

5212
FILED

JUDICIAL EVALUATION SURVEY:

JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION ELECTION IN 1996

PREPARED FOR
THE ALASKA JUDICIAL COUNCIL

MAY 1996

JC# 9612.01

JUSTICE CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>BAR</u>	<u>PPO</u>
First Judicial District		
Judge Walter L. Carpeneti.....	13	17
Judge Michael A. Thompson.....	21	25
Third Judicial District		
Judge Larry D. Card.....	29	33
Judge Brian C. Shortell.....	37	41
Judge Peter G. Ashman.....	45	49
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	53	57
Judge William H. Fuld.....	61	65
Judge Stephanie Joannides.....	69	73
Judge James Wanamaker.....	77	81
Fourth Judicial District		
Judge Ralph R. Beistline.....	85	89
Judge Richard D. Savell.....	93	97
Judge Charles Pengilly.....	101	105
Judge Mark I. Wood.....	109	113

I. BACKGROUND

The Constitution and laws of the State of Alaska require that each justice and judge be subject to approval or rejection on a non-partisan ballot at the general election. By law, the Alaska Judicial Council evaluates each justice and judge and makes its recommendations to the voters prior to the election. In making its evaluation, the Council surveys Peace and Probation Officers and active members of the Alaska Bar Association regarding their ratings of the judges and justices eligible to stand for retention.* The following report contains the results of those surveys.

* In addition, the Council evaluated judges and justices not standing for retention until 1998, in order to give them an opportunity to assess their performance in mid-term. Those results are reported separately.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996**

II. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire booklets containing the names of thirteen judges eligible to stand for retention in 1996 and seventeen judges and justices eligible to stand for retention in 1998 were sent to active members of the Alaska Bar Association and all Alaska Peace and Probation Officers. The portion of the questionnaire regarding those eligible to stand for retention in 1996 contained a more extensive series of evaluation items than did the portion regarding those eligible to stand in 1998.

The initial mailing took place on January 31, 1996 with a follow-up mailing to non-respondents on March 6, 1996.

A. CONFIDENTIALITY

The Council assured all respondents to the questionnaire of confidentiality:

All responses will be aggregated solely for statistical analysis. The identity of individual respondents will remain strictly confidential. Responses to the demographic questions also are confidential. Demographic data are critical to our analysis; strict guidelines are followed to protect the identities of all respondents.

B. VALIDATION

To guarantee a fair evaluation and avoid duplications, all returns were validated by comparing the mailing lists with signatures on the return envelopes.* Respondents were instructed to take the following steps to assure validity:

A self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluation. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked "Confidential" and seal the envelope. Place the "Confidential" envelope in the return envelope and sign in the space provided. The return envelope **MUST BE SIGNED** in order for your survey to be counted. Also, please print your name and address on the return envelope.

*Note: A total of sixty-eight surveys were returned without signatures, and therefore were not tallied or analyzed.

C. SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Each questionnaire booklet contained detailed information about how to evaluate the judges:

In this survey booklet you will evaluate justices and judges eligible to stand for retention in 1996 and 1998. **Please rate only those justices and judges for whom you have a sufficient basis for evaluation.** Your evaluation may be based upon direct professional experience, social contacts, or professional reputation. If you lack sufficient knowledge to evaluate, circle the number 9 ("insufficient knowledge to evaluate this justice or judge") under Question 1, and go on to the next justice or judge.

All questions relate only to the qualities of the justice or judge in the performance of judicial duties. The first set of items on each page asks for your experience with each justice or judge. Please circle the appropriate numbers. For remaining items, use the following rating scale.

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1. Unacceptable | Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 2. Deficient | Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 3. Acceptable | Meets minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 4. Good | Often exceeds the minimum standards of performance for this court. |
| 5. Excellent | Consistently exceeds minimum standards for this court. |

D. DESCRIPTIVE RATINGS

This report contains detailed breakdowns of each candidate's evaluation scores on a series of traits, and tables displaying the mean scores of seven composite scales derived from those traits: Legal Ability, Impartiality, Integrity, Judicial Temperament, Diligence, Special Skills, and Overall Evaluation. (The Peace and Probation Officers' questionnaire did not contain the items comprising the Legal Ability scale). The survey instrument defines each trait, and specifies the meaning of each number on the five-point scale (see Appendix I for a copy of the actual survey form). Unless otherwise noted, mean ratings are tabulated only from replies by respondents based on direct professional experience with the applicant. The responses each applicant received on the five scales (each with a range from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)) were summarized into arithmetic means. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

Mean Score	Range Description
4.0-5.0	Excellent
3.5-3.9	Good
3.0-3.4	Acceptable
2.5-2.9	Below Acceptable
1.0-2.4	Poor

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

III. RESPONSE RATE

By the final cut-off date, a total of 1756 questionnaire booklets were returned as described below:

A. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Total mailed.....	1241	
Total responding.....	547	
Response rate.....		44%

B. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

Total mailed.....	2650	
Total responding.....	1209	
Response rate.....		46%

C. COMBINED RESULTS

Total mailed.....	3891	
Total responding.....	1756	
Response rate.....		45%

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS

A. ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

1. Type of Practice

Which of the following best describes your practice?

		1989 Membership Survey Results*
Private, solo.....	20%	16%
Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	18%	28%
Private, office of 6 or more attorneys..	22%	23%
Private corporate employee.....	2%	2%
State judge or judicial officer.....	6%	4%
Government.....	20%	21%
Public service agency organization (not government).....	2%	4%
Other.....	1%	2%
No response.....	9%	--

2. Length of Alaska Practice

How many years have you practiced law in Alaska?

5 years or less (1-3 yrs.).....	16%	(12%)
6-10 years (4-9 yrs.).....	20%	(31%)
11-15 years (10-15 yrs.).....	20%	(34%)
16-20 years (16-19 yrs.).....	19%	(9%)
21 or more years (20+ yrs.).....	15%	(14%)
No response.....	9%	--
Mean.....	13.5	11.6

* The 1989 Alaska Bar Membership Survey, the first and only general survey of the legal profession in Alaska, contains baseline information about Bar members' economic and professional characteristics, experience, and professional activities.

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

1989
Membership
Survey
Results

3. Gender

Male.....	67%	75%
Female.....	24%	25%
No response.....	9%	--

4. Cases Handled

The majority of your practice consists of:

Prosecution.....	4%	5%
Mainly criminal.....	5%	4%
Mixed criminal and civil.....	18%	15%
Mainly civil.....	61%	71%
Other.....	4%	5%
No response.....	9%	--

5. Location of Work

In which judicial district is most
of your work conducted?

First District.....	13%	14%
Second District.....	1%	2%
Third District.....	65%	73%
Fourth District.....	10%	11%
Not in Alaska.....	2%	--
No response.....	9%	--

B. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

1. Type of Work

My current position in law enforcement is:

State law enforcement officer.....	38%
Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	42%
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO).....	0%
Probation/parole officer.....	10%
Other.....	4%
No response.....	7%

2. Length of Time as Alaska Officer

How many years have you been a peace or probation officer in Alaska?

Less than 5 years.....	26%
6-10 years.....	20%
11-15 years.....	20%
16-20 years.....	19%
Over 21 years.....	9%
No response.....	7%

Mean.....17.2

3. Gender

Male.....	82%
Female.....	12%
No response.....	7%

4. Location of Work

In which judicial district has most of your work been conducted during the past six (6) years?

First District.....	14%
Second District.....	6%
Third District.....	55%
Fourth District.....	17%
Outside.....	1%
No response.....	8%

5. Community Population

What is the population of the community in which you work?

Under 2,000.....	7%
Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	37%
31,000 or over.....	49%
No response.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

C. ALASKA BAR MEMBERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	<u>Direct Professional Experience</u>	<u>Professional Reputation</u>	<u>Social Contacts</u>	<u>No Answer</u>	<u>n</u>	Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*
Judge Walter L. Carpeneti.....	75%	18%	5%	2%	423	26%
Judge Michael A. Thompson.....	82%	10%	6%	3%	158	11%
Judge Larry D. Card.....	80%	14%	4%	4%	439	29%
Judge Brian C. Shortell.....	89%	6%	1%	4%	734	54%
Judge Peter G. Ashman.....	84%	9%	3%	4%	276	19%
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	83%	9%	4%	4%	452	31%
Judge William H. Fuld.....	86%	6%	2%	7%	442	31%
Judge Stephanie Joannides.....	76%	11%	10%	3%	314	20%
Judge James Wanamaker.....	84%	6%	5%	5%	314	22%
Judge Ralph R. Beistline.....	79%	13%	3%	5%	260	17%
Judge Richard D. Savell.....	81%	9%	2%	7%	290	19%
Judge Charles Pengilly.....	84%	7%	2%	7%	180	13%
Judge Mark I. Wood.....	81%	6%	3%	11%	155	10%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

D. PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS' BASIS FOR EVALUATING
JUDGES STANDING FOR RETENTION

	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Social Contacts	No Answer	n	Percent of All Respondents w/ Direct Professional Experience*
Judge Walter L. Carpeneti.....	80%	15%	0%	5%	66	10%
Judge Michael A. Thompson.....	85%	5%	2%	7%	41	6%
Judge Larry D. Card.....	64%	21%	6%	9%	47	5%
Judge Brian C. Shortell.....	74%	22%	0%	3%	58	8%
Judge Peter G. Ashman.....	88%	4%	0%	8%	83	13%
Judge Natalie K. Finn.....	85%	8%	1%	7%	116	18%
Judge William H. Fuld.....	82%	11%	2%	5%	83	12%
Judge Stephanie Joannides.....	64%	14%	13%	9%	64	7%
Judge James Wanamaker.....	77%	9%	2%	12%	43	6%
Judge Ralph R. Beistline.....	85%	12%	0%	3%	66	10%
Judge Richard D. Savell.....	80%	8%	3%	9%	76	11%
Judge Charles Pengilly.....	87%	6%	0%	6%	63	10%
Judge Mark I. Wood.....	82%	5%	4%	10%	82	12%

* Percent of all persons responding to the survey who had direct professional experience with the judge.

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	20%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	18%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	23%
		Private, corporate employee.....	2%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	10%
		Government.....	23%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	2%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer.....	3%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	8%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	27%
		20+ years.....	24%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	72%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	6%
		Mainly criminal.....	5%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	24%
		Mainly civil.....	59%
		Other.....	4%
		No Answer.....	2%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	43%
		Second District.....	1%
		Third District.....	48%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Not in Alaska.....	2%
		No Answer.....	3%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	0%	5	2%	19	6%	73	23%	218	69%	4.6
Knowledge of substantive law...	2	1%	6	2%	18	6%	73	24%	204	67%	4.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	2	1%	5	2%	13	4%	71	24%	205	69%	4.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	4	1%	9	3%	19	6%	61	19%	223	71%	4.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	1%	8	3%	16	5%	58	19%	223	73%	4.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	4	1%	15	5%	38	12%	251	81%	4.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	5	2%	5	2%	16	5%	49	17%	217	74%	4.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	1%	5	2%	18	6%	54	17%	237	75%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	1%	5	2%	21	7%	57	19%	217	72%	4.6
Ability to control courtroom...	1	0%	4	1%	19	7%	77	28%	174	63%	4.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	10	3%	30	10%	65	21%	86	28%	112	37%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	0%	5	2%	24	8%	69	23%	196	66%	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	7	4%	20	12%	53	32%	86	51%	4.3
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	1%	3	2%	8	5%	34	22%	106	70%	4.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	3	2%	9	5%	49	30%	103	62%	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	3	1%	6	2%	20	6%	81	25%	209	66%	4.5

OVERVIEW:

Altogether, 319 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Carpeneti based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 34% had a substantial amount of experience, 32% had a moderate amount, and 32% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.5). The highest mean score came for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.7), while the lowest scored item was reasonable promptness in making decisions (3.9).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	22%	78%	9	4.8
SOLO.....	2%	6%	6%	20%	66%	65	4.4
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	2%	9%	36%	51%	55	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	1%	1%	8%	26%	63%	72	4.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	29%	14%	57%	7	4.3
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	0%	0%	19%	81%	32	4.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	3%	27%	70%	73	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	8	4.9
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	8%	36%	56%	25	4.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	2%	8%	26%	64%	53	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	0%	7%	25%	66%	71	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	3%	6%	24%	66%	86	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	3%	3%	5%	24%	66%	76	4.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	15%	15%	69%	13	4.5
MALE.....	1%	3%	5%	27%	64%	228	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	8%	23%	69%	78	4.6
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	8	4.9
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	0%	44%	56%	18	4.6
CRIMINAL.....	6%	0%	0%	25%	69%	16	4.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	1%	7%	25%	67%	76	4.6
CIVIL.....	1%	3%	8%	26%	63%	188	4.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	8%	92%	13	4.9
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	0%	18%	73%	11	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	5%	23%	70%	138	4.6
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	1%	9%	28%	61%	151	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	10%	0%	30%	60%	10	4.4
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	14%	86%	7	4.9
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	38%	63%	8	4.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	2%	4%	18%	75%	107	4.6
MODERATE.....	1%	2%	8%	25%	65%	102	4.5
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	8%	33%	57%	102	4.5
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	13%	13%	75%	8	4.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	2%	6%	25%	66%	319	4.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	13%	45%	41%	75	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	5%	29%	67%	21	4.6

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	35%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	50%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	15%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	13%
		6-10 years.....	24%
		11-15 years.....	20%
		16-20 years.....	31%
		20+ years.....	11%
		No Answer.....	0%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	91%
		Female.....	9%
		No Answer.....	0%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	67%
		Second District.....	4%
		Third District.....	24%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	4%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	6%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	57%
		31,000 or over.....	35%
		No Answer.....	2%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	2%	8	16%	14	27%	28	55%	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	4%	6	12%	12	24%	30	60%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	14%	10	20%	34	67%	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	1	2%	11	22%	13	26%	25	50%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	13	27%	32	65%	4.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	5	10%	13	27%	31	63%	4.5
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	0	0%	12	24%	15	29%	24	47%	4.2
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	2	4%	12	24%	22	44%	14	28%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	7	16%	16	37%	19	44%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	1	2%	7	15%	19	41%	18	39%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	3%	1	3%	7	18%	16	41%	14	36%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	1	2%	8	15%	17	32%	27	51%	4.3

OVERVIEW:

In all, 53 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Carpeneti from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 19% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 28% had a moderate amount, and 49% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range with the highest score going to the item involving courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.6). The item for reasonable promptness in making decisions scored lowest (4.0).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE WALTER L. CARPENETI

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	5%	26%	21%	47%	19	4.1
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	12%	35%	54%	26	4.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	8	4.5
OTHER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	8%	46%	46%	13	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	10%	20%	70%	10	4.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	6%	18%	29%	47%	17	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
MALE.....	0%	2%	15%	31%	52%	48	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	11%	36%	53%	36	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	8%	33%	17%	42%	12	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	19%	26%	55%	31	4.4
OVER 30,000.....	0%	6%	0%	50%	44%	18	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%	10	4.7
MODERATE.....	0%	7%	20%	13%	60%	15	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	15%	46%	38%	26	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	15%	32%	51%	53	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	30%	40%	30%	10	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Judge Walter L. Carpeneti

First Judicial District (Juneau)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.6	4.5
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.3

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	16%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	24%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	13%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	13%
		Government.....	28%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	2%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer.....	4%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	10%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	27%
		20+ years.....	22%
		No Answer.....	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	76%
		Female.....	20%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	9%
		Mainly criminal.....	10%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	27%
		Mainly civil.....	48%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	4%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	65%
		Second District.....	1%
		Third District.....	27%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	4%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	0	0%	9	7%	35	27%	55	43%	30	23%	3.8
Knowledge of substantive law...	0	0%	10	8%	38	30%	49	38%	31	24%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	1%	4	3%	38	30%	47	37%	36	29%	3.9
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	8	6%	22	17%	49	38%	51	39%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	1%	9	7%	21	16%	42	32%	57	44%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	3	2%	28	22%	33	26%	64	50%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	1	1%	7	6%	20	16%	31	25%	67	53%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	8	6%	11	9%	36	28%	72	56%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	5	4%	14	11%	41	33%	65	52%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom...	1	1%	4	3%	22	19%	42	36%	47	41%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	4	3%	28	24%	55	47%	28	24%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	5	4%	29	25%	47	41%	33	29%	3.9
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	2%	3	6%	10	21%	24	50%	10	21%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	5	7%	13	19%	26	37%	26	37%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	3%	3	5%	17	27%	25	39%	17	27%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	1%	9	7%	24	19%	58	45%	37	29%	3.9

OVERVIEW:

Altogether, 129 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Thompson based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 29% had a substantial amount of experience, 29% had a moderate amount, and 38% had a limited amount. Judge Thompson scored in the "excellent" range in the categories of impartiality, integrity and judicial temperament as well as consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing. Other items, including the overall evaluation (3.9) were in the "good" range.

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
SOLO.....	0%	0%	14%	48%	38%	21	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	4%	4%	14%	54%	25%	28	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	12%	29%	53%	17	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	18%	59%	24%	17	4.1
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	14%	30%	41%	16%	37	3.6
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	3	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	21%	14%	50%	14%	14	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	48%	33%	21	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	11%	11%	48%	30%	27	4.0
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	3%	26%	44%	26%	34	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	3%	3%	17%	41%	34%	29	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
MALE.....	1%	6%	19%	44%	30%	98	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	8%	15%	50%	27%	26	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
PROSECUTION.....	0%	33%	42%	25%	0%	12	2.9
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	17%	42%	42%	12	4.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	0%	17%	61%	22%	36	4.1
CIVIL.....	2%	5%	17%	43%	33%	60	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%	4	4.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
FIRST DISTRICT.....	1%	7%	21%	46%	24%	82	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	3%	17%	42%	39%	36	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	5	3.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	5%	16%	42%	34%	38	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	8%	19%	43%	30%	37	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	6%	20%	49%	24%	49	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	7%	19%	45%	29%	129	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	19%	44%	38%	16	4.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	56%	44%	9	4.4

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	49%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	29%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	20%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	0%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	17%
		6-10 years.....	17%
		11-15 years.....	29%
		16-20 years.....	26%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	14%
		No Answer.....	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	57%
		Second District.....	6%
		Third District.....	29%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	6%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	6%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	66%
		31,000 or over.....	26%
		No Answer.....	3%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	3%	4	12%	12	36%	9	27%	7	21%	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	6%	3	9%	12	36%	9	27%	7	21%	3.5
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	6%	2	6%	8	23%	13	37%	10	29%	3.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	6%	3	9%	11	33%	8	24%	9	27%	3.6
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	1	3%	10	29%	9	26%	14	40%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	6%	0	0%	12	34%	11	31%	10	29%	3.8
Ability to control courtroom...	1	3%	1	3%	12	36%	7	21%	12	36%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	4	13%	10	31%	10	31%	8	25%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	3%	3	10%	10	33%	9	30%	7	23%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	10%	3	10%	10	32%	9	29%	6	19%	3.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	4%	2	8%	9	36%	7	28%	6	24%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	3	9%	1	3%	13	37%	10	29%	8	23%	3.5

OVERVIEW:

Thirty-five Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Thompson from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 23% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 40% had a moderate amount, and 26% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest mean score was in the "excellent" range for courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.0). The lowest-scored item, consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing, was in the "acceptable" range (3.4).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL A. THOMPSON

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
STATE OFFICER.....	12%	6%	29%	29%	24%	17	3.5
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	10%	0%	40%	40%	10%	10	3.4
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%	7	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	67%	17%	17%	6	3.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	17%	33%	50%	0%	6	3.3
11-15 YEARS.....	10%	0%	40%	10%	40%	10	3.7
16-20 YEARS.....	11%	0%	22%	44%	22%	9	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
MALE.....	7%	3%	31%	31%	28%	29	3.7
FEMALE.....	20%	0%	60%	20%	0%	5	2.8
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	5%	5%	50%	25%	15%	20	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	50%	30%	10	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
2,000-30,000.....	9%	4%	39%	26%	22%	23	3.5
OVER 30,000.....	11%	0%	22%	33%	33%	9	3.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	25%	0%	25%	38%	13%	8	3.1
MODERATE.....	7%	7%	36%	21%	29%	14	3.6
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	56%	33%	11%	9	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	9%	3%	37%	29%	23%	35	3.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	2	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0

Judge Michael A. Thompson

First Judicial District (Ketchikan)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.9
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.5

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	31%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	23%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	12%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	10%
		Government.....	16%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	1%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	11%
		6-10 years.....	19%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	22%
		20+ years.....	20%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	66%
		Female.....	28%
		No Answer.....	6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	6%
		Mainly criminal.....	6%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	26%
		Mainly civil.....	54%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	1%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	90%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	10	3%	47	14%	101	29%	128	37%	60	17%	3.5
Knowledge of substantive law...	8	2%	47	14%	97	29%	132	39%	53	16%	3.5
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	2%	34	10%	95	29%	134	41%	59	18%	3.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	8	2%	23	7%	66	19%	116	33%	137	39%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	11	3%	15	4%	64	19%	105	31%	146	43%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	13	4%	60	17%	105	30%	169	48%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	1	0%	12	4%	62	19%	104	32%	147	45%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	1%	14	4%	53	15%	99	29%	178	51%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	5	1%	16	5%	56	16%	106	31%	157	46%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	5	2%	25	8%	73	23%	100	32%	111	35%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	16	5%	28	8%	78	24%	124	38%	84	25%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	11	3%	26	8%	69	21%	125	38%	94	29%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	8	4%	29	15%	47	24%	69	35%	42	22%	3.6
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	2%	6	4%	30	22%	45	33%	51	38%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	15	6%	34	13%	51	19%	88	33%	80	30%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	9	3%	41	12%	71	20%	131	38%	96	28%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 348 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Card based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 27% had a substantial amount of experience, 36% had a moderate amount, and 30% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean score came for courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.3), while the lowest scored items concerned legal and factual analysis (3.5) and knowledge of substantive law (3.5).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	12%	12%	6%	35%	35%	17	3.7
SOLO.....	3%	11%	22%	36%	28%	110	3.8
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	14%	19%	37%	28%	81	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	2%	9%	27%	39%	23%	44	3.7
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	6%	21%	39%	33%	33	4.0
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	2%	13%	20%	37%	28%	54	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	40%	0%	60%	0%	5	3.2
OTHER.....	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	2	2.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	12%	6%	6%	41%	35%	17	3.8
1-5 YEARS.....	5%	13%	13%	33%	36%	39	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	2%	12%	21%	39%	26%	66	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	18%	23%	36%	23%	80	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	8%	22%	40%	30%	77	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	4%	10%	23%	36%	26%	69	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	11%	39%	39%	18	4.0
MALE.....	3%	11%	17%	38%	31%	232	3.8
FEMALE.....	1%	14%	31%	37%	17%	98	3.6
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	7%	7%	7%	47%	33%	15	3.9
PROSECUTION.....	0%	14%	9%	41%	36%	22	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	5%	11%	16%	42%	26%	19	3.7
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	1%	10%	21%	34%	33%	90	3.9
CIVIL.....	3%	13%	22%	38%	23%	193	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	11%	33%	22%	33%	9	3.8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	6%	44%	38%	16	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	12%	22%	37%	27%	318	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	14%	14%	14%	43%	14%	7	3.3
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	16%	24%	28%	28%	25	3.6
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	15%	21%	26%	35%	94	3.7
MODERATE.....	2%	11%	18%	44%	24%	124	3.8
LIMITED.....	2%	9%	22%	43%	25%	105	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	23%	8%	8%	31%	31%	13	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	12%	20%	38%	28%	348	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	11%	39%	30%	16%	61	3.4
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	6%	24%	35%	35%	17	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	33%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	43%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	10%
		Other.....	7%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	10%
		6-10 years.....	20%
		11-15 years.....	20%
		16-20 years.....	33%
		20+ years.....	13%
		No Answer.....	3%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	13%
		No Answer.....	3%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	83%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	13%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	13%
		31,000 or over.....	80%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	2	7%	2	7%	6	20%	12	40%	8	27%	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	7%	1	3%	6	20%	11	37%	10	33%	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	7%	0	0%	6	20%	9	30%	13	43%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	7%	0	0%	6	21%	11	39%	9	32%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	7%	1	3%	4	13%	13	43%	10	33%	3.9
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	7%	1	3%	4	13%	11	37%	12	40%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom...	1	4%	0	0%	5	19%	15	56%	6	22%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	2	8%	5	19%	13	50%	6	23%	3.9
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	5%	0	0%	4	18%	10	45%	7	32%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%	15	65%	5	22%	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	13%	0	0%	4	25%	5	31%	5	31%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	2	7%	1	3%	6	20%	14	47%	7	23%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Thirty Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Card from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 3% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 40% had a moderate amount, and 53% had a limited amount. The mean score for the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest rated items were in the "excellent" range for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0), human understanding and compassion (4.0), willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings (4.0), and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.0). The lowest scored items regarded equal treatment of all parties (3.7) and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (3.7).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LARRY D. CARD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
STATE OFFICER.....	10%	0%	10%	60%	20%	10	3.8
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	8%	8%	23%	38%	23%	13	3.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	20%	10%	10%	50%	10%	10	3.2
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MALE.....	8%	4%	20%	44%	24%	25	3.7
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	4	3.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	4%	20%	44%	28%	25	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
2,000-30,000.....	0%	25%	0%	75%	0%	4	3.5
OVER 30,000.....	8%	0%	25%	38%	29%	24	3.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	0%	58%	42%	12	4.4
LIMITED.....	13%	6%	38%	38%	6%	16	3.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	0%	50%	0%	25%	4	3.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	7%	3%	20%	47%	23%	30	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	10%	10%	50%	30%	10	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0

Judge Larry D. Card

Third Judicial District (Anchorage)



ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	24%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	22%
		Private, corporate employee.....	2%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	6%
		Government.....	17%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	1%
		Other.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	9%
		6-10 years.....	15%
		11-15 years.....	24%
		16-20 years.....	24%
		20+ years.....	23%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	71%
		Female.....	22%
		No Answer.....	7%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	4%
		Mainly criminal.....	4%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	19%
		Mainly civil.....	66%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	86%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	0%	21	3%	95	14%	279	42%	266	40%	4.2
Knowledge of substantive law...	2	0%	16	3%	94	15%	275	43%	252	39%	4.2
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	0%	10	2%	82	13%	260	41%	282	44%	4.3
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	13	2%	43	7%	110	17%	223	34%	269	41%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	11	2%	35	5%	97	15%	216	34%	281	44%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	9	1%	14	2%	92	14%	188	29%	350	54%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	7	1%	20	3%	86	14%	185	30%	314	51%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	20	3%	51	8%	117	18%	195	30%	273	42%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	11	2%	34	5%	123	20%	203	32%	255	41%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom...	3	0%	11	2%	90	14%	209	34%	310	50%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	6	1%	36	6%	141	22%	248	38%	214	33%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	6	1%	34	6%	127	21%	231	37%	220	36%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	13	3%	33	7%	129	27%	144	30%	155	33%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	1%	9	3%	58	22%	83	32%	105	41%	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	4	1%	19	7%	75	26%	90	31%	98	34%	3.9
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	7	1%	34	5%	103	16%	245	37%	267	41%	4.1

OVERVIEW: Six hundred and fifty-six Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Shortell based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience, 35% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.1). Judge Shortell also scored in the "excellent" range in the categories of legal ability, impartiality, integrity, judicial temperament, and diligence. The lowest rated item was in the "good" range and concerned settlement skills (3.8).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	18%	35%	48%	40	4.3
SOLO.....	1%	10%	17%	36%	37%	156	4.0
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	1%	17%	35%	45%	139	4.2
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	5%	17%	38%	41%	144	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	13%	19%	31%	38%	16	3.9
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	5%	0%	0%	41%	54%	41	4.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	1%	6%	16%	42%	35%	110	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	14%	0%	57%	29%	7	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	33%	45%	33	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	2%	2%	18%	44%	35%	55	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	3%	24%	32%	41%	100	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	1%	4%	16%	41%	37%	156	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	7%	13%	36%	42%	162	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	1%	8%	11%	37%	44%	150	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	35%	45%	40	4.3
MALE.....	1%	6%	14%	36%	44%	470	4.1
FEMALE.....	1%	3%	21%	44%	30%	146	4.0
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	36%	42%	33	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	16%	16%	48%	20%	25	3.7
CRIMINAL.....	0%	12%	12%	32%	44%	25	4.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	2%	4%	12%	36%	47%	128	4.2
CIVIL.....	1%	5%	17%	38%	40%	430	4.1
OTHER.....	7%	0%	20%	27%	47%	15	4.1
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	35	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	4%	8%	50%	38%	26	4.2
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	5%	16%	36%	41%	568	4.1
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	12%	6%	41%	41%	17	4.1
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	13%	0%	38%	50%	8	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	1%	5%	13%	33%	47%	78	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	2%	6%	8%	28%	56%	202	4.3
MODERATE.....	0%	5%	19%	42%	34%	232	4.0
LIMITED.....	1%	4%	22%	45%	27%	144	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	7%	17%	24%	48%	29	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	5%	16%	37%	41%	656	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	2%	17%	51%	29%	41	4.1
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	38%	63%	8	4.6

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	49%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	33%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	9%
		Other.....	5%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	2%
		6-10 years.....	14%
		11-15 years.....	30%
		16-20 years.....	30%
		20+ years.....	21%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	86%
		Female.....	12%
		No Answer.....	2%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	2%
		Third District.....	91%
		Fourth District.....	5%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	2%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	0%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	12%
		31,000 or over.....	86%
		No Answer.....	2%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	2%	3	7%	15	35%	13	30%	11	26%	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	2%	3	7%	15	37%	13	32%	9	22%	3.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	2%	1	2%	12	29%	13	31%	15	36%	4.0
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	4	10%	12	29%	12	29%	13	32%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	2	5%	4	9%	12	28%	15	35%	10	23%	3.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	2%	2	5%	15	37%	16	39%	7	17%	3.6
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	0	0%	13	32%	18	44%	10	24%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	3%	0	0%	17	43%	14	35%	8	20%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	16	44%	12	33%	8	22%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	1	3%	14	37%	16	42%	6	16%	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	4%	13	52%	7	28%	4	16%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	4	9%	13	30%	18	42%	8	19%	3.7

OVERVIEW: In all, 43 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Shortell from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 2% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 30% had a moderate amount, and 53% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "good" range (3.7). The highest-rated item was in the "excellent" range for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.0). The lowest scored items were those involving sense of basic fairness and justice, courtesy and freedom from arrogance, human understanding and compassion, and talent and ability for cases involving children and families (each 3.6).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE BRIAN C. SHORTELL

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	10%	19%	43%	29%	21	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	14%	36%	36%	14%	14	3.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	38%	38%	23%	13	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	31%	23%	46%	0%	13	3.2
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
MALE.....	0%	11%	27%	41%	22%	37	3.7
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	5	3.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	8%	31%	41%	21%	39	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	5	3.4
OVER 30,000.....	0%	11%	24%	43%	22%	37	3.8
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	6	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	23%	54%	23%	13	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	17%	35%	35%	13%	23	3.4
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	9%	30%	42%	19%	43	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	8%	23%	46%	23%	13	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.

Judge Brian C. Shortell

Third Judicial District (Anchorage)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	25%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	8%
		Private, corporate employee.....	0%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	18%
		Government.....	20%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	3%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	12%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	25%
		16-20 years.....	24%
		20+ years.....	18%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	69%
		Female.....	25%
		No Answer.....	6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	8%
		Mainly criminal.....	11%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	43%
		Mainly civil.....	31%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District.....	2%
		Third District.....	87%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	2	1%	4	2%	26	11%	80	35%	119	52%	4.3
Knowledge of substantive law...	1	0%	5	2%	23	10%	78	35%	117	52%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	2	1%	4	2%	23	10%	73	33%	121	54%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	2	1%	13	6%	27	12%	66	29%	122	53%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	1%	9	4%	27	12%	57	25%	130	58%	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	5	2%	24	11%	54	24%	141	62%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	1%	6	3%	26	12%	55	25%	133	60%	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	7	3%	13	6%	27	12%	52	22%	133	57%	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	1%	9	4%	27	12%	54	24%	132	59%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom...	1	0%	7	3%	25	12%	66	31%	112	53%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	1%	7	3%	33	15%	76	35%	98	45%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	0%	5	2%	33	15%	65	30%	112	52%	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	2%	3	3%	22	19%	32	28%	57	49%	4.2
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	1%	6	4%	22	14%	41	26%	89	56%	4.3
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	2%	5	4%	16	13%	32	27%	64	54%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	0%	11	5%	30	13%	64	27%	127	55%	4.3

OVERVIEW: Two hundred and thirty-three Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Ashman based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 34% had a substantial amount of experience, 22% had a moderate amount, and 31% had a limited amount. Mean scores on all items placed in the "excellent" range, including the overall evaluation item (4.3).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	42%	33%	12	4.1
SOLO.....	0%	3%	19%	31%	47%	59	4.2
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	6%	14%	29%	49%	49	4.2
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	11%	28%	56%	18	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	7%	2%	22%	68%	41	4.5
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	2%	11%	26%	61%	46	4.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	17%	0%	17%	67%	6	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	38%	38%	13	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	11%	14%	14%	61%	28	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	5%	19%	30%	46%	37	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	3%	7%	38%	52%	58	4.4
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	7%	11%	27%	55%	56	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	2%	0%	15%	17%	66%	41	4.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	36%	43%	14	4.2
MALE.....	1%	6%	12%	28%	53%	161	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	12%	24%	60%	58	4.4
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	42%	33%	12	4.1
PROSECUTION.....	0%	11%	11%	16%	63%	19	4.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	4%	44%	52%	25	4.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	5%	12%	18%	65%	99	4.4
CIVIL.....	1%	5%	15%	37%	41%	73	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	20%	0%	80%	5	4.6
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	42%	33%	12	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	25%	0%	75%	4	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	5%	12%	26%	55%	204	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	4%	4%	11%	21%	61%	28	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	8%	11%	9%	73%	80	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	2%	12%	38%	48%	52	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	4%	16%	42%	37%	73	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	20%	10%	50%	10	3.9
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	5%	13%	27%	55%	233	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	4%	4%	25%	33%	33%	24	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	11%	89%	9	4.9

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	68%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	14%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	11%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	23%
		6-10 years.....	19%
		11-15 years.....	26%
		16-20 years.....	18%
		20+ years.....	8%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	78%
		Female.....	15%
		No Answer.....	7%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	4%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	77%
		Fourth District.....	10%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	8%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	47%
		31,000 or over.....	38%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	1%	16	22%	26	36%	30	41	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	1%	14	20%	25	35%	31	44	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	13	18%	17	24%	41	58	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	1	1%	11	16%	19	28%	36	54	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	3	4%	13	18%	17	23%	39	53	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	1%	16	22%	23	32%	32	44	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	1	1%	13	18%	15	21%	43	60	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	1	1%	13	19%	24	35%	31	45	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	15	23%	22	33%	28	42	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	0	0%	18	28%	20	31%	27	42	4.1
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	13	30%	10	23%	21	48	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	1	1%	13	18%	25	34%	34	47	4.3

OVERVIEW:

Seventy-three Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Ashman from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 29% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 32% had a moderate amount, and 36% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "excellent" range (4.3). The highest-rated items involved conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety, and ability to control courtroom (each 4.4). The lowest item was for consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.1).


JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE PETER G. ASHMAN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	2%	16%	36%	46%	50	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	30%	30%	40%	10	4.1
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	8	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	6%	6%	35%	53%	17	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	14	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	16%	47%	37%	19	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	31%	15%	54%	13	4.2
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	6	4.3
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	0%	80%	5	4.6
MALE.....	0%	2%	21%	37%	40%	57	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	36%	64%	11	4.6
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	20%	34%	45%	56	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	5	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	6	4.5
2,000-30,000.....	0%	3%	26%	24%	47%	34	4.1
OVER 30,000.....	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	28	4.2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	10%	19%	71%	21	4.6
MODERATE.....	0%	4%	4%	57%	35%	23	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	35%	27%	38%	26	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	1%	18%	34%	47%	73	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.

Judge Peter G. Ashman Third Judicial District (Palmer)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	26%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	19%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	13%
		Private, corporate employee.....	2%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	11%
		Government.....	22%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	2%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	14%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	23%
		16-20 years.....	22%
		20+ years.....	20%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	70%
		Female.....	25%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	9%
		Mainly criminal.....	7%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	29%
		Mainly civil.....	49%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	87%
		Fourth District.....	4%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	3	1%	13	3%	72	19%	165	43%	127	33%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law...	3	1%	8	2%	79	21%	166	44%	118	32%	4.0
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	3	1%	6	2%	74	20%	166	45%	122	33%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	5	1%	20	5%	89	23%	131	34%	137	36%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	4	1%	19	5%	90	24%	118	31%	144	38%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	0%	10	3%	67	18%	131	35%	168	45%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	3	1%	13	4%	72	20%	111	32%	153	43%	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	5	1%	30	8%	79	21%	126	33%	143	37%	4.0
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	1%	28	7%	89	24%	134	36%	124	33%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom...	1	0%	8	2%	72	20%	145	39%	143	39%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	1%	5	1%	71	20%	151	42%	127	36%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	2	1%	10	3%	76	21%	145	41%	122	34%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	1%	6	4%	50	29%	55	32%	57	34%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	0%	7	3%	46	20%	71	31%	105	46%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	3	2%	5	3%	36	23%	45	28%	71	44%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	4	1%	15	4%	88	23%	128	34%	140	37%	4.0

OVERVIEW: Altogether, 375 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Finn based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 29% had a substantial amount of experience, 33% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean score came for the items regarding conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2) and consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing (4.2). The lowest scored items were human understanding and compassion (3.9) and settlement skills (3.9).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	41%	17	4.1
SOLO.....	3%	6%	24%	33%	34%	98	3.9
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	27%	44%	29%	73	4.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	6%	21%	36%	36%	47	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	17%	0%	50%	33%	6	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	8%	21%	18%	54%	39	4.2
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	2%	22%	33%	43%	83	4.2
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
OTHER.....	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%	3	2.7
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	38%	31%	31%	16	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	6%	6%	15%	27%	46%	52	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	3%	25%	38%	34%	64	4.0
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	2%	29%	40%	28%	85	3.9
16-20 YEARS.....	1%	7%	23%	31%	38%	84	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	3%	19%	34%	45%	74	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	31%	31%	38%	16	4.1
MALE.....	1%	5%	20%	36%	36%	269	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	1%	31%	28%	40%	90	4.1
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	31%	38%	31%	16	4.0
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	6%	34%	60%	35	4.5
CRIMINAL.....	4%	7%	44%	19%	26%	27	3.6
CRIMINAL & CIVIL....	3%	5%	27%	30%	35%	110	3.9
CIVIL.....	0%	3%	21%	39%	36%	181	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	17%	17%	17%	50%	6	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	15	4.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	22%	56%	22%	9	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	5%	23%	33%	38%	330	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	6%	0%	31%	31%	31%	16	3.8
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	3%	18%	35%	43%	40	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	6%	21%	23%	49%	107	4.1
MODERATE.....	1%	3%	26%	34%	35%	122	4.0
LIMITED.....	1%	4%	25%	44%	26%	106	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	5%	16%	16%	58%	19	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	4%	23%	34%	37%	375	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	3%	33%	44%	21%	39	3.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	26%	53%	21%	19	3.9

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	40%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	50%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	1%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	6%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	15%
		6-10 years.....	13%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	30%
		20+ years.....	15%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	81%
		Female.....	14%
		No Answer.....	5%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	87%
		Fourth District.....	4%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	6%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	2%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	14%
		31,000 or over.....	77%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	1%	0	0%	12	12%	28	29%	56	58	4.4
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	2%	11	12%	28	30%	53	56	4.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	12	12%	21	22%	64	66	4.5
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	2	2%	13	14%	26	29%	50	55	4.4
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	2	2%	8	8%	25	25%	63	64	4.5
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	2	2%	7	7%	30	31%	58	60	4.5
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	1	1%	11	12%	29	31%	53	56	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	12%	26	29%	54	59	4.5
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	10	12%	18	22%	54	66	4.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	1	1%	13	15%	21	25%	50	59	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	11%	16	25%	40	63	4.5
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	2	2%	9	9%	27	28%	60	61	4.5

OVERVIEW:

In all, 98 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Finn from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 27% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 35% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range. The overall evaluation was among the highest rated items (4.5).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE NATALIE K. FINN

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	3%	8%	28%	63%	40	4.5
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	2%	10%	23%	65%	48	4.5
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	7%	43%	50%	14	4.4
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	17%	67%	12	4.5
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	5%	5%	36%	55%	22	4.4
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	3%	10%	20%	67%	30	4.5
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	7%	13%	80%	15	4.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
MALE.....	0%	3%	8%	24%	66%	80	4.5
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	15%	38%	46%	13	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	7%	28%	62%	85	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	4	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	43%	43%	7	4.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	21%	29%	50%	14	4.3
OVER 30,000.....	0%	3%	7%	25%	65%	75	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	9%	9%	73%	11	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	0%	15%	85%	26	4.8
MODERATE.....	0%	3%	12%	35%	50%	34	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	15%	37%	48%	27	4.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	8	4.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	2%	9%	28%	61%	98	4.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	11%	33%	44%	11%	9	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0

Judge Natalie K. Finn

Third Judicial District (Anchorage)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	27%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	20%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	12%
		Private, corporate employee.....	2%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	9%
		Government.....	21%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	2%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	13%
		6-10 years.....	14%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	25%
		No Answer.....	5%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	70%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer.....	6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	8%
		Mainly criminal.....	8%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	26%
		Mainly civil.....	51%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	90%
		Fourth District.....	2%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

8. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	5	1%	30	8%	140	36%	153	39%	60	15%	3.6
Knowledge of substantive law...	2	1%	30	8%	136	36%	147	39%	62	16%	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	2	1%	25	7%	128	34%	152	40%	69	18%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	10	3%	30	8%	120	31%	135	35%	92	24%	3.7
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	8	2%	26	7%	108	29%	144	39%	88	24%	3.7
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	3	1%	14	4%	106	27%	151	39%	112	29%	3.9
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	3	1%	13	4%	101	28%	144	39%	104	28%	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	8	2%	56	14%	104	27%	137	35%	82	21%	3.6
Human understanding and compassion.....	6	2%	47	13%	119	32%	128	34%	76	20%	3.6
Ability to control courtroom...	2	1%	21	6%	106	29%	150	41%	91	25%	3.8
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	7	2%	15	4%	125	34%	137	37%	88	24%	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	6	2%	27	7%	129	35%	132	36%	72	20%	3.6
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	4	2%	13	7%	69	37%	59	31%	43	23%	3.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	1%	11	5%	68	30%	79	35%	62	28%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	1%	15	10%	56	37%	43	29%	34	23%	3.6
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	5	1%	27	7%	126	33%	152	40%	70	18%	3.7

OVERVIEW: Three hundred and eighty Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Fuld based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 31% had a substantial amount of experience, 34% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. Mean scores on all items placed in the "good" range. The highest mean scores were on the integrity category items: conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.9), and makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.9).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	16%	32%	16%	37%	19	3.7
SOLO.....	1%	2%	30%	45%	22%	106	3.8
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	5%	27%	46%	22%	74	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	10%	44%	33%	13%	48	3.5
CORPORATE.....	0%	29%	43%	14%	14%	7	3.1
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	5%	11%	35%	41%	8%	80	3.4
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	7	3.9
OTHER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	12%	24%	24%	41%	17	3.9
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	2%	35%	45%	18%	49	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	2%	12%	33%	42%	12%	52	3.5
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	10%	33%	38%	17%	82	3.6
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	8%	39%	43%	10%	84	3.5
21+ YEARS.....	2%	3%	29%	39%	27%	96	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	5%	10%	35%	15%	35%	20	3.7
MALE.....	1%	6%	30%	44%	19%	269	3.8
FEMALE.....	2%	11%	41%	33%	13%	91	3.4
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	25%	19%	44%	16	3.9
PROSECUTION.....	6%	9%	41%	31%	13%	32	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	27%	43%	30%	30	4.0
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	4%	31%	42%	23%	100	3.8
CIVIL.....	2%	9%	34%	42%	13%	194	3.6
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	38%	13%	8	3.6
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	31%	13%	44%	16	3.9
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	63%	38%	0%	8	3.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	7%	32%	41%	18%	346	3.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	14%	43%	43%	0%	7	3.3
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	9%	33%	40%	19%	43	3.7
SUBSTANTIAL.....	3%	5%	26%	40%	25%	118	3.8
MODERATE.....	1%	8%	35%	38%	19%	128	3.7
LIMITED.....	0%	8%	40%	44%	9%	91	3.5
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	0%	13%	47%	37%	30	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	7%	33%	40%	18%	380	3.7
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	68%	32%	0%	25	3.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	14%	14%	14%	57%	7	4.1

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	40%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	49%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	1%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	7%
		6-10 years.....	10%
		11-15 years.....	31%
		16-20 years.....	32%
		20+ years.....	15%
		No Answer.....	4%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	82%
		Female.....	13%
		No Answer.....	4%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	1%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	90%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	6%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	13%
		31,000 or over.....	76%
		No Answer.....	6%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	3	5%	9	14%	15	23%	32	48%	7	11	3.5
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	4	6%	8	12%	19	29%	27	42%	7	11	3.4
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	4	6%	5	7%	16	24%	33	49%	10	15	3.6
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	3	5%	6	9%	20	30%	29	44%	8	12	3.5
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	7	10%	9	13%	16	24%	29	43%	6	9	3.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	4	6%	7	11%	24	36%	24	36%	7	11	3.3
Ability to control courtroom...	3	5%	8	13%	20	31%	24	38%	9	14	3.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	3	5%	9	14%	21	33%	24	38%	6	10	3.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	7%	7	13%	15	28%	22	41%	6	11	3.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	5	8%	9	15%	20	32%	23	37%	5	8	3.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	5%	4	10%	15	38%	15	38%	3	8	3.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	4	6%	8	12%	23	34%	27	40%	6	9	3.3

OVERVIEW:

Sixty-eight Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Fuld from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 21% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 43% had a moderate amount, and 31% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "acceptable" range (3.3). The highest-rated item was in the "good" range for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.6), while the lowest-rated item was consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing, in the "acceptable" range (3.2).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS


OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE WILLIAM H. FULD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	5	3.6
STATE OFFICER.....	7%	7%	37%	44%	4%	27	3.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	6%	18%	30%	33%	12%	33	3.3
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	5	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	14%	0%	57%	29%	0%	7	3.0
11-15 YEARS.....	5%	10%	33%	33%	19%	21	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	9%	18%	32%	32%	9%	22	3.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	20%	20%	60%	0%	10	3.4
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	3	3.7
MALE.....	4%	13%	38%	38%	9%	56	3.4
FEMALE.....	22%	11%	11%	44%	11%	9	3.1
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1	1.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	2	2.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	13%	34%	39%	10%	61	3.4
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	4	3.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%	3	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	11%	0%	44%	33%	11%	9	3.3
OVER 30,000.....	6%	13%	33%	42%	6%	52	3.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	50%	0%	4	3.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	7%	36%	43%	14%	14	3.6
MODERATE.....	10%	10%	38%	31%	10%	29	3.2
LIMITED.....	5%	14%	29%	48%	5%	21	3.3
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	6%	12%	34%	40%	9%	68	3.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	11%	0%	67%	22%	0%	9	3.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	2	3.0

Judge William H. Fuld

Third Judicial District (Anchorage)

● Bar Members ▲ Peace/Probation Officers



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	21%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	22%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	11%
		Private, corporate employee.....	0%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	11%
		Government.....	27%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	0%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	17%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	22%
		16-20 years.....	24%
		20+ years.....	16%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	68%
		Female.....	26%
		No Answer.....	6%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	11%
		Mainly criminal.....	10%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	31%
		Mainly civil.....	41%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	6%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	12%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	80%
		Fourth District.....	1%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	2	1%	6	3%	40	17%	107	45%	85	35%	4.1
Knowledge of substantive law...	2	1%	6	3%	47	20%	99	42%	81	34%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	2	1%	3	1%	45	19%	94	41%	88	38%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	3	1%	7	3%	33	14%	78	33%	116	49%	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	1%	7	3%	28	12%	76	32%	122	52%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	2	1%	33	14%	65	28%	132	56%	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	1%	2	1%	36	16%	70	32%	111	50%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	4	2%	6	3%	28	12%	64	27%	137	57%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	2	1%	8	3%	27	11%	73	31%	127	54%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom...	1	0%	8	4%	50	23%	75	35%	82	38%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	0%	4	2%	45	21%	84	39%	80	37%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	0%	5	2%	37	17%	78	35%	102	46%	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	2	2%	25	24%	37	35%	40	38%	4.1
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	1%	1	1%	30	19%	56	36%	67	43%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	0	0%	17	18%	34	35%	45	46%	4.3
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	8	3%	38	16%	94	39%	99	41%	4.2

OVERVIEW: A total of 239 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Joannides based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 26% had a substantial amount of experience, 35% had a moderate amount, and 28% had a limited amount. Mean scores on all items placed in the "excellent" range. The items which received the highest scores concerned conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), and courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.4).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	23%	8%	62%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	0%	24%	39%	37%	49	4.1
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	12%	62%	27%	52	4.2
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	7%	18%	39%	36%	28	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	12%	12%	19%	58%	26	4.2
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	10%	37%	49%	67	4.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	23%	54%	13	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	7%	0%	51%	41%	41	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	3%	18%	37%	42%	38	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	21%	35%	44%	52	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	5%	25%	32%	39%	57	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	3%	8%	53%	37%	38	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	8%	69%	13	4.5
MALE.....	0%	4%	15%	43%	38%	162	4.2
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	16%	38%	44%	64	4.2
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	15%	62%	13	4.4
PROSECUTION.....	0%	7%	11%	48%	33%	27	4.1
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	17%	25%	58%	24	4.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL....	0%	3%	17%	31%	50%	72	4.3
CIVIL.....	0%	4%	16%	48%	32%	98	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	5	4.2
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	15%	62%	13	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	14%	34%	52%	29	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	4%	15%	42%	39%	192	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	3	3.3
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	4%	22%	26%	48%	27	4.2
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	3%	10%	29%	58%	62	4.4
MODERATE.....	0%	4%	18%	46%	33%	83	4.1
LIMITED.....	0%	3%	16%	46%	34%	67	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	30%	40%	30%	10	4.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	3%	16%	39%	41%	239	4.2
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	3%	9%	11%	43%	34%	35	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	7%	13%	53%	27%	30	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	41%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	41%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	7%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	15%
		6-10 years.....	17%
		11-15 years.....	34%
		16-20 years.....	22%
		20+ years.....	10%
		No Answer.....	2%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	83%
		Female.....	15%
		No Answer.....	2%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	12%
		Second District.....	7%
		Third District.....	78%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	2%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	10%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	10%
		31,000 or over.....	78%
		No Answer.....	2%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	3%	7	18%	12	31%	19	49	4.3
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	3%	7	18%	11	29%	19	50	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	18%	11	28%	22	55	4.4
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	0	0%	8	23%	11	31%	16	46	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	1	3%	6	15%	10	25%	23	58	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	0	0%	6	16%	11	30%	20	54	4.4
Ability to control courtroom...	2	6%	1	3%	8	24%	9	27%	13	39	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	3%	1	3%	9	26%	7	20%	17	49	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	3%	0	0%	6	18%	9	26%	18	53	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	0	0%	7	22%	9	28%	15	47	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	7	24%	8	28%	14	48	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	2%	1	2%	7	17%	16	39%	16	39	4.1

OVERVIEW: In all, 41 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Joannides from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 17% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 39% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest rated items were also in the "excellent" range including conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.4), courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.4), and human understanding and compassion (4.4). The lowest-rated item, concerning ability to control courtroom, was in the "good" range (3.9).


JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STEPHANIE JOANNIDES

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	12%	35%	53%	17	4.4
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	6%	6%	18%	41%	29%	17	3.8
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	17%	83%	0%	6	3.8
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	29%	14%	57%	7	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	7%	7%	14%	43%	29%	14	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	22%	44%	33%	9	4.1
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	4	5.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
MALE.....	3%	3%	21%	35%	38%	34	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	5	4.8
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	3%	22%	44%	28%	32	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	4	4.3
OVER 30,000.....	3%	3%	19%	41%	34%	32	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	14%	0%	14%	71%	7	4.4
MODERATE.....	6%	0%	19%	44%	31%	16	3.9
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	20%	47%	33%	15	4.1
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	6	3.8
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	2%	17%	39%	39%	41	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	44%	22%	33%	9	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	8	4.5

Judge Stephanie Joannides Third Judicial District (Anchorage)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	28%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	12%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	11%
		Government.....	21%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	0%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	6%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	12%
		6-10 years.....	13%
		11-15 years.....	18%
		16-20 years.....	20%
		20+ years.....	30%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	77%
		Female.....	17%
		No Answer.....	7%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	8%
		Mainly criminal.....	8%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	28%
		Mainly civil.....	49%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	5%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	92%
		Fourth District.....	0%
		Not in Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	5%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	4	2%	28	11%	69	26%	104	40%	58	22%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law...	4	2%	25	10%	69	27%	105	41%	53	21%	3.7
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	4	2%	28	11%	67	26%	100	40%	54	21%	3.7
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	6	2%	17	6%	54	20%	96	36%	92	35%	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	5	2%	17	7%	58	22%	85	33%	95	37%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	10	4%	50	19%	92	35%	110	42%	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	1	0%	15	6%	52	21%	82	33%	95	39%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	0%	13	5%	46	17%	89	33%	117	44%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	1%	23	9%	52	20%	84	33%	95	37%	4.0
Ability to control courtroom...	5	2%	29	12%	66	27%	84	34%	61	25%	3.7
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	11	5%	21	9%	61	25%	90	38%	57	24%	3.7
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	2%	17	7%	59	25%	91	39%	64	27%	3.8
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	2%	13	11%	33	27%	36	30%	38	31%	3.8
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	2%	18	12%	40	27%	48	32%	41	27%	3.7
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	2	2%	12	13%	20	22%	32	34%	27	29%	3.8
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	4	2%	26	10%	58	22%	100	38%	75	29%	3.8

OVERVIEW: Two hundred and sixty-three Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Wanamaker based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 25% had a substantial amount of experience, 37% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean score was in the "excellent" range for courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.2).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	14	4.1
SOLO.....	1%	4%	26%	41%	28%	74	3.9
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	15%	16%	35%	35%	55	3.9
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	3%	0%	24%	41%	32%	34	4.0
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	18%	18%	32%	32%	28	3.8
GOVERNMENT.....	4%	15%	25%	38%	17%	52	3.5
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	1	2.0
OTHER.....	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	2	3.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	21%	36%	43%	14	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	3%	18%	24%	26%	29%	34	3.6
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	6%	12%	39%	42%	33	4.2
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	12%	31%	41%	14%	49	3.5
16-20 YEARS.....	2%	13%	24%	37%	24%	54	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	1%	6%	19%	42%	32%	79	4.0
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	19%	25%	56%	16	4.4
MALE.....	1%	9%	21%	40%	28%	202	3.8
FEMALE.....	2%	18%	27%	33%	20%	45	3.5
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	23%	31%	46%	13	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	10%	15%	25%	40%	10%	20	3.3
CRIMINAL.....	5%	23%	27%	32%	14%	22	3.3
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	15%	29%	29%	27%	75	3.7
CIVIL.....	1%	5%	16%	45%	33%	130	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	3	3.3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%	12	4.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%	4	3.8
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	2%	11%	22%	39%	28%	246	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	16%	30%	46%	37	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	15%	15%	32%	33%	66	3.7
MODERATE.....	1%	9%	26%	38%	26%	97	3.8
LIMITED.....	0%	6%	27%	49%	17%	63	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	13%	27%	40%	20%	15	3.7
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	10%	22%	38%	29%	263	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	11%	32%	42%	16%	19	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	53%	47%	17	4.5

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	27%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	48%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	6%
		Other.....	6%
		No Answer.....	12%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	24%
		6-10 years.....	15%
		11-15 years.....	36%
		16-20 years.....	12%
		20+ years.....	6%
		No Answer.....	6%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	76%
		Female.....	18%
		No Answer.....	6%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	85%
		Fourth District.....	3%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	9%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	6%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	18%
		31,000 or over.....	67%
		No Answer.....	9%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	2	6%	9	28%	15	47%	6	19	3.8
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	3%	2	6%	10	32%	13	42%	5	16	3.6
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	3%	10	32%	13	42%	7	23	3.8
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	2	7%	10	34%	10	34%	7	24	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	3%	3	9%	8	24%	13	39%	8	24	3.7
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	3%	1	3%	10	31%	14	44%	6	19	3.7
Ability to control courtroom...	3	9%	1	3%	12	36%	10	30%	7	21	3.5
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	6%	5	16%	10	31%	9	28%	6	19	3.4
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	4%	4	14%	9	32%	7	25%	7	25	3.5
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	3%	3	10%	9	31%	11	38%	5	17	3.6
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	7%	4	29%	7	50%	2	14	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	3%	5	15%	7	21%	16	48%	4	12	3.5

OVERVIEW: In all, 33 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Wanamaker from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 15% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 39% had a moderate amount, and 39% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "good" range (3.5). The highest rated items were also in the "good" range including equal treatment of all parties (3.8), conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (3.8), and makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism (3.8). The lowest-rated item, reasonable promptness in making decisions, was in the "acceptable" range (3.4).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE JAMES N. WANAMAKER

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	25%	25%	0%	25%	25%	4	3.0
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	22%	22%	33%	22%	9	3.6
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	13%	25%	56%	6%	16	3.6
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	25%	13%	50%	13%	8	3.5
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	60%	20%	20%	0%	5	2.6
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	58%	8%	12	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	2	3.0
MALE.....	0%	16%	20%	52%	12%	25	3.6
FEMALE.....	0%	17%	33%	50%	0%	6	3.3
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	18%	21%	50%	11%	28	3.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	3	3.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	17%	17%	67%	0%	6	3.5
OVER 30,000.....	0%	18%	27%	41%	14%	22	3.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	2	3.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	40%	0%	60%	0%	5	3.2
MODERATE.....	0%	15%	15%	62%	8%	13	3.6
LIMITED.....	8%	8%	23%	38%	23%	13	3.6
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	40%	20%	40%	0%	0%	5	2.0
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	15%	21%	48%	12%	33	3.5
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%	4	2.8
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0

Judge James Wanamaker

Third Judicial District (Anchorage)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	3.7	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.5

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	15%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	18%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	19%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	14%
		Government.....	20%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	4%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	12%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	16%
		16-20 years.....	23%
		20+ years.....	24%
		No Answer.....	9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	66%
		Female.....	24%
		No Answer.....	10%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	3%
		Mainly criminal.....	5%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	27%
		Mainly civil.....	55%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	3%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	42%
		Fourth District.....	44%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	9%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	6	3%	23	11%	49	24%	79	39%	48	23%	3.7
Knowledge of substantive law...	6	3%	22	11%	48	24%	85	43%	37	19%	3.6
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	9	5%	19	10%	47	25%	73	39%	41	22%	3.6
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	4	2%	11	5%	34	17%	77	38%	77	38%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	2	1%	9	4%	35	17%	74	37%	81	40%	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	2	1%	8	4%	31	15%	66	33%	95	47%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	1%	17	9%	30	16%	62	33%	79	42%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	0%	3	1%	21	10%	63	31%	115	57%	4.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	1%	7	4%	28	14%	72	36%	90	45%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	4	2%	16	9%	44	24%	55	31%	61	34%	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	2	1%	8	4%	38	20%	79	42%	63	33%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	3	2%	12	6%	36	19%	71	38%	63	34%	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	2	2%	5	4%	31	27%	32	28%	44	39%	4.0
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	2	2%	10	12%	18	21%	32	38%	23	27%	3.8
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	1%	12	13%	25	28%	27	30%	25	28%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	2	1%	16	8%	40	19%	83	40%	65	32%	3.9

OVERVIEW:

A total of 206 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Beistline based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 36% had a substantial amount of experience, 29% had a moderate amount, and 23% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.9). The highest mean score was in the "excellent" range for courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.4). The lowest mean scores were in the "good" range on knowledge of substantive law and knowledge of evidence and procedure (both 3.6).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	17%	22%	50%	18	4.1
SOLO.....	3%	6%	28%	31%	31%	32	3.8
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	3%	25%	42%	31%	36	4.0
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	2%	15%	49%	34%	41	4.1
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	3%	10%	15%	46%	26%	39	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	25%	25%	38%	13%	8	3.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	16%	16%	58%	19	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	13%	8%	42%	38%	24	4.0
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	6%	9%	50%	34%	32	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	6%	24%	53%	18%	34	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	4%	6%	29%	33%	29%	49	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	0%	8%	21%	42%	29%	48	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	10%	19%	29%	43%	21	4.0
MALE.....	1%	4%	19%	40%	35%	135	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	16%	20%	46%	18%	50	3.7
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	17%	22%	50%	18	4.1
PROSECUTION.....	0%	14%	57%	29%	0%	7	3.1
CRIMINAL.....	9%	18%	9%	36%	27%	11	3.5
CRIMINAL & CIVIL....	2%	13%	15%	42%	29%	55	3.8
CIVIL.....	0%	4%	21%	43%	32%	113	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	16%	26%	47%	19	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	7	4.4
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	1%	3%	18%	44%	33%	87	4.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	1%	12%	23%	38%	25%	91	3.7
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	13%	25%	54%	24	4.3
SUBSTANTIAL.....	1%	12%	19%	40%	28%	75	3.8
MODERATE.....	0%	8%	19%	42%	31%	59	3.9
LIMITED.....	2%	0%	25%	46%	27%	48	4.0
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	17%	33%	42%	12	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	8%	19%	40%	32%	206	3.9
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	9%	32%	47%	12%	34	3.6
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	13%	13%	50%	25%	8	3.9

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	36%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	23%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	25%
		Other.....	4%
		No Answer.....	13%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	23%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	16%
		16-20 years.....	23%
		20+ years.....	9%
		No Answer.....	13%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	70%
		Female.....	18%
		No Answer.....	13%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	4%
		Third District.....	4%
		Fourth District.....	80%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	13%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	4%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	7%
		31,000 or over.....	77%
		No Answer.....	13%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	2%	19	35%	20	36%	15	27	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	1	2%	14	25%	20	36%	20	36	4.1
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	12	22%	20	36%	22	40	4.1
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	3	6%	17	32%	16	30%	17	32	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	2%	0	0%	14	25%	11	20%	30	54	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	1	2%	0	0%	12	21%	16	29%	27	48	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	2	4%	20	37%	13	24%	19	35	3.9
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	3	6%	18	34%	17	32%	15	28	3.8
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	0	0%	16	33%	14	29%	18	38	4.0
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	3	6%	13	26%	21	42%	13	26	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	0	0%	13	34%	12	32%	13	34	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	2	4%	12	21%	22	39%	20	36	4.1

OVERVIEW:

Fifty-six Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Beistline from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 23% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 41% had a moderate amount, and 34% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "excellent" range (4.1). The highest rated items were also in the "excellent" range including courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.2), and human understanding and compassion (4.2). The lowest-rated item, concerning reasonable promptness in making decisions, was in the "good" range (3.8).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RALPH R. BEISTLINE

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	5%	30%	35%	30%	20	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	8%	23%	46%	23%	13	3.8
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	7%	50%	43%	14	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	8%	8%	46%	38%	13	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	11%	67%	22%	9	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	33%	22%	44%	9	4.1
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	38%	38%	23%	13	3.8
21+ YEARS.....	0%	20%	0%	20%	60%	5	4.2
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
MALE.....	0%	5%	26%	38%	31%	39	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	10	4.5
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	4%	22%	42%	31%	45	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	7	4.1
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%	4	4.8
OVER 30,000.....	0%	5%	21%	42%	33%	43	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	8%	31%	62%	13	4.5
MODERATE.....	0%	4%	17%	48%	30%	23	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	5%	37%	32%	26%	19	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	4%	21%	39%	36%	56	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.

Judge Ralph R. Beistline

Fourth Judicial District (Fairbanks)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.0	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.9	4.1

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	16%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	21%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	15%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	12%
		Government.....	21%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	5%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	10%
		6-10 years.....	14%
		11-15 years.....	21%
		16-20 years.....	23%
		20+ years.....	24%
		No Answer.....	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	65%
		Female.....	26%
		No Answer.....	8%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	4%
		Mainly criminal.....	6%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	25%
		Mainly civil.....	56%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	6%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	45%
		Fourth District.....	41%
		Not in Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	5	2%	3	1%	48	20%	101	43%	80	34%	4.0
Knowledge of substantive law...	5	2%	4	2%	36	16%	99	43%	87	38%	4.1
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	6	3%	0	0%	41	18%	97	43%	84	37%	4.1
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	11	5%	28	12%	61	26%	76	32%	58	25%	3.6
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	9	4%	26	11%	54	24%	77	34%	63	28%	3.7
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	12	5%	19	8%	57	24%	79	33%	69	29%	3.7
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	11	5%	16	7%	54	24%	74	33%	69	31%	3.8
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	18	8%	45	19%	60	25%	61	26%	52	22%	3.4
Human understanding and compassion.....	9	4%	28	12%	67	29%	70	31%	55	24%	3.6
Ability to control courtroom...	5	2%	3	1%	51	22%	77	34%	91	40%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	4	2%	1	0%	63	28%	91	40%	70	31%	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	4	2%	2	1%	47	21%	95	41%	81	35%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	3	3%	5	5%	34	31%	47	43%	20	18%	3.7
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	3	3%	2	2%	34	31%	40	36%	32	29%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	4	3%	11	9%	34	29%	39	33%	30	25%	3.7
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	7	3%	17	7%	51	22%	100	43%	60	26%	3.8

OVERVIEW:

Altogether, 235 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Savell based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 39% had a substantial amount of experience, 22% had a moderate amount, and 24% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "good" range (3.8). The highest mean scores were in the "excellent" range on the categories of legal ability and diligence and the item regarding ability to control the courtroom (4.1). The lowest score was in the "acceptable" range, for courtesy and freedom from arrogance (3.4).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	28%	39%	22%	18	3.7
SOLO.....	11%	11%	16%	32%	32%	38	3.6
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	2%	10%	21%	44%	23%	48	3.8
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	29%	53%	18%	34	3.9
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	3	4.0
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....							
GOVERNMENT.....	2%	10%	18%	47%	24%	51	3.8
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	8%	42%	25%	25%	12	3.7
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	12%	29%	41%	18%	17	3.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	12%	12%	28%	48%	25	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	6%	27%	48%	18%	33	3.8
11-15 YEARS.....	2%	4%	29%	38%	27%	48	3.8
16-20 YEARS.....	5%	9%	20%	50%	16%	56	3.6
21+ YEARS.....	5%	5%	16%	43%	30%	56	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	20%	25%	40%	15%	20	3.5
MALE.....	5%	6%	22%	40%	28%	152	3.8
FEMALE.....	0%	6%	21%	49%	24%	63	3.9
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	28%	39%	22%	18	3.7
PROSECUTION.....	0%	11%	11%	22%	56%	9	4.2
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	13%	60%	27%	15	4.1
CRIMINAL & CIVIL....	9%	5%	19%	41%	26%	58	3.7
CIVIL.....	2%	8%	22%	43%	25%	130	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	5	3.4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	11%	28%	39%	22%	18	3.7
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	7%	7%	71%	14%	14	3.9
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	1	3.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	4%	5%	25%	44%	23%	106	3.8
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	3%	9%	19%	38%	31%	95	3.8
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	1	5.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	3%	9%	18%	35%	35%	34	3.9
SUBSTANTIAL.....	7%	8%	20%	38%	28%	92	3.7
MODERATE.....	0%	12%	21%	50%	17%	52	3.7
LIMITED.....	0%	2%	28%	47%	23%	57	3.9
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	10%	19%	10%	29%	33%	21	3.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	3%	7%	22%	43%	26%	235	3.8
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	4%	0%	44%	44%	7%	27	3.5
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	14%	71%	14%	7	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	43%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	20%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	26%
		Other.....	5%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	25%
		6-10 years.....	18%
		11-15 years.....	18%
		16-20 years.....	21%
		20+ years.....	11%
		No Answer.....	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	72%
		Female.....	21%
		No Answer.....	7%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	3%
		Third District.....	5%
		Fourth District.....	85%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	3%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	15%
		31,000 or over.....	75%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	2%	8	13%	10	16%	19	31%	23	38	3.9
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	3	5%	5	8%	10	17%	17	29%	24	41	3.9
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	2%	3	5%	12	20%	13	22%	30	51	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	1	2%	5	8%	13	22%	17	29%	23	39	3.9
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	3	5%	5	8%	12	20%	15	25%	24	41	3.9
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	6	10%	9	16%	19	33%	24	41	4.1
Ability to control courtroom...	1	2%	2	4%	12	21%	15	26%	27	47	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	3	5%	15	26%	17	29%	23	40	4.0
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	5	10%	8	15%	15	29%	24	46	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	2%	7	13%	11	20%	12	21%	25	45	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	5	13%	6	16%	9	24%	18	47	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	2%	7	11%	8	13%	18	30%	27	44	4.0

OVERVIEW:

In all, 61 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Savell from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 34% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 38% had a moderate amount, and 25% had a limited amount. The overall evaluation was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest rated item was in the "excellent" range for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), while the lowest-rated items were in the "good" range (3.9).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RICHARD D. SAVELL


DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
STATE OFFICER.....	4%	4%	12%	35%	46%	26	4.2
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	33%	25%	25%	17%	12	3.3
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	6%	6%	31%	56%	16	4.4
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	3	5.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
1-5 YEARS.....	7%	7%	7%	47%	33%	15	3.9
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	11	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	9%	18%	9%	64%	11	4.3
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	15%	15%	23%	46%	13	4.0
21+ YEARS.....	0%	14%	14%	43%	29%	7	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
MALE.....	2%	14%	14%	30%	41%	44	3.9
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	8%	31%	62%	13	4.5
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	2	5.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	12%	13%	31%	42%	52	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	25%	25%	25%	25%	4	3.5
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	11%	56%	33%	9	4.2
OVER 30,000.....	2%	13%	11%	26%	48%	46	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	2	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	5%	19%	5%	24%	48%	21	3.9
MODERATE.....	0%	4%	17%	26%	52%	23	4.3
LIMITED.....	0%	13%	20%	40%	27%	15	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	14%	14%	14%	29%	29%	7	3.4
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	11%	13%	30%	44%	61	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0

Judge Richard D. Savell

Fourth Judicial District (Fairbanks)

● Bar Members ▲ Peace/Probation Officers

100



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
Bar Members	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.8
Peace/Probation Officers	-	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	15%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	16%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	14%
		Private, corporate employee.....	2%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	15%
		Government.....	25%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	4%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	14%
		6-10 years.....	16%
		11-15 years.....	19%
		16-20 years.....	30%
		20+ years.....	13%
		No Answer.....	8%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	58%
		Female.....	31%
		No Answer.....	10%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	6%
		Mainly criminal.....	9%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	30%
		Mainly civil.....	45%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	2%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	36%
		Fourth District.....	53%
		Not in Alaska.....	1%
		No Answer.....	8%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	1	1%	4	3%	15	10%	50	32%	84	55%	4.4
Knowledge of substantive law...	2	1%	2	1%	17	11%	49	32%	83	54%	4.4
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	1	1%	2	1%	13	9%	53	36%	79	53%	4.4
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	1%	10	7%	23	15%	51	34%	67	44%	4.1
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	1	1%	9	6%	20	13%	46	31%	74	49%	4.2
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	1	1%	5	3%	18	12%	48	31%	81	53%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	2	1%	1	1%	19	13%	49	35%	71	50%	4.3
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	6	4%	5	3%	26	17%	41	27%	75	49%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	3	2%	3	2%	29	19%	47	32%	67	45%	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	1	1%	1	1%	15	11%	54	38%	71	50%	4.4
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	1	1%	2	1%	17	12%	53	38%	65	47%	4.3
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	1	1%	2	1%	11	8%	46	33%	81	57%	4.4
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	1	1%	4	4%	7	7%	27	26%	63	62%	4.4
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	1	1%	0	0%	10	13%	21	26%	48	60%	4.4
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	1	2%	4	7%	7	13%	14	25%	30	54%	4.2
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	1%	3	2%	21	14%	56	37%	71	47%	4.3

OVERVIEW: A total of 152 Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Pengilly based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 40% had a substantial amount of experience, 26% had a moderate amount, and 21% had a limited amount. Mean scores on all of the items were in the "excellent" range. The highest mean scores were in the categories regarding legal ability, judicial temperament, diligence, and special skills (4.4).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	15%	15%	62%	13	4.2
SOLO.....	0%	0%	8%	50%	42%	24	4.3
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	8%	12%	40%	40%	25	4.1
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	9%	50%	41%	22	4.3
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	10%	38%	52%	21	4.4
GOVERNMENT.....	0%	3%	17%	31%	50%	36	4.3
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	50%	17%	33%	6	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	17%	17%	58%	12	4.2
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	10%	10%	24%	57%	21	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	19%	35%	46%	26	4.3
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	4%	14%	39%	43%	28	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	9%	43%	48%	46	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	21%	47%	32%	19	4.1
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	6%	6%	13%	19%	56%	16	4.1
MALE.....	0%	1%	11%	40%	48%	88	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	2%	19%	38%	42%	48	4.2
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	15%	15%	62%	13	4.2
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	30%	40%	30%	10	4.0
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	0%	21%	79%	14	4.8
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	5%	11%	32%	52%	44	4.3
CIVIL.....	0%	1%	14%	48%	36%	69	4.2
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	8%	0%	15%	15%	62%	13	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	4%	9%	44%	44%	55	4.3
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	1%	18%	34%	48%	80	4.3
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	10%	70%	20	4.5
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	5%	7%	31%	57%	61	4.4
MODERATE.....	3%	0%	21%	46%	31%	39	4.0
LIMITED.....	0%	0%	16%	53%	31%	32	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	8%	15%	31%	46%	13	4.2
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	2%	14%	37%	47%	152	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	8%	25%	33%	33%	12	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	45%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.	25%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	15%
		Other.....	5%
		No Answer.....	9%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	25%
		6-10 years.....	13%
		11-15 years.....	24%
		16-20 years.....	24%
		20+ years.....	5%
		No Answer.....	9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	76%
		Female.....	15%
		No Answer.....	9%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	4%
		Third District.....	7%
		Fourth District.....	78%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	11%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	9%
		31,000 or over.....	75%
		No Answer.....	9%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	2	4%	11	20%	26	48%	15	28	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	4%	11	21%	27	51%	13	25	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	10	19%	21	39%	22	41	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	1	2%	11	22%	21	42%	17	34	4.1
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	0	0%	8	15%	24	44%	22	41	4.3
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	2%	9	17%	23	44%	19	37	4.2
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	0	0%	10	20%	25	49%	16	31	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	0	0%	11	22%	22	44%	17	34	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	9	21%	13	30%	20	47	4.2
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	2	4%	11	24%	20	43%	13	28	4.0
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	4%	6	23%	12	46%	7	27	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	2%	1	2%	7	13%	30	55%	16	29	4.1

OVERVIEW:

Fifty-five Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Pengilly from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 13% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 40% had a moderate amount, and 35% had a limited amount. All the mean scores were in the "excellent" range with the highest score going to courtesy and freedom from arrogance (4.3).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996


PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE CHARLES PENGILLY

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
STATE OFFICER.....	4%	4%	20%	40%	32%	25	3.9
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	7%	64%	29%	14	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	88%	13%	8	4.1
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	14	4.2
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	86%	14%	7	4.1
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	8%	8%	46%	38%	13	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	8%	0%	8%	62%	23%	13	3.9
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	3	3.7
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
MALE.....	2%	2%	14%	52%	29%	42	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	0%	63%	38%	8	4.4
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	6	4.2
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	2	4.0
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	2%	2%	14%	53%	28%	43	4.0
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	5	4.0
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	4	4.0
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	5	4.4
OVER 30,000.....	2%	2%	15%	49%	32%	41	4.0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	14%	57%	29%	7	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	14%	57%	29%	7	4.1
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	22	4.2
LIMITED.....	5%	5%	11%	58%	21%	19	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	4	4.5
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	2%	2%	13%	55%	29%	55	4.1
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	25%	50%	25%	4	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.

Judge Charles Pengilly

Fourth Judicial District (Fairbanks)



	Legal ability	Impartiality	Integrity	Judicial temperament	Diligence	Special skills	Overall evaluation
<i>Bar Members</i>	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.3
<i>Peace/Probation Officers</i>	-	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

V. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION SECTION

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

A. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	Private, solo.....	17%
		Private, office of 2-5 attorneys.....	17%
		Private, office of 6 or more attorneys....	13%
		Private, corporate employee.....	1%
		State judge or judicial officer.....	13%
		Government.....	24%
		Public service agency organization (not government).....	6%
		Other.....	2%
		No Answer.....	7%
2.	<u>Length of Practice:</u>	1-5 years.....	17%
		6-10 years.....	13%
		11-15 years.....	19%
		16-20 years.....	27%
		20+ years.....	18%
		No Answer.....	7%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	63%
		Female.....	29%
		No Answer.....	8%
4.	<u>Cases Handled:</u>	Prosecution.....	7%
		Mainly criminal.....	10%
		Mixed criminal and civil.....	28%
		Mainly civil.....	48%
		Other.....	1%
		No Answer.....	7%
5.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	5%
		Second District.....	0%
		Third District.....	30%
		Fourth District.....	59%
		Not in Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	7%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

B. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Legal Ability</u>											
Legal and factual analysis.....	0	0%	6	5%	38	29%	53	41%	33	25%	3.9
Knowledge of substantive law...	0	0%	5	4%	43	33%	49	38%	33	25%	3.8
Knowledge of evidence and procedure.....	0	0%	3	2%	35	27%	51	40%	39	30%	4.0
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	1	1%	7	5%	26	20%	58	45%	38	29%	4.0
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	9	7%	27	21%	52	40%	42	32%	4.0
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	5	4%	18	15%	44	36%	55	45%	4.2
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	1	1%	5	4%	24	21%	43	38%	41	36%	4.0
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	1	1%	6	5%	23	18%	49	38%	50	39%	4.1
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	8	6%	35	28%	44	35%	37	30%	3.9
Ability to control courtroom...	1	1%	0	0%	28	24%	50	42%	40	34%	4.1
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	5	4%	23	19%	53	44%	40	33%	4.1
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	5	4%	23	19%	48	39%	48	39%	4.1
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Settlement skills.....	0	0%	1	2%	18	30%	27	45%	14	23%	3.9
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	2	3%	25	36%	23	33%	20	29%	3.9
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	1	2%	16	32%	17	34%	16	32%	4.0
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	1	1%	3	2%	28	22%	56	45%	37	30%	4.0

OVERVIEW: One hundred and twenty-five Alaska Bar members evaluated Judge Wood based on their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 39% had a substantial amount of experience, 27% had a moderate amount, and 22% had a limited amount. Mean score on the overall evaluation item was in the "excellent" range (4.0). The highest mean score was for conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety (4.2), while the knowledge of substantive law ranked lowest (3.8).

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

ALASKA BAR ASSOCIATION

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
SOLO.....	0%	5%	29%	43%	24%	21	3.9
2-5 ATTORNEYS.....	0%	0%	9%	57%	35%	23	4.3
6+ ATTORNEYS.....	0%	7%	36%	36%	21%	14	3.7
CORPORATE.....	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	2	3.5
JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	16	4.1
GOVERNMENT.....	3%	3%	27%	37%	30%	30	3.9
PUBLIC SERVICE.....	0%	0%	14%	71%	14%	7	4.0
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3	4.0
LENGTH OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	22%	67%	9	4.6
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	9%	55%	36%	22	4.3
6-10 YEARS.....	6%	6%	17%	39%	33%	18	3.9
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	52%	35%	23	4.2
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	3%	42%	36%	18%	33	3.7
21+ YEARS.....	0%	5%	25%	55%	15%	20	3.8
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	9%	45%	45%	11	4.4
MALE.....	1%	3%	19%	46%	31%	78	4.0
FEMALE.....	0%	3%	33%	42%	22%	36	3.8
CASES HANDLED							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
PROSECUTION.....	0%	0%	13%	50%	38%	8	4.3
CRIMINAL.....	0%	0%	8%	42%	50%	12	4.4
CRIMINAL & CIVIL.....	0%	0%	29%	46%	26%	35	4.0
CIVIL.....	2%	5%	25%	45%	23%	60	3.8
OTHER.....	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	1	4.0
LOCATION OF PRACTICE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	11%	33%	56%	9	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
THIRD DISTRICT.....	3%	9%	11%	49%	29%	35	3.9
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	28%	45%	27%	74	4.0
NOT IN ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	7%	14%	43%	36%	14	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	2%	27%	39%	33%	49	4.0
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	15%	59%	26%	34	4.1
LIMITED.....	4%	4%	29%	39%	25%	28	3.8
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	24%	47%	29%	17	4.1
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	1%	2%	22%	45%	30%	125	4.0
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	0%	44%	22%	33%	9	3.9
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	4	4.3

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

D. DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICER RESPONDENTS

1.	<u>Type of Practice:</u>	State law enforcement officer.....	46%
		Municipal/Borough law enforcement officer.....	27%
		Village Public Safety Officer.....	0%
		Probation/Parole officer.....	15%
		Other.....	3%
		No Answer.....	9%
2.	<u>Length of Duty:</u>	1-5 years.....	24%
		6-10 years.....	15%
		11-15 years.....	19%
		16-20 years.....	22%
		20+ years.....	10%
		No Answer.....	9%
3.	<u>Gender:</u>	Male.....	81%
		Female.....	10%
		No Answer.....	9%
4.	<u>Location of Practice:</u>	First District.....	0%
		Second District.....	4%
		Third District.....	7%
		Fourth District.....	78%
		Outside Alaska.....	0%
		No Answer.....	10%
5.	<u>Community Population:</u>	Under 2,000.....	7%
		Between 2,000 and 30,000.....	19%
		31,000 or over.....	64%
		No Answer.....	9%

JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

E. EVALUATION OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

	Unacceptable		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		Mean
	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	Num	Pct	
<u>Impartiality</u>											
Equal treatment of all parties.	0	0%	1	1%	12	18%	26	39%	28	42%	4.2
Sense of basic fairness and justice.....	0	0%	2	3%	8	13%	25	39%	29	45%	4.3
<u>Integrity</u>											
Conduct free from impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.....	0	0%	1	2%	10	15%	22	33%	33	50%	4.3
Makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.	0	0%	3	5%	11	17%	22	33%	30	45%	4.2
<u>Judicial temperament</u>											
Courtesy, freedom from arrogance.....	0	0%	5	7%	8	12%	23	34%	31	46%	4.2
Human understanding and compassion.....	0	0%	1	2%	9	14%	28	42%	28	42%	4.3
Ability to control courtroom...	0	0%	1	2%	8	13%	23	37%	30	48%	4.3
<u>Diligence</u>											
Reasonable promptness in making decisions.....	0	0%	2	3%	8	12%	28	43%	27	42%	4.2
Willingness to work diligently; preparation for hearings.....	0	0%	1	2%	9	15%	22	37%	27	46%	4.3
<u>Special Skills</u>											
Consideration of all relevant factors in sentencing.....	0	0%	3	5%	9	15%	24	39%	26	42%	4.2
Talent and ability for cases involving children and families.....	0	0%	2	5%	6	15%	16	41%	15	38%	4.1
<u>Overall Evaluation</u>											
Overall evaluation of judge....	0	0%	1	1%	10	15%	25	37%	31	46%	4.3

OVERVIEW: In all, 67 Peace and Probation Officers evaluated Judge Wood from their direct professional experience. Of these respondents, 24% had a substantial amount of experience with the judge, 27% had a moderate amount, and 37% had a limited amount. All of the mean scores were in the "excellent" range.

**JUDICIAL EVALUATION REPORT
MAY 1996**

PEACE AND PROBATION OFFICERS

OVERALL EVALUATION: DISTRICT COURT JUDGE MARK I. WOOD

DEMOGRAPHICS	UNACCEPTABLE	DEFICIENT	ACCEPTABLE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	Total	
						n	Mean
TYPE OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
STATE OFFICER.....	0%	3%	16%	26%	55%	31	4.3
MUNI/BOROUGH OFFICER.....	0%	0%	17%	44%	39%	18	4.2
VILLAGE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
PROB/PAROLE OFFICER.	0%	0%	10%	50%	40%	10	4.3
OTHER.....	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	2	4.0
LENGTH OF DUTY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
1-5 YEARS.....	0%	0%	31%	25%	44%	16	4.1
6-10 YEARS.....	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	10	4.4
11-15 YEARS.....	0%	8%	0%	31%	62%	13	4.5
16-20 YEARS.....	0%	0%	13%	33%	53%	15	4.4
21+ YEARS.....	0%	0%	43%	29%	29%	7	3.9
GENDER							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
MALE.....	0%	2%	15%	33%	50%	54	4.3
FEMALE.....	0%	0%	29%	43%	29%	7	4.0
LOCATION OF WORK							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	7	4.4
FIRST DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SECOND DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	3	4.3
THIRD DISTRICT.....	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5	4.2
FOURTH DISTRICT.....	0%	2%	17%	33%	48%	52	4.3
OUTSIDE ALASKA.....	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	.
SIZE OF COMMUNITY							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	6	4.3
UNDER 2,000.....	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	5	4.2
2,000-30,000.....	0%	0%	8%	46%	46%	13	4.4
OVER 30,000.....	0%	2%	21%	26%	51%	43	4.3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	8	4.1
SUBSTANTIAL.....	0%	0%	6%	19%	75%	16	4.7
MODERATE.....	0%	0%	11%	61%	28%	18	4.2
LIMITED.....	0%	4%	20%	32%	44%	25	4.2
BASIS FOR EVALUATION							
NO ANSWER.....	0%	0%	13%	13%	75%	8	4.6
DIRECT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.....	0%	1%	15%	37%	46%	67	4.3
PROFESSIONAL REPUTATION.....	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	4	4.0
SOCIAL CONTACTS.....	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	3	4.7

Judge Mark I. Wood

Fourth Judicial District (Fairbanks)

