



UAA Center for Behavioral
Health Research & Services
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Bethel Superior Court

Technical Report

Maia Wen, B.A., Research Professional
Katelyn Saft, Undergraduate Research Assistant
Stacy Tanner, B.A., Graduate Research Assistant
Bridget Hanson, Ph.D., Research Associate Professor

April 17, 2018

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

<http://www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/cbhrs/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	1
Introduction.....	2
Methodology	2
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics	3
Instrumentation.....	4
Confidentiality and Data Safety	4
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	5
Data Management.....	5
Results.....	5
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants.....	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	9
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	10
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice.....	11
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled.....	12
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice.....	13
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	14
<i>Applicant Tables</i>	
Table 11: Terrence P. Haas: Demographic Description of Respondents	15
Table 12: Terrence P. Haas: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 13: Melony P. Lockwood: Demographic Description of Respondents	17
Table 14: Melony P. Lockwood: Detailed Responses.....	18
Table 15: Tara Logsdon: Demographic Description of Respondents	19
Table 16: Tara Logsdon: Detailed Responses.....	20
Table 17: Michael Sean McLaughlin: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	21
Table 18: Michael Sean McLaughlin: Detailed Responses	22
Table 19: Will Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents	23
Table 20: Will Montgomery: Detailed Responses	24
Table 21: David L. Roghair: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	25
Table 22: David L. Roghair: Detailed Responses	26

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Bethel Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge Dwayne W. McConnell. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) received a total of 7 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Terrence P. Haas, Melony P. Lockwood, Tara Logsdon, Michael Sean McLaughlin, Will Montgomery, John O. Putikka, and David L. Roghair. John O. Putikka withdrew his application. Therefore, his 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 Rating for this Position*. 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

	<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 Rating <i>M</i>
Terrence P. Haas	63	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	54	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.5	3.7
Tara Logsdon	63	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	53	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Will Montgomery	47	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.5
David L. Roghair	52	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.6	3.7

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

Judicial Selection Survey: Bethel 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 Rating for this Position*. 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 Center for Behavioral Health Research and Services (CBHRS), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. CBHRS 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 Judicial Council but were returned directly to CBHRS for processing, data entry, and analysis. CBHRS prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Anchorage Superior Court, Bethel Superior Court, Fairbanks Superior Court, Juneau Superior Court, Kenai Superior Court, and Bethel District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for the Bethel Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge Dwayne W. McConnell. By the application deadline, the Council had received a total of 7 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Terrence P. Haas, Melony P. Lockwood, Tara Logsdon, Michael Sean McLaughlin, Will Montgomery, John O. Putikka, and David L. Roghair. John O. Putikka withdrew his application. Therefore, his 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 3,367 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,295) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Thirty-two individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 40 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 939 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; 34 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, 905 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 24 paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. One paper survey was excluded because it was unsigned. Five paper surveys were excluded either because the respondents answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2 or because they left that question blank. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, 18 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 905 online surveys and 18 paper surveys, for a total of 923 surveys and a survey return rate of 27.4%. Of the 923 returned surveys, 165 did not rate any of the 62 applicants (19 Anchorage Superior Court applicants, seven Bethel Superior Court applicants, ten Fairbanks Superior Court applicants, ten Juneau Superior Court applicants, eight Kenai Superior Court applicants, and eight Bethel District Court applicants); 758 (82.1%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All Respondents	Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant		
		<i>n</i>	%	
	923	100.0		
		758	100.0	
Type of Practice				
No response	14	1.5	5	0.7
Private, solo	190	20.6	150	19.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	152	16.5	126	16.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	105	11.4	85	11.2
Private, corporate employee	24	2.6	16	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	83	9.0	78	10.3
Government	262	28.4	226	29.8
Public service agency or organization	35	3.8	29	3.8
Retired	49	5.3	35	4.6
Other	9	1.0	8	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	45	4.9	28	3.7
5 years or fewer	117	12.7	92	12.1
6 to 10 years	108	11.7	90	11.9
11 to 15 years	98	10.6	83	10.9
16 to 20 years	107	11.6	89	11.7
More than 20 years	448	48.5	376	49.6
Cases Handled				
No response	17	1.8	11	1.5
Prosecution	58	6.3	55	7.3
Criminal	76	8.2	68	9.0
Mixed criminal & civil	217	23.5	191	25.2
Civil	494	53.5	391	51.6
Other	61	6.6	42	5.5
Location of Practice				
No response	15	1.6	6	0.8
First District	118	12.8	99	13.1
Second District	9	1.0	6	0.8
Third District	627	67.9	519	68.5
Fourth District	118	12.8	109	14.4
Outside Alaska	36	3.9	19	2.5
Gender				
No response	26	2.8	14	1.8
Male	529	57.3	424	55.9
Female	368	39.9	320	42.2

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 CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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. One paper survey was returned that had no signed name on the outside of the envelope and no signed comments. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis and was not reflected in the total number of valid surveys received. 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, and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. After merging online and entered paper data, CBHRS 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, CBHRS 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. Before entry, all paper data was reviewed and cleaned prior to data entry. Then, a second staff member confirmed all data cleaning and entered the surveys. After the paper surveys were entered, the first staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes. 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. 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 numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results for the applicant.

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 Rating* 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 11-22 provide a demographics summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Terrence P. Haas	74	8.0	85.1	13.5	1.4
Melony P. Lockwood	58	6.3	93.1	5.2	1.7
Tara Logsdon	77	8.3	81.8	11.7	6.5
Michael Sean McLaughlin	68	7.4	77.9	16.2	5.9
Will Montgomery	56	6.1	83.9	14.3	1.8
David L. Roghair	60	6.5	86.7	8.3	5.0

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>
Terrence P. Haas	73	4.2	5.0	1.0	62	4.2	5.0	1.0
Melony P. Lockwood	57	3.7	4.0	1.3	53	3.7	4.0	1.2
Tara Logsdon	77	3.7	4.0	1.3	63	4.0	4.0	1.2
Michael Sean McLaughlin	67	4.4	5.0	0.8	52	4.4	5.0	0.7
Will Montgomery	55	3.6	4.0	1.4	46	3.5	4.0	1.4
David L. Roghair	59	3.8	4.0	1.2	51	3.7	4.0	1.2

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Terrence P. Haas	62	-	-	5	8.1	10	16.1	14	22.6	33	53.2
Melony P. Lockwood	53	1	1.9	11	20.8	8	15.1	14	26.4	19	35.8
Tara Logsdon	63	2	3.2	10	15.9	5	7.9	17	27.0	29	46.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	52	-	-	-	-	7	13.5	15	28.8	30	57.7
Will Montgomery	46	4	8.7	10	21.7	7	15.2	9	19.6	16	34.8
David L. Roghair	51	3	5.9	5	9.8	10	19.6	17	33.3	16	31.4

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		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>	
Terrence P. Haas	3	3.0	5	4.2	1	5.0	-	-	10	4.2	35	4.3	8	4.4	-	-	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	4	4.3	10	3.3	3	4.3	-	-	10	4.0	14	3.1	9	4.7	1	5.0	3.7
Tara Logsdon	16	4.1	13	3.5	2	5.0	1	4.0	15	4.2	13	3.9	-	-	3	3.7	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	8	4.3	4	4.3	6	3.5	2	3.5	6	4.7	18	4.8	2	5.0	5	4.6	4.4
Will Montgomery	2	3.5	5	2.8	1	1.0	-	-	10	3.9	23	3.5	4	4.0	1	4.0	3.5
David L. Roghair	9	3.6	5	3.2	2	4.5	-	-	12	3.8	20	3.8	3	4.7	-	-	3.7

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>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>	
Terrence P. Haas	15	3.5	12	4.8	8	4.4	9	4.2	17	4.4	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	8	3.3	10	3.9	9	3.4	8	4.3	16	3.8	3.7
Tara Logsdon	5	4.6	5	3.0	8	4.0	10	3.7	34	4.1	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	1	5.0	2	4.5	2	5.0	8	4.6	34	4.3	4.4
Will Montgomery	13	3.6	7	3.1	7	3.4	4	3.3	14	3.6	3.5
David L. Roghair	10	3.8	6	3.8	5	4.0	9	4.0	20	3.5	3.7

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>
Terrence P. Haas	9	3.0	12	4.8	26	4.3	14	4.4	1	3.0	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	4	2.3	3	3.3	21	3.5	25	4.2	-	-	3.7
Tara Logsdon	-	-	5	2.4	32	4.1	23	4.0	2	5.0	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	11	4.8	6	4.5	10	4.2	18	4.3	5	4.6	4.4
Will Montgomery	6	4.0	4	3.8	24	3.9	12	2.4	-	-	3.5
David L. Roghair	2	3.5	4	3.8	28	3.6	17	4.0	-	-	3.7

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>	
Terrence P. Haas	2	4.0	1	3.0	27	4.4	31	4.0	1	5.0	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	1	5.0	-	-	9	4.2	42	3.6	1	5.0	3.7
Tara Logsdon	-	-	-	-	60	4.0	2	4.5	1	1.0	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	2	4.0	-	-	44	4.5	4	4.0	1	5.0	4.4
Will Montgomery	1	2.0	1	4.0	13	2.9	30	3.9	1	1.0	3.5
David L. Roghair	3	3.7	2	3.0	12	3.8	33	3.8	1	2.0	3.7

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>
Terrence P. Haas	28	4.2	34	4.2	4.2
Melony P. Lockwood	25	3.6	28	3.8	3.7
Tara Logsdon	34	4.1	29	3.8	4.0
Michael Sean McLaughlin	36	4.3	15	4.7	4.4
Will Montgomery	23	3.8	23	3.2	3.5
David L. Roghair	29	3.6	22	3.9	3.7

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

Table 11
Terrence P. Haas
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	74	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	63	85.1
Professional reputation	10	13.5
Other personal contacts	1	1.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	58	92.1
Substantial amount of experience	31	49.2
Moderate amount of experience	19	30.2
Limited amount of experience	12	19.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	5	6.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	6.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	2.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	16.2
Government	40	54.1
Public service agency or organization	9	12.2
Retired	-	-
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	11	14.9
16 to 20 years	9	12.2
More than 20 years	21	28.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	11	14.9
Criminal	18	24.3
Mixed criminal & civil	27	36.5
Civil	17	23.0
Other	1	1.4
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	5.4
Second District	1	1.4
Third District	36	48.6
Fourth District	32	43.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.4
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	35	47.3
Female	39	52.7

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

Table 12
Terrence P. Haas
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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	74	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	63	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	58	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	5	4.3	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	31	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1
Limited amount of experience	12	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.2
Professional reputation	10	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	3	4.0	2.3	2.3	3.3	2.7	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2
Government	35	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
Public service agency or organization	8	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	15	4.1	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.5
6 to 10 years	12	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.9	4.8
11 to 15 years	8	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
16 to 20 years	9	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2
More than 20 years	18	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	3.8	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.0
Criminal	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	26	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3
Civil	14	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4
Other	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0
Second District	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Third District	28	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
Fourth District	31	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	29	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Female	34	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.2

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

Table 13
Melony P. Lockwood
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	58	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	54	93.1
Professional reputation	3	5.2
Other personal contacts	1	1.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	53	98.1
Substantial amount of experience	22	40.7
Moderate amount of experience	23	42.6
Limited amount of experience	9	16.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	5	8.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	17.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	6.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	17.2
Government	16	27.6
Public service agency or organization	9	15.5
Retired	1	1.7
Other	3	5.2
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	3.4
5 years or fewer	9	15.5
6 to 10 years	13	22.4
11 to 15 years	9	15.5
16 to 20 years	9	15.5
More than 20 years	16	27.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	4	6.9
Criminal	4	6.9
Mixed criminal & civil	22	37.9
Civil	28	48.3
Other	-	-
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.7
Second District	-	-
Third District	12	20.7
Fourth District	44	75.9
Outside Alaska	1	1.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	29	50.0
Female	29	50.0

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

Table 14
Melony P. Lockwood
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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	58	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	54	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.5	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	53	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.5	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	-	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	22	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.5	3.7	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	23	3.4	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.6
Limited amount of experience	9	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.1	3.5
Professional reputation	3	1.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	2.3	2.3
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.0	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5	3.9	4.0
Government	15	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	2.8	3.1
Public service agency or organization	9	4.1	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.4	4.7
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	3.1	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.0	3.3
6 to 10 years	11	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.5	3.7	3.9
11 to 15 years	9	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.2	3.0	3.4
16 to 20 years	8	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3
More than 20 years	16	3.9	4.3	4.3	4.1	3.7	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.3	2.3
Criminal	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.3	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	21	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.2	3.1	3.5
Civil	26	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	10	4.0	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.0	4.2
Fourth District	42	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.3	3.6
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	26	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.6
Female	28	3.7	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8

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

Table 15
Tara Logsdon
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	77	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	63	81.8
Professional reputation	9	11.7
Other personal contacts	5	6.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	56	88.9
Substantial amount of experience	26	41.3
Moderate amount of experience	25	39.7
Limited amount of experience	12	19.0
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	18	23.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	18.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	3.9
Private, corporate employee	2	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	17	22.1
Government	18	23.4
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	5	6.5
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.3
5 years or fewer	5	6.5
6 to 10 years	7	9.1
11 to 15 years	10	13.0
16 to 20 years	15	19.5
More than 20 years	39	50.6
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.3
Prosecution	-	-
Criminal	6	7.8
Mixed criminal & civil	35	45.5
Civil	32	41.6
Other	3	3.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	71	92.2
Fourth District	4	5.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.3
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	40	51.9
Female	37	48.1

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

Table 16
Tara Logsdon
Detailed Responses

	n	Professional Competence M	Integrity M	Fairness M	Judicial Temperament M	Suitability of Experience M	Overall Rating M
All respondents	77	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.6	3.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	63	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.8	4.0
Experience within last 5 years	56	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	5	3.8	4.6	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.4
Substantial amount of experience	26	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.0	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	25	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.7	3.8
Limited amount of experience	12	3.8	4.5	4.4	4.2	3.9	4.0
Professional reputation	9	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.4	1.8	2.0
Other personal contacts	5	3.8	4.2	3.8	3.8	4.2	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.2	4.6	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	3.3	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.0
Private, corporate employee	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Government	13	3.8	4.3	4.3	4.6	3.9	3.9
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	2.7	4.3	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.2	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.6
6 to 10 years	5	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.0
11 to 15 years	8	3.9	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.0	4.0
16 to 20 years	10	3.4	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.7	3.7
More than 20 years	34	4.0	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	5	2.4	3.4	3.4	3.0	2.4	2.4
Mixed criminal & civil	32	4.0	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.1
Civil	23	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.0
Other	2	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	60	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.9	4.0
Fourth District	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Outside Alaska	1	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Gender*							
Male	34	3.9	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.9	4.1
Female	29	3.9	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8

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

Table 17
Michael Sean McLaughlin
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	68	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	53	77.9
Professional reputation	11	16.2
Other personal contacts	4	5.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	25	47.2
Substantial amount of experience	23	43.4
Moderate amount of experience	19	35.8
Limited amount of experience	11	20.8
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.5
Private, solo	12	17.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	7	10.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	11.8
Private, corporate employee	3	4.4
Judge or judicial officer	9	13.2
Government	20	29.4
Public service agency or organization	2	2.9
Retired	6	8.8
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	8.8
5 years or fewer	2	2.9
6 to 10 years	3	4.4
11 to 15 years	2	2.9
16 to 20 years	8	11.8
More than 20 years	47	69.1
Cases Handled		
No response	2	2.9
Prosecution	12	17.6
Criminal	6	8.8
Mixed criminal & civil	14	20.6
Civil	28	41.2
Other	6	8.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.5
First District	2	2.9
Second District	-	-
Third District	57	83.8
Fourth District	6	8.8
Outside Alaska	2	2.9
Gender		
No response	1	1.5
Male	46	67.6
Female	21	30.9

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

Table 18
Michael Sean McLaughlin
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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	68	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	53	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	25	4.5	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	28	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	23	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.3
Limited amount of experience	11	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0
Professional reputation	11	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.9
Other personal contacts	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.5
Private, corporate employee	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Judge or judicial officer	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.7
Government	18	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.8
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0
Retired	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.6	4.6
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.5
11 to 15 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
16 to 20 years	8	4.8	5.0	4.9	4.5	4.4	4.6
More than 20 years	35	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	11	4.7	5.0	4.8	4.7	4.5	4.8
Criminal	6	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	10	4.3	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.2
Civil	19	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other	5	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.6
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	45	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5
Fourth District	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	37	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3
Female	15	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.7

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

Table 19
Will Montgomery
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	56	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	47	83.9
Professional reputation	8	14.3
Other personal contacts	1	1.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	45	95.7
Substantial amount of experience	28	59.6
Moderate amount of experience	12	25.5
Limited amount of experience	7	14.9
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	5.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	10.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	3.6
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	19.6
Government	28	50.0
Public service agency or organization	4	7.1
Retired	1	1.8
Other	1	1.8
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.8
5 years or fewer	15	26.8
6 to 10 years	10	17.9
11 to 15 years	9	16.1
16 to 20 years	5	8.9
More than 20 years	16	28.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	14.3
Criminal	5	8.9
Mixed criminal & civil	25	44.6
Civil	17	30.4
Other	1	1.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	1.8
Second District	1	1.8
Third District	21	37.5
Fourth District	32	57.1
Outside Alaska	1	1.8
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	25	44.6
Female	31	55.4

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

Table 20
Will Montgomery
Detailed Responses

		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>
All respondents	56	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.3	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	47	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	45	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	28	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.5
Moderate amount of experience	12	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.5
Limited amount of experience	7	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.0	3.3
Professional reputation	8	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.3	3.3	3.9
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.8	4.2	3.8	2.8	2.8	2.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9
Government	24	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.1	3.5
Public service agency or organization	4	4.5	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0
Retired	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	13	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.6
6 to 10 years	7	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.1
11 to 15 years	8	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.4	3.4
16 to 20 years	4	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.3
More than 20 years	14	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.2	4.0
Criminal	4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	3.8	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	24	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.5	3.9
Civil	12	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.4
Other	1	2.0	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Third District	14	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9
Fourth District	30	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.5	3.9
Outside Alaska	1	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0
Gender*							
Male	23	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.4	3.8
Female	24	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.2

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

Table 21
David L. Roghair
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	60	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	52	86.7
Professional reputation	5	8.3
Other personal contacts	3	5.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	45	86.5
Substantial amount of experience	17	32.7
Moderate amount of experience	13	25.0
Limited amount of experience	22	42.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	9	15.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	10.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.0
Private, corporate employee	1	1.7
Judge or judicial officer	14	23.3
Government	23	38.3
Public service agency or organization	4	6.7
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.7
5 years or fewer	10	16.7
6 to 10 years	7	11.7
11 to 15 years	7	11.7
16 to 20 years	12	20.0
More than 20 years	23	38.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	2	3.3
Criminal	4	6.7
Mixed criminal & civil	30	50.0
Civil	23	38.3
Other	1	1.7
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	5.0
Second District	3	5.0
Third District	18	30.0
Fourth District	35	58.3
Outside Alaska	1	1.7
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	33	55.0
Female	27	45.0

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

Table 22
David L. Roghair
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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	60	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	52	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.6	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	45	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.6	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.3	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.5
Substantial amount of experience	17	3.5	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6
Moderate amount of experience	13	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.3	3.5	3.7
Limited amount of experience	22	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.9
Professional reputation	5	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.8
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	3.4	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.4	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.1	3.3	3.8
Government	21	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.7
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	3.6	3.9	3.6	4.2	3.6	3.8
6 to 10 years	6	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.8
11 to 15 years	5	3.8	4.6	4.6	4.6	3.8	4.0
16 to 20 years	10	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.0
More than 20 years	20	3.5	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.3	3.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	2	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5
Criminal	4	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.8	4.0	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	28	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.4	3.6
Civil	18	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.1	3.8	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7
Second District	3	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Third District	12	3.6	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Fourth District	33	3.7	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	3.0	-	5.0	3.0	2.0
Gender*							
Male	29	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.6
Female	23	3.6	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.9

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