



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Palmer District Court

Technical Report

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

August 19-23, 2024

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

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: Chris Darnall: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Chris Darnall: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Derek M. Koehler: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Derek M. Koehler: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Glenn J. Shidner: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Glenn J. Shidner: 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 Palmer District Court created by the appointment of Judge Amanda L. Browning to the Sitka Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Chris Darnall, Derek M. Koehler, and Glenn J. Shidner.

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

	<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>
Chris Darnall	100	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	65	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	40	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.0

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

2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Palmer District 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 and Bethel District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Palmer District Court, created by the appointment of Judge Amanda L. Browning to the Sitka Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Chris Darnall, Derek M. Koehler, and Glenn J. Shidner.

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 3,749 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,736) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 13 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 637 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; nine surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; three surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. One online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 624 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned three 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. 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. One paper survey was returned by an individual who also completed the online survey. The paper survey was more complete and was included in the analysis. Therefore, three paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 624 online surveys and three paper surveys, for a total of 627 surveys and a survey return rate of 16.8%. Of the 627 returned surveys, 414 (66%) did not rate any of the five applicants (three

Palmer District Court applicants and two Bethel District Court applicants); 213 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
	All respondents	627	100	213	34.0
Type of Practice					
	No response	2	0.3	1	0.5
	Private, solo	121	19.3	25	11.7
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	66	10.5	19	8.9
	Private, 6+ attorneys	69	11.0	16	7.5
	Private, corporate employee	11	1.8	1	0.5
	Judge or judicial officer	66	10.5	44	20.7
	Government	158	25.2	88	41.3
	Public service agency or organization	26	4.1	10	4.7
	Retired	97	15.5	8	3.8
	Other	11	1.8	1	0.5
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	31	4.9	4	1.9
	5 years or fewer	78	12.4	46	21.6
	6 to 10 years	61	9.7	28	13.1
	11 to 15 years	61	9.7	31	14.6
	16 to 20 years	72	11.5	25	11.7
	More than 20 years	324	51.7	79	37.1
Cases Handled					
	No response	5	0.8	1	0.5
	Prosecution	55	8.8	44	20.7
	Criminal	58	9.3	29	13.6
	Mixed criminal & civil	156	24.9	78	36.6
	Civil	309	49.3	58	27.2
	Other	44	7.0	3	1.4
Location of Practice					
	No response	5	0.8	2	0.9
	First District	65	10.4	8	3.8
	Second District	16	2.6	12	5.6
	Third District	453	72.2	164	77.0
	Fourth District	59	9.4	22	10.3
	Outside Alaska	29	4.6	5	2.3
Gender					
	No response	12	1.9	4	1.9
	Male	359	57.3	117	54.9
	Female	253	40.4	92	43.2
	Another identity	3	0.5	-	-

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>
<i>Professional Competence</i>	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
<i>Integrity</i>	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
<i>Fairness</i>	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
<i>Judicial Temperament</i>	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
<i>Suitability of Experience</i>	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
<i>Overall Rating</i>	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. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

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
Chris Darnall	112	17.9	89.3	8.9	1.8
Derek M. Koehler	74	11.8	87.8	9.5	2.7
Glenn J. Shidner	48	7.7	83.3	12.5	4.2

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>
Chris Darnall	110	4.1	4.0	1.0	99	4.1	4.0	1.0
Derek M. Koehler	74	3.6	4.0	1.4	65	3.5	4.0	1.4
Glenn J. Shidner	47	3.9	4.0	1.2	40	4.0	4.0	1.2

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Chris Darnall	99	2	2.0	5	5.1	16	16.2	31	31.3	45	45.5
Derek M. Koehler	65	6	9.2	13	20.0	11	16.9	12	18.5	23	35.4
Glenn J. Shidner	40	2	5.0	2	5.0	8	20.0	10	25.0	18	45.0

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>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>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Chris Darnall	4	4.3	3	2.7	7	4.0	-	-	25	4.0	56	4.3	2	2.5	2	5.0	-	-	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	9	4.6	9	4.4	4	4.8	-	-	13	3.4	28	2.8	1	2.0			1	4.0	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	2	4.5	4	4.3	2	3.0	-	-	5	3.8	20	4.1	6	3.7	1	5.0	-	-	4.0

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>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>
Chris Darnall	20	4.4	17	4.2	15	3.9	19	3.9	27	4.1	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	18	3.2	3	2.3	11	3.4	12	2.6	21	4.6	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	9	3.9	5	4.2	9	4.1	10	3.8	7	4.1	4.0

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>
Chris Darnall	36	4.7	17	3.6	37	3.9	6	3.7	3	3.7	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	11	1.9	6	3.8	28	3.8	19	3.9	1	4.0	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	7	4.1	3	2.7	16	4.2	13	4.1	1	3.0	4.0

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>	
Chris Darnall	6	4.5	6	4.3	72	4.1	13	4.2	1	5.0	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	-	-	-	-	63	3.5	1	3.0	1	5.0	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	-	-	-	-	37	4.0	2	5.0	1	2.0	4.0

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>	
Chris Darnall	56	4.1	42	4.2	-	-	4.1
Derek M. Koehler	29	3.8	35	3.2	-	-	3.5
Glenn J. Shidner	22	3.9	18	4.1	-	-	4.0

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

Table 11
Chris Darnall
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	112	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	100	89.3
Professional reputation	10	8.9
Other personal contacts	2	1.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	98	98.0
Substantial amount of experience	27	27.0
Moderate amount of experience	48	48.0
Limited amount of experience	25	25.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	4	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	7.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	27	24.1
Government	64	57.1
Public service agency or organization	3	2.7
Retired	3	2.7
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	0.9
5 years or fewer	24	21.4
6 to 10 years	18	16.1
11 to 15 years	16	14.3
16 to 20 years	20	17.9
More than 20 years	33	29.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	39	34.8
Criminal	19	17.0
Mixed criminal & civil	41	36.6
Civil	10	8.9
Other	3	2.7
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.9
First District	6	5.4
Second District	6	5.4
Third District	85	75.9
Fourth District	13	11.6
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	61	54.5
Female	50	44.6
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Chris Darnall
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	112	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	100	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	98	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	27	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	48	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Limited amount of experience	25	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	10	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	2.7	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.1	4.4	4.1	3.7	3.7	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Government	57	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	2.0	2.5
Retired	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	21	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.4
6 to 10 years	17	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.2
11 to 15 years	15	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
16 to 20 years	19	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.9
More than 20 years	27	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	36	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.4	4.7
Criminal	18	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.6
Mixed criminal & civil	37	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9
Civil	6	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.8	3.2	3.7
Other	3	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5
Second District	6	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.5	4.3	4.3
Third District	73	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Fourth District	13	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	57	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Female	42	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Derek M. Koehler
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	74	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	65	87.8
Professional reputation	7	9.5
Other personal contacts	2	2.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	60	92.3
Substantial amount of experience	25	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	24	36.9
Limited amount of experience	16	24.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	13.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	13.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	6.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	18.9
Government	30	40.5
Public service agency or organization	3	4.1
Retired	1	1.4
Other	1	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	19	25.7
6 to 10 years	4	5.4
11 to 15 years	11	14.9
16 to 20 years	13	17.6
More than 20 years	27	36.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	11	14.9
Criminal	7	9.5
Mixed criminal & civil	32	43.2
Civil	23	31.1
Other	1	1.4
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	1.4
Third District	70	94.6
Fourth District	1	1.4
Outside Alaska	2	2.7
Gender		
No response	1	1.4
Male	35	47.3
Female	38	51.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Derek M. Koehler
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	74	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	65	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	60	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	5	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.2
Substantial amount of experience	25	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	24	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
Limited amount of experience	16	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.0
Professional reputation	7	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.5	5.0	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.8	3.4
Government	28	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.8
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	18	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2
6 to 10 years	3	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.3	3.0	2.3
11 to 15 years	11	3.2	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4
16 to 20 years	12	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.6	3.2	2.6
More than 20 years	21	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	11	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.4	1.9
Criminal	6	3.8	4.3	4.0	4.2	3.7	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	28	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8
Civil	19	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9
Other	1	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	63	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
Fourth District	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	29	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8
Female	35	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Glenn J. Shidner
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	48	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	40	83.3
Professional reputation	6	12.5
Other personal contacts	2	4.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	87.5
Substantial amount of experience	19	47.5
Moderate amount of experience	14	35.0
Limited amount of experience	7	17.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	2	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	8.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	6.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	14.6
Government	24	50.0
Public service agency or organization	7	14.6
Retired	1	2.1
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	11	22.9
6 to 10 years	6	12.5
11 to 15 years	11	22.9
16 to 20 years	12	25.0
More than 20 years	8	16.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	9	18.8
Criminal	3	6.3
Mixed criminal & civil	21	43.8
Civil	14	29.2
Other	1	2.1
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	2.1
Third District	44	91.7
Fourth District	2	4.2
Outside Alaska	1	2.1
Gender		
No response	1	2.1
Male	24	50.0
Female	23	47.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Glenn J. Shidner
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	48	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	40	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.0	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	14	3.7	4.1	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.9
Limited amount of experience	7	3.3	4.3	4.3	3.7	3.2	3.3
Professional reputation	6	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.2
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.0	3.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2	3.6	3.8
Government	20	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	6	3.8	4.2	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.0	3.9
6 to 10 years	5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.2
11 to 15 years	9	3.9	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1
16 to 20 years	10	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8
More than 20 years	7	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	7	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.1
Criminal	3	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.7	2.7	2.7
Mixed criminal & civil	16	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.2
Civil	13	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.1
Other	1	1.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	37	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
Gender*							
Male	22	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9
Female	18	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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