



alaska judicial council

1029 W. Third Avenue, Suite 201, Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1969
<http://www.ajc.state.ak.us>

(907) 279-2526 FAX (907) 276-5046
E-mail: postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Eleanor Andrews
Katie Hurley
Gigi Pilcher

MEMORANDUM

ATTORNEY MEMBERS
Geoffrey G. Currall
Robert B. Groseclose
Susan Orlansky

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO
Dana Fabe
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

TO: Judicial Council Members

FROM: Peggy Skeers

DATE: April 16, 2002

RE: Court Employee Survey Analysis

The Judicial Council began surveying court system employees in 1996. This is the fourth time the Council has asked court system staff to evaluate the performance of judges standing for retention election.

The court employee survey was mailed to all court system employees except judges. Each employee received one survey booklet, with no follow up mailings. Of 625 surveys mailed, 222 were returned (36%). Fifty-five of the returned surveys contained comments on the judges. Council staff entered and analyzed the data from the surveys. Comments were entered separately.

Table 1 shows the basis for evaluation of each judge. In approximately 30% of the total responses, no basis for evaluation was indicated.

Table 1: Basis for Evaluation 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey, AJC				
<i>Judge</i>	<i>Direct professional experience</i>	<i>Professional reputation</i>	<i>Social contacts</i>	<i>Total Responses</i>
Adams	42	3	2	74
Card	50	6	2	85
Carpeneti	38	7	1	63
Collins	38	4	0	58
Froehlich	36	5	1	51
Kauvar	29	2	0	47
Lohff	50	5	1	81
Mannheimer	24	5	1	39
Miller	16	3	0	26
Motyka	42	4	1	69
Murphy	49	4	1	82
Neville	9	3	0	16
Pengilly	31	6	0	53
Rhoades	48	6	0	80
Savell	31	2	0	47
Thompson	23	2	0	40

Survey Results

The comments from the court employee surveys will be distributed to Judicial Council members. Comments are confidential and will not be distributed to the judges. This memorandum summarizes the findings from the survey, and will go to the Council and to the judges.

The survey results appear in the following tables. Court employees used a five-point scale, with *excellent* scored as five, and *unacceptable* scored as one. The closer the employees' scores were to five, the higher that judge's evaluation by the employees. The mean score and number of responses appear for each variable. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

4.0 - 5.0 = Excellent
3.5 - 3.9 = Good
3.0 - 3.4 = Acceptable
2.5 - 2.9 = Deficient
1.0 - 2.4 = Unacceptable

All mean scores for the overall performance rating fell between 3.9 and 4.9, indicating that on average, court employees found the judges' performance good to excellent.

Table 2: Mean Score for Each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Judge	Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	Does this judge treat other people with respect?	Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	Does this judge act with integrity?	Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	Overall Performance	
								Mean	Total
Adams	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	74
Card	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7	85
Carpeneti	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	63
Collins	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.7	4.8	58
Froehlich	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.3	3.9	51
Kauvar	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.2	47
Lohff	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	81
Mannheimer	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	39
Miller	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	26
Motyka	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	69
Murphy	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4	82
Neville	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	16
Pengilly	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	53
Rhoades	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.0	80
Savell	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	47
Thompson	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	40

Table 3: Court Employee Survey Results for Samuel D. Adams
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 74)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	65.8 (48)	31.5 (23)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	0	4.6	73
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	55.7 (39)	40.0 (28)	4.3 (3)	0	0	4.5	70
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	44.1 (26)	50.8 (30)	5.1 (3)	0	0	4.4	59
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	55.7 (34)	37.7 (23)	4.9 (3)	1.6 (1)	0	4.5	61
Does this judge act with integrity?	63.6 (42)	33.3 (22)	1.5 (1)	1.5 (1)	0	4.6	66
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	61.2 (41)	37.3 (25)	1.5 (1)	0	0	4.6	67
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	65.1 (41)	31.7 (20)	3.2 (2)	0	0	4.6	63
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	61.1 (44)	34.7 (25)	4.2 (3)	0	0	4.6	72

Table 4: Court Employee Survey Results for Larry D. Card
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 85)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	75.9 (63)	16.9 (14)	7.2 (6)	0	0	4.7	83
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	73.8 (59)	17.5 (14)	8.8 (7)	0	0	4.7	80
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	69.8 (44)	20.6 (13)	7.9 (5)	1.6 (1)	0	4.6	63
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	68.7 (46)	22.4 (15)	9.0 (6)	0	0	4.6	67
Does this judge act with integrity?	72.0 (54)	22.7 (17)	4.0 (3)	1.3 (1)	0	4.7	75
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	70.8 (51)	20.8 (15)	6.9 (5)	1.4 (1)	0	4.6	72
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	70.1 (47)	20.9 (14)	9.0 (6)	0	0	4.6	67
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	74.1 (60)	18.5 (15)	7.4 (6)	0	0	4.7	81

Table 5: Court Employee Survey Results for Walter L. Carpeneti
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 63)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	86.4 (51)	6.8 (4)	6.8 (4)	0	0	4.8	59
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	86.2 (50)	10.3 (6)	3.4 (2)	0	0	4.8	58
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	50.0 (21)	23.8 (10)	21.4 (9)	4.8 (2)	0	4.2	42
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	66.0 (31)	17.0 (8)	12.8 (6)	4.3 (2)	0	4.4	47
Does this judge act with integrity?	89.1 (49)	3.6 (2)	7.3 (4)	0	0	4.8	55
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	86.8 (46)	5.7 (3)	7.5 (4)	0	0	4.8	53
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	79.5 (31)	15.4 (6)	5.1 (2)	0	0	4.7	39
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	81.7 (49)	6.7 (4)	11.7 (7)	0	0	4.7	60

Table 6: Court Employee Survey Results for Patricia A. Collins
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 58)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	89.1 (49)	10.9 (6)	0	0	0	4.9	55
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	88.5 (46)	11.5 (6)	0	0	0	4.9	52
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	65.0 (26)	25.0 (10)	10.0 (4)	0	0	4.6	40
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	73.9 (34)	21.7 (10)	4.3 (2)	0	0	4.7	46
Does this judge act with integrity?	90.6 (48)	9.4 (5)	0	0	0	4.9	53
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	88.7 (47)	11.3 (6)	0	0	0	4.9	53
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	72.7 (32)	25.0 (11)	2.3 (1)	0	0	4.7	44
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	85.2 (46)	13.0 (7)	1.9 (1)	0	0	4.8	54

Table 7: Court Employee Survey Results for Peter Froehlich
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 51)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	31.3 (15)	33.3 (16)	22.9 (11)	8.3 (4)	4.2 (2)	3.8	48
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	31.1 (14)	28.9 (13)	31.1 (14)	4.4 (2)	4.4 (2)	3.8	45
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	34.1 (14)	39.0 (16)	17.1 (7)	7.3 (3)	2.4 (1)	4.0	41
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	47.5 (19)	30.0 (12)	17.5 (7)	2.5 (1)	2.5 (1)	4.2	40
Does this judge act with integrity?	42.6 (20)	31.9 (15)	19.1 (9)	2.1 (1)	4.3 (2)	4.1	47
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	36.2 (17)	31.9 (15)	17.0 (8)	10.6 (5)	4.3 (2)	3.9	47
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	51.3 (20)	30.8 (12)	15.4 (6)	0	2.6 (1)	4.3	39
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	34.7 (17)	36.7 (18)	20.4 (10)	4.1 (2)	4.1 (2)	3.9	49

Table 8: Court Employee Survey Results for Jane F. Kauvar
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 47)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	52.2 (24)	21.7 (10)	21.7 (10)	2.2 (1)	2.2 (1)	4.2	46
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	47.8 (22)	32.6 (15)	17.4 (8)	0	2.2 (1)	4.2	46
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	42.1 (16)	28.9 (11)	23.7 (9)	2.6 (1)	2.6 (1)	4.1	38
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	43.6 (17)	30.8 (12)	17.9 (7)	5.1 (2)	2.6 (1)	4.1	39
Does this judge act with integrity?	51.2 (22)	23.3 (10)	20.9 (9)	0	4.7 (2)	4.2	43
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	51.2 (22)	20.9 (9)	23.3 (10)	0	4.7 (2)	4.1	43
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	60.5 (23)	21.1 (8)	15.8 (6)	0	2.6 (1)	4.4	38
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	44.4 (20)	33.3 (15)	17.8 (8)	2.2 (1)	2.2 (1)	4.2	45

Table 9: Court Employee Survey Results for John R. Lohff
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 81)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	59.5 (47)	25.3 (20)	12.7 (10)	2.5 (2)	0	4.4	79
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	61.1 (44)	25.0 (18)	12.5 (9)	0	1.4 (1)	4.4	72
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	56.1 (37)	25.8 (17)	16.7 (11)	0	1.5 (1)	4.3	66
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	55.2 (37)	31.3 (21)	11.9 (8)	1.5 (1)	0	4.4	67
Does this judge act with integrity?	56.9 (41)	30.6 (22)	11.1 (8)	0	1.4 (1)	4.4	72
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	59.4 (41)	29.0 (20)	10.1 (7)	0	1.4 (1)	4.4	69
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	54.4 (37)	30.9 (21)	13.2 (9)	1.5 (1)	0	4.4	68
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	53.2 (41)	32.5 (25)	13.0 (10)	1.3 (1)	0	4.4	77

Table 10: Court Employee Survey Results for David Mannheimer
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 39)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	75.0 (27)	16.7 (6)	8.3 (3)	0	0	4.7	36
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	72.7 (24)	18.2 (6)	9.1 (3)	0	0	4.6	33
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	78.3 (18)	17.4 (4)	4.3 (1)	0	0	4.7	23
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	74.1 (20)	18.5 (5)	7.4 (2)	0	0	4.7	27
Does this judge act with integrity?	72.7 (24)	24.2 (8)	3.0 (1)	0	0	4.7	33
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	71.9 (23)	18.8 (6)	9.4 (3)	0	0	4.6	32
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	75.0 (15)	20.0 (4)	5.0 (1)	0	0	4.7	20
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	69.4 (25)	22.2 (8)	8.3 (3)	0	0	4.6	36

Table 11: Court Employee Survey Results for Kevin G. Miller
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 26)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	100.0 (23)	0	0	0	0	5.0	23
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	100.0 (23)	0	0	0	0	5.0	23
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	89.5 (17)	10.5 (2)	0	0	0	4.9	19
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	90.5 (19)	9.5 (2)	0	0	0	4.9	21
Does this judge act with integrity?	100.0 (21)	0	0	0	0	5.0	21
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	100.0 (21)	0	0	0	0	5.0	21
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	94.4 (17)	5.6 (1)	0	0	0	5.0	21
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	91.3 (21)	4.3 (1)	4.3 (1)	0	0	4.9	23

Table 12: Court Employee Survey Results for Gregory Motyka
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 69)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	57.4 (39)	29.4 (20)	8.8 (6)	4.4 (3)	0	4.4	68
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	54.1 (33)	32.8 (20)	8.2 (5)	4.9 (3)	0	4.4	61
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	41.8 (23)	43.6 (24)	10.9 (6)	3.6 (2)	0	4.2	55
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	42.9 (24)	42.9 (24)	10.7 (6)	3.6 (2)	0	4.3	56
Does this judge act with integrity?	49.2 (31)	44.4 (28)	3.2 (2)	3.2 (2)	0	4.4	63
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	53.2 (33)	38.7 (24)	6.5 (4)	1.6 (1)	0	4.4	62
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	51.7 (30)	39.7 (23)	6.9 (4)	1.7 (1)	0	4.4	58
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	49.3 (33)	41.8 (28)	7.5 (5)	1.5 (1)	0	4.4	67

Table 13: Court Employee Survey Results for Sigurd E. Murphy
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 82)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	51.9 (42)	25.9 (21)	17.3 (14)	3.7 (3)	1.2 (1)	4.2	81
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	53.8 (43)	30.0 (24)	13.8 (11)	1.3 (1)	1.3 (1)	4.3	80
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	54.9 (39)	32.4 (23)	9.9 (7)	0	2.8 (2)	4.4	71
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	57.7 (41)	33.8 (24)	5.6 (4)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	4.5	71
Does this judge act with integrity?	56.6 (43)	28.9 (22)	11.8 (9)	0	2.6 (2)	4.4	76
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	58.1 (43)	28.4 (21)	10.8 (8)	0	2.7 (2)	4.4	74
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	62.5 (45)	29.2 (21)	6.9 (5)	1.4 (1)	0	4.5	72
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	59.0 (46)	28.2 (22)	10.3 (8)	0	2.6 (2)	4.4	78

Table 14: Court Employee Survey Results for M. Francis Neville
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 16)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	64.3 (9)	28.6 (4)	0	7.1 (1)	0	4.5	14
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	64.3 (9)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)	0	0	4.5	14
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	58.3 (7)	25.0 (3)	16.7 (2)	0	0	4.4	12
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	61.5 (8)	23.1 (3)	15.4 (2)	0	0	4.5	13
Does this judge act with integrity?	64.3 (9)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)	0	0	4.5	14
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	64.3 (9)	21.4 (3)	14.3 (2)	0	0	4.5	14
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	69.2 (9)	23.1 (3)	7.7 (1)	0	0	4.6	13
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	60.0 (9)	26.7 (4)	13.3 (2)	0	0	4.5	15

Table 15: Court Employee Survey Results for Charles R. Pengilly
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 53)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	46.0 (23)	28.0 (14)	20.0 (10)	4.0 (2)	2.0 (1)	4.1	50
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	49.0 (24)	32.7 (16)	14.3 (7)	4.1 (2)	0	4.3	49
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	52.5 (21)	37.5 (15)	7.5 (3)	2.5 (1)	0	4.4	40
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	52.3 (23)	34.1 (15)	11.4 (5)	2.3 (1)	0	4.4	44
Does this judge act with integrity?	57.4 (27)	23.4 (11)	12.8 (6)	4.3 (2)	2.1 (1)	4.3	47
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	55.3 (26)	27.7 (13)	10.6 (5)	4.3 (2)	2.1 (1)	4.3	47
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	55.8 (24)	32.6 (14)	11.6 (5)	0	0	4.4	43
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	49.0 (25)	33.3 (17)	11.8 (6)	3.9 (2)	2.0 (1)	4.2	51

Table 16: Court Employee Survey Results for Stephanie Rhoades
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 80)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	38.0 (30)	21.5 (17)	24.1 (19)	12.7 (10)	3.8 (3)	3.8	79
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	37.7 (29)	23.4 (18)	26.0 (20)	7.8 (6)	5.2 (4)	3.8	77
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	52.2 (35)	29.9 (20)	16.4 (11)	0	1.5 (1)	4.3	67
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	49.3 (34)	29.0 (20)	20.3 (14)	0	1.4 (1)	4.2	69
Does this judge act with integrity?	44.6 (33)	33.8 (25)	12.2 (9)	6.8 (5)	2.7 (2)	4.1	74
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	45.2 (33)	28.8 (21)	19.2 (14)	5.5 (4)	1.4 (1)	4.1	73
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	57.1 (40)	24.3 (17)	17.1 (12)	1.4 (1)	0	4.4	70
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	41.6 (32)	32.5 (25)	16.9 (13)	6.5 (5)	2.6 (2)	4.0	77

Table 17: Court Employee Survey Results for Richard D. Savell
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 47)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	69.6 (32)	26.1 (12)	2.2 (1)	2.2 (1)	0	4.6	46
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	69.6 (32)	23.9 (11)	4.3 (2)	2.2 (1)	0	4.6	46
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	63.4 (26)	29.3 (12)	7.3 (3)	0	0	4.6	41
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	67.4 (29)	23.3 (10)	9.3 (4)	0	0	4.6	43
Does this judge act with integrity?	73.8 (31)	19.0 (8)	4.8 (2)	2.4 (1)	0	4.6	42
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	71.4 (30)	19.0 (8)	4.8 (2)	4.8 (2)	0	4.6	42
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	66.7 (26)	25.6 (10)	7.7 (3)	0	0	4.6	39
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	73.9 (34)	19.6 (9)	6.5 (3)	0	0	4.7	46

Table 18: Court Employee Survey Results for Michael A. Thompson
 2002 Retention Court Employee Survey: AJC

Question	Excellent % (n)	Good % (n)	Acceptable % (n)	Deficient % (n)	Unacceptable % (n)	Mean	Total Respondents (Total returned = 40)
Does this judge treat court staff with respect?	70.3 (26)	29.7 (11)	0	0	0	4.7	37
Does this judge treat other people with respect?	68.6 (24)	25.7 (9)	5.7 (2)	0	0	4.6	35
Does this judge manage the caseload and staff capably and effectively?	61.3 (19)	35.5 (11)	3.2 (1)	0	0	4.6	31
Does this judge work diligently and act promptly on matters that need attention?	63.6 (21)	33.3 (11)	3.0 (1)	0	0	4.6	33
Does this judge act with integrity?	66.7 (24)	33.3 (12)	0	0	0	4.7	36
Does this judge act with fairness and impartiality?	73.0 (27)	27.0 (10)	0	0	0	4.7	37
Does this judge have the ability to control the courtroom?	74.2 (23)	19.4 (6)	6.5 (2)	0	0	4.7	31
Overall evaluation of the judge's performance.	68.6 (24)	25.7 (9)	5.7 (2)	0	0	4.6	35