



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Alaska Supreme Court

Technical Report

Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional
Rosylind Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional

May 24-28, 2021

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.iseralaska.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	6
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
Table 11: Dani Crosby: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Dani Crosby: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Jennifer Stuart Henderson: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Jennifer Stuart Henderson: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Yvonne Lamoureux: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Yvonne Lamoureux: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 17: Margaret Paton Walsh: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	22
Table 18: Margaret Paton Walsh: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 19: Paul A. Roetman: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Paul A. Roetman: Detailed Responses	25
Table 21: Ben Whipple: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	26
Table 22: Ben Whipple: Detailed Responses	27
Table 23: Jonathan A. Woodman: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: Jonathan A. Woodman: Detailed Responses.....	29

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Alaska Supreme Court created by the retirement of Chief Justice Joel H. Bolger. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Dani Crosby, Jennifer Stuart Henderson, Yvonne Lamoureux, Margaret Paton Walsh, Paul A. Roetman, Ben Whipple, and Jonathan A. Woodman.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked bar members to evaluate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence, Integrity, Fairness, Judicial Temperament, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy, and Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each applicant on all six characteristics by respondents with direct professional experience.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
Dani Crosby	293	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	311	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	239	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	172	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	192	3.5	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.4
Ben Whipple	55	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	2.5	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	206	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2

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

2021 Judicial Selection Survey, Alaska Supreme Court

Introduction

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate all applicants for a judicial vacancy. The Council nominates the two or more most qualified applicants to the governor who must appoint from the Council's list. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska Bar Association members and asked them to rate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence*, *Integrity*, *Fairness*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER), a research institute at the University of Alaska Anchorage. ISER was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Parallel paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Council but returned directly to ISER for processing, data entry, and analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancy: Alaska Supreme Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for the Alaska Supreme Court, created by the retirement of Chief Justice Joel H. Bolger. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Dani Crosby, Jennifer Stuart Henderson, Yvonne Lamoureux, Margaret Paton Walsh, Paul A. Roetman, Ben Whipple, and Jonathan A. Woodman.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,553 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,540) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Five individuals received only a paper version of the survey and eight individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 967 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; 21 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; two surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online surveys were returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 944 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned six paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. One paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned. No paper surveys were excluded because the respondent did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, five paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 944 online surveys and five paper surveys, for a total of 949 surveys and a survey return rate of 26.7%. Of the 949 returned surveys, 286 (30.1%) did not rate any of the seven applicants; 663 respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All Respondents	Respondents who		
		Rated ≥ 1 Applicant		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	949	100	663	100
Type of Practice				
No response	6	0.6	1	0.2
Private, solo	185	19.5	111	16.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	111	11.7	73	11.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	132	13.9	102	15.4
Private, corporate employee	17	1.8	10	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	84	8.9	67	10.1
Government	232	24.4	181	27.3
Public service agency or organization	35	3.7	31	4.7
Retired	15	1.6	12	1.8
Other	132	13.9	75	11.3
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	85	9.0	48	7.2
5 years or fewer	83	8.7	60	9.0
6 to 10 years	94	9.9	69	10.4
11 to 15 years	106	11.2	82	12.4
16 to 20 years	95	10.0	73	11.0
More than 20 years	486	51.2	331	49.9
Cases Handled				
No response	7	0.7	3	0.5
Prosecution	56	5.9	46	6.9
Criminal	64	6.7	42	6.3
Mixed criminal & civil	195	20.5	146	22.0
Civil	553	58.3	387	58.4
Other	74	7.8	39	5.9
Location of Practice				
No response	8	0.8	3	0.5
First District	94	9.9	40	6.0
Second District	18	1.9	14	2.1
Third District	699	73.7	547	82.5
Fourth District	80	8.4	37	5.6
Outside Alaska	50	5.3	22	3.3
Gender				
No response	18	1.9	9	1.4
Male	559	58.9	386	58.2
Female	365	38.5	263	39.7
Another identity	7	0.7	5	0.8

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant.

Both versions of the survey required a certification by the respondent that they had rated the applicants as required by the bar’s Professional Rule 8.2. Specific instructions regarding the certification were provided:

“Please refer to Professional Conduct Rule 8.2 concerning your obligation to provide truthful and candid opinions on the qualifications or integrity of these applicants.”

Respondents evaluated applicants in six areas of performance included in the survey using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided for each of the performance areas. The scale and instructions for respondents were:

“Please rate the applicant on each of the following qualities by selecting the number that best represents your evaluation. Applicants should be evaluated on each quality separately. Use the ends of the scales as well as the middle. The tendency to rate an applicant “excellent” or “poor” on every trait should be avoided since each person has strengths and weaknesses. If you cannot rate the applicant on any one quality, leave that one blank.”

	(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
<i>Professional Competence</i>	Lacking in knowledge and/or effectiveness	Below-average performance occasionally	Possesses sufficient knowledge and required skills	Usually knowledgeable and effective	Meets the highest standards for knowledge and effectiveness
<i>Integrity</i>	Unconcerned with propriety and/or appearance, or acts in violation of codes of professional conduct	Appears lacking in knowledge of professional codes of conduct and/or unconcerned with propriety or appearance at times	Follows codes of professional conduct, respects propriety and appearance of propriety at all times	Above-average awareness of ethics, holds self to higher standard than most	Outstanding integrity and highest standards of conduct
<i>Fairness</i>	Often shows strong bias for or against some person or groups	Displays, verbally or otherwise, some bias for or against groups or persons	Free of substantial bias or prejudice against groups or persons	Above-average ability to treat all persons and groups impartially	Unusually fair and impartial to all groups
<i>Judicial Temperament</i>	Often lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Sometimes lacks compassion, humility, or courtesy	Possesses appropriate compassion, humility, and courtesy	Above-average compassion, humility, and courtesy	Outstanding compassion, humility, and courtesy
<i>Suitability of Experience</i>	Has little or no suitable experience	Has less than suitable experience	Has suitable experience	Has highly suitable experience	Has the most suitable experience for this position
<i>Overall Rating</i>	Has few qualifications for this position	Has insufficient qualifications for this position	Has suitable qualifications for this position	Has highly suitable qualifications for this position	Has exceptionally high qualifications for this position

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial selection survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically, paper surveys are kept in a lockable file cabinet located in a locked office. Data are kept locked at all times except when being used for data entry or related purposes. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Online data and data that have been entered from paper surveys are maintained on a secure server.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

To ensure that as few duplicates or invalid surveys as possible were received, clear instructions were provided to potential paper survey respondents regarding how to handle the survey booklets:

“A postage-paid business reply envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed evaluations. Place the completed survey inside the envelope marked “Confidential,” and seal the envelope. Then use the business reply envelope, being sure to sign in the space provided. The return envelope MUST BE SIGNED in order for your survey to be counted.”

Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. For the surveys returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope was opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. One paper survey was returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once. After merging online and entered paper data, ISER analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. No duplicate surveys were identified. Had any duplicates been identified, the most complete survey data would have been retained and the duplicate removed, ensuring that only one survey per respondent was used in the data analysis.

Data Management

With the goal of virtually error-free data handling, ISER implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Paper data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper survey were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

Table 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each applicant.

Ratings of Applicants

In the tables that follow, responses to the rating questions are shown in a variety of ways. Most tables show the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*). Tables 4-10 present details on the *Overall* item. Table 4 compares all applicants to those with direct professional experience and includes the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*) in addition to number of respondents and average. Tables 5-10 present data only from those respondents who indicated direct professional experience. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses. Table 6 provides applicants' mean ratings broken down by respondents' type of practice. Table 7 provides applicants' mean ratings broken down by respondents' length of Alaska practice. Table 8 provides applicants' mean ratings broken down by respondents' type of caseload handled. Table 9 provides applicants' mean ratings broken down by respondents' location of practice. Table 10 provides applicants' mean ratings broken down by respondents' gender.

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-24 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Dani Crosby	373	39.3	78.6	18.8	2.7
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	378	39.8	82.3	14.3	3.4
Yvonne Lamoureux	278	29.3	86.0	12.2	1.8
Margaret Paton Walsh	230	24.2	74.8	22.2	3.0
Paul A. Roetman	235	24.8	81.7	16.6	1.7
Ben Whipple	83	8.7	66.3	31.3	2.4
Jonathan A. Woodman	272	28.7	75.7	16.5	7.7

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Dani Crosby	368	4.4	5.0	0.9	290	4.4	5.0	1.0
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	374	4.6	5.0	0.8	308	4.5	5.0	0.9
Yvonne Lamoureux	276	4.4	5.0	0.9	238	4.4	5.0	0.9
Margaret Paton Walsh	227	4.1	4.0	1.0	171	4.2	4.0	1.0
Paul A. Roetman	232	3.4	3.0	1.3	190	3.4	3.0	1.3
Ben Whipple	81	2.5	2.0	1.2	54	2.6	2.0	1.1
Jonathan A. Woodman	270	4.3	5.0	1.0	205	4.2	5.0	1.0

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Dani Crosby	290	5	1.7	16	5.5	24	8.3	69	23.8	176	60.7
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	308	4	1.3	11	3.6	22	7.1	55	17.9	216	70.1
Yvonne Lamoureux	238	3	1.3	10	4.2	18	7.6	62	26.1	145	60.9
Margaret Paton Walsh	171	3	1.8	14	8.2	16	9.4	59	34.5	79	46.2
Paul A. Roetman	190	12	6.3	43	22.6	42	22.1	40	21.1	53	27.9
Ben Whipple	54	8	14.8	22	40.7	12	22.2	8	14.8	4	7.4
Jonathan A. Woodman	205	7	3.4	10	4.9	20	9.8	59	28.8	109	53.2

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Dani Crosby	62	4.2	44	4.3	54	4.5	6	4.3	37	4.6	50	4.3	10	4.3	4	4.8	23	4.6	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	51	4.3	41	4.1	46	4.5	2	4.5	47	4.8	88	4.6	14	4.7	1	5.0	18	4.5	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	34	3.9	29	4.0	49	4.5	2	5.0	37	4.8	58	4.5	11	4.7	1	5.0	16	4.7	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	13	3.8	10	4.2	30	4.4	1	5.0	23	4.1	62	4.2	8	3.5	3	5.0	21	4.0	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	31	3.4	18	3.9	21	3.7	1	3.0	38	3.4	57	3.3	5	2.4	1	5.0	18	3.1	3.4
Ben Whipple	7	2.0	11	3.3	8	2.9	-	-	14	2.5	9	2.3	-	-	-	-	5	2.2	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	29	3.7	27	3.9	19	4.7	1	2.0	33	4.5	68	4.3	9	3.1	-	-	19	4.8	4.2

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Dani Crosby	17	4.5	26	3.9	27	4.3	23	4.6	179	4.4	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	27	4.5	41	4.6	38	4.6	33	4.7	149	4.4	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	18	4.8	21	4.3	31	4.6	25	4.4	129	4.4	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	10	4.5	20	4.0	28	4.3	24	4.3	83	4.1	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	9	3.9	14	3.8	25	3.4	20	3.5	106	3.3	3.4
Ben Whipple	1	1.0	1	2.0	4	2.8	6	2.2	38	2.7	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	9	4.0	20	4.3	25	4.3	28	4.1	108	4.3	4.2

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Dani Crosby	8	4.5	9	4.3	64	4.3	195	4.4	14	4.4	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	29	4.9	19	4.6	83	4.4	161	4.5	15	4.5	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	16	4.7	12	4.9	59	4.5	140	4.4	10	4.0	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	9	4.3	3	3.0	33	4.0	117	4.2	8	4.4	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	20	3.7	14	3.1	79	3.2	65	3.7	12	3.3	3.4
Ben Whipple	2	3.0	-	-	21	2.4	30	2.7	-	-	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	11	4.7	13	3.5	65	4.1	110	4.3	6	4.5	4.2

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Dani Crosby	7	4.7	1	4.0	264	4.3	10	4.6	7	4.9	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	9	4.9	2	4.5	280	4.5	14	4.6	2	5.0	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	11	4.8	1	5.0	213	4.4	8	4.8	3	5.0	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	19	3.9	1	2.0	138	4.2	7	3.9	6	4.0	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	7	2.4	11	4.1	146	3.3	23	4.2	3	5.0	3.4
Ben Whipple	-	-	-	-	52	2.6	2	1.5	-	-	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	9	4.7	-	-	178	4.2	14	4.3	2	5.0	4.2

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Dani Crosby	184	4.4	101	4.3	-	-	4.4
Jennifer Stuart Henderson	186	4.4	117	4.7	2	5.0	4.5
Yvonne Lamoureux	144	4.4	90	4.4	1	5.0	4.4
Margaret Paton Walsh	91	4.0	79	4.3	1	5.0	4.2
Paul A. Roetman	110	3.5	76	3.3	1	5.0	3.4
Ben Whipple	31	2.8	22	2.2	-	-	2.6
Jonathan A. Woodman	104	4.2	100	4.2	-	-	4.2

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

Table 11
Dani Crosby
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	373	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	293	78.6
Professional reputation	70	18.8
Other personal contacts	10	2.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	242	82.6
Substantial amount of experience	81	27.7
Moderate amount of experience	115	39.4
Limited amount of experience	96	32.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	73	19.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	49	13.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	69	18.5
Private, corporate employee	9	2.4
Judge or judicial officer	44	11.8
Government	66	17.7
Public service agency or organization	16	4.3
Retired	8	2.1
Other	39	10.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	27	7.2
5 years or fewer	23	6.2
6 to 10 years	29	7.8
11 to 15 years	36	9.7
16 to 20 years	33	8.8
More than 20 years	225	60.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	15	4.0
Criminal	15	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	80	21.4
Civil	241	64.6
Other	22	5.9
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.3
First District	12	3.2
Second District	2	0.5
Third District	338	90.6
Fourth District	13	3.5
Outside Alaska	7	1.9
Gender		
No response	5	1.3
Male	227	60.9
Female	140	37.5
Another identity	1	0.3

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

Table 12
Dani Crosby
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	373	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	293	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	242	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	46	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	81	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	115	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	96	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	70	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.5
Other personal contacts	10	4.9	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	63	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	44	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	54	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5
Private, corporate employee	6	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.3	4.3
Judge or judicial officer	37	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Government	50	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	11	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3
Retired	4	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8
Other	24	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	17	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	4.5
6 to 10 years	27	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.5	3.8	3.9
11 to 15 years	27	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.3
16 to 20 years	23	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6
More than 20 years	180	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5
Criminal	9	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	66	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3
Civil	196	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Other	14	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Second District	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	-	4.0
Third District	266	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	10	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6
Outside Alaska	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.9
Gender*							
Male	186	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.4
Female	102	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Jennifer Stuart Henderson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	378	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	311	82.3
Professional reputation	54	14.3
Other personal contacts	13	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	286	92.0
Substantial amount of experience	95	30.7
Moderate amount of experience	144	46.6
Limited amount of experience	70	22.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	60	15.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	44	11.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	56	14.8
Private, corporate employee	4	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	54	14.3
Government	109	28.8
Public service agency or organization	18	4.8
Retired	3	0.8
Other	30	7.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	23	6.1
5 years or fewer	31	8.2
6 to 10 years	50	13.2
11 to 15 years	48	12.7
16 to 20 years	45	11.9
More than 20 years	181	47.9
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.3
Prosecution	33	8.7
Criminal	24	6.3
Mixed criminal & civil	99	26.2
Civil	200	52.9
Other	21	5.6
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.3
First District	12	3.2
Second District	3	0.8
Third District	345	91.3
Fourth District	15	4.0
Outside Alaska	2	0.5
Gender		
No response	3	0.8
Male	218	57.7
Female	155	41.0
Another identity	2	0.5

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

Table 14
Jennifer Stuart Henderson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	378	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	311	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	286	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	22	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	95	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	144	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	70	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	54	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other personal contacts	13	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	52	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	41	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	46	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5
Private, corporate employee	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	48	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Government	89	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6
Public service agency or organization	14	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	18	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	27	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.5
6 to 10 years	42	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	38	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.6
16 to 20 years	34	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7
More than 20 years	150	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	29	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.9
Criminal	19	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	84	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Civil	162	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Other	16	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	9	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.6	4.9
Second District	2	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Third District	283	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Fourth District	14	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	188	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4
Female	118	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.7
Another identity	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺

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

⁺Too few respondents to report.

Table 15
Yvonne Lamoureux
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	278	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	239	86.0
Professional reputation	34	12.2
Other personal contacts	5	1.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	219	91.6
Substantial amount of experience	73	30.5
Moderate amount of experience	89	37.2
Limited amount of experience	77	32.2
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.4
Private, solo	39	14.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	35	12.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	54	19.4
Private, corporate employee	3	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	42	15.1
Government	70	25.2
Public service agency or organization	13	4.7
Retired	2	0.7
Other	19	6.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	15	5.4
5 years or fewer	19	6.8
6 to 10 years	25	9.0
11 to 15 years	39	14.0
16 to 20 years	32	11.5
More than 20 years	148	53.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.4
Prosecution	21	7.6
Criminal	15	5.4
Mixed criminal & civil	67	24.1
Civil	161	57.9
Other	13	4.7
Location of Practice		
No response	2	0.7
First District	13	4.7
Second District	2	0.7
Third District	249	89.6
Fourth District	8	2.9
Outside Alaska	4	1.4
Gender		
No response	3	1.1
Male	162	58.3
Female	112	40.3
Another identity	1	0.4

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

Table 16
Yvonne Lamoureux
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	278	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	239	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	219	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	7	4.9	4.6	4.2	4.5	5.0	4.9
Substantial amount of experience	73	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	89	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Limited amount of experience	77	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	34	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Other personal contacts	5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	34	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	29	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	49	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.5
Private, corporate employee	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	37	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8
Government	59	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Public service agency or organization	11	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	16	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.7
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	18	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
6 to 10 years	21	4.5	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.3
11 to 15 years	32	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6
16 to 20 years	25	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.4
More than 20 years	129	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	16	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7
Criminal	12	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	5.0	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	59	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5
Civil	140	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Other	11	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	11	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8
Second District	1	5.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	214	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
Fourth District	8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.8
Outside Alaska	3	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	145	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Female	90	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4
Another identity	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺

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

⁺Too few respondents to report.

Table 17
Margaret Paton Walsh
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	230	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	172	74.8
Professional reputation	51	22.2
Other personal contacts	7	3.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	150	87.2
Substantial amount of experience	74	43.3
Moderate amount of experience	53	31.0
Limited amount of experience	44	25.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	7.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	7.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	40	17.4
Private, corporate employee	3	1.3
Judge or judicial officer	28	12.2
Government	83	36.1
Public service agency or organization	11	4.8
Retired	4	1.7
Other	27	11.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	8	3.5
5 years or fewer	16	7.0
6 to 10 years	29	12.6
11 to 15 years	40	17.4
16 to 20 years	32	13.9
More than 20 years	105	45.7
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.4
Prosecution	18	7.8
Criminal	5	2.2
Mixed criminal & civil	42	18.3
Civil	152	66.1
Other	12	5.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	26	11.3
Second District	1	0.4
Third District	188	81.7
Fourth District	9	3.9
Outside Alaska	6	2.6
Gender		
No response	1	0.4
Male	117	50.9
Female	111	48.3
Another identity	1	0.4

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

Table 18
Margaret Paton Walsh
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	230	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	172	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	150	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	20	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	74	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	53	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.1	4.1
Limited amount of experience	44	4.6	4.2	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9
Professional reputation	51	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0
Other personal contacts	7	4.6	3.9	3.4	3.1	4.0	3.9
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	13	4.3	4.4	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.5	4.3	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	30	4.8	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	23	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Government	63	4.7	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.4	4.2
Public service agency or organization	8	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3	5.0
Other	21	4.7	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.5
6 to 10 years	21	4.7	4.5	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.0
11 to 15 years	28	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.3
16 to 20 years	24	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.3
More than 20 years	83	4.6	4.5	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.3
Criminal	3	4.7	3.0	2.3	3.3	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	33	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0
Civil	118	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.2	4.2
Other	8	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.1	4.5	4.4
Location of Practice*							
First District	20	4.5	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.9
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
Third District	138	4.7	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	7	4.3	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.9
Outside Alaska	6	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.0
Gender*							
Male	92	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1	4.0
Female	79	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.3
Another identity	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺

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

⁺Too few respondents to report.

Table 19
Paul A. Roetman
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	235	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	192	81.7
Professional reputation	39	16.6
Other personal contacts	4	1.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	144	75.0
Substantial amount of experience	64	33.3
Moderate amount of experience	71	37.0
Limited amount of experience	57	29.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	36	15.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	23	9.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	26	11.1
Private, corporate employee	1	0.4
Judge or judicial officer	46	19.6
Government	69	29.4
Public service agency or organization	6	2.6
Retired	3	1.3
Other	25	10.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	18	7.7
5 years or fewer	13	5.5
6 to 10 years	20	8.5
11 to 15 years	31	13.2
16 to 20 years	26	11.1
More than 20 years	127	54.0
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	25	10.6
Criminal	18	7.7
Mixed criminal & civil	91	38.7
Civil	87	37.0
Other	14	6.0
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	10	4.3
Second District	12	5.1
Third District	184	78.3
Fourth District	26	11.1
Outside Alaska	3	1.3
Gender		
No response	3	1.3
Male	136	57.9
Female	95	40.4
Another identity	1	0.4

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

Table 20
Paul A. Roetman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	235	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	192	3.5	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.4
Experience within last 5 years	144	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	46	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	64	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	71	3.5	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.5
Limited amount of experience	57	3.6	4.2	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	39	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.2
Other personal contacts	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	31	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	3.8	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	21	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.7
Private, corporate employee	1	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	39	3.5	4.3	3.9	4.1	3.3	3.4
Government	58	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.3
Public service agency or organization	5	2.4	3.2	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.4
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	18	3.1	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.2	3.1
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9
6 to 10 years	15	3.9	4.3	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.8
11 to 15 years	25	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.4
16 to 20 years	20	3.3	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.5
More than 20 years	107	3.4	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.3	3.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	20	3.7	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.7
Criminal	15	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.1
Mixed criminal & civil	80	3.3	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.2
Civil	65	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.7
Other	12	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	7	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.6	2.4
Second District	12	4.2	4.6	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.1
Third District	147	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.4	3.3
Fourth District	23	4.2	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.2
Outside Alaska	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	112	3.6	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.5
Female	76	3.4	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.3
Another identity	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺	- ⁺

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

⁺Too few respondents to report.

Table 21
Ben Whipple
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	83	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	55	66.3
Professional reputation	26	31.3
Other personal contacts	2	2.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	41	74.5
Substantial amount of experience	13	23.6
Moderate amount of experience	24	43.6
Limited amount of experience	18	32.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	11	13.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	15.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	14	16.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	17	20.5
Government	17	20.5
Public service agency or organization	2	2.4
Retired	-	-
Other	9	10.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	4.8
5 years or fewer	3	3.6
6 to 10 years	7	8.4
11 to 15 years	6	7.2
16 to 20 years	9	10.8
More than 20 years	54	65.1
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.2
Prosecution	5	6.0
Criminal	1	1.2
Mixed criminal & civil	28	33.7
Civil	47	56.6
Other	1	1.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	78	94.0
Fourth District	3	3.6
Outside Alaska	1	1.2
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	48	57.8
Female	34	41.0
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 22
Ben Whipple
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	83	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.4	2.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	55	2.7	3.7	3.5	3.4	2.5	2.6
Experience within last 5 years	41	2.7	3.7	3.6	3.5	2.4	2.6
Experience not within last 5 years	13	2.6	3.8	3.4	3.4	2.8	2.8
Substantial amount of experience	13	2.5	3.5	3.4	3.1	2.3	2.4
Moderate amount of experience	24	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	2.5	2.7
Limited amount of experience	18	2.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	2.6	2.6
Professional reputation	26	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.2	2.2
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	2.3	3.9	3.1	3.4	2.1	2.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	3.3	4.2	3.8	3.6	2.9	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	3.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	2.8	2.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	2.9	3.4	3.7	3.4	2.5	2.5
Government	9	2.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.1	2.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5	2.0	3.7	3.3	2.7	2.3	2.2
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	2.0	4.0	3.0	-	1.0	1.0
6 to 10 years	1	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
11 to 15 years	4	3.0	3.5	3.8	3.5	2.8	2.8
16 to 20 years	6	2.0	3.7	3.2	3.0	1.8	2.2
More than 20 years	39	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.5	2.6	2.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	2	2.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
Criminal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mixed criminal & civil	22	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.6	2.4
Civil	30	2.8	3.9	3.6	3.5	2.4	2.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	53	2.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	2.5	2.6
Fourth District	2	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	31	3.0	3.8	3.6	3.6	2.7	2.8
Female	23	2.3	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.1	2.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 23
Jonathan A. Woodman
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	272	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	206	75.7
Professional reputation	45	16.5
Other personal contacts	21	7.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	175	85.0
Substantial amount of experience	77	37.6
Moderate amount of experience	63	30.7
Limited amount of experience	65	31.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	34	12.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	34	12.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	33	12.1
Private, corporate employee	4	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	37	13.6
Government	93	34.2
Public service agency or organization	9	3.3
Retired	1	0.4
Other	27	9.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	18	6.6
5 years or fewer	13	4.8
6 to 10 years	26	9.6
11 to 15 years	37	13.6
16 to 20 years	37	13.6
More than 20 years	141	51.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	18	6.6
Criminal	18	6.6
Mixed criminal & civil	72	26.5
Civil	150	55.1
Other	14	5.1
Location of Practice		
No response	2	0.7
First District	10	3.7
Second District	-	-
Third District	242	89.0
Fourth District	14	5.1
Outside Alaska	4	1.5
Gender		
No response	1	0.4
Male	149	54.8
Female	121	44.5
Another identity	1	0.4

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

Table 24
Jonathan A. Woodman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	272	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	206	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	175	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	30	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7
Substantial amount of experience	77	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	63	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	65	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1
Professional reputation	45	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	21	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	29	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	27	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	19	4.6	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.8	4.7
Private, corporate employee	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Judge or judicial officer	33	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Government	69	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	9	3.3	3.9	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.1
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	19	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.3	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	20	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.3
11 to 15 years	25	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	28	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1
More than 20 years	108	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	11	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7
Criminal	13	3.9	4.1	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	65	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1
Civil	110	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3
Other	7	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	9	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.9	4.3	4.7
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	179	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	14	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	104	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2
Female	100	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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