



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Juneau Superior Court

Technical Report

Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional
Rosylind Frazier, M.S., Senior Research Professional
Jessica Passini, B.S., Research Professional

September 28, 2018

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

<https://iseralaska.org/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
<i>Applicant Tables</i>	
Table 11: Angie Kemp: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Angie Kemp Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Debra O’Gara: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Debra O’Gara: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Daniel Schally: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Daniel Schally: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Shawn Traini: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Shawn Traini: Detailed Responses	23
Table 19: Julie Willoughby: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Julie Willoughby: Detailed Responses	25

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for a new judicial vacancy on the Juneau Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of 6 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kelly Cavanaugh, Angie Kemp, Debra O’Gara, Daniel Schally, Shawn Traini, and Julie Willoughby. Kelly Cavanaugh withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

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

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

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall Rating
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Angie Kemp	94	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0
Debra O’Gara	23	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.4	2.7
Daniel Schally	162	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Shawn Traini	80	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9
Julie Willoughby	117	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4

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

Judicial Selection Survey: Juneau Superior Court

Introduction

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate all applicants for a judicial vacancy. The Council nominates the two or more most qualified applicants to the governor who must appoint from the Council's list. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the 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*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Alaska Court of Appeals, Juneau Superior Court, Utqiagvik Superior Court¹, Kenai Superior Court, and Bethel Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for Juneau Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Council had received total of 6 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Kelly Cavanaugh, Angie Kemp, Debra O'Gara, Daniel Schally, Shawn Traini, and Julie Willoughby. Kelly Cavanaugh withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,263 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,239) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Twenty-four individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 37 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 982 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; 35 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question. No online surveys were returned by individuals who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 947 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 20 paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because they were unsigned. Four paper surveys were excluded because the respondents did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, 16 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 947 online surveys and 16 paper surveys, for a total of 963 surveys and a survey return rate of 29.5%. Of the 963 returned surveys, 290 did not rate any of the 26 applicants (six Alaska Court of

¹ The Utqiagvik Superior Court selection was later cancelled and re-advertised by the Alaska Judicial Council.

Appeals applicants, six Juneau Superior Court applicants, two Utqiagvik Superior Court applicants, eight Kenai Superior Court applicants, four Bethel Superior Court applicants; 673 (69.9%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
		963	100	673	100
Type of Practice					
	No response	21	2.2	8	1.2
	Private, solo	186	19.3	115	17.1
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	117	12.1	84	12.5
	Private, 6+ attorneys	80	8.3	42	6.2
	Private, corporate employee	19	2.0	9	1.3
	Judge or judicial officer	100	10.4	87	12.9
	Government	286	29.7	224	33.3
	Public service agency or organization	30	3.1	23	3.4
	Retired	28	2.9	19	2.8
	Other	96	10.0	62	9.2
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	74	7.7	41	6.1
	5 years or fewer	119	12.4	81	12.0
	6 to 10 years	125	13.0	99	14.7
	11 to 15 years	103	10.7	82	12.2
	16 to 20 years	84	8.7	51	7.6
	More than 20 years	458	47.6	319	47.4
Cases Handled					
	No response	24	2.5	8	1.2
	Prosecution	90	9.3	83	12.3
	Criminal	102	10.6	91	13.5
	Mixed criminal & civil	224	23.3	189	28.1
	Civil	434	45.1	251	37.3
	Other	89	9.2	51	7.6
Location of Practice					
	No response	23	2.4	8	1.2
	First District	122	12.7	110	16.3
	Second District	24	2.5	20	3.0
	Third District	646	67.1	432	64.2
	Fourth District	101	10.5	85	12.6
	Outside Alaska	47	4.9	18	2.7
Gender					
	No response	25	2.6	8	1.2
	Male	565	58.7	389	57.8
	Female	373	38.7	276	41.0

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant. Some applicants applied for more than one vacancy; in these cases, the six evaluation items and space for comments appeared separately for each vacancy and respondents were asked to rate the applicant and comment based on each specific vacancy.

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

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

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

Data Management

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

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-20 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with Applicants

		Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...			
		% of all respondents who rated applicant	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
		<i>n</i>			
Angie Kemp	126	13.1	74.6	19.8	5.6
Debra O’Gara	43	4.5	53.5	25.6	20.9
Daniel Schally	201	20.9	80.6	13.9	5.5
Shawn Traini	90	9.3	88.9	10.0	1.1
Julie Willoughby	188	19.5	62.2	34.0	3.7

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Angie Kemp	123	3.9	4.0	1.1	92	4.0	4.0	1.1
Debra O’Gara	41	3.0	3.0	1.0	23	2.7	2.0	0.9
Daniel Schally	200	4.5	5.0	0.8	162	4.5	5.0	0.8
Shawn Traini	89	3.8	4.0	1.1	79	3.9	4.0	1.0
Julie Willoughby	186	4.3	5.0	1.0	116	4.4	5.0	1.0

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent		
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Angie Kemp	92	2	2.2	9	9.8	11	12.0	31	33.7	39	42.4
Debra O’Gara	23	1	4.3	11	47.8	7	30.4	3	13.0	1	4.3
Daniel Schally	162	-	-	5	3.1	16	9.9	39	24.1	102	63.0
Shawn Traini	79	1	1.3	7	8.9	17	21.5	27	34.2	27	34.2
Julie Willoughby	116	2	1.7	8	6.9	7	6.0	22	19.0	77	66.4

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Angie Kemp	17	3.2	4	3.0	4	3.3	-	-	10	4.6	45	4.3	-	-	1	5.0	11	4.4	4.0
Debra O’Gara	7	2.1	1	4.0	-	-	-	-	5	2.6	5	2.8	3	3.3	1	3.0	1	2.0	2.7
Daniel Schally	16	4.2	17	4.8	10	4.9	1	4.0	35	4.7	58	4.4	3	4.3	3	5.0	16	3.9	4.5
Shawn Traini	13	3.9	3	3.3	5	4.4	-	-	11	4.1	41	3.9	1	4.0	3	2.7	2	4.0	3.9
Julie Willoughby	26	4.9	10	4.8	2	3.5	-	-	18	4.2	34	4.1	6	4.8	2	4.0	16	4.4	4.4

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Angie Kemp	5	4.4	16	3.8	15	4.4	7	4.4	44	3.9	4.0
Debra O’Gara	4	3.0	-	-	4	2.5	1	3.0	14	2.6	2.7
Daniel Schally	10	4.9	30	4.6	24	4.7	11	4.5	83	4.3	4.5
Shawn Traini	9	3.8	17	3.8	13	3.7	7	4.3	31	4.0	3.9
Julie Willoughby	6	4.7	16	4.7	14	4.5	11	4.1	59	4.4	4.4

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Angie Kemp	30	4.5	9	3.6	32	3.8	16	3.8	4	4.3	4.0
Debra O’Gara	3	2.3	1	5.0	6	2.5	10	2.6	3	2.7	2.7
Daniel Schally	34	4.5	20	4.6	68	4.4	30	4.6	9	4.4	4.5
Shawn Traini	26	4.1	13	3.2	30	4.0	7	4.0	2	4.0	3.9
Julie Willoughby	18	3.7	15	4.9	49	4.6	24	4.4	7	4.1	4.4

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Angie Kemp	44	3.9	1	5.0	39	4.2	5	4.0	2	4.5	4.0
Debra O’Gara	20	2.6	1	2.0	2	3.5	-	-	-	-	2.7
Daniel Schally	11	3.8	4	4.8	131	4.5	14	4.4	2	5.0	4.5
Shawn Traini	4	3.8	1	3.0	71	3.9	2	3.5	-	-	3.9
Julie Willoughby	63	4.6	1	4.0	40	4.2	8	4.1	2	4.5	4.4

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Angie Kemp	48	4.2	42	4.0	4.0
Debra O’Gara	10	2.9	13	2.5	2.7
Daniel Schally	99	4.5	60	4.4	4.5
Shawn Traini	50	3.8	27	4.2	3.9
Julie Willoughby	60	4.4	53	4.5	4.4

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

Table 11
Angie Kemp
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	126	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	94	74.6
Professional reputation	25	19.8
Other personal contacts	7	5.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	87	92.6
Substantial amount of experience	38	40.4
Moderate amount of experience	35	37.2
Limited amount of experience	21	22.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	25	19.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	8.7
Government	63	50.0
Public service agency or organization	2	1.6
Retired	2	1.6
Other	12	9.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	9	7.1
5 years or fewer	7	5.6
6 to 10 years	24	19.0
11 to 15 years	20	15.9
16 to 20 years	10	7.9
More than 20 years	56	44.4
Cases Handled		
No response	2	1.6
Prosecution	39	31.0
Criminal	11	8.7
Mixed criminal & civil	35	27.8
Civil	34	27.0
Other	5	4.0
Location of Practice		
No response	1	.8
First District	62	49.2
Second District	2	1.6
Third District	54	42.9
Fourth District	5	4.0
Outside Alaska	2	1.6
Gender		
No response	2	1.6
Male	67	53.2
Female	57	45.2

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

Table 12
Angie Kemp
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	126	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	94	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	87	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.8	4.6	4.4	4.2	3.5	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	38	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	35	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1
Limited amount of experience	21	3.9	4.3	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.6
Professional reputation	25	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.5
Other personal contacts	7	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.0	3.1
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	17	3.8	4.1	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.5	3.7	2.7	3.3	2.5	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	4.0	4.3	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6
Government	47	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	11	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.4
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
6 to 10 years	18	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.8
11 to 15 years	15	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
16 to 20 years	7	4.4	5.0	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
More than 20 years	44	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	31	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Criminal	9	4.1	4.3	4.1	3.6	3.3	3.6
Mixed criminal & civil	32	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8
Civil	16	4.2	4.4	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.8
Other	5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.8	4.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	44	4.3	4.4	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.9
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	41	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	5	4.0	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5
Gender*							
Male	49	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
Female	43	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0

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

Table 13
Debra O’Gara
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	43	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	23	53.5
Professional reputation	11	25.6
Other personal contacts	9	20.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	95.7
Substantial amount of experience	4	17.4
Moderate amount of experience	12	52.2
Limited amount of experience	6	26.1
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	15	34.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	16.3
Government	9	20.9
Public service agency or organization	4	9.3
Retired	1	2.3
Other	5	11.6
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	2.3
5 years or fewer	6	14.0
6 to 10 years	2	4.7
11 to 15 years	6	14.0
16 to 20 years	2	4.7
More than 20 years	26	60.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	3	7.0
Criminal	3	7.0
Mixed criminal & civil	12	27.9
Civil	21	48.8
Other	4	9.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	36	83.7
Second District	2	4.7
Third District	5	11.6
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	19	44.2
Female	24	55.8

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

Table 14
Debra O’Gara
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	43	3.0	3.8	3.6	3.6	2.8	3.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	23	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.4	2.7
Experience within last 5 years	22	2.8	3.5	3.4	3.3	2.4	2.6
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	2.8	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	12	2.7	3.5	3.4	3.2	2.6	2.6
Limited amount of experience	6	2.5	3.2	2.8	3.2	1.8	2.2
Professional reputation	11	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.4
Other personal contacts	9	3.6	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	2.6	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.1	2.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	2.8	3.8	3.4	3.2	2.4	2.6
Government	5	2.6	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.8
Public service agency or organization	3	3.3	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.0	3.3
Retired	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Other	1	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	4	2.5	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.5	2.5
16 to 20 years	1	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0
More than 20 years	14	2.8	3.7	3.6	3.4	2.3	2.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	2.0	2.7	3.0	3.3	2.3	2.3
Criminal	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	6	2.7	4.2	3.5	3.5	2.2	2.5
Civil	10	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.2	2.6
Other	3	2.7	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	20	2.7	3.6	3.5	3.4	2.4	2.6
Second District	1	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
Third District	2	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	10	2.9	3.8	3.7	3.4	2.5	2.9
Female	13	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.4	2.5

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

Table 15
Daniel Schally
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	201	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	162	80.6
Professional reputation	28	13.9
Other personal contacts	11	5.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	133	82.1
Substantial amount of experience	34	21.0
Moderate amount of experience	71	43.8
Limited amount of experience	56	34.6
Type of Practice		
No response	3	1.5
Private, solo	20	10.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	20	10.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	12	6.0
Private, corporate employee	3	1.5
Judge or judicial officer	46	22.9
Government	69	34.3
Public service agency or organization	5	2.5
Retired	4	2.0
Other	19	9.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	3.0
5 years or fewer	12	6.0
6 to 10 years	34	16.9
11 to 15 years	28	13.9
16 to 20 years	16	8.0
More than 20 years	105	52.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	.5
Prosecution	37	18.4
Criminal	27	13.4
Mixed criminal & civil	82	40.8
Civil	43	21.4
Other	11	5.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	21	10.4
Second District	7	3.5
Third District	151	75.1
Fourth District	19	9.5
Outside Alaska	3	1.5
Gender		
No response	3	1.5
Male	125	62.2
Female	73	36.3

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

Table 16
Daniel Schally
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	201	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	162	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	133	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	26	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	34	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	71	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.5
Limited amount of experience	56	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Professional reputation	28	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.4
Other personal contacts	11	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	10	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	4.9
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	35	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.7
Government	58	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3
Retired	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.3	5.0	5.0
Other	16	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.9
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.9
6 to 10 years	30	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
11 to 15 years	24	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7
16 to 20 years	11	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
More than 20 years	83	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	34	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Criminal	20	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6
Mixed criminal & civil	68	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Civil	30	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6
Other	9	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.4
Location of Practice*							
First District	11	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8
Second District	4	4.5	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
Third District	131	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Fourth District	14	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	99	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5
Female	60	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4

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

Table 17
Shawn Traini
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	90	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	80	88.9
Professional reputation	9	10.0
Other personal contacts	1	1.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	72	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	41	51.3
Moderate amount of experience	26	32.5
Limited amount of experience	13	16.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	15	16.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	5.6
Private, corporate employee	1	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	12	13.3
Government	47	52.2
Public service agency or organization	2	2.2
Retired	3	3.3
Other	2	2.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.2
5 years or fewer	10	11.1
6 to 10 years	20	22.2
11 to 15 years	15	16.7
16 to 20 years	9	10.0
More than 20 years	34	37.8
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.1
Prosecution	27	30.0
Criminal	16	17.8
Mixed criminal & civil	33	36.7
Civil	11	12.2
Other	2	2.2
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	4	4.4
Second District	1	1.1
Third District	81	90.0
Fourth District	3	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	2	2.2
Male	57	63.3
Female	31	34.4

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

Table 18
Shawn Traini
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	90	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	80	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	72	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	41	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	26	3.9	4.2	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8
Limited amount of experience	13	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Professional reputation	9	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.7
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	13	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.6	4.1
Government	42	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	3	3.7	3.7	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.7
Other	2	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.2	4.6	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.8
6 to 10 years	17	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8
11 to 15 years	13	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
16 to 20 years	7	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3
More than 20 years	31	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	26	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.1
Criminal	13	3.5	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	31	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.8	4.0
Civil	7	3.9	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
Other	2	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	4	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8
Second District	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Third District	71	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9
Fourth District	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	50	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Female	28	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2

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

Table 19
Julie Willoughby
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	188	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	117	62.2
Professional reputation	64	34.0
Other personal contacts	7	3.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	101	86.3
Substantial amount of experience	44	37.6
Moderate amount of experience	35	29.9
Limited amount of experience	37	31.6
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.1
Private, solo	37	19.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	20	10.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	2.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	13.3
Government	64	34.0
Public service agency or organization	11	5.9
Retired	4	2.1
Other	21	11.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	13	6.9
5 years or fewer	12	6.4
6 to 10 years	22	11.7
11 to 15 years	26	13.8
16 to 20 years	17	9.0
More than 20 years	98	52.1
Cases Handled		
No response	3	1.6
Prosecution	25	13.3
Criminal	28	14.9
Mixed criminal & civil	60	31.9
Civil	58	30.9
Other	14	7.4
Location of Practice		
No response	2	1.1
First District	89	47.3
Second District	2	1.1
Third District	79	42.0
Fourth District	13	6.9
Outside Alaska	3	1.6
Gender		
No response	3	1.6
Male	99	52.7
Female	86	45.7

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

Table 20
Julie Willoughby
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	188	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	117	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	101	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	13	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2
Substantial amount of experience	44	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	35	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	37	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.0
Professional reputation	64	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	7	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	26	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.1	4.2
Government	35	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.1
Public service agency or organization	6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Retired	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other	16	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	4.2	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.7
6 to 10 years	16	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.7
11 to 15 years	14	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.5
16 to 20 years	11	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1
More than 20 years	59	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	18	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.7
Criminal	15	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	50	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Civil	24	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4
Other	7	4.1	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.0	4.1
Location of Practice*							
First District	63	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Second District	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	40	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Fourth District	9	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Outside Alaska	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Gender*							
Male	60	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.4
Female	54	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5

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