



# 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](mailto:postmaster@ajc.state.ak.us)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Larry Cohn

NON-ATTORNEY MEMBERS  
Eleanor Andrews  
Bill Gordon  
Christena Williams

ATTORNEY MEMBERS  
Douglas Bailly  
James H. Cannon  
Susan Orlansky

CHAIR, EX OFFICIO  
Alexander O. Bryner  
Chief Justice  
Supreme Court

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Judicial Council Members

**FROM:** Staff

**DATE:** April 17, 2006

**RE:** Court Employee Survey Report

---

The Judicial Council began surveying court system employees in 1996. This is the sixth 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 and attorneys. Each employee received one survey booklet, with no followup mailings. Of 606 surveys mailed, 239 were returned for a return rate of 39%. Of the 239 returned surveys, 12 had no ratings or comment on any judge and were not included in the analysis. Council staff entered data, produced descriptive statistics, and transcribed comments from the surveys. The court employee ratings were shared with judges and published on the Council's website. Comments were seen only by Judicial Council members and the individual judges. A sample survey page is included at the end of this memorandum.

Table 1 shows the basis for evaluation of each judge. In approximately 31% of the responses court employees did not identify the basis for their evaluation. The survey analysis includes all of the ratings for each judge, whether the basis for evaluation was direct professional experience, professional reputation, social contacts, or “no basis checked.”

<b>Table 1: Basis for Evaluation 2006 Alaska Judicial Council Retention Court Employee Survey</b>					
<b>Judge</b>	<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>Professional reputation</b>	<b>Social contacts</b>	<b>Rated judge but no basis checked</b>	<b>Total responses</b>
Bolger	21	2	0	11	34
Brown	13	2	1	9	25
Burbank	24	2	1	9	36
Clark	30	2	0	14	46
Devaney	21	2	0	11	34
Erlich	20	3	0	7	30
Esch	21	4	0	14	39
Estelle	12	0	0	9	21
Heath	11	0	0	6	17
Huguelet	13	0	0	9	22
Kauvar	29	2	0	15	46
Landry	13	2	0	4	19
Lohff	39	3	0	25	67
Michalski	50	12	1	28	91
Miller	30	1	0	3	34
Morse	37	10	0	14	61
Motyka	33	3	1	25	62
Murphy, Sigurd	52	4	1	22	79
Olsen	29	1	1	6	37
Rhoades	45	8	0	25	78
Smith, Eric	21	3	0	14	38
Smith, Jack	27	2	0	13	42
Suddock	31	3	0	21	55
Tan	50	6	1	27	84
Torrisi	19	2	0	16	37
Volland	30	3	0	20	53
Weeks	43	4	1	10	58
Wolfe	11	3	1	9	24
Wolverton	38	2	0	30	70
Wood	29	1	1	11	42
Zervos	34	2	2	7	45

## Survey Results

This memorandum summarizes the data from individual responses to the Court Employee Survey and is distributed to Council members and judges. Confidential comments from the court employee surveys are only distributed to Judicial Council members.

The survey results appear in the following tables. Court employees used a five point scale, with *excellent* scored as five, and *poor* 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. Mean scores for the overall performance rating fell between 3.3 and 4.8. The means fit into the following descriptive ratings:

- 5.0 = Excellent
- 4.0 = Good
- 3.0 = Acceptable
- 2.0 = Deficient
- 1.0 = Poor

<b>Table 2: Mean Score for Each Variable and for "Overall Performance," by Judge Retention 2006 Court Employee Survey</b>						
	Impartiality	Integrity	Temperament	Diligence	Overall Performance	
					Mean	Total
Bolger	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	34
Brown	4.0	4.2	3.7	4.1	4.0	25
Burbank	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	36
Clark	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	46
Devaney	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	34
Erllich	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.6	30
Esch	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.4	39
Estelle	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.3	21
Heath	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5	17
Huguelet	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	22
Kauvar	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	46
Landry	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.7	19
Lohff	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	67
Michalski	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.4	91
Miller	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	34
Morse	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.5	4.3	61
Motyka	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	62
Murphy, Sigurd	3.7	3.7	3.5	4.0	3.7	79
Olsen	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	37
Rhoades	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.2	78
Smith, Eric	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	38
Smith, Jack	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5	42
Suddock	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0	4.0	55
Tan	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	84
Torrissi	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	37
Volland	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	53
Weeks	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	58
Wolfe	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	24
Wolverton	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	70
Wood	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6	42
Zervos	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.7	45

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results</b>  <b>2006 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>Joel Bolger</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p align="center"><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Mean</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Excellent</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Good</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Acceptable</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Deficient</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Poor</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Total</b> <b>Returned = 34</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	59% 20	32% 11	6% 2	0% 0	3% 1					
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>4.5</b></p>	65% 22	24% 8	6% 2	3% 1	0% 0					
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	50% 17	29% 10	9% 3	3% 1	0% 0					
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.5</b></p>	62% 21	24% 8	6% 2	3% 1	0% 0					
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.5</b></p>	59% 20	29% 10	6% 2	3% 1	0% 0					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Harold M. Brown</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 25</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.0</b>	28% 7	44% 11	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	23					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.2</b>	48% 12	32% 8	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	25					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>3.7</b>	20% 5	48% 12	24% 6	0% 0	8% 2	25					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.1</b>	36% 9	44% 11	16% 4	0% 0	4% 1	25					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.0</b>	36% 9	36% 9	20% 5	0% 0	4% 1	24					

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Winston S. Burbank</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 36</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p>78% 28</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p>81% 29</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p>81% 29</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p>75% 27</p>	<p>11% 4</p>	<p>6% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>33</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p>83% 30</p>	<p>14% 5</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Brian K. Clark</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 46</b>				
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.5</b>	50% 23	46% 21	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	44				
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	52% 24	46% 21	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	45				
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.6</b>	63% 29	30% 14	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	45				
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.5</b>	54% 25	35% 16	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	44				
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.6</b>	59% 27	39% 18	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	46				



<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Leonard R. Devaney</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 34</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>53% 18</p>	<p>29% 10</p>	<p>18% 6</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>50% 17</p>	<p>38% 13</p>	<p>12% 4</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>53% 18</p>	<p>32% 11</p>	<p>15% 5</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.3</b></p>	<p>44% 15</p>	<p>32% 11</p>	<p>15% 5</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>32</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>56% 19</p>	<p>32% 11</p>	<p>12% 4</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>34</p>				

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Richard H. Erlich</b>											
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>									
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 30</b>				
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.4</b>	60% 18	13% 4	17% 5	3% 1	0% 0	28				
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.6</b>	70% 21	13% 4	13% 4	0% 0	0% 0	29				
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.3</b>	53% 16	30% 9	10% 3	7% 2	0% 0	30				
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.4</b>	60% 18	20% 6	17% 5	3% 1	0% 0	30				
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.6</b>	67% 20	17% 5	13% 4	0% 0	0% 0	29				

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Ben Esch</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 39</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>4.6</b></p>	<p>59% 23</p>	<p>26% 10</p>	<p>8% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>56% 22</p>	<p>31% 12</p>	<p>8% 3</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>38</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>4.2</b></p>	<p>39% 15</p>	<p>44% 17</p>	<p>13% 5</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>38</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.5</b></p>	<p>64% 25</p>	<p>26% 10</p>	<p>8% 3</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>39</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>49% 19</p>	<p>33% 13</p>	<p>10% 4</p>	<p>10% 4</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results</b>  <b>2006 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>William Estelle</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p align="center"><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Mean</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Excellent</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Good</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Acceptable</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Deficient</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Poor</b> % (n)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Total Returned = 21</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>3.5</b></p>	19% 4	29% 6	24% 5	24% 5	0% 0					
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>3.4</b></p>	24% 5	29% 6	24% 5	14% 3	10% 2					
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>3.2</b></p>	19% 4	33% 7	14% 3	5% 1	24% 5					
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>3.0</b></p>	24% 5	19% 4	10% 2	24% 5	24% 5					
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>3.3</b></p>	29% 6	24% 5	19% 4	10% 2	19% 4					

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Court Employee Survey Results</b>  <b>2006 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>Gregory Heath</b></p>											
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>									
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 17</b>				
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.4</b>	47% 8	41% 7	6% 1	0% 0	0% 0	16				
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	65% 11	24% 4	6% 1	6% 1	0% 0	17				
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.3</b>	41% 7	35% 6	12% 2	0% 0	0% 0	15				
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.3</b>	47% 8	41% 7	6% 1	6% 1	0% 0	17				
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.5</b>	53% 9	35% 6	6% 1	0% 0	0% 0	16				

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Charles Huguelet</b>											
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>									
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 22</b>				
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.0</b>	27% 6	41% 9	27% 6	0% 0	0% 0	21				
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.1</b>	41% 9	32% 7	27% 6	0% 0	0% 0	22				
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.2</b>	41% 9	36% 8	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	21				
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.2</b>	36% 8	46% 10	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	22				
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.2</b>	41% 9	36% 8	18% 4	0% 0	0% 0	21				

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Jane F. Kauvar</b>											
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>									
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 46</b>				
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.5</b>	59% 27	26% 12	9% 4	0% 0	0% 0	43				
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.6</b>	61% 28	30% 14	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	45				
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.4</b>	50% 23	30% 14	15% 7	0% 0	0% 0	44				
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.4</b>	57% 26	24% 11	15% 7	0% 0	0% 0	44				
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.5</b>	65% 30	24% 11	11% 5	0% 0	0% 0	46				

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      David S. Landry</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 19</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>3.5</b></p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>37% 7</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>19</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>3.6</b></p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>18</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>3.8</b></p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>42% 8</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>18</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>3.5</b></p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>26% 5</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>16% 3</p>	<p>11% 2</p>	<p>19</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>3.7</b></p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>32% 6</p>	<p>21% 4</p>	<p>11% 2</p>	<p>5% 1</p>	<p>19</p>				



<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      John R. Lohff</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 67</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.3</b>	48% 32	31% 21	19% 13	0% 0	0% 0	66					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.4</b>	48% 32	36% 24	13% 9	0% 0	0% 0	65					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.3</b>	49% 33	30% 20	16% 11	3% 2	0% 0	66					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.3</b>	46% 31	33% 22	16% 11	0% 0	0% 0	64					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.4</b>	49% 33	33% 22	13% 9	0% 0	0% 0	64					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Peter A. Michalski</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b> % (n)		<b>Good</b> % (n)		<b>Acceptable</b> % (n)		<b>Deficient</b> % (n)		<b>Poor</b> % (n)		<b>Total                      Returned = 91</b>
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.2</b>	44%	40	34%	31	13%	12	4%	4	0%	0	87
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	62%	56	24%	22	11%	10	0%	0	0%	0	88
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.2</b>	48%	44	28%	25	14%	13	3%	3	2%	2	87
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.4</b>	50%	45	33%	30	9%	8	2%	2	0%	0	85
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.4</b>	55%	50	26%	24	10%	9	3%	3	0%	0	86

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Kevin G. Miller</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 34</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.8</b>	79% 27	15% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	33					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.8</b>	82% 28	15% 5	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	34					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.8</b>	85% 29	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	34					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.8</b>	82% 28	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	33					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.8</b>	85% 29	12% 4	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	34					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      William F. Morse</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 61</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.3</b>	36% 22	34% 21	12% 7	2% 1	0% 0	51					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.4</b>	44% 27	39% 24	5% 3	0% 0	0% 0	54					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.1</b>	34% 21	39% 24	15% 9	3% 2	2% 1	57					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.5</b>	46% 28	39% 24	2% 1	2% 1	0% 0	54					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.3</b>	46% 28	36% 22	7% 4	2% 1	2% 1	56					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Gregory Motyka</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 62</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.2</b>	39% 24	39% 24	13% 8	3% 2	0% 0	58					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.3</b>	42% 26	36% 22	13% 8	2% 1	0% 0	57					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.2</b>	42% 26	32% 20	18% 11	0% 0	2% 1	58					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.1</b>	39% 24	31% 19	19% 12	3% 2	0% 0	57					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.2</b>	44% 27	31% 19	15% 9	3% 2	0% 0	57					

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Sigurd E. Murphy</b></p>												
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Returned = 79</b>
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>3.7</b>	25%	20	35%	28	25%	20	9%	7	3%	2	77
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>3.7</b>	33%	26	28%	22	23%	18	6%	5	8%	6	77
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>3.5</b>	30%	24	25%	20	15%	12	15%	12	11%	9	77
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.0</b>	35%	28	30%	24	19%	15	8%	6	1%	1	74
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>3.7</b>	30%	24	27%	21	22%	17	11%	9	5%	4	75

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results</b>  <b>2006 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>Randy M. Olsen</b></p>												
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 37</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.5</b>	57% 21	30% 11	5% 2	0% 0	3% 1						
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.6</b>	65% 24	22% 8	11% 4	0% 0	0% 0						
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.5</b>	65% 24	22% 8	3% 1	3% 1	3% 1						
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.4</b>	51% 19	30% 11	5% 2	3% 1	3% 1						
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.4</b>	60% 22	24% 9	8% 3	3% 1	3% 1						

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Stephanie Rhoades</b></p>												
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 78</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.2</b>	42% 33	37% 29	13% 10	4% 3	0% 0	75					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.3</b>	50% 39	32% 25	12% 9	3% 2	0% 0	75					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.0</b>	39% 30	32% 25	17% 13	8% 6	3% 2	76					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.3</b>	47% 37	32% 25	12% 9	3% 2	1% 1	74					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.2</b>	44% 34	37% 29	10% 8	5% 4	0% 0	75					



<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Eric Smith</b></p>												
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Returned = 38</b>
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.4</b>	61%	23	26%	10	11%	4	3%	1	0%	0	38
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	58%	22	29%	11	8%	3	3%	1	0%	0	37
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.4</b>	55%	21	29%	11	8%	3	5%	2	0%	0	37
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.4</b>	53%	20	32%	12	11%	4	3%	1	0%	0	37
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.4</b>	58%	22	29%	11	8%	3	5%	2	0%	0	38

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Court Employee Survey Results</b>  <b>2006 Retention Evaluation</b>  <b>Jack Smith</b></p>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Poor</b>		<b>Total</b>
		<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>(n)</b>	<b>Returned = 42</b>
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.4</b>	43%	18	45%	19	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	39
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	50%	21	36%	15	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	38
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.4</b>	50%	21	36%	15	10%	4	0%	0	0%	0	40
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.5</b>	52%	22	33%	14	5%	2	2%	1	0%	0	39
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.5</b>	50%	21	36%	15	7%	3	0%	0	0%	0	39

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation John Suddock</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 55</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>3.8</b></p>	<p>20% 11</p>	<p>38% 21</p>	<p>29% 16</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>50</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>3.9</b></p>	<p>24% 13</p>	<p>40% 22</p>	<p>18% 10</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>49</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>3.8</b></p>	<p>24% 13</p>	<p>42% 23</p>	<p>20% 11</p>	<p>6% 3</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>52</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p>29% 16</p>	<p>38% 21</p>	<p>18% 10</p>	<p>4% 2</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>50</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.0</b></p>	<p>31% 17</p>	<p>36% 20</p>	<p>26% 14</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>2% 1</p>	<p>53</p>				

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Sen K. Tan</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 84</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.6</b>	66% 55	30% 25	1% 1	1% 1	0% 0	82					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.8</b>	75% 63	21% 18	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	82					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.7</b>	67% 56	27% 23	1% 1	0% 0	0% 0	80					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.7</b>	69% 58	25% 21	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	81					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.7</b>	75% 63	20% 17	2% 2	0% 0	0% 0	82					

<p align="center"><b>Court Employee Survey Results 2006 Retention Evaluation Fred Torrisi</b></p>											
		<p align="center"><b>Distribution of Ratings</b></p>									
<p><b>Survey Category</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Good % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Acceptable % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Deficient % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Poor % (n)</b></p>	<p><b>Total Returned = 37</b></p>				
<p><b>Impartiality/Fairness</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>46% 17</p>	<p>46% 17</p>	<p>5% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				
<p><b>Integrity</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>46% 17</p>	<p>46% 17</p>	<p>5% 2</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				
<p><b>Judicial Temperament</b></p>	<p><b>4.5</b></p>	<p>54% 20</p>	<p>41% 15</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				
<p><b>Diligence</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>43% 16</p>	<p>46% 17</p>	<p>8% 3</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				
<p><b>Overall Evaluation</b></p>	<p><b>4.4</b></p>	<p>43% 16</p>	<p>51% 19</p>	<p>3% 1</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>0% 0</p>	<p>36</p>				

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Philip Volland</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 53</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.5</b>	59% 31	28% 15	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	50					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.5</b>	59% 31	28% 15	8% 4	0% 0	0% 0	50					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.6</b>	64% 34	26% 14	6% 3	0% 0	0% 0	51					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.6</b>	62% 33	30% 16	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	50					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.6</b>	64% 34	28% 15	4% 2	0% 0	0% 0	51					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Larry Weeks</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 58</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.7</b>	74% 43	16% 9	3% 2	3% 2	0% 0						
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.7</b>	79% 46	12% 7	5% 3	2% 1	0% 0						
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.6</b>	64% 37	19% 11	9% 5	0% 0	0% 0						
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.7</b>	71% 41	17% 10	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0						
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.8</b>	81% 47	12% 7	3% 2	0% 0	0% 0						

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      John W. Wolfe</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 24</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.4</b>	42% 10	38% 9	8% 2	0% 0	0% 0	21					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.4</b>	46% 11	38% 9	8% 2	0% 0	0% 0	22					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.4</b>	42% 10	42% 10	4% 1	0% 0	0% 0	21					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.5</b>	54% 13	33% 8	4% 1	0% 0	0% 0	22					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.5</b>	54% 13	33% 8	4% 1	0% 0	0% 0	22					



<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Michael L. Wolverton</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 70</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.7</b>	69% 48	24% 17	4% 3	0% 0	0% 0	68					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.7</b>	73% 51	20% 14	4% 3	0% 0	0% 0	68					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.7</b>	74% 52	17% 12	6% 4	0% 0	0% 0	68					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.6</b>	69% 48	23% 16	6% 4	0% 0	0% 0	68					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.7</b>	74% 52	19% 13	4% 3	0% 0	0% 0	68					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Mark I. Wood</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 42</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.6</b>	67% 28	21% 9	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	40					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.7</b>	71% 30	21% 9	5% 2	0% 0	0% 0	41					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.6</b>	62% 26	26% 11	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	40					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.7</b>	71% 30	19% 8	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	39					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.6</b>	69% 29	24% 10	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	42					

<b>Court Employee Survey Results                      2006 Retention Evaluation                      Larry C. Zervos</b>												
		<b>Distribution of Ratings</b>										
<b>Survey Category</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Excellent % (n)</b>	<b>Good % (n)</b>	<b>Acceptable % (n)</b>	<b>Deficient % (n)</b>	<b>Poor % (n)</b>	<b>Total Returned = 45</b>					
<b>Impartiality/Fairness</b>	<b>4.7</b>	71% 32	24% 11	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	44					
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>4.8</b>	78% 35	20% 9	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	45					
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>4.6</b>	62% 28	29% 13	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	44					
<b>Diligence</b>	<b>4.6</b>	67% 30	24% 11	7% 3	0% 0	0% 0	44					
<b>Overall Evaluation</b>	<b>4.7</b>	71% 32	27% 12	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	45					

