



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Technical Report

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

2024

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges.....	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Instrumentation	4
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	4
Results.....	4
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 2: Level of Experience with Judges.....	6
Table 3: Summary of Overall Ratings	7
Table 4: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	8
Table 5: Dario Borghesan: Description of Respondents	9
Table 6: Dario Borghesan: Detailed Responses	9
Table 7: Jennifer S. Henderson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	10
Table 8: Jennifer S. Henderson: Detailed Responses	10
Table 9: Marjorie K. Allard: Description of Respondents' Experience	11
Table 10: Marjorie K. Allard: Detailed Responses.....	11
Table 11: Timothy W. Terrell: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	12
Table 12: Timothy W. Terrell: Detailed Responses	12
Table 13: Kristian B. Pickrell: Description of Respondents' Experience	13
Table 14: Kristian B. Pickrell: Detailed Responses.....	13
Table 15: Rachel Ahrens: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	14
Table 16: Rachel Ahrens: Detailed Responses	14
Table 17: Bride Seifert: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	15
Table 18: Bride Seifert: Detailed Responses	15
Table 19: Herman G. Walker: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 20: Herman G. Walker: Detailed Responses	16
Table 21: Adolf V. Zeman: Description of Respondents' Experience	17
Table 22: Adolf V. Zeman: Detailed Responses	17
Table 23: Leslie Dickson: Description of Respondents' Experience	18
Table 24: Leslie Dickson: Detailed Responses.....	18
Table 25: Michael Franciosi: Description of Respondents' Experience	19
Table 26: Michael Franciosi: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 27: J. Patrick Hanley: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	20
Table 28: J. Patrick Hanley: Detailed Responses	20
Table 29: Michael B. Logue: Description of Respondents' Experience	21
Table 30: Michael B. Logue: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 31: Kari L. McCrea: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	22
Table 32: Kari L. McCrea: Detailed Responses	22
Table 33: David R. Wallace: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	23
Table 34: David R. Wallace: Detailed Responses	23
Table 35: Pamela S. Washington: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	24
Table 36: Pamela S. Washington: Detailed Responses	24
Table 37: Patricia L. Haines: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	25
Table 38: Patricia L. Haines: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 39: Maria P. Bahr: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	26
Table 40: Maria P. Bahr: Detailed Responses	26
Table 41: Matthew Christian: Description of Respondents' Experience	27
Table 42: Matthew Christian: Detailed Responses.....	27

Executive Summary

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska court employees to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2024 survey included 21 trial court judges eligible for retention: (presented in alphabetical order): Justice Dario Borghesan, Justice Jennifer S. Henderson, Judge Marjorie K. Allard, Judge Timothy W. Terrell, Judge Kristian B. Pickrell, Judge Rachel Ahrens, Judge Bride Seifert, Judge Herman G. Walker, Judge Adolf V. Zeman, Judge Amanda L. Browning, Judge Leslie Dickson, Judge Michael Franciosi, Judge J. Patrick Hanley, Judge Michael B. Logue, Judge Kari L. McCrea, Judge David R. Wallace, Judge Pamela S. Washington, Judge Patricia L. Haines, Judge Maria P. Bahr, Judge Matthew Christian, and Judge William T. Montgomery. During the creation of this report, Judges Amanda Browning and William T. Montgomery were appointed to new judgeships and no longer qualify to stand for retention; therefore, their individual results will not be included.

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

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

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Judges

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall Evaluation <i>M</i>
Dario Borghesan	27	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Jennifer S. Henderson	45	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Marjorie K. Allard	18	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8
Timothy W. Terrell	16	4.1	4.6	4.1	3.3	3.6
Kristian B. Pickrell	19	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9
Rachel Ahrens	8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Bride Seifert	23	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Herman G. Walker	31	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5
Adolf V. Zeman	22	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Leslie Dickson	30	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Michael Franciosi	36	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
J. Patrick Hanley	31	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Michael B. Logue	30	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Kari L. McCrea	29	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
David R. Wallace	30	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Pamela S. Washington	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.5
Patricia L. Haines	37	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Maria P. Bahr	33	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7
Matthew Christian	34	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.9	4.8

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

2024 Judicial Retention Survey: Court Employees

Introduction

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

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

This 2024 retention survey for court employees included 21 trial court judges eligible for retention: (presented in alphabetical order): Justice Dario Borghesan, Justice Jennifer S. Henderson, Judge Marjorie K. Allard, Judge Timothy W. Terrell, Judge Kristian B. Pickrell, Judge Rachel Ahrens, Judge Bride Seifert, Judge Herman G. Walker, Judge Adolf V. Zeman, Judge Amanda L. Browning, Judge Leslie Dickson, Judge Michael Franciosi, Judge J. Patrick Hanley, Judge Michael B. Logue, Judge Kari L. McCrea, Judge David R. Wallace, Judge Pamela S. Washington, Judge Patricia L. Haines, Judge Maria P. Bahr, Judge Matthew Christian, and Judge William T. Montgomery. During the creation of this report, Judges Amanda Browning and William T. Montgomery were appointed to new judgeships and no longer qualify to stand for retention; therefore, their individual results will not be included.

Methodology

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

Of the 670 total employees invited via email to participate, 289 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 43.1%. Of the 289 returned surveys, 94 did not rate any of the judges; 195 (67.5%) respondents evaluated one or more judges.

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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

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

Results

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

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

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Judge

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

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

Ratings of Judges

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

For each individual judge, Tables 5-42 provide a summary of respondents' experience with each judge and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent experience.

Summary Tables

Table 2

Respondents' Level of Experience with Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Dario Borghesan	30	10.4	90.0	10.0	-
Jennifer S. Henderson	58	20.1	77.6	13.8	8.6
Marjorie K. Allard	21	7.3	85.7	-	14.3
Timothy W. Terrell	17	5.9	94.1	-	5.9
Kristian B. Pickrell	22	7.6	86.4	4.5	9.1
Rachel Ahrens	11	3.8	72.7	18.2	9.1
Bride Seifert	29	10.0	79.3	13.8	6.9
Herman G. Walker	37	12.8	83.8	13.5	2.7
Adolf V. Zeman	27	9.3	81.5	18.5	-
Leslie Dickson	32	11.1	93.8	-	6.3
Michael Franciosi	36	12.5	100	-	-
J. Patrick Hanley	33	11.4	93.9	3.0	3.0
Michael B. Logue	31	10.7	96.8	3.2	-
Kari L. McCrea	30	10.4	96.7	3.3	-
David R. Wallace	33	11.4	90.9	3.0	6.1
Pamela S. Washington	35	12.1	85.7	8.6	5.7
Patricia L. Haines	43	14.9	86.0	9.3	4.7
Maria P. Bahr	34	11.8	97.1	2.9	-
Matthew Christian	37	12.8	91.9	8.1	-

Table 3
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dario Borghesan	27	4.8	5.0	0.6	24	4.9	5.0	0.4
Jennifer S. Henderson	54	4.9	5.0	0.4	43	4.9	5.0	0.4
Marjorie K. Allard	21	4.9	5.0	0.4	18	4.8	5.0	0.4
Timothy W. Terrell	17	3.6	4.0	1.0	16	3.6	3.5	1.1
Kristian B. Pickrell	21	4.9	5.0	0.3	18	4.9	5.0	0.3
Rachel Ahrens	10	5.0	5.0	0.0	8	5.0	5.0	0.0
Bride Seifert	27	4.4	5.0	0.8	22	4.4	5.0	0.8
Herman G. Walker	34	4.3	5.0	0.9	28	4.5	5.0	0.8
Adolf V. Zeman	27	4.3	5.0	0.9	22	4.5	5.0	0.9
Leslie Dickson	32	4.7	5.0	0.5	30	4.7	5.0	0.5
Michael Franciosi	34	4.8	5.0	0.5	34	4.8	5.0	0.5
J. Patrick Hanley	32	4.9	5.0	0.2	31	4.9	5.0	0.2
Michael B. Logue	31	4.2	5.0	1.2	30	4.2	5.0	1.2
Kari L. McCrea	30	5.0	5.0	0.0	29	5.0	5.0	0.0
David R. Wallace	32	4.6	5.0	0.9	30	4.6	5.0	1.0
Pamela S. Washington	34	4.6	5.0	0.9	30	4.5	5.0	0.9
Patricia L. Haines	40	5.0	5.0	0.0	36	5.0	5.0	0.0
Maria P. Bahr	34	4.7	5.0	0.6	33	4.7	5.0	0.6
Matthew Christian	37	4.8	5.0	0.4	34	4.8	5.0	0.4

Table 4
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Dario Borghesan	24	-	-	-	-	1	4.2	1	4.2	22	91.7
Jennifer S. Henderson	43	-	-	-	-	1	2.3	2	4.7	40	93.0
Marjorie K. Allard	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	16.7	15	83.3
Timothy W. Terrell	16	-	-	3	18.8	5	31.3	4	25.0	4	25.0
Kristian B. Pickrell	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	11.1	16	88.9
Rachel Ahrens	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	100.0
Bride Seifert	22	-	-	-	-	4	18.2	6	27.3	12	54.5
Herman G. Walker	28	-	-	1	3.6	2	7.1	7	25.0	18	64.3
Adolf V. Zeman	22	-	-	1	4.5	2	9.1	5	22.7	14	63.6
Leslie Dickson	30	-	-	-	-	1	3.3	7	23.3	22	73.3
Michael Franciosi	34	-	-	-	-	1	2.9	5	14.7	28	82.4
J. Patrick Hanley	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	6.5	29	93.5
Michael B. Logue	30	2	6.7	1	3.3	5	16.7	3	10.0	19	63.3
Kari L. McCrea	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	100.0
David R. Wallace	30	1	3.3	1	3.3	1	3.3	4	13.3	23	76.7
Pamela S. Washington	30	1	3.3	-	-	3	10.0	4	13.3	22	73.3
Patricia L. Haines	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36	100.0
Maria P. Bahr	33	-	-	-	-	2	6.1	6	18.2	25	75.8
Matthew Christian	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	23.5	26	76.5

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

Individual Tables

Table 5

Dario Borghesan

Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	27	90.0
Professional reputation	3	10.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	22.2
Moderate amount of experience	9	33.3
Limited amount of experience	12	44.4

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

Table 6

Dario Borghesan

Detailed Responses

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	30	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	27	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	12	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.7
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.0	4.7	4.3	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 7
Jennifer S. Henderson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	58	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	45	77.6
Professional reputation	8	13.8
Other personal contacts	5	8.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	45	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	22.2
Moderate amount of experience	20	44.4
Limited amount of experience	15	33.3

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

Table 8
Jennifer S. Henderson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	58	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	45	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	45	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	20	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Limited amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	8	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.9
Other personal contacts	5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 9
Marjorie K. Allard
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	21	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	18	85.7
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	3	14.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	18	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	61.1
Moderate amount of experience	4	22.2
Limited amount of experience	3	16.7

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

Table 10
Marjorie K. Allard
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	21	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	18	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	18	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7	5.0

Table 11
Timothy W. Terrell
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	17	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	16	94.1
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	56.3
Moderate amount of experience	4	25.0
Limited amount of experience	3	18.8

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

Table 12
Timothy W. Terrell
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	17	4.1	4.7	4.1	3.4	3.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	16	4.1	4.6	4.1	3.3	3.6
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.1	4.6	4.1	3.3	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.1	4.9	4.0	3.1	3.4
Moderate amount of experience	4	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.5
Limited amount of experience	3	4.3	5.0	4.3	4.5	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 13
Kristian B. Pickrell
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	22	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	19	86.4
Professional reputation	1	4.5
Other personal contacts	2	9.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	17	89.5
Substantial amount of experience	11	57.9
Moderate amount of experience	3	15.8
Limited amount of experience	5	26.3

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

Table 14
Kristian B. Pickrell
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	22	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	19	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	17	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.7	5.0	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	3	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	5.0
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 15
Rachel Ahrens
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	11	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	8	72.7
Professional reputation	2	18.2
Other personal contacts	1	9.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	8	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	6	75.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	2	25.0

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

Table 16
Rachel Ahrens
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	11	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	8	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	6	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	-	-	5.0	-	5.0

Table 17
Bride Seifert
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	23	79.3
Professional reputation	4	13.8
Other personal contacts	2	6.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	21.7
Moderate amount of experience	9	39.1
Limited amount of experience	9	39.1

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

Table 18
Bride Seifert
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	29	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	23	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	23	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.1
Limited amount of experience	9	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4
Professional reputation	4	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.0

Table 19
Herman G. Walker
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	37	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	31	83.8
Professional reputation	5	13.5
Other personal contacts	1	2.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	96.8
Substantial amount of experience	5	16.1
Moderate amount of experience	16	51.6
Limited amount of experience	10	32.3

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

Table 20
Herman G. Walker
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	37	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	31	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.9
Professional reputation	5	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.8
Other personal contacts	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0

Table 21
Adolf V. Zeman
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	27	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	22	81.5
Professional reputation	5	18.5
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	22.7
Moderate amount of experience	5	22.7
Limited amount of experience	12	54.5

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

Table 22
Adolf V. Zeman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	27	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	22	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	22	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.8	4.4
Limited amount of experience	12	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.4	4.7
Professional reputation	5	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.8
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 23
Leslie Dickson
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	32	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	93.8
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	6.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	26.7
Moderate amount of experience	12	40.0
Limited amount of experience	10	33.3

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

Table 24
Leslie Dickson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	32	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.8
Limited amount of experience	10	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 25
Michael Franciosi
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	36	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	36	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	25.7
Moderate amount of experience	15	42.9
Limited amount of experience	11	31.4

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

Table 26
Michael Franciosi
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	36	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	36	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.9	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9
Limited amount of experience	11	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 27
J. Patrick Hanley
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	33	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	31	93.9
Professional reputation	1	3.0
Other personal contacts	1	3.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	96.7
Substantial amount of experience	7	23.3
Moderate amount of experience	15	50.0
Limited amount of experience	8	26.7

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

Table 28
J. Patrick Hanley
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	31	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Limited amount of experience	8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.9
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	-	5.0

Table 29
Michael B. Logue
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	31	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	96.8
Professional reputation	1	3.2
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	30	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	13	43.3
Moderate amount of experience	7	23.3
Limited amount of experience	10	33.3

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

Table 30
Michael B. Logue
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	31	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	30	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	13	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Limited amount of experience	10	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.0
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 31
Kari L. McCrea
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	30	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	29	96.7
Professional reputation	1	3.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	27.6
Moderate amount of experience	10	34.5
Limited amount of experience	11	37.9

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

Table 32
Kari L. McCrea
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	30	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	29	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	29	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	11	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 33
David R. Wallace
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	33	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	90.9
Professional reputation	1	3.0
Other personal contacts	2	6.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	96.7
Substantial amount of experience	10	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	13	43.3
Limited amount of experience	7	23.3

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

Table 34
David R. Wallace
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	33	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	13	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	7	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6
Professional reputation	1	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 35
Pamela S. Washington
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	35	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	30	85.7
Professional reputation	3	8.6
Other personal contacts	2	5.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	29	96.7
Substantial amount of experience	11	36.7
Moderate amount of experience	12	40.0
Limited amount of experience	7	23.3

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

Table 36
Pamela S. Washington
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	35	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	30	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	29	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	11	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.7
Professional reputation	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	-	5.0

Table 37
Patricia L. Haines
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	43	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	37	86.0
Professional reputation	4	9.3
Other personal contacts	2	4.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	24.3
Moderate amount of experience	18	48.6
Limited amount of experience	10	27.0

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

Table 38
Patricia L. Haines
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	43	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	37	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience within last 5 years	37	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	18	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	10	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Table 39
Maria P. Bahr
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	34	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	33	97.1
Professional reputation	1	2.9
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	24.2
Moderate amount of experience	14	42.4
Limited amount of experience	11	33.3

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

Table 40
Maria P. Bahr
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	34	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	33	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	32	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.5	4.8	4.4	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.4	4.6
Limited amount of experience	11	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 41
Matthew Christian
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	37	100
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	34	91.9
Professional reputation	3	8.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	34	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	35.3
Moderate amount of experience	15	44.1
Limited amount of experience	7	20.6

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

Table 42
Matthew Christian
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	37	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.8	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	34	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.9	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	34	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.9	4.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	12	5.0	5.0	4.6	5.0	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	15	4.7	4.8	4.2	4.7	4.6
Limited amount of experience	7	4.8	5.0	4.4	5.0	4.9
Professional reputation	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-