



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

February 24-28, 2025

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: Krista Anderson: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Krista Anderson: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: James Bauman: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: James Bauman: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Glenn J. Shidner: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Glenn J. Shidner: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Jonathan Stinson: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Jonathan Stinson: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Matt Widmer: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Matt Widmer: Detailed Responses	27

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for two judicial vacancies on the Palmer District Court created by the appointments of Judge Tom V. Jamgochian to the Palmer Superior Court and Judge Amanda Browning to the Sitka Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Krista Anderson, James Bauman, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., Elliot Revis, John Revis, Glenn J. Shidner, Jonathan Stinson, and Matt Widmer. Elliot Revis and John Revis withdrew their applications; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

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
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>
Krista Anderson	80	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4
James Bauman	33	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	129	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	41	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	66	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.5	3.7
Matt Widmer	119	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3

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

2025 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, Anchorage Superior Court, and Kodiak Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for two vacancies on Palmer District Court, created by the appointment of Judge Tom V. Jamgochian to the Palmer Superior Court and Judge Amanda Browning to the Sitka Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of eight applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Krista Anderson, James Bauman, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., Elliot Revis, John Revis, Glenn J. Shidner, Jonathan Stinson, and Matt Widmer. Elliot Revis and John Revis withdrew their applications; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

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>	%
All respondents	715	100	466	65.2
Type of Practice				
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
Length of Alaska Practice				
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
Cases Handled				
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
Location of Practice				
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
Gender				
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>
<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. 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 11-22 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
Krista Anderson	84	11.7	95.2	3.6	1.2
James Bauman	37	5.2	89.2	5.4	5.4
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	155	21.7	83.2	14.2	2.6
Glenn J. Shidner	53	7.4	77.4	20.8	1.9
Jonathan Stinson	83	11.6	79.5	19.3	1.2
Matt Widmer	146	20.4	81.5	11.6	6.8

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>
Krista Anderson	84	3.4	4.0	1.3	80	3.4	4.0	1.3
James Bauman	36	3.0	3.0	1.1	33	2.9	3.0	1.0
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	152	3.9	4.0	1.1	127	3.9	4.0	1.1
Glenn J. Shidner	53	4.0	4.0	1.1	41	4.2	5.0	1.0
Jonathan Stinson	82	3.6	4.0	1.2	65	3.7	4.0	1.2
Matt Widmer	142	4.3	5.0	1.0	118	4.3	5.0	1.0

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Krista Anderson	80	9	11.3	13	16.3	16	20.0	21	26.3	21	26.3
James Bauman	33	2	6.1	11	33.3	10	30.3	8	24.2	2	6.1
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	127	5	3.9	10	7.9	27	21.3	36	28.3	49	38.6
Glenn J. Shidner	41	-	-	4	9.8	4	9.8	12	29.3	21	51.2
Jonathan Stinson	65	3	4.6	10	15.4	11	16.9	19	29.2	22	33.8
Matt Widmer	118	3	2.5	3	2.5	14	11.9	32	27.1	66	55.9

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>	
Krista Anderson	2	3.0	5	2.8	6	3.0	-	-	16	3.9	44	3.3	2	2.5	4	4.5	1	5.0	3.4
James Bauman	2	4.5	5	3.6	2	3.0	-	-	7	3.4	16	2.4	1	1.0	-	-	-	-	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	8	3.3	12	3.7	9	3.8	-	-	22	4.0	64	4.0	4	3.5	8	3.8			3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	1	4.0	6	4.2	2	4.5	-	-	7	4.3	22	4.3	3	3.7	-	-	-	-	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	2	4.0	1	1.0	4	4.5	-	-	22	3.6	32	3.8	4	3.5	-	-	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	12	4.2	13	4.0	25	4.7	-	-	26	4.4	35	4.1	3	5.0	3	4.3	1	2.0	4.3

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>
Krista Anderson	16	3.1	7	2.9	18	3.3	13	3.2	24	4.0	3.4
James Bauman	3	2.7	5	2.4	9	3.3	8	2.8	7	3.1	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	19	4.1	13	3.9	23	4.0	20	3.7	49	4.0	3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	7	4.3	3	4.0	13	4.3	8	4.4	7	4.4	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	11	4.1	10	3.6	9	3.2	13	3.5	19	3.9	3.7
Matt Widmer	8	4.5	8	4.6	24	4.6	32	4.3	43	4.0	4.3

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>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>	
Krista Anderson	14	4.1	18	2.6	37	3.5	9	4.0	2	2.0	3.4
James Bauman	1	3.0	5	2.8	17	3.1	10	2.6	-	-	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	25	4.7	33	3.5	46	3.7	22	3.9	1	4.0	3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	4	4.5	10	4.0	18	4.4	9	3.9	-	-	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	12	3.8	10	3.2	23	3.9	19	3.8	1	2.0	3.7
Matt Widmer	9	3.7	19	4.6	44	4.3	40	4.4	6	4.2	4.3

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>	
Krista Anderson	3	4.7	-	-	71	3.4	2	2.5	4	2.8	3.4
James Bauman	-	-	1	2.0	31	3.0	-	-	1	1.0	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	5	4.6	1	4.0	114	3.9	6	3.7	1	2.0	3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	-	-	-	-	37	4.4	-	-	3	2.7	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	3	4.7	-	-	59	3.7	3	4.0	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	1	4.0	2	4.5	106	4.3	7	4.4	2	4.0	4.3

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>	
Krista Anderson	38	3.3	42	3.5	-	-	3.4
James Bauman	18	3.0	15	2.8	-	-	2.9
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.	78	3.9	49	3.9	-	-	3.9
Glenn J. Shidner	23	4.2	18	4.3	-	-	4.2
Jonathan Stinson	32	3.9	33	3.5	-	-	3.7
Matt Widmer	63	4.5	55	4.1	-	-	4.3

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

Table 11
Krista Anderson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	84	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	80	95.2
Professional reputation	3	3.6
Other personal contacts	1	1.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	71	88.8
Substantial amount of experience	36	45.0
Moderate amount of experience	27	33.8
Limited amount of experience	17	21.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	2	2.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	7.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	7.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	20.2
Government	46	54.8
Public service agency or organization	2	2.4
Retired	4	4.8
Other	1	1.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.4
5 years or fewer	16	19.0
6 to 10 years	8	9.5
11 to 15 years	18	21.4
16 to 20 years	14	16.7
More than 20 years	26	31.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	14	16.7
Criminal	18	21.4
Mixed criminal & civil	38	45.2
Civil	11	13.1
Other	3	3.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.6
Second District	-	-
Third District	75	89.3
Fourth District	2	2.4
Outside Alaska	4	4.8
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	40	47.6
Female	44	52.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Krista Anderson
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	84	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.7	3.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	80	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4
Experience within last 5 years	71	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4
Experience not within last 5 years	9	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	36	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.5
Moderate amount of experience	27	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.2
Limited amount of experience	17	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.5
Professional reputation	3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.0	3.3
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.8	3.6	2.6	3.0	3.2	2.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.2	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.3	3.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	16	4.0	4.1	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.9
Government	44	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.6	3.3
Public service agency or organization	2	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.5
Retired	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	16	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.5	3.1
6 to 10 years	7	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.3	2.9
11 to 15 years	18	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.3
16 to 20 years	13	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.2
More than 20 years	24	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	14	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.1
Criminal	18	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.6
Mixed criminal & civil	37	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.5
Civil	9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.4	4.0
Other	2	1.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	5.0	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	71	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4
Fourth District	2	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	2.5
Outside Alaska	4	2.5	2.0	2.8	2.5	3.5	2.8
Gender*							
Male	38	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.3
Female	42	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
James Bauman
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	37	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	33	89.2
Professional reputation	2	5.4
Other personal contacts	2	5.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	81.8
Substantial amount of experience	8	24.2
Moderate amount of experience	18	54.5
Limited amount of experience	7	21.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	8.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	13.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	5.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	21.6
Government	18	48.6
Public service agency or organization	1	2.7
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	2.7
5 years or fewer	4	10.8
6 to 10 years	5	13.5
11 to 15 years	9	24.3
16 to 20 years	8	21.6
More than 20 years	10	27.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	2.7
Criminal	6	16.2
Mixed criminal & civil	18	48.6
Civil	12	32.4
Other	-	-
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	2.7
Third District	35	94.6
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	2.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	21	56.8
Female	16	43.2
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
James Bauman
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	37	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	33	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.1	2.9
Experience within last 5 years	27	2.9	3.4	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.8
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	8	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.3	2.9
Moderate amount of experience	18	2.8	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.9	2.8
Limited amount of experience	7	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.3
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Other personal contacts	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.4	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	3.3	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.4
Government	16	2.4	3.1	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.4
Public service agency or organization	1	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	2.7	3.0	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.7
6 to 10 years	5	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4
11 to 15 years	9	3.2	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.1	3.3
16 to 20 years	8	2.9	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.1	2.8
More than 20 years	7	3.1	3.4	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	1	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
Criminal	5	2.6	3.6	3.5	3.0	2.8	2.8
Mixed criminal & civil	17	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.1
Civil	10	2.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.0
Third District	31	3.0	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.1	3.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0
Gender*							
Male	18	3.1	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.0
Female	15	2.8	3.1	3.3	2.9	3.0	2.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	155	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	129	83.2
Professional reputation	22	14.2
Other personal contacts	4	2.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	115	89.1
Substantial amount of experience	53	41.1
Moderate amount of experience	42	32.6
Limited amount of experience	34	26.4
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	13	8.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	10.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	7.7
Private, corporate employee	1	0.6
Judge or judicial officer	29	18.7
Government	70	45.2
Public service agency or organization	4	2.6
Retired	10	6.5
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	1.9
5 years or fewer	23	14.8
6 to 10 years	14	9.0
11 to 15 years	29	18.7
16 to 20 years	23	14.8
More than 20 years	63	40.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	26	16.8
Criminal	35	22.6
Mixed criminal & civil	52	33.5
Civil	40	25.8
Other	2	1.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	5	3.2
Second District	1	0.6
Third District	141	91.0
Fourth District	6	3.9
Outside Alaska	2	1.3
Gender		
No response	1	0.6
Male	94	60.6
Female	60	38.7
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Patrick J. McKay, Jr.
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	155	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	129	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	115	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	14	3.6	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.5	3.4
Substantial amount of experience	53	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	42	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Limited amount of experience	34	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	22	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
Other personal contacts	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Government	66	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Public service agency or organization	4	4.0	4.3	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5
Retired	8	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	21	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
6 to 10 years	13	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9
11 to 15 years	23	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.0
16 to 20 years	20	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7
More than 20 years	49	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	26	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7
Criminal	34	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	46	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7
Civil	22	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9
Other	1	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.6
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	116	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
Fourth District	6	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.7
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	2.0
Gender*							
Male	79	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9
Female	50	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Glenn J. Shidner
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	53	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	41	77.4
Professional reputation	11	20.8
Other personal contacts	1	1.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	85.4
Substantial amount of experience	19	46.3
Moderate amount of experience	13	31.7
Limited amount of experience	9	22.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	1	1.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	13.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	15.1
Government	29	54.7
Public service agency or organization	4	7.5
Retired	1	1.9
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	5.7
5 years or fewer	8	15.1
6 to 10 years	7	13.2
11 to 15 years	16	30.2
16 to 20 years	10	18.9
More than 20 years	9	17.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	6	11.3
Criminal	12	22.6
Mixed criminal & civil	22	41.5
Civil	13	24.5
Other	-	-
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.9
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	48	90.6
Fourth District	1	1.9
Outside Alaska	3	5.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	29	54.7
Female	24	45.3
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
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	53	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.2	3.9	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	41	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	35	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	6	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	13	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.3	3.8	4.2
Limited amount of experience	9	3.6	3.7	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	11	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.3
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.0	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.0	4.3
Government	22	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3
Public service agency or organization	3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0
11 to 15 years	13	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
16 to 20 years	8	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.1	4.4
More than 20 years	7	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.6	3.9	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Criminal	10	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	18	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.1	4.4
Civil	9	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	37	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.4
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	3	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.3	3.0	2.7
Gender*							
Male	23	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.2
Female	18	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 19
Jonathan Stinson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	83	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	66	79.5
Professional reputation	16	19.3
Other personal contacts	1	1.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	66	100
Substantial amount of experience	24	36.4
Moderate amount of experience	24	36.4
Limited amount of experience	18	27.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	4	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	2.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	8.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	31.3
Government	39	47.0
Public service agency or organization	5	6.0
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	3.6
5 years or fewer	14	16.9
6 to 10 years	12	14.5
11 to 15 years	11	13.3
16 to 20 years	16	19.3
More than 20 years	27	32.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	12	14.5
Criminal	14	16.9
Mixed criminal & civil	31	37.3
Civil	25	30.1
Other	1	1.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.6
Second District	-	-
Third District	76	91.6
Fourth District	4	4.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	43	51.8
Female	40	48.2
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 20
Jonathan Stinson
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	83	3.8	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.5	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	66	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.5	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	66	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.5	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	24	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.4	3.7	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	24	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.5	3.7
Limited amount of experience	18	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.3	3.6
Professional reputation	16	3.1	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.2
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.5	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.4	3.6
Government	32	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.3	3.6	3.8
Public service agency or organization	4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.5
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	11	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1
6 to 10 years	10	3.9	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.3	3.6
11 to 15 years	9	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	3.2
16 to 20 years	14	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.2	3.5
More than 20 years	19	4.0	4.8	4.8	4.5	3.7	3.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	12	3.9	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.6	3.8
Criminal	10	3.4	4.0	4.0	4.1	2.9	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	23	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.8	3.9
Civil	20	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Other	1	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.0	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	60	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.5	3.7
Fourth District	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.3	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	33	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.4	3.7	3.9
Female	33	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 21
Matt Widmer
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	146	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	119	81.5
Professional reputation	17	11.6
Other personal contacts	10	6.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	94	79.0
Substantial amount of experience	45	37.8
Moderate amount of experience	48	40.3
Limited amount of experience	26	21.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	13	8.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	10.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	28	19.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	28	19.2
Government	48	32.9
Public service agency or organization	6	4.1
Retired	6	4.1
Other	2	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	2.7
5 years or fewer	9	6.2
6 to 10 years	13	8.9
11 to 15 years	29	19.9
16 to 20 years	36	24.7
More than 20 years	55	37.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	6.8
Criminal	29	19.9
Mixed criminal & civil	49	33.6
Civil	51	34.9
Other	7	4.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	2	1.4
Second District	2	1.4
Third District	132	90.4
Fourth District	7	4.8
Outside Alaska	3	2.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	78	53.4
Female	68	46.6
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Matt Widmer
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	146	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	119	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	94	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	25	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	45	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	48	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Limited amount of experience	26	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.8
Professional reputation	17	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	10	4.1	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	12	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	3.8	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.1	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	25	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4
Government	35	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1
Public service agency or organization	4	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3
Other	1	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	25	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
16 to 20 years	32	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	43	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.7
Criminal	19	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	44	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Civil	41	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Other	6	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.2
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	2	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Third District	107	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.4
Outside Alaska	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	63	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Female	56	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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