



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Juneau 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 5, 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	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: Kevin Andrew Higgins: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Kevin Andrew Higgins: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Margaret McWilliams: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: Margaret McWilliams: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Amy Gurton Mead: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	20
Table 16: Amy Gurton Mead: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Debra O’Gara: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Debra O’Gara: Detailed Responses	23
Table 19: Hanna Sebold: Demographic Description of Respondents	24
Table 20: Hanna Sebold: Detailed Responses.....	25
Table 21: Franklin E. Spaulding: Demographic Description of Respondents	26
Table 22: Franklin E. Spaulding: Detailed Responses	27
Table 23: Gary L. Stapp: Demographic Description of Respondents	28
Table 24: Gary L. Stapp: Detailed Responses.....	29
Table 25: Julie Willoughby: Demographic Description of Respondents	30
Table 26: Julie Willoughby: Detailed Responses.....	31

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Juneau Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge Louis James Menendez. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) received a total of 10 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Lael Harrison, Kevin Andrew Higgins, Margaret McWilliams, Amy Gurton Mead, Debra O’Gara, Hanna Sebold, Franklin E. Spaulding, Gary L. Stapp, William W. Taylor, and Julie Willoughby. Lael Harrison and William W. Taylor withdrew their applications. Therefore, their 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 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

		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>
Kevin Andrew Higgins	57	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	41	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	69	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7
Debra O’Gara	27	2.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0
Hanna Sebold	89	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	28	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	55	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.0
Julie Willoughby	92	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3

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 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 Juneau Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge Louis James Menendez. By the application deadline, the Council had received a total of 10 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Lael Harrison, Kevin Andrew Higgins, Margaret McWilliams, Amy Gurton Mead, Debra O'Gara, Hanna Sebold, Franklin E. Spaulding, Gary L. Stapp, William W. Taylor, and Julie Willoughby. Lael Harrison and William W. Taylor withdrew their applications. Therefore, their 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 3,367 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 11-26 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
Kevin Andrew Higgins	69	7.5	82.6	13.0	4.3
Margaret McWilliams	52	5.6	78.8	17.3	3.8
Amy Gurton Mead	93	10.1	74.2	18.3	7.5
Debra O’Gara	42	4.6	64.3	19.0	16.7
Hanna Sebold	113	12.2	78.8	13.3	8.0
Franklin E. Spaulding	44	4.8	63.6	22.7	13.6
Gary L. Stapp	70	7.6	78.6	14.3	7.1
Julie Willoughby	137	14.8	67.2	24.1	8.8

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>
Kevin Andrew Higgins	68	3.9	4.0	1.0	56	3.9	4.0	1.0
Margaret McWilliams	51	3.2	3.0	1.2	40	3.3	3.0	1.3
Amy Gurton Mead	92	3.6	4.0	1.2	68	3.7	4.0	1.2
Debra O’Gara	42	3.3	3.0	1.0	27	3.0	3.0	1.0
Hanna Sebold	111	3.9	4.0	1.1	87	3.9	4.0	1.1
Franklin E. Spaulding	42	2.7	3.0	0.9	27	2.7	3.0	1.0
Gary L. Stapp	68	3.1	3.0	1.2	54	3.0	3.0	1.2
Julie Willoughby	133	4.3	5.0	1.1	90	4.3	5.0	1.1

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>	%
Kevin Andrew Higgins	56	1	1.8	5	8.9	7	12.5	27	48.2	16	28.6
Margaret McWilliams	40	4	10.0	8	20.0	10	25.0	10	25.0	8	20.0
Amy Gurton Mead	68	5	7.4	8	11.8	8	11.8	27	39.7	20	29.4
Debra O’Gara	27	1	3.7	8	29.6	10	37.0	6	22.2	2	7.4
Hanna Sebold	87	2	2.3	11	12.6	13	14.9	30	34.5	31	35.6
Franklin E. Spaulding	27	3	11.1	9	33.3	9	33.3	5	18.5	1	3.7
Gary L. Stapp	54	5	9.3	15	27.8	16	29.6	12	22.2	6	11.1
Julie Willoughby	90	5	5.6	4	4.4	6	6.7	21	23.3	54	60.0

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 M
	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	n	M	
Kevin Andrew Higgins	14	3.8	8	3.6	-	-	-	-	8	4.3	19	4.2	3	3.7	2	3.0	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	8	3.1	3	3.7	-	-	-	-	7	3.3	14	3.5	4	2.5	2	1.5	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	11	3.5	17	3.8	6	4.2	-	-	11	3.6	17	3.5	2	3.0	3	4.7	3.7
Debra O’Gara	8	3.3	2	3.5	-	-	-	-	5	2.6	7	2.9	4	2.8	1	4.0	3.0
Hanna Sebold	12	3.0	9	3.9	5	3.6	1	5.0	13	3.8	38	4.2	7	4.0	1	4.0	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	4	3.3	3	2.7	1	1.0	-	-	7	2.9	8	2.4	2	4.0	1	2.0	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	6	3.0	11	2.9	7	3.9	1	5.0	10	3.1	12	2.4	2	3.0	4	2.5	3.0
Julie Willoughby	17	4.8	9	4.0	3	2.3	2	4.0	17	4.1	32	4.3	3	5.0	4	5.0	4.3

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>	
Kevin Andrew Higgins	3	4.0	14	3.9	8	4.3	4	4.3	26	3.8	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	1	2.0	9	3.4	4	3.5	8	3.4	16	2.9	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	6	3.7	6	3.7	4	3.3	6	3.3	43	3.8	3.7
Debra O’Gara	2	2.5	4	3.0	3	2.7	4	3.5	14	3.0	3.0
Hanna Sebold	5	4.6	15	3.6	13	3.9	10	3.6	41	4.0	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	1	4.0	6	2.8	4	1.8	5	2.4	10	2.9	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	3	3.0	9	2.9	5	2.2	9	3.3	26	3.0	3.0
Julie Willoughby	7	4.3	16	4.4	7	4.3	12	3.9	44	4.3	4.3

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>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>	
Kevin Andrew Higgins	5	3.6	4	4.8	24	4.0	21	3.8	1	4.0	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	-	-	4	3.0	12	3.5	21	3.1	1	1.0	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	3	3.0	2	3.5	20	3.5	41	3.8	1	5.0	3.7
Debra O’Gara	-	-	1	3.0	9	2.6	16	3.3	1	2.0	3.0
Hanna Sebold	4	4.5	5	3.8	27	3.7	46	3.9	4	4.8	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	4	2.5	1	4.0	14	2.6	8	2.9	-	-	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	5	2.6	2	2.5	23	3.1	23	3.0	1	3.0	3.0
Julie Willoughby	8	4.4	11	4.8	32	4.3	32	4.2	5	3.8	4.3

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>	
Kevin Andrew Higgins	46	3.8	-	-	8	4.3	1	5.0	-	-	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	27	3.0	1	5.0	8	3.4	2	4.0	-	-	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	43	3.5	-	-	21	4.2	3	3.0	-	-	3.7
Debra O’Gara	21	3.0	1	1.0	5	3.6	-	-	-	-	3.0
Hanna Sebold	44	3.6	1	5.0	31	4.2	9	4.1	-	-	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	1	3.0	-	-	3	3.0	22	2.6	1	4.0	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	-	-	-	-	8	2.9	46	3.0	-	-	3.0
Julie Willoughby	49	4.5	1	4.0	35	3.9	3	3.7	-	-	4.3

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>
Kevin Andrew Higgins	27	3.9	28	3.9	3.9
Margaret McWilliams	13	3.8	25	2.9	3.3
Amy Gurton Mead	39	3.8	29	3.7	3.7
Debra O’Gara	13	3.0	14	3.0	3.0
Hanna Sebold	36	3.8	50	3.9	3.9
Franklin E. Spaulding	12	2.9	15	2.5	2.7
Gary L. Stapp	29	3.3	25	2.6	3.0
Julie Willoughby	49	4.3	37	4.5	4.3

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

Table 11
Kevin Andrew Higgins
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	69	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	57	82.6
Professional reputation	9	13.0
Other personal contacts	3	4.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	52	91.2
Substantial amount of experience	20	35.1
Moderate amount of experience	19	33.3
Limited amount of experience	18	31.6
Type of Practice		
No response	2	2.9
Private, solo	16	23.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	13.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	1.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	11.6
Government	26	37.7
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3
Retired	2	2.9
Other	2	2.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	4.3
5 years or fewer	5	7.2
6 to 10 years	17	24.6
11 to 15 years	11	15.9
16 to 20 years	6	8.7
More than 20 years	27	39.1
Cases Handled		
No response	2	2.9
Prosecution	5	7.2
Criminal	7	10.1
Mixed criminal & civil	25	36.2
Civil	29	42.0
Other	1	1.4
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.9
First District	53	76.8
Second District	-	-
Third District	13	18.8
Fourth District	1	1.4
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	2	2.9
Male	32	46.4
Female	35	50.7

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

Table 12
Kevin Andrew Higgins
Detailed Responses

	n	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	69	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	57	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	52	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	20	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.8
Limited amount of experience	18	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9
Professional reputation	9	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.8
Other personal contacts	3	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	14	4.1	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.3	4.3
Government	19	4.5	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Public service agency or organization	3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.7
Retired	2	3.5	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	3.0
Other	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	14	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9
11 to 15 years	8	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.3
More than 20 years	26	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6
Criminal	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	24	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.7	4.0	4.0
Civil	22	4.1	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8
Other	1	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	46	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.8
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	9	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.8	4.3
Fourth District	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	27	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.9
Female	29	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9

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

Table 13
Margaret McWilliams
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	52	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	41	78.8
Professional reputation	9	17.3
Other personal contacts	2	3.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	40	97.6
Substantial amount of experience	18	43.9
Moderate amount of experience	13	31.7
Limited amount of experience	10	24.4
Type of Practice		
No response	3	5.8
Private, solo	12	23.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	7.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	1.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	13.5
Government	18	34.6
Public service agency or organization	4	7.7
Retired	2	3.8
Other	1	1.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	7.7
5 years or fewer	2	3.8
6 to 10 years	11	21.2
11 to 15 years	6	11.5
16 to 20 years	8	15.4
More than 20 years	21	40.4
Cases Handled		
No response	3	5.8
Prosecution	1	1.9
Criminal	5	9.6
Mixed criminal & civil	14	26.9
Civil	28	53.8
Other	1	1.9
Location of Practice		
No response	3	5.8
First District	35	67.3
Second District	1	1.9
Third District	11	21.2
Fourth District	2	3.8
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	3	5.8
Male	18	34.6
Female	31	59.6

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

Table 14
Margaret McWilliams
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	52	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.2
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	41	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	40	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.0	3.2
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	18	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.5	2.9	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	13	3.8	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4
Limited amount of experience	10	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.1
Professional reputation	9	2.9	3.3	2.6	2.9	2.4	2.6
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.3
Government	14	3.9	4.2	3.7	3.7	3.1	3.5
Public service agency or organization	4	3.8	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	2.5
Retired	2	2.5	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.0	1.5
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
6 to 10 years	9	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.2	3.4
11 to 15 years	4	3.8	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.5
16 to 20 years	8	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.4
More than 20 years	17	3.2	3.7	3.2	3.4	2.6	2.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	4	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.5	2.5	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	12	3.9	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.3	3.5
Civil	22	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.1
Other	1	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	27	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.0
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0
Third District	9	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.4
Fourth District	2	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	13	3.8	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.8
Female	26	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.2	2.8	2.9

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

Table 15
Amy Gurton Mead
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	93	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	69	74.2
Professional reputation	17	18.3
Other personal contacts	7	7.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	88.4
Substantial amount of experience	24	34.8
Moderate amount of experience	22	31.9
Limited amount of experience	23	33.3
Type of Practice		
No response	2	2.2
Private, solo	17	18.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	19	20.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	7.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	12.9
Government	28	30.1
Public service agency or organization	4	4.3
Retired	3	3.2
Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	6	6.5
5 years or fewer	7	7.5
6 to 10 years	11	11.8
11 to 15 years	8	8.6
16 to 20 years	9	9.7
More than 20 years	52	55.9
Cases Handled		
No response	3	3.2
Prosecution	6	6.5
Criminal	2	2.2
Mixed criminal & civil	24	25.8
Civil	56	60.2
Other	2	2.2
Location of Practice		
No response	3	3.2
First District	59	63.4
Second District	1	1.1
Third District	26	28.0
Fourth District	4	4.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	2	2.2
Male	51	54.8
Female	40	43.0

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

Table 16
Amy Gurton Mead
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	93	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	69	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	61	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	6	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	24	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	22	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3
Limited amount of experience	23	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	17	3.7	3.4	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.4
Other personal contacts	7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.6
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	11	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	17	4.0	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.5	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.2
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	11	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.6
Government	18	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.5
Public service agency or organization	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.2	3.8	3.7
6 to 10 years	6	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.4	3.5	3.7
11 to 15 years	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.3
16 to 20 years	6	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.3
More than 20 years	44	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	3.7	3.3	4.5	4.0	3.0	3.0
Criminal	2	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	21	4.1	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5
Civil	41	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	44	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.5
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	21	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Fourth District	3	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	39	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
Female	30	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7

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

Table 17
Debra O’Gara
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	42	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	27	64.3
Professional reputation	8	19.0
Other personal contacts	7	16.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	85.2
Substantial amount of experience	4	14.8
Moderate amount of experience	14	51.9
Limited amount of experience	9	33.3
Type of Practice		
No response	1	2.4
Private, solo	13	31.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	6	14.3
Government	14	33.3
Public service agency or organization	4	9.5
Retired	1	2.4
Other	1	2.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	4.8
5 years or fewer	5	11.9
6 to 10 years	8	19.0
11 to 15 years	3	7.1
16 to 20 years	5	11.9
More than 20 years	19	45.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	2.4
Prosecution	1	2.4
Criminal	2	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	14	33.3
Civil	22	52.4
Other	2	4.8
Location of Practice		
No response	2	4.8
First District	29	69.0
Second District	1	2.4
Third District	9	21.4
Fourth District	1	2.4
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	2.4
Male	18	42.9
Female	23	54.8

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

Table 18
Debra O’Gara
Detailed Responses

	n	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	42	3.2	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	27	2.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0
Experience within last 5 years	23	2.9	3.5	3.3	3.2	2.5	3.0
Experience not within last 5 years	4	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.3
Substantial amount of experience	4	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.5
Moderate amount of experience	14	2.9	3.6	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0
Limited amount of experience	9	3.1	3.7	3.6	3.6	2.8	3.2
Professional reputation	8	3.6	4.3	4.3	3.6	3.6	3.8
Other personal contacts	7	3.9	4.3	4.6	4.3	3.7	3.9
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	2.9	3.6	3.6	3.5	2.6	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	2.4	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.2	2.6
Government	7	3.0	4.0	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.9
Public service agency or organization	4	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.8
Retired	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5
6 to 10 years	4	2.8	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.0	3.0
11 to 15 years	3	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.0	2.7	2.7
16 to 20 years	4	3.5	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.3	3.5
More than 20 years	14	2.8	3.6	3.5	3.4	2.6	3.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	1	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Mixed criminal & civil	9	2.3	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.6
Civil	16	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.0	3.3
Other	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	21	2.9	3.7	3.5	3.3	2.5	3.0
Second District	1	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Third District	5	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.6
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	13	2.8	3.8	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0
Female	14	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.3	2.6	3.0

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

Table 19
Hanna Sebold
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	113	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	89	78.8
Professional reputation	15	13.3
Other personal contacts	9	8.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	79	88.8
Substantial amount of experience	42	47.2
Moderate amount of experience	21	23.6
Limited amount of experience	26	29.2
Type of Practice		
No response	1	0.9
Private, solo	18	15.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	11.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	5.3
Private, corporate employee	1	0.9
Judge or judicial officer	18	15.9
Government	45	39.8
Public service agency or organization	8	7.1
Retired	3	2.7
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	3.5
5 years or fewer	5	4.4
6 to 10 years	17	15.0
11 to 15 years	16	14.2
16 to 20 years	14	12.4
More than 20 years	57	50.4
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.9
Prosecution	5	4.4
Criminal	9	8.0
Mixed criminal & civil	32	28.3
Civil	62	54.9
Other	4	3.5
Location of Practice		
No response	2	1.8
First District	57	50.4
Second District	1	0.9
Third District	41	36.3
Fourth District	11	9.7
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	48	42.5
Female	64	56.6

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

Table 20
Hanna Sebold
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	113	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	89	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	79	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	9	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.5	3.5
Substantial amount of experience	42	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	21	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.7
Limited amount of experience	26	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.7	3.8
Professional reputation	15	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.7	3.9
Other personal contacts	9	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.1
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	13	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.1	3.7	3.8
Government	38	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.2
Public service agency or organization	7	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1	3.7	4.0
Retired	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.6
6 to 10 years	15	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.6
11 to 15 years	13	4.2	4.8	4.5	4.4	3.8	3.9
16 to 20 years	11	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.6
More than 20 years	42	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Criminal	7	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	27	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.7
Civil	46	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.9
Other	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	44	4.0	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Third District	33	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.2
Fourth District	9	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.1
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	37	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.8
Female	51	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.7	3.9

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

Table 21
Franklin E. Spaulding
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	44	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	28	63.6
Professional reputation	10	22.7
Other personal contacts	6	13.6
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	82.1
Substantial amount of experience	5	17.9
Moderate amount of experience	15	53.6
Limited amount of experience	8	28.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	6	13.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	20.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	22.7
Government	11	25.0
Public service agency or organization	3	6.8
Retired	1	2.3
Other	2	4.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	4.5
5 years or fewer	3	6.8
6 to 10 years	10	22.7
11 to 15 years	4	9.1
16 to 20 years	9	20.5
More than 20 years	16	36.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	4	9.1
Criminal	2	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	22	50.0
Civil	14	31.8
Other	2	4.5
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	2.3
Second District	-	-
Third District	6	13.6
Fourth District	36	81.8
Outside Alaska	1	2.3
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	22	50.0
Female	22	50.0

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

Table 22
Franklin E. Spaulding
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	44	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.7
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	28	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.7
Experience within last 5 years	23	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.8
Experience not within last 5 years	5	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.2	2.4
Substantial amount of experience	5	2.4	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.2
Moderate amount of experience	15	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7
Limited amount of experience	8	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.0
Professional reputation	10	3.1	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.8
Other personal contacts	6	3.3	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	4	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.9
Government	8	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.4
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Retired	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Other	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	6	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8
11 to 15 years	4	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.0	1.8
16 to 20 years	6	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.4
More than 20 years	10	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.2	2.9	2.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.5
Criminal	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	15	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6
Civil	8	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.9
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	3	3.0	2.7	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0
Fourth District	23	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.6
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	13	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.9
Female	15	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.7	2.5

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

Table 23
Gary L. Stapp
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	70	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	55	78.6
Professional reputation	10	14.3
Other personal contacts	5	7.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	51	92.7
Substantial amount of experience	16	29.1
Moderate amount of experience	30	54.5
Limited amount of experience	8	14.5
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	11	15.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	20.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	11.4
Private, corporate employee	1	1.4
Judge or judicial officer	11	15.7
Government	16	22.9
Public service agency or organization	3	4.3
Retired	5	7.1
Other	1	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	3	4.3
5 years or fewer	5	7.1
6 to 10 years	13	18.6
11 to 15 years	5	7.1
16 to 20 years	13	18.6
More than 20 years	31	44.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	5	7.1
Criminal	3	4.3
Mixed criminal & civil	27	38.6
Civil	33	47.1
Other	2	2.9
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.4
First District	2	2.9
Second District	-	-
Third District	12	17.1
Fourth District	54	77.1
Outside Alaska	1	1.4
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	37	52.9
Female	33	47.1

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

Table 24
Gary L. Stapp
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	70	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	55	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.0
Experience within last 5 years	51	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.0
Experience not within last 5 years	4	2.8	2.8	3.5	2.8	3.0	2.8
Substantial amount of experience	16	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.5
Moderate amount of experience	30	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.1
Limited amount of experience	8	3.6	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.4
Professional reputation	10	2.9	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.1
Other personal contacts	5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	6	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.1	2.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.7	3.9
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	10	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.1
Government	12	2.4	2.8	3.1	3.2	2.6	2.4
Public service agency or organization	3	3.0	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Retired	4	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.5
Other	1	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	10	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9
11 to 15 years	5	2.2	3.2	3.4	3.8	2.6	2.2
16 to 20 years	9	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.3
More than 20 years	26	3.0	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	2.8	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.0	2.6
Criminal	2	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.5
Mixed criminal & civil	23	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.1	3.1
Civil	24	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.0
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	9	3.0	2.7	3.4	3.3	2.9	2.9
Fourth District	46	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	30	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.3
Female	25	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.6

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

Table 25
Julie Willoughby
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	137	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	92	67.2
Professional reputation	33	24.1
Other personal contacts	12	8.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	74	80.4
Substantial amount of experience	34	37.0
Moderate amount of experience	36	39.1
Limited amount of experience	22	23.9
Type of Practice		
No response	3	2.2
Private, solo	26	19.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	10.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	5	3.6
Private, corporate employee	4	2.9
Judge or judicial officer	26	19.0
Government	45	32.8
Public service agency or organization	6	4.4
Retired	5	3.6
Other	2	1.5
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	9	6.6
5 years or fewer	11	8.0
6 to 10 years	19	13.9
11 to 15 years	9	6.6
16 to 20 years	21	15.3
More than 20 years	68	49.6
Cases Handled		
No response	3	2.2
Prosecution	9	6.6
Criminal	15	10.9
Mixed criminal & civil	44	32.1
Civil	59	43.1
Other	7	5.1
Location of Practice		
No response	3	2.2
First District	64	46.7
Second District	1	0.7
Third District	58	42.3
Fourth District	11	8.0
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	5	3.6
Male	69	50.4
Female	63	46.0

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

Table 26
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 Rating <i>M</i>
All respondents	137	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	92	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	74	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9
Substantial amount of experience	34	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	36	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Limited amount of experience	22	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.3	4.3
Professional reputation	33	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	12	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	17	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.0	2.3	2.3
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.4	4.1
Government	33	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
Public service agency or organization	3	5.0	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0
Retired	4	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Other	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.4	4.3
6 to 10 years	16	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	7	4.6	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	12	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9
More than 20 years	45	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
Criminal	11	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	34	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3
Civil	32	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2
Other	5	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	49	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Second District	1	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0
Third District	36	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.9
Fourth District	4	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.3	3.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	49	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3
Female	39	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5

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