

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Fairbanks District Court

Fourth Judicial District

Technical Report

December 2011

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Fairbanks District Court

Fourth Judicial District

Technical Report

December 2011

Sylvan Robb, Senior Consultant and Project Manager

Nancy Lowe, Project Coordinator

Prepared for

Alaska Judicial Council
1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969

Prepared by

Information Insights, Inc.
212 Front Street, Suite 100
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
907.450.2450 phone
907.450.2470 fax

iialaska.com
info@iialaska.com



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
<i>Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants</i>	<i>3</i>
Introduction	4
Methodology	4
<i>Table 2: Respondent Characteristics</i>	<i>6</i>
Instrumentation	7
Confidentiality and Data Safety	8
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding	8
Data Management	9
Data Analyses	9
Results	9
Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Applicant	9
Ratings of Applicants	9
<i>Table 3: Respondents' Level of Experience with Applicants</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Table 4: Distribution of Responses and Measures of Central Tendency for Overall Rating</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Table 5: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Caseload Handled</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Table 6: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Location of Practice</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Table 7: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Practice</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Table 8: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Gender</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Table 9: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Length of Alaska Practice</i>	<i>16</i>
Detailed Results for Each Applicant	17
<i>Table 10: Matthew Christian: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 11: Matthew Christian: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Table 12: Gene L. Gustafson: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table 13: Gene L. Gustafson: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Table 14: Bethany Spalding Harbison: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Table 15: Bethany Spalding Harbison: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Table 16: Robert S. Noreen: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Table 17: Robert S. Noreen: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Table 18: Alicemary L. Rasley: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Table 19: Alicemary L. Rasley: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Table 20: Ben Seekins: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>28</i>

<i>Table 21: Ben Seekins: Detailed Information on Responses.....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Table 22: Cassandra Tilly: Demographic Description of Respondents</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Table 23: Cassandra Tilly: Detailed Information on Responses</i>	<i>31</i>

Executive Summary

This selection survey was conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy in the Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District. By the application deadline, the Council had received seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Matthew Christian, Gene L. Gustafson, Bethany Spalding Harbison, Robert S. Noreen, Alicemary L. Rasley, Ben Seekins, and Cassandra Tilly.

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 Rating for this Position*. This report presents the results of the survey.

Table 1 shows the mean scores given by respondents with direct professional experience with these applicants. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). The findings are summarized by applicant, with the ratings on each of the six characteristics.

Matthew Christian was evaluated by 81 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 3.9, Integrity 4.2, Fairness 4.0, Judicial Temperament 3.9, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 3.8, and Overall Rating for this Position 3.8.

Gene L. Gustafson was evaluated by 52 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 3.8, Integrity 3.9, Fairness 3.5, Judicial Temperament 3.7, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 3.8, and Overall Rating for this Position 3.6.

Bethany Spalding Harbison was evaluated by 105 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 4.4, Integrity 4.5, Fairness 4.3, Judicial Temperament 4.3, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 4.3, and Overall Rating for this Position 4.3.

Robert S. Noreen was evaluated by 88 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 3.2, Integrity 3.4, Fairness 3.4, Judicial Temperament 3.1, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 3.3, and Overall Rating for this Position 3.1.

Alicemary L. Rasley was evaluated by 123 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 3.8, Integrity 3.9, Fairness 3.7, Judicial Temperament 3.5, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 3.7, and Overall Rating for this Position 3.6.

Ben Seekins was evaluated by 66 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 4.0, Integrity 4.4, Fairness 4.3, Judicial Temperament 4.3, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 4.0, and Overall Rating for this Position 4.1.

Cassandra Tilly was evaluated by 32 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: Professional Competence 3.2, Integrity 3.8, Fairness 3.5, Judicial Temperament 3.1, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy 2.5, and Overall Rating for this Position 2.8.

**Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District, December 2011**

	N	Professional Competence Mean	Integrity Mean	Fairness Mean	Judicial Temperament Mean	Suitability of Experience Mean	Overall Rating Mean
Matthew Christian	81	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	52	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	105	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	88	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	123	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.6
Ben Seekins	66	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	32	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.5	2.8

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

Judicial Selection Survey

Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District

Introduction

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial 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 Judicial 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 Rating for this Position*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, gender, types of cases handled, and primary location of practice.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with Information Insights, a public policy and management consulting firm with offices in Anchorage and Fairbanks to administer the surveys. Information Insights was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection related to the online version of the survey. Paper surveys were printed and mailed by the Judicial Council, but returned directly to Information Insights for processing, data entry and analysis. Information Insights prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

This selection survey was conducted for one judicial vacancy in the Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District. By the application deadline, the Council had received seven applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Matthew Christian, Gene L. Gustafson, Bethany Spalding Harbison, Robert S. Noreen, Alicemary L. Rasley, Ben Seekins, and Cassandra Tilly.

Methodology

On August 8, 2011, the Alaska Judicial Council invited all active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association to participate in this survey. The Council also invited inactive in-state members (including retired members) and active out-of-state members to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them.

These ABA members were asked to rate the applicants named above. Of the 3,002 surveys sent, the vast majority of bar members (2,483) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Two hundred and fifty members received only a paper version of the survey, and 269 received both the paper and online versions of the survey. The Council mailed the paper surveys with a due date of September 8, 2011. Attorneys returned 70 paper surveys. To allow for delayed mail delivery from rural areas, and to facilitate participation, paper surveys were considered if they were received by September 15, 2011. If surveys had been received after that date they would not have been included; none were received after the deadline.

Three paper surveys were unsigned and therefore excluded from analysis. One survey was excluded either because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they

had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2, or left that question blank. Sixty-seven paper surveys qualified for analysis.

Invitations to complete the on-line survey also were sent with a response deadline of September 8, 2011. Attorneys initiated 444 online surveys, but completed 431. No online 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. One respondent replied to both the online and paper surveys; the more complete version of the survey was used in the analysis and the other one discarded which resulted in one paper survey being excluded.

The final analysis included 66 paper and 431 online surveys, a total of 497 surveys. When all respondents’ surveys are included, the overall return rate was 17.1%. Among the completed and valid surveys, 41.8% (180) of the online respondents rated one or more applicants. Among respondents to the paper survey, 48.5% rated one or more applicants. This represents 7.1% of those invited to complete the survey who evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

**Table 2: Respondent Characteristics
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No response	5	1.0%
Private, solo	110	22.1%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	80	16.1%
Private, 6+ attorneys	55	11.1%
Private, corporate employee	17	3.4%
Judge or judicial officer	56	11.1%
Government	129	26.0%
Public service agency or organization (non-governmental)	10	2.0%
Retired	24	4.8%
Other	11	2.2%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	10	2.0%
Mean = 22.6 years		
Median = 25.0 years		
Minimum = 0.0 year		
Maximum = 51.0 years		
Gender		
No response	8	1.6%
Male	332	64.8%
Female	167	33.6%
Cases Handled		
No response	9	1.8%
Prosecution	28	5.6%
Mainly criminal	38	7.6%
Mixed criminal and civil	110	22.1%
Mainly civil	275	55.3%
Other	37	7.4%
Location of Practice		
No response	6	1.2%
First District	61	12.3%
Second District	6	1.2%
Third District	307	61.8%
Fourth District	96	19.3%
Outside Alaska	21	4.2%

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, and six evaluation items for each applicant. Both versions of the survey included a certification by the respondent that they had rated the applicants as required by the bar’s Professional Rule 8.2. The Council explained the importance of the survey to bar members as follows:

“Attached is the bar survey for applicants for the current vacancy on the Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District. 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 each of the 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 are set out below.

“Please rate the applicant on each of the following qualities by checking the answer 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 Poor	2 Deficient	3 Acceptable	4 Good	5 Excellent
<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 codes of professional 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 standards 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 towards 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 possible 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 Alaska Judicial Council included a statement with each survey that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at Information Insights 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, Information Insights has rigorous procedures to protect data. Specifically paper surveys are kept in a lockable, tamper-resistant file cabinet that is kept locked at all times except during business hours. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensuring that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. Once entered online, all electronic data are maintained on a secure server. No data are ever maintained on the hard drives of individual desktop or laptop computers.

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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. Then use the self-addressed postage-paid 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, Information Insights implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each applicant. Before the return envelope was opened and the survey removed, the individual’s name, as identified on the outside of the return envelope, was added to a survey log and marked as received. If an individual’s name was already on the log marked as received and another envelope was received from that individual, the second envelope would not have been opened. No duplicate paper surveys were received. If a survey had been returned without a name on the outside envelope, the envelope would have been opened to ascertain whether the individual signed the comment section. No paper surveys were returned without a name on the outside of the envelope. These procedures insure that only one survey per respondent was used in data analysis. Additionally, surveys returned without signatures, with illegible signatures, or without being on the mailing list were excluded from the data entry and analysis and are not reflected in the total number of surveys received. Three surveys were received without a signature and one survey was not certified. Those surveys were not included in the analysis.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once, and only from the e-mail address to which it was sent. Information Insights carefully compared this list against a list of paper survey respondents to ensure that only one type of survey was completed (a paper OR an online version). One duplicate survey was identified and the most complete survey was retained and the duplicate discarded.

Data Management

With a goal of virtually error-free data handling, Information Insights has implemented rigorous data entry procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. For the paper surveys, staff entered the data twice and compared the results to locate discrepancies. Frequencies for all questions were run and outliers were located and compared with the paper survey. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported to SPSS for analysis. The paper survey responses were added to the online responses in SPSS to create one data file of all responses.

Data Analyses

To achieve maximum relevance of the ratings provided in this report, the information respondents provided regarding their level of knowledge about each applicant was used to extract ratings from only those respondents who reported direct professional experience with the applicant. Unless otherwise noted in a given table, the ratings provided are based strictly on surveys from those respondents who reported direct professional experience with the applicant in question.

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents' level of experience with each applicant rated is shown. Second, ratings and comparisons of the applicants are provided in a variety of ways. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on a very small number of respondents. Results based on a handful of people should be regarded with caution, and more weight should be given to the overall results for that applicant.

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Applicant

All respondents were asked to describe the type of experience (or basis of evaluation) for each applicant they rated: was it direct professional experience, professional reputation, or other personal contacts?

Table 3 shows the type of experience of respondents. Included in the first column of numbers is the percentage of individuals who rated this applicant. This percentage is based on all respondents who rated the applicant, not just those with direct professional experience.

Ratings of Applicants

In the tables that follow, responses to the selection survey are shown in a variety of ways. Table 4 provides the distribution of responses across the 5-point Likert scale on the *Overall Rating* item for all applicants. Table 5 provides applicants' mean score on the *Overall Rating* item broken down by respondents' type of caseload handled. Table 6 provides applicants' mean score on the *Overall Rating* item broken down by respondents' location of practice. Table 7 provides applicants' mean scores on the *Overall Rating* item broken down by respondents' type of practice. Table 8 provides applicants' mean scores on the *Overall Rating* item broken down by respondents' gender. Table 9 provides applicants' mean scores on the *Overall Rating* item broken down by respondents' length of Alaska practice. For each individual applicant, Tables 10 through 23 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on responses provided on the survey.

**Table 3: Respondents' Level of Experience with Applicants
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	% of all respondents who rated applicant	N	No response N	Direct professional experience* N	Professional reputation N	Other personal contacts N
Matthew Christian	17.9	89	408	81	6	2
Gene L. Gustafson	17.1	85	412	53	23	9
Bethany Spalding Harbison	25.6	127	370	105	14	8
Robert S. Noreen	21.7	108	389	89	12	7
Alicemary L. Rasley	27.0	134	363	123	9	2
Ben Seekins	19.5	97	400	66	28	3
Cassandra Tilly	9.3	46	451	32	10	4

*Some respondents checked “direct professional experience with this applicant” and then did not rate the applicant. This number may be larger than the number of respondents actually rating the applicant.

**Table 4: Distribution of Responses and Measures of Central Tendency for Overall Rating
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	Poor N	Deficient N	Acceptable N	Good N	Excellent N	Mean	Median	Std
Matthew Christian	80	2	10	18	21	29	3.8	4.0	1.1
Gene L. Gustafson	51	5	6	9	16	15	3.6	4.0	1.3
Bethany Spalding Harbison	105	1	8	10	24	62	4.3	5.0	1.0
Robert S. Noreen	88	11	21	24	13	19	3.1	3.0	1.3
Alicemary L. Rasley	123	10	16	26	34	37	3.6	4.0	1.3
Ben Seekins	66	--	4	11	25	26	4.1	4.0	0.9
Cassandra Tilly	32	5	9	6	11	1	2.8	3.0	1.2

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

**Table 5: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Caseload Handled
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	Prosecution		Mainly Criminal		Mixed Criminal and Civil		Mainly Civil		Other		Overall Evaluation Mean
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	
Matthew Christian	2.8	6	4.1	7	4.0	48	3.8	16	2.5	2	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	4.3	3	4.3	3	2.9	24	4.1	17	4.0	1	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	2.9	8	4.7	12	4.5	46	4.4	33	4.0	4	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	2.3	7	2.9	11	3.2	33	3.2	31	4.0	4	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	3.2	5	3.3	11	3.3	50	4.0	46	4.3	8	3.6
Ben Seekins	4.6	12	4.0	8	4.0	29	4.3	14	3.0	2	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	2.0	1	4.0	1	2.6	14	3.0	12	3.3	3	2.8

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

**Table 6: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Location of Practice
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall Evaluation Mean
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	
Matthew Christian	4.0	2	4.0	1	4.4	39	3.2	36	4.0	1	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	4.0	2	4.0	1	4.2	13	3.2	33	--	0	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	5.0	2	4.5	2	4.5	27	4.2	73	--	0	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	2.0	1	5.0	1	3.0	17	3.1	64	4.0	3	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	3.5	2	4.0	2	3.7	34	3.5	81	5.0	2	3.6
Ben Seekins	3.3	3	5.0	1	3.8	12	4.2	49	--	0	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	--	0	--	0	2.5	2	2.9	29	--	0	2.8

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

**Table 7: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Type of Practice
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	Private, Solo		Private, 2-5 Attorneys		Private, 6+ Attorneys		Private, Corporate Employee		Judge or Judicial Officer		Government		Public Service Agency or Organization (Not Govt)		Retired		Other		Overall Evaluation
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Matthew Christian	4.3	12	3.2	15	4.0	1	--	0	4.5	26	3.3	21	3.5	2	3.5	2	--	0	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	3.3	7	2.6	9	2.0	1	--	0	3.9	7	4.0	21	4.0	1	3.7	3	--	0	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	4.4	16	4.4	19	3.6	7	--	0	4.4	23	4.2	30	5.0	3	4.6	5	4.0	1	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	3.5	15	3.6	14	2.4	7	--	0	3.0	11	2.8	32	3.5	2	3.3	6	--	0	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	3.8	17	3.6	23	4.4	10	4.0	1	3.7	24	3.3	36	4.0	3	3.1	7	--	0	3.6
Ben Seekins	3.9	8	4.1	11	4.3	3	5.0	1	3.6	10	4.4	28	5.0	2	3.0	1	4.0	1	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	2.0	2	2.9	8	3.3	4	--	0	3.4	5	2.6	11	--	0	3.0	1	--	0	2.8

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

**Table 8: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Gender
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	Male		Female		Overall Evaluation Mean
	Mean	N	Mean	N	
Matthew Christian	4.0	50	3.4	27	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	3.6	30	3.6	18	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	4.2	56	4.5	46	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	3.4	52	2.8	34	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	3.6	69	3.6	50	3.6
Ben Seekins	4.2	42	4.0	22	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	2.8	16	3.0	14	2.8

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

**Table 9: Mean Scores on Overall Rating by Length of Alaska Practice
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall Evaluation
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Matthew Christian	3.8	11	2.9	14	4.3	10	4.0	5	4.0	39	3.8
Gene L. Gustafson	3.0	1	3.2	6	3.3	7	3.3	7	3.8	28	3.6
Bethany Spalding Harbison	4.4	16	4.1	17	4.3	15	4.3	6	4.4	50	4.3
Robert S. Noreen	3.3	9	2.5	11	3.7	7	3.0	9	3.2	51	3.1
Alicemary L. Rasley	4.0	16	3.4	14	4.1	13	3.7	13	3.5	65	3.6
Ben Seekins	4.4	15	4.4	12	4.3	7	4.0	5	3.9	26	4.1
Cassandra Tilly	2.7	3	2.3	3	3.4	5	3.0	5	2.7	14	2.8

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

Detailed Results for Each Applicant

Tables 10-23

**Table 10: Matthew Christian: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	1	1.1%
Private, solo	13	14.6%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	19.1%
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	2.2%
Private, corporate employee	--	0.0%
Judge or judicial officer	27	30.3%
Government	25	28.1%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	2	2.2%
Retired	2	2.2%
Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.1%
5 years or fewer	12	13.5%
6 to 10 years	15	16.9%
11 to 15 years	13	14.6%
16 to 20 years	6	6.7%
21 years or more	42	47.2%
Gender		
No response	3	3.4%
Male	55	61.8%
Female	31	34.8%
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1%
Prosecution	7	7.9%
Mainly criminal	7	7.9%
Mixed criminal & civil	50	56.2%
Mainly civil	21	23.6%
Other	3	3.4%
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1%
First District	2	2.2%
Second District	1	1.1%
Third District	44	49.4%
Fourth District	40	44.9%
Outside Alaska	1	1.1%

Table 11: Matthew Christian: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Matthew Christian was evaluated by 81 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 3.9, *Integrity* 4.2, *Fairness* 4.0, *Judicial Temperament* 3.9, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 3.8, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 3.8.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		0		1		2		4		2		1
Direct Professional Experience	3.9	81	4.2	80	4.0	80	3.9	78	3.8	80	3.8	80
Professional reputation	3.3	6	3.5	6	3.3	6	3.3	6	3.3	6	3.3	6
Other personal contacts	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	2
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		1		1		3		1		1
Private, solo	4.2	12	4.6	12	4.2	12	4.3	12	4.2	12	4.3	12
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3.4	15	3.7	15	3.7	15	3.5	15	3.2	14	3.2	15
Private, 6+ attorneys	4.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	3.0	1	4.0	1
Private, corporate employee	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Judge or judicial officer	4.5	26	4.6	26	4.5	26	4.2	24	4.5	26	4.5	26
Government	3.5	22	4.0	21	3.6	21	3.6	21	3.3	22	3.3	21
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3.5	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.5	2
Retired	3.5	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.0	2	3.5	2	3.5	2
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		0		1		1		3		1		1
5 years or less	4.0	11	4.2	11	3.6	11	4.2	11	3.8	11	3.8	11
6 to 10 years	3.1	14	3.9	14	3.6	14	3.3	13	3.0	14	2.9	14
11 to 15 years	4.4	11	4.6	10	4.4	10	4.2	10	4.3	10	4.3	10
16 to 20 years	4.2	5	4.4	5	4.2	5	4.2	5	3.8	5	4.0	5
21 years or more	4.0	39	4.2	39	4.1	39	3.8	38	4.0	39	4.0	39
GENDER												
No response		0		1		1		2		1		1
Male	4.0	50	4.4	50	4.1	50	4.0	49	3.9	49	4.0	50
Female	3.6	28	3.9	27	3.7	27	3.6	27	3.5	28	3.4	27
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		0		1		1		3		1		1
Prosecution	3.2	6	3.5	6	3.3	6	2.8	6	2.7	6	2.8	6
Mainly criminal	4.0	7	4.4	7	4.0	7	4.3	7	4.3	7	4.1	7
Mixed criminal and civil	4.1	48	4.3	48	4.1	48	4.0	47	3.9	48	4.0	48
Mainly civil	3.6	16	4.3	16	4.0	16	3.9	14	3.7	15	3.8	16
Other	3.3	3	2.5	2	3.0	2	3.0	3	3.0	3	2.5	2
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		1		1		3		1		1
First District	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2
Second District	4.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
Third District	4.4	40	4.6	39	4.4	39	4.3	38	4.4	40	4.4	39
Fourth District	3.3	36	3.8	36	3.6	36	3.4	35	3.1	35	3.2	36
Outside Alaska	4.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		0		1		1		3		1		1
Substantial and recent	4.0	35	4.3	35	4.0	35	4.0	33	3.9	35	3.9	35
Moderate	4.0	25	4.3	25	4.1	25	3.9	24	3.8	24	4.0	25
Limited	3.5	21	3.9	20	3.8	20	3.6	21	3.4	21	3.5	20

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

**Table 12: Gene L. Gustafson: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	2	2.4%
Private, solo	12	14.1%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	18.8%
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	7.1%
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2%
Judge or judicial officer	9	10.6%
Government	30	35.3%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3	3.5%
Retired	5	5.9%
Other	1	1.2%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.4%
5 years or fewer	5	5.9%
6 to 10 years	12	14.1%
11 to 15 years	8	9.4%
16 to 20 years	13	15.3%
21 years or more	45	52.9%
Gender		
No response	3	3.5%
Male	52	31.2%
Female	30	35.3%
Cases Handled		
No response	3	3.5%
Prosecution	5	5.9%
Mainly criminal	6	7.1%
Mixed criminal & civil	30	35.3%
Mainly civil	39	45.9%
Other	2	2.4%
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.4%
First District	4	4.7%
Second District	1	1.2%
Third District	24	28.2%
Fourth District	54	63.5%
Outside Alaska	--	0.0%

Table 13: Gene L. Gustafson: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Gene L. Gustafson was evaluated by 52 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 3.8, *Integrity* 3.9, *Fairness* 3.5, *Judicial Temperament* 3.7, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 3.8, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 3.6.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		3		6		4		6		6		4
Direct Professional Experience	3.8	51	3.9	52	3.5	52	3.7	50	3.8	51	3.6	51
Professional reputation	3.6	23	3.7	19	3.7	21	3.7	21	3.7	21	3.5	22
Other personal contacts	4.0	8	4.1	8	4.0	8	4.0	8	4.0	7	4.0	8
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
Private, solo	3.1	7	3.4	7	3.1	7	3.3	7	3.0	7	3.3	7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2.6	8	3.2	9	2.9	9	3.0	9	2.8	9	2.6	9
Private, 6+ attorneys	2.0	1	3.0	1	1.0	1	2.0	1	3.0	1	2.0	1
Private, corporate employee	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Judge or judicial officer	4.1	7	4.1	7	3.9	7	4.0	6	3.9	7	3.9	7
Government	4.1	22	4.1	22	3.7	22	4.0	21	4.2	21	4.0	21
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
Retired	3.7	3	4.0	3	3.7	3	3.7	3	4.3	3	3.7	3
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
5 years or less	3.0	1	3.0	1	2.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1
6 to 10 years	3.3	6	3.5	6	3.5	6	3.8	6	3.7	6	3.2	6
11 to 15 years	3.3	6	3.6	7	3.3	7	3.1	7	3.1	7	3.3	7
16 to 20 years	3.7	7	3.6	7	3.1	7	3.4	7	3.7	7	3.3	7
21 years or more	3.9	29	4.0	29	3.7	29	3.8	27	3.9	28	3.8	28
GENDER												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
Male	3.7	30	3.8	31	3.6	31	3.7	29	3.6	30	3.6	30
Female	3.8	18	3.9	18	3.5	18	3.6	18	3.8	18	3.6	18
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
Prosecution	4.3	4	3.8	4	3.8	4	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.3	3
Mainly criminal	4.3	3	4.7	3	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.0	3	4.3	3
Mixed criminal and civil	3.2	24	3.4	24	3.0	24	3.2	23	3.2	24	2.9	24
Mainly civil	4.1	16	4.2	17	3.9	17	3.9	17	4.1	17	4.1	17
Other	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
First District	4.0	2	4.5	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.5	2	4.0	2
Second District	4.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
Third District	4.2	13	4.3	13	4.1	13	4.1	13	4.2	13	4.2	13
Fourth District	3.5	33	3.6	34	3.2	34	3.4	32	3.5	33	3.2	33
Outside Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		2		1		1		3		2		2
Substantial and recent	3.7	21	3.9	21	3.6	21	3.8	21	3.7	21	3.6	21
Moderate	3.8	21	3.9	22	3.5	22	3.5	21	3.8	22	3.6	22
Limited	3.7	9	3.9	9	3.7	9	3.9	8	3.9	8	3.8	8

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

**Table 14: Bethany Spalding Harbison: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	2	2.4%
Private, solo	12	14.1%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	16	18.8%
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	7.1%
Private, corporate employee	1	1.2%
Judge or judicial officer	9	10.6%
Government	30	35.3%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3	3.5%
Retired	5	5.9%
Other	1	1.2%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.4%
5 years or fewer	5	5.9%
6 to 10 years	12	14.1%
11 to 15 years	8	9.4%
16 to 20 years	13	15.3%
21 years or more	45	52.9%
Gender		
No response	3	3.5%
Male	52	61.2%
Female	30	35.3%
Cases Handled		
No response	3	3.5%
Prosecution	5	5.9%
Mainly criminal	6	7.1%
Mixed criminal & civil	30	35.3%
Mainly civil	39	45.9%
Other	2	2.4%
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.4%
First District	4	4.7%
Second District	1	1.2%
Third District	24	28.2%
Fourth District	54	63.5%
Outside Alaska	--	0.0%

Table 15: Bethany Spalding Harbison: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Bethany Spalding Harbison was evaluated by 105 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 4.4, *Integrity* 4.5, *Fairness* 4.3, *Judicial Temperament* 4.3, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 4.3, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 4.3.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		0		1		2		4		4		0
Direct Professional Experience	4.4	105	4.5	104	4.3	105	4.3	102	4.3	101	4.3	105
Professional reputation	4.3	14	4.2	14	4.3	13	4.3	14	4.3	14	4.4	14
Other personal contacts	4.4	8	4.6	8	4.6	7	4.7	7	4.6	8	4.6	8
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		1		0		3		4		0
Private, solo	4.4	16	4.6	15	4.3	16	4.4	16	4.5	14	4.4	16
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4.5	19	4.4	19	4.4	19	4.4	18	4.3	19	4.4	19
Private, 6+ attorneys	3.7	7	4.0	7	3.6	7	4.0	6	3.6	7	3.6	7
Private, corporate employee	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Judge or judicial officer	4.6	23	4.7	23	4.6	23	4.3	22	4.5	22	4.4	23
Government	4.4	30	4.3	30	4.3	30	4.4	30	4.2	30	4.2	30
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	4.7	3	4.7	3	4.3	3	4.7	3	5.0	3	5.0	3
Retired	4.6	5	4.6	5	4.8	5	4.4	5	4.6	5	4.6	5
Other	4.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	5.0	1	--	0	4.0	1
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		0		1		0		3		4		0
5 years or less	4.6	16	4.3	16	4.3	16	4.6	16	4.4	16	4.4	16
6 to 10 years	4.3	17	4.4	17	4.1	17	4.0	16	4.2	17	4.1	17
11 to 15 years	4.2	15	4.3	15	4.2	15	4.3	15	4.3	14	4.3	15
16 to 20 years	4.3	6	4.5	6	4.3	6	4.5	6	4.3	6	4.3	6
21 years or more	4.5	50	4.6	49	4.5	50	4.4	48	4.3	47	4.4	50
GENDER												
No response		0		1		0		2		4		0
Male	4.3	56	4.4	55	4.2	56	4.2	56	4.2	53	4.2	56
Female	4.5	46	4.5	46	4.5	46	4.6	44	4.4	45	4.5	46
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		0		1		0		3		4		0
Prosecution	3.1	8	3.1	8	2.8	8	3.5	8	2.9	7	2.9	8
Mainly criminal	4.8	12	4.8	12	4.8	12	4.7	12	4.7	12	4.7	12
Mixed criminal and civil	4.6	46	4.7	46	4.5	46	4.4	45	4.5	45	4.5	46
Mainly civil	4.4	33	4.5	32	4.3	33	4.4	31	4.3	31	4.4	33
Other	4.0	4	3.8	4	4.3	4	4.3	4	4.0	4	4.0	4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		1		0		3		4		0
First District	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2
Second District	4.5	2	5.0	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2
Third District	4.7	27	4.7	27	4.6	27	4.4	26	4.5	26	4.5	27
Fourth District	4.3	73	4.4	72	4.3	73	4.3	71	4.2	70	4.2	73
Outside Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		0		1		0		3		3		0
Substantial and recent	4.4	55	4.4	55	4.2	55	4.3	53	4.3	53	4.2	55
Moderate	4.5	28	4.6	28	4.4	28	4.4	27	4.4	28	4.4	28
Limited	4.4	20	4.5	20	4.5	20	4.5	20	4.4	19	4.4	20

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

**Table 16: Robert S. Noreen: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	2	1.9%
Private, solo	18	16.7%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	22	20.4%
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	7.4%
Private, corporate employee	1	0.9%
Judge or judicial officer	12	11.1%
Government	36	33.3%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3	2.8%
Retired	6	5.6%
Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.9%
5 years or fewer	12	11.1%
6 to 10 years	14	13.0%
11 to 15 years	9	8.3%
16 to 20 years	12	11.1%
21 years or more	59	54.6%
Gender		
No response	3	2.8%
Male	61	56.5%
Female	44	40.7%
Cases Handled		
No response	3	2.8%
Prosecution	9	8.3%
Mainly criminal	11	10.2%
Mixed criminal & civil	36	33.3%
Mainly civil	44	40.7%
Other	5	4.6%
Location of Practice		
No response	3	2.8%
First District	1	0.9%
Second District	1	0.9%
Third District	24	22.2%
Fourth District	76	70.4%
Outside Alaska	3	2.8%

Table 17: Robert S. Noreen: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Robert S. Noreen was evaluated by 88 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 3.2, *Integrity* 3.4, *Fairness* 3.4, *Judicial Temperament* 3.1, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 3.3, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 3.1.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		2		3		5		7		3		2
Direct Professional Experience	3.2	88	3.4	87	3.4	85	3.1	83	3.3	88	3.1	88
Professional reputation	3.2	11	3.3	11	3.4	11	3.1	11	3.2	11	3.1	11
Other personal contacts	3.7	7	3.7	7	3.6	7	3.6	7	3.7	6	3.9	7
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		2		4		6		1		1
Private, solo	3.7	15	3.7	15	3.6	14	3.3	15	3.5	15	3.5	15
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3.6	14	3.9	14	3.7	14	3.5	14	3.7	14	3.6	14
Private, 6+ attorneys	2.9	7	2.9	7	3.1	7	2.3	6	3.2	6	2.4	7
Private, corporate employee	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Judge or judicial officer	3.2	11	3.2	11	3.3	11	3.0	11	3.1	11	3.0	11
Government	3.0	33	3.2	31	3.3	30	2.9	28	3.1	33	2.8	32
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.5	2	4.0	2	5.0	2	3.5	2
Retired	3.2	5	3.8	6	3.2	6	3.0	6	3.7	6	3.3	6
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		1		2		4		6		1		1
5 years or less	3.6	9	3.8	9	3.7	9	3.3	9	3.3	9	3.3	9
6 to 10 years	2.7	11	2.7	11	2.6	10	2.7	11	2.9	11	2.5	11
11 to 15 years	3.6	7	3.9	7	4.0	7	3.6	7	4.0	7	3.7	7
16 to 20 years	2.9	9	3.0	9	3.2	9	3.0	9	3.1	9	3.0	9
21 years or more	3.3	51	3.5	50	3.5	49	3.1	46	3.4	51	3.2	51
GENDER												
No response		1		2		4		6		1		1
Male	3.5	52	3.7	52	3.6	50	3.4	47	3.5	52	3.4	52
Female	2.9	34	3.0	33	3.1	33	2.7	34	3.1	34	2.8	34
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		1		2		4		6		1		1
Prosecution	2.4	8	2.9	7	2.7	7	2.7	6	2.8	8	2.3	7
Mainly criminal	3.1	11	3.2	11	3.3	10	2.8	10	3.1	11	2.9	11
Mixed criminal and civil	3.3	32	3.4	33	3.4	32	3.2	32	3.4	33	3.2	33
Mainly civil	3.4	31	3.4	30	3.5	30	3.0	29	3.4	30	3.2	31
Other	4.0	4	4.0	4	4.0	4	4.0	4	4.3	4	4.0	4
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		2		4		6		2		1
First District	2.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1
Second District	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1
Third District	3.2	17	3.4	17	3.4	17	2.9	15	3.3	16	3.0	17
Fourth District	3.2	64	3.4	63	3.4	61	3.2	62	3.4	65	3.1	64
Outside Alaska	3.7	3	4.3	3	4.3	3	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	3
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		1		2		4		6		1		1
Substantial and recent	3.3	39	3.6	40	3.5	38	3.3	39	3.5	40	3.3	40
Moderate	3.1	33	3.0	31	3.2	31	3.0	30	3.2	33	2.8	32
Limited	3.1	15	3.5	15	3.3	15	2.6	13	3.1	14	3.0	15

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

**Table 18: Alicemary L. Rasley: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	2	1.5%
Private, solo	19	14.2%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	25	18.7%
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	8.2%
Private, corporate employee	1	0.7%
Judge or judicial officer	27	20.1%
Government	39	29.1%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	3	2.2%
Retired	7	5.2%
Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.5%
5 years or fewer	17	12.7%
6 to 10 years	14	10.4%
11 to 15 years	15	11.2%
16 to 20 years	15	11.2%
21 years or more	71	53.0%
Gender		
No response	4	3.0%
Male	76	56.7%
Female	54	40.3%
Cases Handled		
No response	3	2.2%
Prosecution	5	3.7%
Mainly criminal	11	8.2%
Mixed criminal & civil	55	41.0%
Mainly civil	52	38.8%
Other	8	6.0%
Location of Practice		
No response	3	2.2%
First District	2	1.5%
Second District	2	1.5%
Third District	42	31.3%
Fourth District	82	61.2%
Outside Alaska	3	2.2%

Table 19: Alicemary L. Rasley: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Alicemary L. Rasley was evaluated by 123 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 3.8, *Integrity* 3.9, *Fairness* 3.7, *Judicial Temperament* 3.5, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 3.7, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 3.6.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
Direct Professional Experience	3.8	122	3.9	121	3.7	119	3.5	120	3.7	120	3.6	123
Professional reputation	3.7	9	3.8	9	3.7	9	3.7	9	3.7	9	3.7	9
Other personal contacts	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
Private, solo	3.9	17	3.9	17	3.8	17	3.8	16	3.7	16	3.8	17
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3.8	23	3.9	23	3.7	23	3.5	23	3.6	23	3.6	23
Private, 6+ attorneys	4.2	10	4.6	9	4.1	10	4.4	10	4.4	10	4.4	10
Private, corporate employee	4.0	1	3.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	--	0	4.0	1
Judge or judicial officer	3.9	24	4.0	24	3.9	24	3.6	24	3.8	24	3.7	24
Government	3.7	35	3.7	35	3.7	32	3.3	34	3.5	35	3.3	36
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	4.0	3	4.3	3	3.7	3	3.3	3	4.0	3	4.0	3
Retired	3.1	7	3.4	7	2.9	7	3.0	7	3.3	7	3.1	7
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
5 years or less	4.2	16	4.1	16	3.9	16	3.6	16	4.1	16	4.0	16
6 to 10 years	3.4	14	4.0	14	3.8	14	3.5	14	3.4	14	3.4	14
11 to 15 years	4.2	13	4.3	13	3.9	13	4.1	13	3.9	13	4.1	13
16 to 20 years	3.8	13	4.0	13	3.9	13	4.0	13	3.8	12	3.7	13
21 years or more	3.7	64	3.7	63	3.6	61	3.4	62	3.6	63	3.5	65
GENDER												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
Male	3.8	68	3.9	67	3.7	67	3.6	67	3.7	67	3.6	69
Female	3.8	50	3.9	50	3.8	48	3.5	49	3.6	49	3.6	50
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
Prosecution	3.2	5	3.8	5	3.4	5	3.4	5	3.2	5	3.2	5
Mainly criminal	3.4	11	3.6	11	3.5	10	3.5	11	3.6	11	3.3	11
Mixed criminal and civil	3.5	49	3.7	49	3.4	49	3.2	49	3.5	49	3.3	50
Mainly civil	4.1	46	4.1	45	4.1	45	3.9	45	3.9	44	4.0	46
Other	4.4	8	4.1	8	4.1	7	3.7	7	4.0	8	4.3	8
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
First District	3.0	2	3.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	3.0	2	3.5	2
Second District	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	2
Third District	3.9	33	4.0	32	3.9	32	3.8	32	3.7	32	3.7	34
Fourth District	3.7	81	3.8	81	3.6	79	3.4	80	3.7	80	3.5	81
Outside Alaska	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	2
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		1		2		4		3		3		0
Substantial and recent	3.4	55	3.6	54	3.4	54	3.2	55	3.4	55	3.3	55
Moderate	4.2	42	4.1	42	4.1	42	3.8	41	4.0	40	3.9	42
Limited	3.9	24	4.0	24	3.8	22	3.8	23	3.8	24	3.6	25

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

**Table 20: Ben Seekins: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	1	1.4%
Private, solo	9	12.2%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	14.9%
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.1%
Private, corporate employee	1	1.4%
Judge or judicial officer	10	13.5%
Government	35	47.3%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	2	2.7%
Retired	1	1.4%
Other	1	1.4%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.4%
5 years or fewer	17	23.0%
6 to 10 years	15	20.3%
11 to 15 years	7	9.5%
16 to 20 years	5	6.8%
21 years or more	29	39.2%
Gender		
No response	2	2.7%
Male	48	64.9%
Female	24	32.4%
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.4%
Prosecution	16	21.6%
Mainly criminal	8	10.8%
Mixed criminal & civil	29	39.2%
Mainly civil	18	24.3%
Other	2	2.7%
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.4%
First District	5	6.8%
Second District	1	1.4%
Third District	18	24.3%
Fourth District	49	66.2%
Outside Alaska	--	0.0%

Table 21: Ben Seekins: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Ben Seekins was evaluated by 66 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with him. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 4.0, *Integrity* 4.4, *Fairness* 4.3, *Judicial Temperament* 4.3, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 4.0, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 4.1.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		0		0		0		3		1		0
Direct Professional Experience	4.0	66	4.4	66	4.3	66	4.3	64	4.0	65	4.1	66
Professional reputation	2.9	28	3.1	28	3.0	28	3.0	27	2.9	28	2.9	28
Other personal contacts	3.3	3	3.7	3	3.3	3	3.7	3	3.3	3	3.3	3
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
Private, solo	3.8	8	4.0	8	4.0	8	4.0	7	3.5	8	3.9	8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4.0	11	4.3	11	4.2	11	4.0	11	3.9	11	4.1	11
Private, 6+ attorneys	4.3	3	4.7	3	5.0	3	5.0	3	4.0	3	4.3	3
Private, corporate employee	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1
Judge or judicial officer	3.6	10	4.1	10	4.0	10	3.9	10	3.6	9	3.6	10
Government	4.3	28	4.6	28	4.5	28	4.6	27	4.3	28	4.4	28
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	4.5	2	5.0	2
Retired	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1
Other	4.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
5 years or less	4.4	15	4.5	15	4.5	15	4.5	15	4.3	15	4.4	15
6 to 10 years	4.3	12	4.8	12	4.8	12	4.8	11	4.5	11	4.4	12
11 to 15 years	4.1	7	4.3	7	4.3	7	4.3	7	4.4	7	4.3	7
16 to 20 years	3.8	5	4.4	5	4.2	5	4.6	5	3.6	5	4.0	5
21 years or more	3.8	26	4.2	26	4.0	26	4.0	25	3.6	26	3.9	26
GENDER												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
Male	4.1	42	4.4	42	4.3	42	4.3	41	4.0	41	4.2	42
Female	4.0	22	4.4	22	4.3	22	4.2	21	4.0	22	4.0	22
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
Prosecution	4.7	12	4.8	12	4.8	12	4.8	12	4.5	12	4.6	12
Mainly criminal	3.9	8	4.5	8	4.4	8	4.3	7	4.0	8	4.0	8
Mixed criminal and civil	3.9	29	4.3	29	4.1	29	4.2	29	3.8	28	4.0	29
Mainly civil	4.1	14	4.3	14	4.4	14	4.4	13	4.1	14	4.3	14
Other	3.0	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.0	2
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
First District	3.3	3	4.0	3	3.7	3	3.7	3	3.3	3	3.3	3
Second District	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	1
Third District	3.8	12	4.2	12	4.1	12	3.9	12	3.9	11	3.8	12
Fourth District	4.1	49	4.5	49	4.4	49	4.5	47	4.0	49	4.2	49
Outside Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		0		0		0		2		1		0
Substantial and recent	4.2	43	4.5	43	4.5	43	4.5	41	4.1	42	4.3	43
Moderate	3.8	11	4.2	11	4.0	11	3.8	11	3.6	11	3.8	11
Limited	3.7	12	4.1	12	3.9	12	3.9	12	3.7	12	3.8	12

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

**Table 22: Cassandra Tilly: Demographic Description of Respondents
Fairbanks District Court, Fourth Judicial District**

	N	%
Type of Practice		
No Response	1	2.2%
Private, solo	5	10.9%
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	28.3%
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	13.0%
Private, corporate employee	1	2.2%
Judge or judicial officer	7	15.2%
Government	12	26.1%
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	--	0.0%
Retired	1	2.2%
Other	--	0.0%
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	4.3%
5 years or fewer	3	6.5%
6 to 10 years	9	19.6%
11 to 15 years	6	13.0%
16 to 20 years	8	17.4%
21 years or more	18	39.1%
Gender		
No response	2	4.3%
Male	26	56.5%
Female	18	39.1%
Cases Handled		
No response	1	2.2%
Prosecution	1	2.2%
Mainly criminal	1	2.2%
Mixed criminal & civil	19	41.3%
Mainly civil	21	45.7%
Other	--	0.0%
Location of Practice		
No response	1	2.2%
First District	--	0.0%
Second District	--	0.0%
Third District	6	13.0%
Fourth District	39	84.8%
Outside Alaska	--	0.0%

Table 23: Cassandra Tilly: Detailed Information on Responses

Applicant Cassandra Tilly was evaluated by 32 respondents on at least one variable, based on their direct professional experience with her. The mean ratings received by this applicant were as follows: *Professional Competence* 3.2, *Integrity* 3.8, *Fairness* 3.5, *Judicial Temperament* 3.1, *Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy* 2.5, and *Overall Rating for this Position* 2.8.

	Professional Competence		Integrity		Fairness		Judicial Temperament		Suitability of Experience		Overall Rating	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
BASIS FOR EVALUATION												
No response		2		3		4		4		2		0
Direct Professional Experience	3.2	31	3.8	30	3.5	29	3.1	29	2.5	31	2.8	32
Professional reputation	2.6	9	3.3	9	3.3	9	3.1	9	2.3	10	2.3	10
Other personal contacts	3.5	4	4.0	4	3.3	4	3.3	4	3.3	3	3.5	4
TYPE OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		1		2		2		1		0
Private, solo	2.0	2	2.5	2	2.5	2	2.0	2	1.5	2	2.0	2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3.5	8	3.8	8	3.6	8	3.4	8	2.5	8	2.9	8
Private, 6+ attorneys	3.3	4	4.5	4	3.8	4	3.5	4	2.8	4	3.3	4
Private, corporate employee	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Judge or judicial officer	4.0	4	4.0	4	4.3	3	3.7	3	2.8	4	3.4	5
Government	2.9	11	3.7	11	3.3	11	2.8	11	2.5	11	2.6	11
Public service agency or organization (not govt)	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Retired	4.0	1	4.0	1	3.0	1	2.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1
Other	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
YEARS OF PRACTICE IN ALASKA												
No response		1		0		1		2		0		0
5 years or less	2.7	3	3.3	3	3.3	3	2.7	3	2.7	3	2.7	3
6 to 10 years	2.3	3	4.0	3	3.0	3	2.7	3	2.3	3	2.3	3
11 to 15 years	4.0	5	5.0	5	4.6	5	4.2	5	2.6	5	3.4	5
16 to 20 years	3.4	5	3.8	5	3.4	5	3.0	5	2.8	5	3.0	5
21 years or more	3.1	13	3.4	14	3.2	13	2.8	12	2.4	14	2.7	14
GENDER												
No response		1		1		2		2		1		0
Male	3.1	15	3.6	16	3.4	15	3.0	14	2.4	16	2.8	16
Female	3.4	14	4.0	13	3.5	13	3.1	14	2.6	13	3.0	14
MAJORITY OF PRACTICE CONSISTS OF												
No response		1		1		2		2		1		0
Prosecution	2.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	1
Mainly criminal	3.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1	3.0	1	4.0	1	4.0	1
Mixed criminal and civil	3.2	13	3.8	14	3.5	13	2.9	12	2.4	14	2.6	14
Mainly civil	3.2	12	3.8	12	3.4	12	3.3	12	2.7	12	3.0	12
Other	4.0	3	4.0	2	4.0	2	3.3	3	2.0	2	3.3	3
LOCATION OF PRACTICE												
No response		1		1		2		2		1		0
First District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Second District	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
Third District	2.5	2	2.5	2	2.5	2	3.0	2	2.0	2	2.5	2
Fourth District	3.3	28	3.9	28	3.6	27	3.1	27	2.5	28	2.9	29
Outside Alaska	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--	0
AMOUNT OF EXPERIENCE												
No response		1		2		3		3		1		0
Substantial and recent	3.2	15	4.0	15	3.5	15	2.9	14	2.4	15	2.7	15
Moderate	3.2	6	3.7	6	3.3	6	2.8	6	2.7	6	2.7	6
Limited	3.1	10	3.6	9	3.6	8	3.4	9	2.4	10	3.0	11

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