



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Fairbanks Superior Court

Technical Report

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

May 18, 2023

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: Tom V. Jamgochian: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Tom V. Jamgochian: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: William T. Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Amy K. Welch: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Amy K. Welch: Detailed Responses	21

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Fairbanks Superior Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Paul R. Lyle. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of five applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Tom V. Jamgochian, Risa Leonard, William T. Montgomery, Spenser J. Ruppert, and Amy K. Welch. Risa Leonard and Spenser J. Ruppert withdrew their applications; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

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

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

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Tom V. Jamgochian	119	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2
William T. Montgomery	79	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0
Amy K. Welch	65	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.8

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

2023 Judicial Selection Survey, Fairbanks Superior 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: Fairbanks Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Fairbanks Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Paul R. Lyle. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of five applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Tom V. Jamgochian, Risa Leonard, William T. Montgomery, Spenser J. Ruppert, and Amy K. Welch. Risa Leonard and Spenser J. Ruppert withdrew their applications; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,741 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,728) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 13 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 635 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; four 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 survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 629 online surveys qualified for analysis.

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

The final analysis included 629 online surveys and five paper surveys, for a total of 634 surveys and a survey return rate of 16.9%. Of the 634 returned surveys, 395 did not rate any of the five applicants; 239 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		634	100	239	100
Type of Practice					
	No response	6	0.9	2	0.8
	Private, solo	132	20.8	29	12.1
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	74	11.7	27	11.3
	Private, 6+ attorneys	78	12.3	24	10.0
	Private, corporate employee	11	1.7	3	1.3
	Judge or judicial officer	54	8.5	38	15.9
	Government	142	22.4	83	34.7
	Public service agency or organization	20	3.2	8	3.3
	Retired	105	16.6	21	8.8
	Other	12	1.9	4	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	49	7.7	15	6.3
	5 years or fewer	66	10.4	34	14.2
	6 to 10 years	51	8.0	30	12.6
	11 to 15 years	62	9.8	34	14.2
	16 to 20 years	68	10.7	38	15.9
	More than 20 years	338	53.3	88	36.8
Cases Handled					
	No response	7	1.1	1	0.4
	Prosecution	43	6.8	32	13.4
	Criminal	51	8.0	26	10.9
	Mixed criminal & civil	163	25.7	96	40.2
	Civil	331	52.2	76	31.8
	Other	39	6.2	8	3.3
Location of Practice					
	No response	10	1.6	1	0.4
	First District	66	10.4	9	3.8
	Second District	12	1.9	8	3.3
	Third District	403	63.6	125	52.3
	Fourth District	114	18.0	94	39.3
	Outside Alaska	29	4.6	2	0.8
Gender					
	No response	13	2.1	2	0.8
	Male	385	60.7	141	59.0
	Female	232	36.6	94	39.3
	Another identity	4	0.6	2	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. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. Signed names on the envelopes were compared to the mailing list, ensuring the individual was an eligible participant. Each individual’s unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys. No surveys were signed by individuals who were not on the mailing list.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once. After merging online and entered paper data, ISER analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. 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 surveys were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were merged with the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-16 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Tom V. Jamgochian	148	23.3	80.4	15.5	4.1
William T. Montgomery	104	16.4	76.0	21.2	2.9
Amy K. Welch	81	12.8	80.2	16.0	3.7

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>
Tom V. Jamgochian	148	4.2	5.0	1.0	119	4.2	5.0	1.0
William T. Montgomery	104	4.1	4.0	1.1	79	4.0	4.0	1.2
Amy K. Welch	79	3.7	4.0	0.9	64	3.8	4.0	0.9

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

		Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Tom V. Jamgochian	119	2	1.7	7	5.9	13	10.9	36	30.3	61	51.3
William T. Montgomery	79	3	3.8	8	10.1	9	11.4	23	29.1	36	45.6
Amy K. Welch	64	-	-	5	7.8	21	32.8	22	34.4	16	25.0

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall
	<i>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>	<i>M</i>
Tom V. Jamgochian	16	4.2	15	3.3	12	4.3	-	-	25	4.6	36	4.4	1	4.0	10	4.6	2	4.0	4.2
William T. Montgomery	4	3.8	7	3.9	4	3.8	-	-	23	4.6	28	3.8	4	3.3	7	4.3	1	3.0	4.0
Amy K. Welch	7	3.7	10	3.3	7	3.4	1	5.0	12	4.3	20	3.8	1	3.0	5	3.6	1	4.0	3.8

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Tom V. Jamgochian	10	4.3	9	4.7	18	3.8	23	4.3	50	4.2	4.2
William T. Montgomery	10	4.2	11	3.5	12	3.8	12	4.2	31	4.3	4.0
Amy K. Welch	9	3.4	6	4.5	10	3.4	6	3.8	32	3.8	3.8

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Tom V. Jamgochian	18	4.6	12	4.1	56	4.1	28	4.5	4	4.0	4.2
William T. Montgomery	5	4.6	12	3.9	45	4.3	15	3.3	1	3.0	4.0
Amy K. Welch	9	3.9	3	3.0	28	3.9	23	3.7	1	4.0	3.8

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>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>	
Tom V. Jamgochian	8	4.8	5	4.8	73	4.3	30	3.8	2	4.5	4.2
William T. Montgomery	5	3.6	4	3.3	29	4.2	40	4.1	-	-	4.0
Amy K. Welch	1	4.0	-	-	13	3.5	50	3.8	-	-	3.8

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>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Tom V. Jamgochian	79	4.2	39	4.4	-	-	4.2
William T. Montgomery	48	4.3	29	3.8	+	+	4.0
Amy K. Welch	35	3.9	28	3.6	-	-	3.8

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the applicants.
 +Too few respondents to report.

Table 11
Tom V. Jamgochian
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	148	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	119	80.4
Professional reputation	23	15.5
Other personal contacts	6	4.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	87	73.1
Substantial amount of experience	43	36.1
Moderate amount of experience	41	34.5
Limited amount of experience	35	29.4
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.4
Private, solo	18	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	11.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	10.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	30	20.3
Government	47	31.8
Public service agency or organization	2	1.4
Retired	14	9.5
Other	2	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	11	7.4
5 years or fewer	12	8.1
6 to 10 years	14	9.5
11 to 15 years	24	16.2
16 to 20 years	29	19.6
More than 20 years	58	39.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.7
Prosecution	22	14.9
Criminal	14	9.5
Mixed criminal & civil	66	44.6
Civil	40	27.0
Other	5	3.4
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.7
First District	9	6.1
Second District	6	4.1
Third District	90	60.8
Fourth District	40	27.0
Outside Alaska	2	1.4
Gender		
No response	1	0.7
Male	93	62.8
Female	54	36.5
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Tom V. Jamgochian
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	148	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	119	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	87	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	32	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	43	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	41	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	35	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1
Professional reputation	23	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.1
Other personal contacts	6	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Government	36	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	10	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.6
Other	2	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	9	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.7
11 to 15 years	18	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.8
16 to 20 years	23	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3
More than 20 years	50	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	18	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Criminal	12	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Mixed criminal & civil	56	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Civil	28	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Other	4	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.8	3.8	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	4.6	4.9	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.8
Second District	5	5.0	4.6	4.6	5.0	4.6	4.8
Third District	73	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	30	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.8
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5
Gender*							
Male	79	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2
Female	39	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
William T. Montgomery
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	104	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	79	76.0
Professional reputation	22	21.2
Other personal contacts	3	2.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	71	89.9
Substantial amount of experience	35	44.3
Moderate amount of experience	20	25.3
Limited amount of experience	24	30.4
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.9
Private, solo	5	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	8.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	5.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	26	25.0
Government	38	36.5
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8
Retired	11	10.6
Other	2	1.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	7	6.7
5 years or fewer	11	10.6
6 to 10 years	14	13.5
11 to 15 years	20	19.2
16 to 20 years	15	14.4
More than 20 years	37	35.6
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.0
Prosecution	7	6.7
Criminal	15	14.4
Mixed criminal & civil	57	54.8
Civil	20	19.2
Other	4	3.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.0
First District	6	5.8
Second District	4	3.8
Third District	43	41.3
Fourth District	49	47.1
Outside Alaska	1	1.0
Gender		
No response	1	1.0
Male	57	54.8
Female	44	42.3
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 14
William T. Montgomery
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	104	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	79	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	71	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	8	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.3	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	35	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	20	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.0
Limited amount of experience	24	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2
Professional reputation	22	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	23	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6
Government	28	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.9	3.8
Public service agency or organization	4	4.0	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.8	3.3
Retired	7	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.4	4.6	4.5	3.8	4.3	4.2
6 to 10 years	11	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.9	3.5
11 to 15 years	12	3.9	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.8
16 to 20 years	12	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2
More than 20 years	31	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.6	4.6
Criminal	12	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.1	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	45	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3
Civil	15	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.3
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.4	4.0	3.6
Second District	4	3.8	3.8	4.3	3.5	3.8	3.3
Third District	29	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	40	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.1
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	48	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3
Female	29	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8
Another identity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 15
Amy K. Welch
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	81	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	65	80.2
Professional reputation	13	16.0
Other personal contacts	3	3.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	62	96.9
Substantial amount of experience	20	30.8
Moderate amount of experience	29	44.6
Limited amount of experience	16	24.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	10	12.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	16.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	9.9
Private, corporate employee	3	3.7
Judge or judicial officer	13	16.0
Government	24	29.6
Public service agency or organization	1	1.2
Retired	7	8.6
Other	2	2.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.5
5 years or fewer	14	17.3
6 to 10 years	7	8.6
11 to 15 years	10	12.3
16 to 20 years	8	9.9
More than 20 years	40	49.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	12.3
Criminal	5	6.2
Mixed criminal & civil	34	42.0
Civil	30	37.0
Other	2	2.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	18	22.2
Fourth District	62	76.5
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.2
Male	44	54.3
Female	36	44.4
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Amy K. Welch
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	81	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	65	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	62	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	2	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	29	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8
Limited amount of experience	16	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	13	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.2	3.3
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	4.0	4.3	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.3	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.4
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	12	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
Government	21	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8
Public service agency or organization	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Retired	5	3.6	4.4	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.6
Other	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4
6 to 10 years	6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	10	3.7	3.9	4.3	4.3	3.4	3.4
16 to 20 years	6	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8
More than 20 years	32	4.0	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0	3.9
Criminal	3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.9
Civil	23	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7
Other	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	14	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.5
Fourth District	50	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	36	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
Female	28	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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