58	30%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	11	4%	25	8%	59	20%	84	28%	123	41%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	26	5%	65	12%	124	24%	167	32%	140	27%	3.6

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 522 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Reese based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 43% had a substantial amount of experience, 28% had a moderate amount, and 18% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.6). The highest mean scores came for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.0), and ability to control courtroom (4.0). The lowest scored item was reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	14%	11%	36%	36%	28	3.9
SOLO.....	5%	13%	26%	27%	29%	118	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	5%	10%	27%	32%	26%	115	3.6
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	6%	18%	25%	31%	20%	125	3.4
CORPORATE.....	0%	14%	29%	43%	14%	7	3.6
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	5%	18%	43%	35%	40	4.1
GOVERNMENT.....	8%	9%	24%	33%	27%	79	3.6
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	25%	0%	50%	25%	4	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	17%	0%	17%	67%	6	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	15%	12%	31%	35%	26	3.7
1-5 YEARS.....	4%	7%	14%	42%	33%	57	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	5%	11%	20%	35%	30%	66	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	11%	27%	35%	22%	95	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	5%	16%	25%	27%	27%	131	3.6
21+ YEARS.....	5%	13%	28%	29%	24%	147	3.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	10%	17%	13%	33%	27%	30	3.5
MALE.....	6%	13%	24%	30%	28%	369	3.6
FEMALE.....	2%	11%	25%	38%	24%	123	3.7
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	16%	12%	32%	36%	25	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	9%	0%	27%	23%	41%	22	3.9
CRIMINAL.....	4%	16%	16%	20%	44%	25	3.8
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	7%	26%	40%	24%	107	3.8
CIVIL.....	6%	15%	24%	31%	24%	331	3.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	12	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	17%	13%	33%	33%	24	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	7%	14%	57%	21%	14	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
THIRD DISTRICT.....	5%	13%	25%	30%	27%	463	3.6
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	7%	29%	64%	0%	14	3.6
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	16%	22%	33%	26%	58	3.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	8%	17%	17%	27%	32%	222	3.6
MODERATE.....	2%	10%	32%	31%	25%	147	3.7
LIMITED.....	4%	4%	28%	44%	19%	95	3.7
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	17%	30%	30%	22%	23	3.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	5%	12%	24%	32%	27%	522	3.6
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	2%	9%	18%	38%	33%	66	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	21%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	58%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	3%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	8%
		Other.....	8%
		No Answer.....	3%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	13%
		6-10 years.....	11%
		11-15 years.....	21%
		16-20 years.....	29%
		20+ years.....	21%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	82%
		Female.....	16%
		No Answer.....	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	97%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	3%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	3%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	16%
		31,000 or over.....	76%
		No Answer.....	5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	3	8%	1	3%	9	24%	13	34%	12	32%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	3%	4	13%	6	19%	10	31%	11	34%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	3%	1	3%	8	23%	5	14%	20	57%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	1	3%	1	3%	8	23%	9	26%	16	46%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	6%	4	11%	6	17%	10	28%	14	39%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	8%	2	5%	6	16%	12	32%	14	38%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	3%	2	6%	8	22%	8	22%	17	47%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	6%	3	8%	9	25%	7	19%	15	42%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	3	10%	1	3%	7	23%	7	23%	12	40%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	3	11%	2	7%	6	21%	8	29%	9	32%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	6%	2	6%	6	19%	8	25%	14	44%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	7%	2	7%	5	19%	8	30%	10	37%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	5%	2	5%	8	22%	11	30%	14	38%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 37 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Reese from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 24% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 22% had a moderate amount, and 46% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9), with the highest score going to the conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2) item. The item regarding settlement skills scored lowest (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
STATE OFFICER.....	13%	0%	13%	38%	38%	8	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	5%	10%	24%	29%	33%	21	3.8
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	20%	0%	80%	5	4.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	18%	18%	36%	27%	11	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	29%	0%	14%	29%	29%	7	3.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
MALE.....	7%	7%	20%	33%	33%	30	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%	6	4.5
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	6%	6%	19%	31%	39%	36	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
2,000-30,000.....	17%	0%	33%	17%	33%	6	3.5
OVER 30,000.....	4%	7%	14%	36%	39%	28	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	3	3.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	11%	44%	44%	9	4.3
MODERATE.....	13%	0%	25%	25%	38%	8	3.8
LIMITED.....	6%	6%	24%	24%	41%	17	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	5%	5%	22%	30%	38%	37	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	15%	31%	23%	23%	8%	13	2.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	31%
		Guardian Ad Litem	31%
		CASA Volunteer	31%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	8%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	38%
		6-10 years	31%
		11-15 years	8%
		16-20 years	15%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	8%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	15%
		Female	77%
		No Answer	8%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	92%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	8%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	8%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	85%
		31,000 or over	8%
		No Answer	%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%	3	23%	5	38%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	4	31%	5	38%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%	9	82%	4.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%	8	67%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	8%	1	8%	2	15%	4	31%	5	38%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	15%	1	8%	2	15%	1	8%	7	54%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	4	33%	6	50%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	23%	1	8%	2	15%	1	8%	6	46%	3.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	8%	3	25%	1	8%	7	58%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	5	63%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	4	80%	4.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%	3	25%	5	42%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	2	15%	3	23%	2	15%	6	46%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 13 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Reese from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 16% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 46% had a moderate amount, and 38% had a limited amount. Mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest scored item was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.8). The item for reasonable promptness in making decisions scored lowest (3.5).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE JOHN REESE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	10%	20%	20%	50%	10	4.1
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	8%	25%	17%	50%	12	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	9%	27%	9%	55%	11	4.1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.5
MODERATE.....	0%	17%	17%	0%	67%	6	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	15%	23%	15%	46%	13	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 14%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 11%
		Government 18%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 1%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 14%
		6-10 years 16%
		11-15 years 16%
		16-20 years 19%
		20+ years 29%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 71%
		Female 23%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 11%
		Mainly criminal 11%
		Mixed criminal and civil 29%
		Mainly civil 42%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 2%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 91%
		Fourth District 1%
		Not in Alaska 0%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	1%	21	8%	90	33%	105	38%	54	20%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	3	1%	18	7%	90	34%	103	39%	53	20%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	3	1%	18	7%	80	30%	110	42%	53	20%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	5	2%	9	3%	67	24%	101	37%	92	34%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	5	2%	9	3%	64	24%	95	35%	96	36%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	5	2%	5	2%	40	15%	103	39%	114	43%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	4	2%	9	4%	53	21%	102	41%	83	33%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	4	1%	8	3%	45	16%	96	35%	120	44%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	4	1%	12	4%	48	18%	103	38%	101	38%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	3	1%	14	5%	72	28%	104	40%	66	25%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	4	2%	9	4%	65	26%	105	42%	65	26%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	5	2%	9	4%	57	22%	110	43%	73	29%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	3	3%	6	5%	28	25%	46	41%	28	25%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	5	3%	8	5%	45	26%	71	42%	42	25%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	4	4%	6	5%	26	24%	45	41%	29	26%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	4	1%	12	4%	67	24%	122	45%	69	25%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 274 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Lohff based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 43% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 20% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean scores were for: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), and courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.2). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.7), knowledge of substantive law (3.7), and knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	21%	37%	37%	19	4.1
SOLO.....	0%	1%	19%	46%	33%	67	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	5%	22%	48%	22%	60	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	3%	5%	16%	50%	26%	38	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	7%	20%	57%	17%	30	3.8
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	4%	45%	27%	22%	51	3.6
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	38%	38%	13	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	10%	25%	38%	25%	40	3.7
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	2%	32%	43%	23%	44	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	2%	29%	49%	20%	45	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	6%	21%	38%	33%	52	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	3%	4%	20%	51%	23%	80	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	19%	50%	31%	16	4.1
MALE.....	2%	4%	23%	47%	25%	195	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	8%	32%	35%	25%	63	3.8
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	47%	33%	15	4.1
PROSECUTION.....	3%	0%	37%	37%	23%	30	3.8
CRIMINAL.....	0%	14%	31%	31%	24%	29	3.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	1%	6%	26%	45%	21%	80	3.8
CIVIL.....	1%	3%	19%	52%	25%	114	4.0
OTHER.....	17%	0%	17%	0%	67%	6	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	43%	36%	14	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	20%	0%	60%	20%	5	3.8
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	4%	25%	44%	25%	249	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	3%	34%	45%	17%	29	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	4%	21%	37%	36%	118	4.0
MODERATE.....	1%	4%	22%	47%	25%	72	3.9
LIMITED.....	2%	5%	29%	56%	7%	55	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	5	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	4%	24%	45%	25%	274	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	38%	23%	38%	13	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	24%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	63%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	7%
		Other.....	5%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	32%
		6-10 years.....	5%
		11-15 years.....	29%
		16-20 years.....	24%
		20+ years.....	7%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	90%
		Female.....	10%
		No Answer.....	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	100%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	2%
		31,000 or over.....	95%
		No Answer.....	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	19	48%	14	35%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	15%	20	49%	15	37%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	20	50%	15	38%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	20	51%	12	31%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	17	41%	20	49%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	23	56%	14	34%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	20	50%	13	33%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	3%	5	13%	21	55%	11	29%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%	17	50%	12	35%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	21%	11	38%	12	41%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	14%	17	49%	13	37%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	14%	10	48%	8	38%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	12%	23	56%	13	32%	4.2

OVERVIEW: In all, 41 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Lohff from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 49% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 15% had a moderate amount, and 29% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range with the highest score going to the item involving courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.4). The items scored lowest were: makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (4.1), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	10%	80%	10%	10	4.0
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	15%	46%	38%	26	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC							
SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	69%	31%	13	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	58%	25%	12	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%	10	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	11%	57%	32%	37	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	12%	56%	32%	41	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	13%	59%	28%	39	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%	20	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	12	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	12%	56%	32%	41	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	4	2.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	100%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	100%
		6-10 years	0%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	0%
		31,000 or over	100%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteer evaluated Judge Lohff from their direct professional experience. This respondent had a substantial amount of experience with the judge. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JOHN R. LOHFF

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 27%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 12%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 10%
		Government 17%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 0%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 14%
		6-10 years 15%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 21%
		20+ years 28%
		No Answer 6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 69%
		Female 24%
		No Answer 7%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 11%
		Mainly criminal 9%
		Mixed criminal and civil 27%
		Mainly civil 45%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 0%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 92%
		Fourth District 0%
		Not in Alaska 0%
		No Answer 6%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	2	1%	11	5%	81	35%	93	41%	42	18%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	2	1%	14	6%	69	31%	95	43%	43	19%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	2	1%	12	5%	69	31%	97	43%	43	19%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	1	0%	16	7%	55	24%	88	39%	67	30%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice	2	1%	14	6%	57	26%	81	36%	69	31%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	1	0%	7	3%	60	27%	75	33%	81	36%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	1%	6	3%	63	31%	70	34%	65	32%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	2	1%	9	4%	66	29%	68	30%	80	36%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion	2	1%	11	5%	66	30%	73	33%	70	32%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom	1	0%	3	1%	61	29%	75	35%	74	35%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	2	1%	7	3%	60	28%	85	40%	58	27%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	2	1%	8	4%	62	30%	75	37%	58	28%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	1%	4	4%	30	32%	35	37%	25	26%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	2	2%	5	4%	46	35%	39	30%	38	29%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	1%	3	4%	28	35%	25	31%	24	30%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	2	1%	13	6%	65	28%	92	40%	57	25%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 229 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Motyka based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 41% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean scores were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.0), and ability to control courtroom (4.0). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.7), knowledge of substantive law (3.7), and knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	25%	44%	25%	16	3.9
SOLO.....	0%	6%	18%	47%	29%	62	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	9%	39%	32%	18%	56	3.6
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	4%	0%	11%	59%	26%	27	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	9%	52%	13%	26%	23	3.6
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	29%	42%	26%	38	3.9
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	17%	42%	33%	12	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	3%	31%	50%	16%	32	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	3%	21%	41%	35%	34	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	5%	34%	39%	22%	41	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	4%	4%	21%	45%	26%	47	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	0%	10%	35%	32%	24%	63	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	20%	47%	27%	15	3.9
MALE.....	1%	7%	25%	45%	23%	159	3.8
FEMALE.....	2%	2%	42%	25%	29%	55	3.8
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	15%	46%	31%	13	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	4%	19%	46%	31%	26	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	11%	58%	16%	16%	19	3.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	3%	8%	36%	33%	20%	64	3.6
CIVIL.....	0%	4%	22%	47%	27%	103	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	15%	46%	31%	13	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	6%	28%	40%	25%	211	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	35%	50%	15%	20	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	6%	26%	34%	32%	94	3.9
MODERATE.....	0%	6%	23%	47%	24%	62	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	6%	38%	40%	17%	53	3.7
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	14%	14%	29%	43%	7	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	6%	28%	40%	25%	229	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	10%	10%	24%	43%	14%	21	3.4
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	21%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	65%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	5%
		Other.....	9%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	19%
		6-10 years.....	9%
		11-15 years.....	30%
		16-20 years.....	30%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	86%
		Female.....	14%
		No Answer.....	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	100%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	7%
		31,000 or over.....	91%
		No Answer.....	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	2	5%	6	14%	14	33%	20	48%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	2%	6	15%	15	37%	19	46%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	19%	12	29%	22	52%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	18%	12	30%	20	50%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	21%	11	26%	22	52%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	17%	16	38%	18	43%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	2	5%	2	5%	16	39%	21	51%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	3%	4	11%	16	42%	17	45%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	16%	10	31%	17	53%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	21%	9	27%	16	48%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	0	0%	5	14%	12	32%	19	51%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	3	14%	5	24%	13	62%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	17%	12	29%	21	51%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 41 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Motyka from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 54% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 15% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range. The highest scored item concerned talent and ability for cases involving children and families (4.5). The lowest scored items were: equal treatment of all parties (4.2), human understanding and compassion (4.2), and settlement skills (4.2).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	4%	22%	30%	44%	27	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	7	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	31%	23%	46%	13	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	8%	8%	17%	67%	12	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	3%	19%	30%	49%	37	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	17%	29%	51%	41	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
OVER 30,000.....	0%	3%	18%	29%	50%	38	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	22	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	11%	11%	33%	44%	9	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	20%	20%	20%	0%	40%	5	3.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	17%	29%	51%	41	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	14%	0%	29%	57%	0%	7	3.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

- 1. Type of Work: Social Worker 0%
Guardian Ad Litem 0%
CASA Volunteer 100%
Other 0%
No Answer 0%

- 2. Length of Duty: 1-5 years 100%
6-10 years 0%
11-15 years 0%
16-20 years 0%
20+ years 0%
No Answer 0%

- 3. Gender: Male 0%
Female 100%
No Answer 0%

- 4. Location of Work: First District 0%
Second District 0%
Third District 100%
Fourth District 0%
Outside Alaska 0%
No Answer 0%

- 5. Community Population: Under 2,000 0%
Between 2,000 and 30,000 0%
31,000 or over 100%
No Answer 0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	3.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteer evaluated Judge Motyka from their direct professional experience. This respondent had a substantial amount of experience with the judge. All of the mean scores were in the "excellent" range, with the exception of the courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.0) item.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GREGORY MOTYKA

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 20%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 8%
		Government 19%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 1%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 11%
		6-10 years 14%
		11-15 years 18%
		16-20 years 21%
		20+ years 32%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 69%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 7%
		Mainly criminal 8%
		Mixed criminal and civil 22%
		Mainly civil 56%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 3%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 83%
		Fourth District 8%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 4%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	12	3%	41	9%	115	26%	159	37%	107	25%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	12	3%	36	9%	114	27%	150	36%	109	26%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	11	3%	39	9%	105	25%	148	36%	110	27%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	20	5%	34	8%	91	21%	146	34%	141	33%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	18	4%	36	8%	90	21%	139	33%	142	33%	3.8
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	19	5%	26	6%	82	20%	139	33%	154	37%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	15	4%	24	6%	104	26%	115	29%	141	35%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	21	5%	40	9%	102	24%	119	28%	149	35%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion	18	4%	33	8%	116	28%	121	30%	122	30%	3.7
Ability to control courtroom	10	3%	8	2%	100	25%	140	35%	142	36%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	5	1%	11	3%	95	24%	146	37%	141	35%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	5	1%	13	3%	84	21%	130	33%	160	41%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	5	3%	11	6%	48	25%	52	27%	74	39%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	8	4%	14	7%	65	32%	53	26%	64	31%	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	7	5%	9	6%	47	33%	34	24%	47	33%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	14	3%	38	9%	109	25%	138	32%	129	30%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 428 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Murphy based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 38% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest score came for willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings (4.1). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.7), knowledge of substantive law (3.7), knowledge of evidence and procedure (3.7), human understanding and compassion (3.7), consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (3.7), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	5%	27%	32%	36%	22	4.0
SOLO.....	2%	9%	18%	28%	43%	100	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	5%	7%	21%	28%	40%	86	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	8%	24%	39%	27%	88	3.8
CORPORATE.....	0%	17%	17%	17%	50%	6	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
OFFICER.....	3%	8%	38%	35%	16%	37	3.5
GOVERNMENT.....	6%	14%	35%	36%	9%	80	3.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	19%	38%	38%	16	4.1
1-5 YEARS.....	4%	13%	21%	40%	23%	48	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	3%	8%	24%	24%	40%	62	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	12%	22%	36%	29%	77	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	7%	9%	30%	31%	23%	90	3.6
21+ YEARS.....	2%	7%	27%	31%	33%	135	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	22%	39%	35%	23	4.0
MALE.....	3%	8%	25%	32%	32%	298	3.8
FEMALE.....	5%	12%	27%	31%	25%	107	3.6
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	24%	35%	35%	17	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	13%	10%	43%	30%	3%	30	3.0
CRIMINAL.....	3%	17%	31%	31%	19%	36	3.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	5%	10%	27%	23%	35%	97	3.7
CIVIL.....	2%	7%	23%	36%	32%	237	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	9%	9%	36%	45%	11	4.2
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	6%	24%	35%	35%	17	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	7%	21%	57%	14%	14	3.8
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	4	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	10%	25%	32%	30%	358	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	7%	3%	20%	30%	40%	30	3.9
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	40%	0%	60%	5	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	2%	6%	27%	35%	31%	52	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	6%	11%	22%	26%	35%	161	3.7
MODERATE.....	2%	11%	29%	32%	26%	111	3.7
LIMITED.....	1%	6%	27%	40%	26%	104	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	11%	7%	22%	11%	48%	27	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	9%	25%	32%	30%	428	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	7%	24%	42%	20%	45	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	26%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	60%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	2%
		Other.....	8%
		No Answer.....	4%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	24%
		6-10 years.....	6%
		11-15 years.....	23%
		16-20 years.....	27%
		20+ years.....	15%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	82%
		Female.....	14%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	83%
		Fourth District.....	13%
		Outside Alaska.....	4%
		No Answer.....	%
		0	
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	8%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	87%
		31,000 or over.....	5%
		No Answer.....	%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	6	8%	3	4%	17	21%	16	20%	38	48%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	5	6%	4	5%	10	13%	19	24%	40	51%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	3	4%	3	4%	12	15%	18	23%	42	54%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	4	5%	4	5%	12	15%	22	28%	36	46%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	4%	0	0%	14	17%	21	26%	44	54%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	4%	0	0%	15	19%	21	26%	41	51%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom.....	6	8%	2	3%	9	12%	19	24%	42	54%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	4	5%	3	4%	14	18%	24	32%	31	41%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	6%	2	3%	11	16%	20	30%	30	45%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	4%	2	4%	7	12%	19	33%	27	47%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	4	6%	1	2%	9	15%	19	31%	29	47%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	5%	1	3%	6	15%	10	26%	20	51%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	7	9%	2	2%	12	15%	23	28%	38	46%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 82 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Murphy from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 16% had a moderate amount, and 32% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range with the highest score going to the item involving courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.3). The items scored lowest were: equal treatment of all parties (4.0), reasonable promptness in making decisions, willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings (4.0), and the overall evaluation (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	5%	14%	45%	36%	22	4.1
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....							
	12%	0%	12%	20%	55%	49	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....							
	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	14%	43%	14%	29%	7	3.6
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
1-5 YEARS.....	5%	0%	20%	40%	35%	20	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	5%	21%	16%	53%	19	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	5%	5%	5%	36%	50%	22	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	23%	0%	8%	8%	62%	13	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
MALE.....	7%	3%	13%	29%	48%	69	4.1
FEMALE.....	9%	0%	27%	18%	45%	11	3.9
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	3%	14%	28%	54%	69	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	45%	0%	18%	27%	9%	11	2.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	6	3.5
OVER 30,000.....	8%	1%	14%	27%	49%	73	4.1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	0%	80%	10	4.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	12%	0%	12%	21%	55%	33	4.1
MODERATE.....	15%	8%	15%	31%	31%	13	3.5
LIMITED.....	4%	4%	15%	46%	31%	26	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	9%	2%	15%	28%	46%	82	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	25%	8%	17%	25%	25%	12	3.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	100%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	100%
		6-10 years	0%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	0%
		31,000 or over	100%
		No Answer	%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteer evaluated Judge Murphy from their direct professional experience. This respondent had a substantial amount of experience with the judge. All of the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SIGURD E. MURPHY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 22%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 10%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 14%
		Government 25%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 0%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 14%
		11-15 years 17%
		16-20 years 27%
		20+ years 28%
		No Answer 4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 69%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 7%
		Mainly criminal 5%
		Mixed criminal and civil 29%
		Mainly civil 53%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 5%
		Second District 2%
		Third District 83%
		Fourth District 5%
		Not in Alaska 0%
		No Answer 5%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	3	3%	10	9%	21	19%	50	45%	26	24%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law	2	2%	11	10%	17	16%	51	47%	27	25%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	1	1%	7	7%	21	20%	51	49%	24	23%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	4	4%	8	7%	16	15%	42	39%	37	35%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice	3	3%	6	6%	17	16%	40	38%	39	37%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	2	2%	3	3%	21	20%	42	39%	39	36%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	2	2%	6	6%	13	14%	41	43%	33	35%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	1%	6	6%	14	13%	41	38%	46	43%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion	2	2%	6	6%	13	12%	39	37%	45	43%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	6	6%	22	22%	41	41%	32	32%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	1	1%	3	3%	23	24%	42	44%	27	28%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	1	1%	3	3%	20	20%	47	47%	28	28%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	2%	2	4%	16	30%	21	39%	14	26%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	5	8%	13	20%	28	43%	19	29%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	1	2%	2	4%	11	20%	20	36%	21	38%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	3	3%	7	7%	19	18%	45	42%	33	31%	3.9

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 107 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Neville based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience, 31% had a moderate amount, and 19% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean score came for courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.2). The lowest scored items were: legal and factual analysis (3.8), knowledge of substantive law (3.8), and settlement skills (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
SOLO.....	9%	14%	18%	27%	32%	22	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	4%	4%	17%	61%	13%	23	3.7
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	27%	0%	55%	18%	11	3.6
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	0%	27%	47%	27%	15	4.0
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	28	4.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	20%	50%	30%	10	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	14%	29%	36%	21%	14	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	44%	39%	18	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	3%	3%	10%	47%	37%	30	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	6%	13%	23%	35%	23%	31	3.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%	7	4.4
MALE.....	4%	7%	19%	43%	27%	74	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	8%	15%	42%	35%	26	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	8	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	6	3.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	6%	10%	19%	39%	26%	31	3.7
CIVIL.....	2%	5%	14%	43%	36%	56	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	7%	18%	43%	29%	89	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	2%	19%	40%	33%	43	3.9
MODERATE.....	0%	12%	12%	48%	27%	33	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	30%	45%	20%	20	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	50%	0%	25%	25%	4	3.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	7%	18%	42%	31%	107	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	41%	29%	29%	17	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	44%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	44%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	7%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	2%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	19%
		6-10 years.....	33%
		11-15 years.....	16%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	91%
		Female.....	5%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	95%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	2%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	84%
		31,000 or over.....	14%
		No Answer.....	2%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	2%	0	0%	5	12%	20	47%	17	40%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	5	13%	13	33%	21	54%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	4	10%	14	33%	23	55%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	1	3%	6	15%	16	40%	17	43%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	1	2%	0	0%	4	10%	14	33%	23	55%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	2%	1	2%	3	7%	13	32%	23	56%	4.4
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	1	3%	8	21%	14	36%	16	41%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	15%	20	50%	14	35%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	9	24%	16	43%	12	32%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	1	4%	0	0%	3	11%	13	48%	10	37%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	1	3%	0	0%	8	21%	14	37%	15	39%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	23%	8	36%	9	41%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	1	2%	5	12%	18	42%	19	44%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 43 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Neville from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 19% had a moderate amount, and 35% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range. The highest scored items were: sense of basic fairness and justice (4.4), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.4), and human understanding and compassion (4.4). The lowest scored items were: willingness to work diligently, preparation for hearings (4.1), settlement skills (4.1), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	53%	37%	19	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....							
	0%	5%	16%	32%	47%	19	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....							
	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	7%	14%	29%	50%	14	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	71%	29%	7	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
MALE.....	0%	3%	13%	41%	44%	39	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	12%	39%	46%	41	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	3%	8%	42%	47%	36	4.3
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	6%	53%	41%	17	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	13%	13%	25%	50%	8	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	20%	27%	53%	15	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....							
	0%	2%	12%	42%	44%	43	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....							
	29%	0%	29%	29%	14%	7	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....							
	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0%
		Guardian Ad Litem	100%
		CASA Volunteer	0%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	0%
		6-10 years	100%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	50%
		31,000 or over	50%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	4.5
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	5.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	5.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 2 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Neville from their direct professional experience. One of these respondents had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, and the other had a limited amount. All of the mean scores were in the "excellent" range. The item concerning settlement skills was the lowest rated item (4.5).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE M. FRANCIS NEVILLE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	1	5.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	1	5.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	1	5.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 23%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 12%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 11%
		Government 21%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 0%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 16%
		6-10 years 14%
		11-15 years 19%
		16-20 years 21%
		20+ years 26%
		No Answer 5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 69%
		Female 26%
		No Answer 6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 11%
		Mainly criminal 10%
		Mixed criminal and civil 27%
		Mainly civil 44%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 2%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 90%
		Fourth District 2%
		Not in Alaska 5%
		No Answer %

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	14	5%	34	12%	79	27%	109	38%	54	19%	3.5
Knowledge of substantive law	13	5%	31	11%	79	28%	106	37%	54	19%	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	11	4%	26	9%	82	29%	104	37%	57	20%	3.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	35	12%	63	22%	78	27%	74	25%	41	14%	3.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice	34	12%	53	19%	82	29%	73	26%	42	15%	3.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	24	8%	25	9%	89	31%	83	29%	66	23%	3.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	18	7%	22	8%	85	31%	82	30%	64	24%	3.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	67	23%	60	21%	72	25%	58	20%	33	11%	2.8
Human understanding and compassion	52	18%	62	22%	75	26%	58	20%	38	13%	2.9
Ability to control courtroom	16	6%	22	8%	89	32%	90	32%	60	22%	3.6
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	9	3%	17	6%	91	34%	91	34%	61	23%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	13	5%	27	10%	82	31%	85	32%	59	22%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	12	11%	17	15%	28	25%	29	26%	25	23%	3.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	19	11%	15	9%	51	29%	58	33%	33	19%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	10	10%	9	9%	28	28%	29	29%	25	25%	3.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	30	10%	56	20%	77	27%	84	29%	40	14%	3.2

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 287 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Rhoades based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 44% had a substantial amount of experience, 22% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "acceptable" range (3.2). The highest mean scored item was for reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.7), while the lowest scored item was courtesy, freedom from arrogance (2.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	12%	24%	18%	35%	12%	17	3.1
SOLO.....	9%	24%	23%	35%	9%	66	3.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	17%	14%	30%	29%	11%	66	3.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	9%	15%	39%	24%	12%	33	3.2
CORPORATE.....	0%	25%	0%	50%	25%	4	3.8
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	13%	16%	38%	25%	9%	32	3.0
GOVERNMENT.....	6%	25%	17%	27%	24%	63	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	60%	0%	40%	5	3.8
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	15%	23%	23%	31%	8%	13	2.9
1-5 YEARS.....	5%	20%	39%	18%	18%	44	3.3
6-10 YEARS.....	8%	33%	15%	23%	21%	39	3.2
11-15 YEARS.....	7%	15%	33%	38%	7%	55	3.2
16-20 YEARS.....	18%	15%	28%	31%	8%	61	3.0
21+ YEARS.....	11%	19%	21%	31%	19%	75	3.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	13%	25%	25%	25%	13%	16	3.0
MALE.....	11%	21%	23%	31%	13%	196	3.1
FEMALE.....	8%	13%	36%	25%	17%	75	3.3
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	21%	21%	29%	14%	14	3.1
PROSECUTION.....	6%	27%	21%	21%	24%	33	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	13%	17%	27%	40%	3%	30	3.0
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	13%	23%	29%	25%	11%	80	3.0
CIVIL.....	9%	16%	28%	32%	15%	124	3.3
OTHER.....	17%	17%	17%	17%	33%	6	3.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	21%	21%	29%	14%	14	3.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	20%	0%	40%	40%	5	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	11%	20%	28%	28%	14%	258	3.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	6	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	21%	26%	29%	18%	38	3.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	15%	17%	23%	28%	17%	126	3.1
MODERATE.....	11%	28%	33%	20%	8%	64	2.9
LIMITED.....	3%	14%	29%	42%	12%	59	3.5
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	24%	12%	47%	12%	17	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	10%	20%	27%	29%	14%	287	3.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	24%	24%	34%	10%	41	3.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	33%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	56%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	4%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	5%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	%
		18	
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	12%
		6-10 years.....	23%
		11-15 years.....	26%
		16-20 years.....	18%
		20+ years.....	3%
		No Answer.....	%
		85	
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	14%
		Female.....	1%
		No Answer.....	%
		0	
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	1%
		Second District.....	95%
		Third District.....	3%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	%
		1	
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	11%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	85%
		31,000 or over.....	3%
		No Answer.....	%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	2	3%	7	10%	13	18%	23	32%	27	38%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	3%	6	8%	13	18%	21	30%	29	41%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	3%	6	9%	10	14%	21	30%	30	43%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	2	3%	3	4%	15	22%	23	33%	26	38%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	8	11%	6	8%	9	13%	23	32%	25	35%	3.7
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	5	7%	11	16%	25	36%	27	39%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	1%	5	7%	10	15%	23	34%	28	42%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	5	7%	11	16%	25	36%	28	40%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	2%	5	8%	9	15%	21	35%	24	40%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	4%	4	8%	13	25%	13	25%	19	37%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	3%	6	10%	10	16%	20	32%	24	39%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	4	9%	9	20%	13	30%	17	39%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	1	1%	10	14%	9	13%	24	33%	28	39%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 72 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Rhoades from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 43% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 24% had a moderate amount, and 19% had a limited amount. The mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest scored items were: ability to control courtroom (4.1), and reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.1). The lowest scored item was courtesy and freedom from arrogance (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	13%	13%	38%	38%	24	4.0
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	3%	18%	15%	33%	33%	40	3.8
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	15%	46%	38%	13	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	22%	0%	33%	44%	9	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	18%	24%	24%	35%	17	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	17%	11%	28%	44%	18	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	8%	15%	8%	38%	31%	13	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MALE.....	2%	15%	11%	32%	40%	62	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	11%	22%	33%	33%	9	3.9
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	13%	13%	31%	41%	68	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	2	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	29%	0%	29%	43%	7	3.9
OVER 30,000.....	2%	13%	15%	32%	39%	62	3.9
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	30%	30%	10	3.7
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	10%	13%	26%	52%	31	4.2
MODERATE.....	6%	12%	6%	35%	41%	17	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	21%	14%	50%	14%	14	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	0%	25%	50%	4	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	14%	13%	33%	39%	72	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	8%	23%	8%	46%	15%	13	3.4
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	0%
		Guardian Ad Litem	0%
		CASA Volunteer	100%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	100%
		6-10 years	0%
		11-15 years	0%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	100%
		Fourth District	0%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	0%
		31,000 or over	100%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 1 Social Worker/Guardian Ad Litem/CASA Volunteer evaluated Judge Rhoades from their direct professional experience. This respondent had a substantial amount of experience with the judge. All of the scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE RHOADES

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 20%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 15%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 17%
		Private, corporate employee 1%
		State judge or judicial officer 14%
		Government 22%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 2%
		Other 1%
		No Answer 8%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 10%
		6-10 years 13%
		11-15 years 19%
		16-20 years 18%
		20+ years 34%
		No Answer 7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 66%
		Female 25%
		No Answer 9%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 5%
		Mainly criminal 6%
		Mixed criminal and civil 24%
		Mainly civil 56%
		Other 3%
		No Answer 7%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 6%
		Second District 0%
		Third District 51%
		Fourth District 34%
		Not in Alaska 1%
		No Answer 7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	4	2%	27	12%	56	25%	88	39%	49	22%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law	5	2%	23	11%	59	27%	86	39%	46	21%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	6	3%	20	9%	57	27%	87	40%	45	21%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	6	3%	30	14%	45	20%	70	32%	69	31%	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice	6	3%	22	10%	47	21%	71	32%	76	34%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	4	2%	6	3%	51	23%	78	35%	81	37%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	6	3%	17	8%	48	23%	70	34%	66	32%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	12	5%	23	10%	30	14%	75	34%	82	37%	3.9
Human understanding and compassion	10	5%	18	8%	32	15%	70	32%	87	40%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom	6	3%	15	7%	52	25%	69	33%	64	31%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	11	5%	18	9%	51	25%	72	35%	53	26%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	8	4%	8	4%	48	23%	76	36%	69	33%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	9	9%	6	6%	27	28%	29	30%	25	26%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	4	4%	9	9%	32	30%	31	30%	29	28%	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	8	6%	13	9%	24	17%	44	31%	52	37%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	6	3%	27	12%	47	21%	82	37%	61	27%	3.7

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 223 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Steinkruger based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 48% had a substantial amount of experience, 23% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), while the lowest scored item was settlement skills (3.6).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	18%	12%	29%	35%	17	3.7
SOLO.....	2%	7%	20%	33%	38%	45	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	3%	24%	29%	32%	12%	34	3.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	5%	5%	21%	37%	32%	38	3.8
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	6%	13%	50%	31%	32	4.1
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	19%	26%	38%	15%	47	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	14%	14%	29%	36%	14	3.7
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	42%	21%	37%	19	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	24%	17%	31%	28%	29	3.6
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	7%	24%	43%	24%	42	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	5%	12%	12%	41%	29%	41	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	3%	13%	22%	38%	24%	78	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	21%	16%	21%	37%	19	3.6
MALE.....	3%	11%	21%	40%	25%	150	3.7
FEMALE.....	0%	13%	24%	33%	30%	54	3.8
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	13%	13%	27%	40%	15	3.8
PROSECUTION.....	0%	9%	73%	0%	18%	11	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	33%	17%	25%	25%	12	3.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	6%	11%	15%	45%	23%	53	3.7
CIVIL.....	2%	11%	21%	38%	28%	127	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	13%	13%	25%	44%	16	3.9
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	8%	54%	38%	13	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	7%	18%	42%	29%	113	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	1%	22%	29%	29%	19%	77	3.4
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	12%	29%	29%	29%	17	3.8
SUBSTANTIAL.....	4%	17%	21%	25%	34%	106	3.7
MODERATE.....	4%	8%	15%	50%	23%	52	3.8
LIMITED.....	0%	6%	25%	52%	17%	48	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	17%	33%	17%	0%	33%	6	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	12%	21%	37%	27%	223	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	18%	18%	25%	39%	28	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	49%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	25%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	16%
		Other.....	4%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	29%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	16%
		16-20 years.....	22%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	76%
		Female.....	18%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	9%
		Fourth District.....	82%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	11%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	75%
		31,000 or over.....	7%
		No Answer.....	%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	2	4%	14	26%	22	41%	16	30%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	4%	13	25%	17	33%	19	37%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	14	26%	17	31%	22	41%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	4	8%	12	23%	21	40%	15	29%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	2	4%	13	24%	16	29%	24	44%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	2	4%	11	20%	19	35%	22	41%	4.1
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	1	2%	12	22%	20	37%	21	39%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	5	9%	16	30%	20	38%	12	23%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	14	28%	20	40%	16	32%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	2	5%	9	22%	20	49%	10	24%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	2	4%	13	26%	15	30%	20	40%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	29%	13	38%	11	32%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	2	4%	14	25%	20	36%	19	35%	4.0

OVERVIEW: In all, 55 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Steinkruger from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 45% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 24% had a moderate amount, and 16% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.1), courtesy, freedom from arrogance (4.1), human understanding and compassion (4.1), ability to control courtroom (4.1), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1). The item for reasonable promptness in making decisions scored lowest (3.7).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	4%	19%	37%	41%	27	4.1
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	7%	50%	29%	14%	14	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	44%	38%	16	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	11%	22%	22%	44%	9	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	25%	42%	12	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	5	3.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
MALE.....	0%	5%	29%	33%	33%	42	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	10%	40%	50%	10	4.4
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	5	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	4%	22%	33%	40%	45	4.1
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	6	3.7
OVER 30,000.....	0%	5%	24%	32%	39%	41	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	38%	13%	8	3.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	4%	16%	32%	48%	25	4.2
MODERATE.....	0%	8%	15%	38%	38%	13	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	44%	44%	11%	9	3.7
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	4%	25%	36%	35%	55	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	25%	13%	25%	25%	13%	8	2.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	25%
		CASA Volunteer	25%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	25%
		6-10 years	50%
		11-15 years	25%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	25%
		Fourth District	75%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	0%
		31,000 or over	100%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	4.5
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2	50%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 4 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Steinkruger from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 3 had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, and 1 had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range. The highest scored items were: courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.5), and willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.5). The lowest scored items were: equal treatment of all parties (4.0), sense of basic fairness and justice (4.0), settlement skills (4.0), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.0).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE NIESJE J. STEINKRUGER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo 18%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys 19%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys 9%
		Private, corporate employee 2%
		State judge or judicial officer 15%
		Government 26%
		Public service agency organization (not government) 2%
		Other 2%
		No Answer 7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years 11%
		6-10 years 16%
		11-15 years 15%
		16-20 years 17%
		20+ years 34%
		No Answer 6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male 59%
		Female 32%
		No Answer 9%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution 7%
		Mainly criminal 10%
		Mixed criminal and civil 27%
		Mainly civil 46%
		Other 4%
		No Answer 6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District 3%
		Second District 1%
		Third District 38%
		Fourth District 49%
		Not in Alaska 2%
		No Answer 7%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis	9	6%	20	14%	55	38%	50	34%	11	8%	3.2
Knowledge of substantive law	7	5%	22	15%	52	37%	49	35%	12	8%	3.3
Knowledge of evidence and procedure	7	5%	16	11%	52	37%	51	36%	14	10%	3.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties	12	8%	22	15%	45	31%	45	31%	22	15%	3.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice	10	7%	14	10%	44	31%	51	36%	22	16%	3.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety	12	8%	6	4%	40	28%	56	39%	28	20%	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism	9	7%	7	5%	45	33%	47	35%	28	21%	3.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance	13	9%	18	12%	39	27%	51	35%	24	17%	3.4
Human understanding and compassion	11	8%	21	15%	42	30%	49	35%	19	13%	3.3
Ability to control courtroom	7	5%	8	6%	55	39%	50	35%	21	15%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions	11	8%	14	10%	49	35%	49	35%	17	12%	3.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings	15	10%	29	20%	41	29%	44	31%	14	10%	3.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills	8	12%	10	15%	19	29%	20	30%	9	14%	3.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing	8	8%	8	8%	28	29%	37	39%	15	16%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families	10	15%	7	10%	20	30%	23	34%	7	10%	3.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge	10	7%	19	13%	47	32%	56	38%	16	11%	3.3

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 148 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Kauvar based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 47% had a substantial amount of experience, 22% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "acceptable" range (3.3). The highest mean scored items were: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.6), and makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.6). The lowest scored items were: works diligently; preparation for hearings (3.1), and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.1).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	10%	20%	40%	30%	0%	10	2.9
SOLO.....	4%	15%	30%	52%	0%	27	3.3
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	7%	18%	29%	39%	7%	28	3.2
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	15%	8%	31%	38%	8%	13	3.2
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL							
OFFICER.....	0%	9%	26%	39%	26%	23	3.8
GOVERNMENT.....	8%	8%	39%	32%	13%	38	3.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	3	2.7
OTHER.....	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%	3	2.7
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	11%	22%	33%	33%	0%	9	2.9
1-5 YEARS.....	6%	18%	35%	29%	12%	17	3.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	8%	46%	42%	4%	24	3.4
11-15 YEARS.....	14%	0%	32%	45%	9%	22	3.4
16-20 YEARS.....	8%	12%	31%	35%	15%	26	3.4
21+ YEARS.....	6%	18%	24%	38%	14%	50	3.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	15%	38%	38%	0%	13	3.1
MALE.....	7%	11%	28%	41%	13%	88	3.4
FEMALE.....	6%	15%	36%	32%	11%	47	3.3
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	11%	22%	33%	33%	0%	9	2.9
PROSECUTION.....	0%	20%	30%	40%	10%	10	3.4
CRIMINAL.....	0%	20%	20%	53%	7%	15	3.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	10%	5%	33%	35%	18%	40	3.5
CIVIL.....	7%	13%	32%	37%	10%	68	3.3
OTHER.....	0%	17%	50%	33%	0%	6	3.2
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	10%	30%	30%	30%	0%	10	2.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	20%	40%	20%	20%	5	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	9%	7%	22%	49%	13%	55	3.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	5%	15%	38%	32%	10%	73	3.2
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	27%	27%	33%	13%	15	3.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	12%	12%	33%	29%	14%	69	3.2
MODERATE.....	6%	13%	31%	47%	3%	32	3.3
LIMITED.....	0%	9%	31%	50%	9%	32	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	30%	0%	30%	20%	20%	10	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	7%	13%	32%	38%	11%	148	3.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	7%	0%	50%	21%	21%	14	3.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	52%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer...	32%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	11%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	3%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	28%
		6-10 years.....	20%
		11-15 years.....	17%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	15%
		No Answer.....	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District.....	1%
		Third District.....	16%
		Fourth District.....	76%
		Outside Alaska.....	3%
		No Answer.....	%
		9	
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	25%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	61%
		31,000 or over.....	4%
		No Answer.....	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	6	8%	16	22%	31	42%	21	28%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	3%	4	5%	14	19%	32	44%	21	29%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	2	3%	15	21%	28	38%	28	38%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	4	6%	13	18%	30	42%	24	34%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	4	5%	3	4%	16	21%	31	41%	21	28%	3.8
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	4	6%	13	18%	35	49%	18	25%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom.....	1	1%	4	5%	16	22%	27	37%	25	34%	4.0
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	3	4%	21	29%	26	36%	22	31%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	2%	2	3%	18	27%	29	44%	16	24%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	2%	2	4%	16	29%	23	42%	13	24%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	3%	4	6%	14	22%	25	38%	20	31%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	3%	11	29%	15	39%	11	29%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	2	3%	5	7%	14	19%	31	41%	23	31%	3.9

OVERVIEW: In all, 75 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Kauvar from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 20% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range, with the highest score going to the item involving conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.1). The items scored lowest were: courtesy, freedom from arrogance (3.8), and settlement skills (3.8).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	3%	8%	15%	49%	26%	39	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	4%	4%	25%	42%	25%	24	3.8
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	13%	13%	13%	63%	8	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	5%	24%	38%	33%	21	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	13%	13%	60%	13%	15	3.7
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	8%	15%	38%	38%	13	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	6%	6%	19%	44%	25%	16	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	14%	0%	14%	29%	43%	7	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
MALE.....	3%	5%	19%	45%	27%	62	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	18%	9%	27%	45%	11	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	8%	25%	17%	25%	25%	12	3.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	4%	18%	46%	32%	57	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	0%	67%	3	4.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
2,000-30,000.....	0%	16%	32%	47%	5%	19	3.4
OVER 30,000.....	4%	4%	13%	41%	37%	46	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	22%	44%	9	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	10%	10%	57%	23%	30	3.9
MODERATE.....	13%	0%	20%	27%	40%	15	3.8
LIMITED.....	0%	10%	24%	38%	29%	21	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	0%	20%	33%	40%	15	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	7%	19%	41%	31%	75	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	3	2.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL WORKER/GAL/CASA RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Work:</u>	Social Worker	50%
		Guardian Ad Litem	25%
		CASA Volunteer	25%
		Other	0%
		No Answer	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years	25%
		6-10 years	50%
		11-15 years	25%
		16-20 years	0%
		20+ years	0%
		No Answer	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male	0%
		Female	100%
		No Answer	0%
4.	<u>Location of Work:</u>	First District	0%
		Second District	0%
		Third District	25%
		Fourth District	75%
		Outside Alaska	0%
		No Answer	0%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000	0%
		31,000 or over	100%
		No Answer	0%

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	0	0%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	75%	1	25%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom.....	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	3.7
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge.....	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	3.7

OVERVIEW: In all, 3 Social Workers/Guardians Ad Litem/CASA Volunteers evaluated Judge Kauvar from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 1 had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 1 had a moderate amount, and 1 had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest mean scored items were: human understanding and compassion (4.3), reasonable promptness in making decisions (4.3), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.3). The lowest scored item was ability to control courtroom (3.5).

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1998**

SOCIAL WORKERS/GALs/CASA VOLUNTEERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JANE F. KAUVAR

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	TOTAL	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL WORKER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
GUARDIAN AD LITEM.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
CASA VOLUNTEER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
MALE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0

