



**UAA** Center for Behavioral  
Health Research & Services  
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Retention Survey: Social Service Professionals**

### **Technical Report**

Maia Wen, B.A., Research Professional  
Katelyn Saft, Undergraduate Research Assistant  
Stacy Tanner, B.A., Graduate Research Assistant  
Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Associate Professor

*April 10, 2018*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs/index.php](http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs/index.php)

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges .....	2
Introduction .....	3
Methodology .....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics .....	4
Instrumentation.....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety .....	5
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Judges .....	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings .....	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating .....	9
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Work.....	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Experience .....	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Community Population.....	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Work .....	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender .....	15
<i>Individual Tables</i>	
Table 11: William B. Carey: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: William B. Carey: Detailed Responses .....	17
Table 13: Kevin G. Miller: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	18
Table 14: Kevin G. Miller: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Kirsten Swanson: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Kirsten Swanson: Detailed Responses .....	21
Table 17: Angela M. Greene: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	22
Table 18: Angela M. Greene: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Steve W. Cole: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	24
Table 20: Steve W. Cole: Detailed Responses .....	25
Table 21: Michael D. Corey: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	26
Table 22: Michael D. Corey: Detailed Responses.....	27
Table 23: William F. Morse: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	28
Table 24: William F. Morse: Detailed Responses .....	29
Table 25: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	30
Table 26: Herman G. Walker, Jr.: Detailed Responses .....	31
Table 27: Michael L. Wolverton: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	32
Table 28: Michael L. Wolverton: Detailed Responses .....	33
Table 29: Jo-Ann Chung: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	34
Table 30: Jo-Ann Chung: Detailed Responses.....	35
Table 31: Brian K. Clark: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	36
Table 32: Brian K. Clark: Detailed Responses .....	37
Table 33: William L. Estelle: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	38
Table 34: William L. Estelle: Detailed Responses .....	39
Table 35: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	40
Table 36: Sharon A. S. Illsley: Detailed Responses .....	41
Table 37: John W. Wolfe: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	42
Table 38: John W. Wolfe: Detailed Responses .....	43
Table 39: Paul R. Lyle: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	44
Table 40: Paul R. Lyle: Detailed Responses .....	45
Table 41: Michael P. McConahy: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	46
Table 42: Michael P. McConahy: Detailed Responses.....	47

Table 43: Benjamin A. Seekins: Demographic Description of Respondents ..... 48  
Table 44: Benjamin A. Seekins: Detailed Responses..... 49

## *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 social service professionals to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. This 2018 survey included 17 trial court judges eligible for retention.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked social service professionals 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 <i>M</i>
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
William B. Carey	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
<i>District Court</i>						
Kevin G. Miller	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Steve W. Cole	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
William F. Morse	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
<i>District Court</i>						
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>						
<i>Superior Court</i>						
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
<i>District Court</i>						
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

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

# 2018 Judicial Retention Survey: Social Service Professionals

## *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 social service professionals and asked them to rate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of work, length of experience, community population, location of work, and gender.

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

The 2018 retention survey for social service professionals included 17 trial court judges eligible for retention.

## *Methodology*

State of Alaska social service professionals, specifically Office of Children's Services protective service specialists and managers (also known as social workers), guardians ad litem, and court appointed special advocate (CASA) volunteers, were invited via email to participate in an online survey.

Of the 492 social service professionals invited via email to participate, 120 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 24.4%. Of the 120 returned surveys, 77 did not rate any judges; 43 (35.8%) respondents evaluated one or more judges. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

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

		All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Judge	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>All respondents</b>		<b>120</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Type of Work</b>					
	No response	1	0.8	1	2.3
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	74	61.7	31	72.1
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	19	15.8	6	14.0
	CASA Volunteer	24	20.0	5	11.6
	Other	2	1.7	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>					
	No response	1	0.8	-	-
	5 years or fewer	63	52.5	21	48.8
	6 to 10 years	30	25.0	12	27.9
	11 to 15 years	10	8.3	5	11.6
	16 to 20 years	12	10.0	4	9.3
	More than 20 years	4	3.3	1	2.3
<b>Community Population</b>					
	No response	8	6.7	-	-
	Under 2,000	4	3.3	3	7.0
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	41	34.2	16	37.2
	Over 35,000	67	55.8	24	55.8
<b>Location of Work</b>					
	No response	10	8.3	1	2.3
	First District	17	14.2	9	20.9
	Second District	5	4.2	3	7.0
	Third District	67	55.8	19	44.2
	Fourth District	21	17.5	11	25.6
	Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender</b>					
	No response	-	-	-	-
	Male	19	15.8	6	14.0
	Female	101	84.2	37	86.0

## ***Instrumentation***

The survey contained the names of the judges eligible for retention, questions about demographic information for each respondent, 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 CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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 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 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

### ***Ratings of Judges***

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 ratings to those from respondents 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 on the *Overall* item. Table 6 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' type of work. Table 7 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' length of experience. Table 8 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' community population. Table 9 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' location of work. Table 10 provides judges' mean ratings broken down by respondents' gender.

For each individual judge, Tables 11-44 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

**Table 3**  
**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
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
William B. Carey	7	5.8	100.0	-	-
<i>District Court</i>					
Kevin G. Miller	4	3.3	75.0	25.0	-
Kirsten Swanson	1	0.8	-	100.0	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Angela M. Greene	3	2.5	100.0	-	-
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Steve W. Cole	2	1.7	100.0	-	-
Michael D. Corey	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
William F. Morse	18	15.0	100.0	-	-
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	7	5.8	57.1	28.6	14.3
<i>District Court</i>					
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	2	1.7	50.0	-	50.0
William L. Estelle	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	0.8	100.0	-	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.2	100.0	-	-
Michael P. McConahy	9	7.5	100.0	-	-
<i>District Court</i>					
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	0.8	100.0	-	-

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

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
William B. Carey	7	4.7	5.0	0.5	7	4.7	5.0	0.5
<i>District Court</i>								
Kevin G. Miller	4	4.5	4.5	0.6	3	4.7	5.0	0.6
Kirsten Swanson	1	5.0	5.0	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	2.0	1.5	3	2.3	2.0	1.5
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Steve W. Cole	2	3.5	3.5	0.7	2	3.5	3.5	0.7
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	5.0	-	1	5.0	5.0	-
William F. Morse	17	4.2	5.0	1.0	17	4.2	5.0	1.0
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	7	3.9	4.0	1.5	4	4.3	4.5	1.0
<i>District Court</i>								
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	2	3.5	3.5	2.1	1	5.0	5.0	-
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	5.0	-	1	5.0	5.0	-
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	4.0	-	1	4.0	4.0	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>								
<i>Superior Court</i>								
Paul R. Lyle	5	4.4	4.0	0.5	5	4.4	4.0	0.5
Michael P. McConahy	9	4.1	4.0	1.1	9	4.1	4.0	1.1
<i>District Court</i>								
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	4.0	-	1	4.0	4.0	-

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

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
William B. Carey	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	28.6	5	71.4
<i>District Court</i>											
Kevin G. Miller	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	33.3	1	66.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Angela M. Greene	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	-	-	1	33.3	-	-
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Steve W. Cole	2	-	-	-	-	1	50.0	1	50.0	-	-
Michael D. Corey	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
William F. Morse	17	-	-	1	5.9	3	17.6	4	23.5	9	52.9
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	-	-	-	-	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
<i>District Court</i>											
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
William L. Estelle	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
Sharon A.S. Illsley	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

*Table 5 (cont.)  
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating*

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Paul R. Lyle	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	2	40.0
Michael P. McConahy	9	-	-	1	11.1	1	11.1	3	33.3	4	44.4
<i>District Court</i>											
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0	-	-

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

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

	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)		Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)		CASA Volunteer		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
William B. Carey	6	4.8	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>							
Kevin G. Miller	2	5.0	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Angela M. Greene	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	1	4.0	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	13	4.2	2	4.0	2	4.5	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	2	4.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	4.3
<i>District Court</i>							
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Paul R. Lyle	3	4.3	1	4.0	1	5.0	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	6	4.5	1	4.0	1	2.0	4.1
<i>District Court</i>							
Benjamin A. Seekins	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	4.0

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

**Table 7**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Experience**

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		More than 20 years		Overall M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
William B. Carey	1	4.0	4	4.8	1	5.0	-	-	1	5.0	4.7
<i>District Court</i>											
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	2	5.0	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Angela M. Greene	2	3.0	-	-	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	6	4.0	6	4.3	3	4.0	2	5.0	-	-	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	4	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3
<i>District Court</i>											
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
William L. Estelle	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>											
<i>Superior Court</i>											
Paul R. Lyle	4	4.5	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	7	4.4	2	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.1
<i>District Court</i>											
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0

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

**Table 8**  
**Mean Overall Ratings by Community Population**

	Under 2,000		Between 2,000 and 35,000		Over 35,000		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
William B. Carey	-	-	7	4.7	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>							
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	3	4.7	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Angela M. Greene	2	2.5	1	2.0	-	-	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Steve W. Cole	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	3.5
Michael D. Corey	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	-	-	-	-	17	4.2	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	-	-	-	-	4	4.3	4.3
<i>District Court</i>							
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>							
<i>Superior Court</i>							
Paul R. Lyle	1	4.0	1	4.0	3	4.7	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	2	5.0	4	4.0	3	3.7	4.1
<i>District Court</i>							
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0

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

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

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		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>M</i>
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
William B. Carey	7	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7
<i>District Court</i>									
Kevin G. Miller	3	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Angela M. Greene	-	-	1	1.0	-	-	2	3.0	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Steve W. Cole	-	-	-	-	2	3.5	-	-	3.5
Michael D. Corey	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	-	-	-	-	16	4.2	-	-	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverton	-	-	-	-	4	4.3	-	-	4.3
<i>District Court</i>									
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>									
<i>Superior Court</i>									
Paul R. Lyle	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4.4	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	4.1	4.1
<i>District Court</i>									
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	4.0

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

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

	Male		Female		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
<b><u>First Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
William B. Carey	1	4.0	6	4.8	4.7
<i>District Court</i>					
Kevin G. Miller	-	-	3	4.7	4.7
Kirsten Swanson	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Second Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Angela M. Greene	-	-	3	2.3	2.3
<b><u>Third Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Steve W. Cole	1	3.0	1	4.0	3.5
Michael D. Corey	1	5.0	-	-	5.0
William F. Morse	3	3.7	14	4.4	4.2
Herman G. Walker, Jr.	-	-	-	-	-
Michael L. Wolverson	1	3.0	3	4.7	4.3
<i>District Court</i>					
Jo-Ann Chung	-	-	-	-	-
Brian K. Clark	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
William L. Estelle	-	-	1	5.0	5.0
Sharon A. S. Illsley	-	-	1	4.0	4.0
John W. Wolfe	-	-	-	-	-
<b><u>Fourth Judicial District</u></b>					
<i>Superior Court</i>					
Paul R. Lyle	-	-	5	4.4	4.4
Michael P. McConahy	1	5.0	8	4.0	4.1
<i>District Court</i>					
Benjamin A. Seekins	-	-	1	4.0	4.0

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

**Table 11**  
**William B. Carey**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	7	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	7	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	14.3
Moderate amount of experience	5	71.4
Limited amount of experience	1	14.3
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	85.7
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	14.3
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	14.3
6 to 10 years	4	57.1
11 to 15 years	1	14.3
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	1	14.3
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	7	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	7	100.0
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	1	14.3
Female	6	85.7

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

**Table 12**  
**William B. Carey**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	5	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.6
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.8
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8
11 to 15 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	7	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Female	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8

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

**Table 13**  
**Kevin G. Miller**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	3	75.0
Professional reputation	1	25.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	3	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	33.3
Limited amount of experience	2	66.7
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	50.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	50.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	-	-
6 to 10 years	3	75.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	25.0
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	4	100.0
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	4	100.0

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

**Table 14**  
**Kevin G. Miller**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>4.7</b>
Experience within last 5 years	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7

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

**Table 15**  
**Kirsten Swanson**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
	<b>All respondents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>			
	Direct professional experience	-	-
	Professional reputation	1	100.0
	Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	-	-
	Substantial amount of experience	-	-
	Moderate amount of experience	-	-
	Limited amount of experience	-	-
<b>Type of Work</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
	CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	1	100.0
	6 to 10 years	-	-
	11 to 15 years	-	-
	16 to 20 years	-	-
	More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Under 2,000	-	-
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
	Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>			
	No response	-	-
	First District	1	100.0
	Second District	-	-
	Third District	-	-
	Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Male	-	-
	Female	1	100.0

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

**Table 16**  
**Kirsten Swanson**  
**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	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 17**  
**Angela M. Greene**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	3	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	3	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	2	66.7
Limited amount of experience	-	-
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	2	66.7
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	33.3
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	2	66.7
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	33.3
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	33.3
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	2	66.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	3	100.0

**Table 18**  
**Angela M. Greene**  
**Detailed Responses**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Diligence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
All respondents	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	2	1.5	1.5	2.5	1.5	1.5
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	2	2.5	2.5	4.0	2.0	2.5
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	3	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.3

**Table 19**  
**Steve W. Cole**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	2	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	2	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	50.0
Limited amount of experience	1	50.0
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	50.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	50.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	50.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	50.0
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	2	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	2	100.0
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	1	50.0
Female	1	50.0

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

**Table 20**  
**Steve W. Cole**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.5</b>
Experience within last 5 years	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0

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

**Table 21**  
**Michael D. Corey**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	100.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	100.0
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	1	100.0
Female	-	-

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

**Table 22**  
**Michael D. Corey**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Female	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 23**  
**William F. Morse**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	18	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	88.9
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.6
Moderate amount of experience	9	50.0
Limited amount of experience	7	38.9
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	14	77.8
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	11.1
CASA Volunteer	2	11.1
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	6	33.3
6 to 10 years	6	33.3
11 to 15 years	4	22.2
16 to 20 years	2	11.1
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	18	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	1	5.6
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	17	94.4
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	3	16.7
Female	15	83.3

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

**Table 24**  
**William F. Morse**  
**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	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>
Experience within last 5 years	16	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	3.9	3.9	3.5	3.6	3.9
Limited amount of experience	7	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	14	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.2	4.2
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
CASA Volunteer	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	6	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	6	4.3	4.2	3.7	4.5	4.3
11 to 15 years	4	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.7	4.0
16 to 20 years	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	18	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	17	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Female	15	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.4

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

***Table 25***  
***Herman G. Walker, Jr.***  
***Demographic Description of Respondents***

No Respondents

***Table 26***  
***Herman G. Walker, Jr.***  
***Detailed Responses***

No Respondents

**Table 27**  
**Michael L. Wolverton**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	4	57.1
Professional reputation	2	28.6
Other personal contacts	1	14.3
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	4	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	25.0
Limited amount of experience	3	75.0
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	4	57.1
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	14.3
CASA Volunteer	2	28.6
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	6	85.7
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	1	14.3
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	7	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	14.3
Third District	6	85.7
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	1	14.3
Female	6	85.7

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

**Table 28**  
**Michael L. Wolverton**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	7	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
CASA Volunteer	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Female	3	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7

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

***Table 29***  
***Jo-Ann Chung***  
***Demographic Description of Respondents***

No Respondents

***Table 30***  
***Jo-Ann Chung***  
***Detailed Responses***

No Respondents

**Table 31**  
**Brian K. Clark**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

		<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
	<b>All respondents</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>			
	Direct professional experience	1	50.0
	Professional reputation	-	-
	Other personal contacts	1	50.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
	Substantial amount of experience	-	-
	Moderate amount of experience	1	100.0
	Limited amount of experience	-	-
<b>Type of Work</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	50.0
	Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
	CASA Volunteer	1	50.0
<b>Length of Experience</b>			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	2	100.0
	6 to 10 years	-	-
	11 to 15 years	-	-
	16 to 20 years	-	-
	More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Under 2,000	-	-
	Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
	Over 35,000	2	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>			
	No response	-	-
	First District	-	-
	Second District	-	-
	Third District	2	100.0
	Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>			
	No response	-	-
	Male	-	-
	Female	2	100.0

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

**Table 32**  
**Brian K. Clark**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	2	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	1	1.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0

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

**Table 33**  
**William L. Estelle**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	100.0
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	100.0
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-
Over 35,000	1	100.0
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	1	100.0
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

**Table 34**  
**William L. Estelle**  
**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	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Over 35,000	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

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

**Table 35**  
**Sharon A.S. Illsley**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	100.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	1	100.0
6 to 10 years	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	1	100.0
Fourth District	-	-
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

**Table 36**  
**Sharon A.S. Illsley**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

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

*Table 37*  
*John W. Wolfe*  
*Demographic Description of Respondents*

No Respondents

***Table 38***  
***John W. Wolfe***  
***Detailed Responses***

No Respondents

**Table 39**  
**Paul R. Lyle**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	5	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	5	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	80.0
Limited amount of experience	1	20.0
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	60.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	20.0
CASA Volunteer	1	20.0
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	4	80.0
6 to 10 years	1	20.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	1	20.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	20.0
Over 35,000	3	60.0
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	5	100.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	5	100.0

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

**Table 40**  
**Paul R. Lyle**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Experience within last 5 years	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.8	3.8	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	3	4.3	4.7	3.3	4.3	4.3
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	4	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.5
6 to 10 years	1	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	1	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.7
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	5	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.2	4.4

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

**Table 41**  
**Michael P. McConahy**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	9	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	9	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	4	44.4
Limited amount of experience	2	22.2
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	1	11.1
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	66.7
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	11.1
CASA Volunteer	1	11.1
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	7	77.8
6 to 10 years	2	22.2
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	2	22.2
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	44.4
Over 35,000	3	33.3
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	9	100.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	1	11.1
Female	8	88.9

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

**Table**  
**Michael P. McConahy**  
**Detailed Responses**

		<b>Impartiality/ Fairness</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>Diligence</b>	<b>Overall</b>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Experience within last 5 years	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3
Limited amount of experience	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
CASA Volunteer	1	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	7	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.1	4.4
6 to 10 years	2	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Between 2,000 and 35,000	4	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.0
Over 35,000	3	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	9	4.1	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.1
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Female	8	4.0	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.0

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

**Table 43**  
**Benjamin A. Seekins**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Experience with Judge</b>		
Direct professional experience	1	100.0
Professional reputation	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	100.0
<b>Type of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	100.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-
<b>Length of Experience</b>		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	-	-
6 to 10 years	1	100.0
11 to 15 years	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-
<b>Community Population</b>		
No response	-	-
Under 2,000	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	100.0
Over 35,000	-	-
<b>Location of Work</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	-	-
Second District	-	-
Third District	-	-
Fourth District	1	100.0
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	-	-
Female	1	100.0

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

**Table 44**  
**Benjamin A. Seekins**  
**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	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>						
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Limited amount of experience	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Type of Work*</b>						
Protective Services Specialist (aka Social Worker)	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Guardian Ad Litem (GAL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
CASA Volunteer	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Experience*</b>						
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
11 to 15 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
16 to 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
More than 20 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Community Population*</b>						
Under 2,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Between 2,000 and 35,000	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Over 35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Location of Work*</b>						
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fourth District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
<b>Gender*</b>						
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

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