



**UAA** Institute of Social  
and Economic Research  
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Kodiak Superior Court**

### **Technical Report**

Ashley Schroeder, MPH, Research Professional  
Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional

*February 24-28, 2025*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[www.iseralaska.org](http://www.iseralaska.org)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation .....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management .....	6
Results.....	6
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants .....	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings .....	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating .....	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice .....	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice .....	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled .....	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice .....	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender .....	15
Table 11: Colleen Baxter: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Colleen Baxter: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 13: Andrew Ott: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Andrew Ott: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Dawson Williams: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	20
Table 16: Dawson Williams: Detailed Responses.....	21

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Kodiak Superior Court created by to the forthcoming retirement of Judge Stephen B. Wallace. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Colleen Baxter, Andrew Ott, and Dawson Williams.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked bar members to evaluate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence*, *Integrity*, *Fairness*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each applicant by respondents with direct professional experience.

**Table 1**  
**Mean Ratings of Applicants**

		<b>Professional Competence</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Fairness</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Suitability of Experience</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	61	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	41	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	90	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5

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

# 2025 Judicial Selection Survey, Kodiak Superior Court

## *Introduction*

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate all applicants for a judicial vacancy. The Council nominates the two or more most qualified applicants to the governor who must appoint from the Council's list. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska Bar Association members and asked them to rate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence*, *Integrity*, *Fairness*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER), a research institute at the University of Alaska Anchorage. ISER was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Council but returned directly to ISER for processing, data entry, and analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Palmer District Court, Anchorage Superior Court, and Kodiak Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for one vacancy on Kodiak Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Stephen B. Wallace. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Colleen Baxter, Andrew Ott, and Dawson Williams.

## *Methodology*

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,755 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,742) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Two individuals received only a paper version of the survey, and 11 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 725 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. One individual completed the online survey twice, resulting in a duplicate survey; the most complete response was retained and the duplicate was excluded. No online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 712 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned four paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned; one paper survey was excluded because the respondent could not be identified. No paper survey was excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, three paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 712 online surveys and three paper surveys, for a total of 715 surveys and a survey return rate of 19%. Of the 715 returned surveys, 249 (34.8%) did not rate any of the 17 applicants (eight Palmer

District Court applicants, six Anchorage Superior Court applicants, and three Kodiak Superior Court applicants); 466 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

**Table 2**  
**Respondent Characteristics**

	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>65.2</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>				
No response	3	0.4	-	-
Private, solo	115	16.1	61	13.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	81	11.3	45	9.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	107	15.0	67	14.4
Private, corporate employee	16	2.2	9	1.9
Judge or judicial officer	80	11.2	72	15.5
Government	186	26.0	149	32.0
Public service agency or organization	28	3.9	22	4.7
Retired	91	12.7	37	7.9
Other	8	1.1	4	0.9
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>				
No response	35	4.9	17	3.6
5 years or fewer	89	12.4	62	13.3
6 to 10 years	56	7.8	41	8.8
11 to 15 years	84	11.7	68	14.6
16 to 20 years	84	11.7	70	15.0
More than 20 years	367	51.3	208	44.6
<b>Cases Handled</b>				
No response	5	0.7	-	-
Prosecution	45	6.3	38	8.2
Criminal	75	10.5	67	14.4
Mixed criminal & civil	173	24.2	129	27.7
Civil	375	52.4	214	45.9
Other	42	5.9	18	3.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>				
No response	5	0.7	1	0.2
First District	66	9.2	20	4.3
Second District	9	1.3	6	1.3
Third District	540	75.5	398	85.4
Fourth District	57	8.0	32	6.9
Outside Alaska	38	5.3	9	1.9
<b>Gender</b>				
No response	10	1.4	2	0.4
Male	391	54.7	248	53.2
Female	310	43.4	214	45.9
Another identity	4	0.6	2	0.4

## *Instrumentation*

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant.

Both versions of the survey required a certification by the respondent that they had rated the applicants as required by the bar’s Professional Rule 8.2. Specific instructions regarding the certification were provided:

*“Please refer to Professional Conduct Rule 8.2 concerning your obligation to provide truthful and candid opinions on the qualifications or integrity of these applicants.”*

Respondents evaluated applicants in six areas of performance included in the survey using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided for each of the performance areas. The scale and instructions for respondents were:

*“Please rate the applicant on each of the following qualities by selecting the number that best represents your evaluation. Applicants should be evaluated on each quality separately. Use the ends of the scales as well as the middle. The tendency to rate an applicant “excellent” or “poor” on every trait should be avoided since each person has strengths and weaknesses. If you cannot rate the applicant on any one quality, leave that one blank.”*

	(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
<b><i>Professional Competence</i></b>	Lacking in knowledge and/or effectiveness	Below-average performance occasionally	Possesses sufficient knowledge and required skills	Usually knowledgeable and effective	Meets the highest standards for knowledge and effectiveness
<b><i>Integrity</i></b>	Unconcerned with propriety and/or appearance, or acts in violation of codes of professional conduct	Appears lacking in knowledge of professional codes of conduct and/or unconcerned with propriety or appearance at times	Follows codes of professional conduct, respects propriety and appearance of propriety at all times	Above-average awareness of ethics, holds self to higher standard than most	Outstanding integrity and highest standards of conduct
<b><i>Fairness</i></b>	Often shows strong bias for or against some person or groups	Displays, verbally or otherwise, some bias for or against groups or persons	Free of substantial bias or prejudice against groups or persons	Above-average ability to treat all persons and groups impartially	Unusually fair and impartial to all groups
<b><i>Judicial Temperament</i></b>	Often lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Sometimes lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Possesses appropriate compassion, humility, and courtesy	Above-average compassion, humility, and courtesy	Outstanding compassion, humility, and courtesy
<b><i>Suitability of Experience</i></b>	Has little or no suitable experience	Has less than suitable experience	Has suitable experience	Has highly suitable experience	Has the most suitable experience for this position
<b><i>Overall Rating</i></b>	Has few qualifications for this position	Has insufficient qualifications for this position	Has suitable qualifications for this position	Has highly suitable qualifications for this position	Has exceptionally high qualifications for this position

## *Confidentiality and Data Safety*

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a locked office. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

## ***Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding***

To ensure that as few duplicates or invalid surveys as possible were received, clear instructions were provided to potential paper survey respondents regarding how to handle the survey booklets:

*“A postage-paid business reply envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluations. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked “Confidential,” and seal the envelope. Then use the business reply envelope, being sure to sign in the space provided. The return envelope MUST BE SIGNED in order for your survey to be counted.”*

Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. For the surveys returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. One paper survey was excluded because the respondent could not be identified: while the envelope was signed, the respondent’s name or contact information was not included on the envelope and the signature was illegible.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once. After merging online and entered paper data, ISER analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. One duplicate survey was identified. The most complete survey data was retained and the duplicate was removed, ensuring that only one survey per respondent was used in the data analysis.

## ***Data Management***

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper surveys were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

## ***Results***

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

### ***Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant***

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

Table 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each applicant.



## ***Ratings of Applicants***

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-16 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

**Table 3**  
*Level of Experience with the Applicants*

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	85	11.9	71.8	24.7	3.5
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	44	6.2	93.2	4.5	2.3
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	109	15.2	82.6	15.6	1.8

**Table 4**  
**Summary of Overall Ratings**

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	85	4.1	5.0	1.2	61	4.2	5.0	1.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	44	3.9	4.0	1.0	41	3.9	4.0	1.0
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	108	4.5	5.0	0.8	90	4.5	5.0	0.8

**Table 5**  
***Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating***

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	61	4	6.6	4	6.6	5	8.2	11	18.0	37	60.7
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	41	1	2.4	1	2.4	13	31.7	14	34.1	12	29.3
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	90	1	1.1	4	4.4	2	2.2	25	27.8	58	64.4

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

**Table 6**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice**

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	14	3.6	11	4.3	2	3.5	1	5.0	16	4.8	11	4.1	3	3.7	3	5.0	-	-	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	6	3.3	6	3.8	6	4.2	-	-	5	5.0	14	3.4	-	-	3	5.0	1	3.0	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	11	4.3	8	4.5	7	4.1	1	4.0	32	4.8	22	4.2	2	4.5	5	5.0	2	5.0	4.5

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

**Table 7**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice**

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	7	4.4	6	4.3	5	4.2	7	4.3	34	4.2	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	3	3.7	2	4.0	10	3.9	9	4.0	16	3.8	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	5	4.8	7	4.0	15	4.5	19	4.4	43	4.6	4.5

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

**Table 8**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled**

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	5	4.8	2	3.5	28	4.1	25	4.2	1	5.0	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	3	2.7	4	3.5	18	4.1	12	3.8	4	4.3	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	4	3.8	10	4.5	46	4.7	27	4.3	3	4.3	4.5

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

**Table 9**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice**

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	1	3.0	5	4.8	50	4.2	5	4.2	-	-	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	1	3.0	-	-	39	3.9	1	4.0	-	-	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	4	4.3	2	4.5	72	4.5	10	4.7	2	5.0	4.5

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



**Table 10**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Gender**

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b>Colleen Baxter</b>	39	4.3	21	4.0	+	+	4.2
<b>Andrew Ott</b>	24	3.9	16	3.9	+	+	3.9
<b>Dawson Williams</b>	45	4.6	44	4.5	+	+	4.5

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the applicants.  
 +Too few respondents to report.

**Table 11**  
**Colleen Baxter**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	61	71.8
Professional reputation	21	24.7
Other personal contacts	3	3.5
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	52	85.2
Substantial amount of experience	22	36.1
Moderate amount of experience	23	37.7
Limited amount of experience	16	26.2
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	21	24.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	15.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	7.1
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2
Judge or judicial officer	21	24.7
Government	15	17.6
Public service agency or organization	4	4.7
Retired	4	4.7
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	3	3.5
5 years or fewer	9	10.6
6 to 10 years	8	9.4
11 to 15 years	8	9.4
16 to 20 years	11	12.9
More than 20 years	46	54.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	5	5.9
Criminal	5	5.9
Mixed criminal & civil	33	38.8
Civil	40	47.1
Other	2	2.4
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.2
Second District	5	5.9
Third District	73	85.9
Fourth District	6	7.1
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	51	60.0
Female	33	38.8
Another identity	+	+

\*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the applicant.  
 +Too few respondents to report.

**Table 12**  
**Colleen Baxter**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	85	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	52	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	9	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	22	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	23	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	16	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.2
Professional reputation	21	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	14	3.9	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	16	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8
Government	11	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.1
Public service agency or organization	3	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.3	3.7
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4
6 to 10 years	6	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.3
11 to 15 years	5	4.4	4.0	3.6	3.6	4.2	4.2
16 to 20 years	7	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.3
More than 20 years	34	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8
Criminal	2	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1
Civil	25	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	5	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	5.0	4.8
Third District	50	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	5	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.6	4.4	4.2
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	39	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Female	21	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

**Table 13**  
**Andrew Ott**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	41	93.2
Professional reputation	2	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	2.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	31	75.6
Substantial amount of experience	14	34.1
Moderate amount of experience	16	39.0
Limited amount of experience	11	26.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	7	15.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	15.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	13.6
Private, corporate employee	1	2.3
Judge or judicial officer	5	11.4
Government	14	31.8
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	3	6.8
Other	1	2.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	2.3
5 years or fewer	3	6.8
6 to 10 years	2	4.5
11 to 15 years	11	25.0
16 to 20 years	9	20.5
More than 20 years	18	40.9
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	3	6.8
Criminal	4	9.1
Mixed criminal & civil	19	43.2
Civil	14	31.8
Other	4	9.1
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	1	2.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	42	95.5
Fourth District	1	2.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	25	56.8
Female	18	40.9
Another identity	+	+

\*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the applicant.  
 +Too few respondents to report.

**Table 14**  
**Andrew Ott**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	44	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Experience within last 5 years	31	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	10	3.8	4.3	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	14	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	16	3.8	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.9	3.9
Limited amount of experience	11	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	6	3.3	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.3	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	4.6	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.8	5.0
Government	14	3.5	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.6	3.4
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Other	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	3	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.7
6 to 10 years	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0
11 to 15 years	10	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9
16 to 20 years	9	4.1	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.0
More than 20 years	16	3.6	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.6	3.8
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.7
Criminal	4	3.5	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	18	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1
Civil	12	3.7	4.2	4.3	3.8	3.8	3.8
Other	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	39	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9
Fourth District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	24	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.9
Female	16	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.9
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

**Table 15**  
**Dawson Williams**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	90	82.6
Professional reputation	17	15.6
Other personal contacts	2	1.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	68	75.6
Substantial amount of experience	35	38.9
Moderate amount of experience	32	35.6
Limited amount of experience	23	25.6
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	13	11.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	8.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	6.4
Private, corporate employee	1	0.9
Judge or judicial officer	39	35.8
Government	27	24.8
Public service agency or organization	3	2.8
Retired	8	7.3
Other	2	1.8
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.9
5 years or fewer	6	5.5
6 to 10 years	9	8.3
11 to 15 years	18	16.5
16 to 20 years	21	19.3
More than 20 years	54	49.5
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	4	3.7
Criminal	10	9.2
Mixed criminal & civil	54	49.5
Civil	37	33.9
Other	4	3.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	6	5.5
Second District	2	1.8
Third District	86	78.9
Fourth District	13	11.9
Outside Alaska	2	1.8
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	52	47.7
Female	56	51.4
Another identity	+	+

\*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the applicant.  
 +Too few respondents to report.

**Table 16**  
**Dawson Williams**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	109	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	68	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	22	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	35	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	32	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5
Limited amount of experience	23	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	17	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	11	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.1
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	32	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
Government	22	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Retired	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	5	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
6 to 10 years	7	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.0
11 to 15 years	15	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.5
16 to 20 years	19	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4
More than 20 years	43	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Criminal	10	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	46	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.7
Civil	27	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Other	3	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	4	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.3
Second District	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5
Third District	72	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Fourth District	10	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.7
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	45	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	44	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.