



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Anchorage Superior Court

Technical Report

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

December 1, 2017

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

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: John C. Cagle: Demographic Description of Respondents	15
Table 12: John C. Cagle: Detailed Responses	16
Table 13: Una Sonia Gandbhir: Demographic Description of Respondents	17
Table 14: Una Sonia Gandbhir: Detailed Responses.....	18
Table 15: Josie Garton: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	19
Table 16: Josie Garton: Detailed Responses.....	20
Table 17: Thomas A. Matthews: Demographic Description of Respondents	21
Table 18: Thomas A. Matthews: Detailed Responses	22
Table 19: Andrew Peterson: Demographic Description of Respondents	23
Table 20: Andrew Peterson: Detailed Responses	24

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Anchorage Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge Jack Smith. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) received a total of 7 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): John C. Cagle, Gregory Fisher, Una Sonia Gandbhir, Josie Garton, Thomas A. Matthews, Douglas C. Perkins, and Andrew Peterson. Gregory Fisher and Douglas C. Perkins 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>
John C. Cagle	72	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	129	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Josie Garton	101	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	92	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Andrew Peterson	116	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1

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

Judicial Selection Survey: Anchorage 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, gender, types of cases handled, and primary location of practice.

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 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, Sitka Superior Court, and Anchorage District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for the Anchorage Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge Jack Smith. By the application deadline, the Council had received a total of 7 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): John C. Cagle, Gregory Fisher, Una Sonia Gandbhir, Josie Garton, Thomas A. Matthews, Douglas C. Perkins, and Andrew Peterson. Gregory Fisher and Douglas C. Perkins 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 3,920 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,827) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Forty individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 53 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 865 online surveys. No surveys were excluded because the respondent answered "No" to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2; 35 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question. No online surveys were returned by individuals who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 830 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 21 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. No 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, 20 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 830 online surveys and 20 paper surveys, for a total of 850 surveys and a survey return rate of 21.7%. Of the 850 returned surveys, 211 did not rate any of the 26 applicants (seven Anchorage Superior Court applicants, six Sitka Superior Court applicants, and 13 Anchorage District Court applicants); 639 (75.2%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

	All respondents	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
		850	100.0	639	100.0
Type of Practice					
	No response	6	0.7	4	0.6
	Private, solo	176	20.7	132	20.7
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	125	14.7	92	14.4
	Private, 6+ attorneys	92	10.8	72	11.3
	Private, corporate employee	25	2.9	18	2.8
	Judge or judicial officer	84	9.9	75	11.7
	Government	248	29.2	192	30.0
	Public service agency or organization	17	2.0	16	2.5
	Retired	60	7.1	29	4.5
	Other	17	2.0	9	1.4
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	17	2.0	9	1.4
	5 years or fewer	82	9.6	56	8.8
	6 to 10 years	116	13.6	100	15.6
	11 to 15 years	96	11.3	79	12.4
	16 to 20 years	85	10.0	66	10.3
	More than 20 years	454	53.4	329	51.5
Cases Handled					
	No response	7	0.8	4	0.6
	Prosecution	53	6.2	42	6.6
	Criminal	82	9.6	72	11.3
	Mixed criminal & civil	211	24.8	166	26.0
	Civil	443	52.1	320	50.1
	Other	54	6.4	35	5.5
Location of Practice					
	No response	7	0.8	5	0.8
	First District	118	13.9	91	14.2
	Second District	16	1.9	13	2.0
	Third District	614	72.2	486	76.1
	Fourth District	57	6.7	29	4.5
	Outside Alaska	38	4.5	15	2.3
Gender					
	No response	27	3.2	17	2.7
	Male	511	60.1	379	59.3
	Female	312	36.7	243	38.0

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at 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 11-20 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
John C. Cagle	90	10.6	80.0	18.9	1.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	181	21.3	71.3	19.9	8.8
Josie Garton	145	17.1	69.7	20.7	9.7
Thomas A. Matthews	115	13.5	80.0	15.7	4.3
Andrew Peterson	139	16.4	83.5	9.4	7.2

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>
John C. Cagle	86	4.0	4.0	1.1	70	4.1	4.0	1.0
Una Sonia Gandbhir	177	4.4	5.0	0.8	127	4.4	5.0	0.8
Josie Garton	142	4.4	5.0	1.0	100	4.5	5.0	0.9
Thomas A. Matthews	115	4.5	5.0	0.7	92	4.6	5.0	0.7
Andrew Peterson	134	4.0	4.0	1.0	113	4.1	4.0	0.9

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>	%
John C. Cagle	70	3	4.3	1	1.4	14	20.0	22	31.4	30	42.9
Una Sonia Gandbhir	127	-	-	5	3.9	11	8.7	35	27.6	76	59.8
Josie Garton	100	3	3.0	2	2.0	5	5.0	23	23.0	67	67.0
Thomas A. Matthews	92	-	-	2	2.2	6	6.5	23	25.0	61	66.3
Andrew Peterson	113	2	1.8	4	3.5	21	18.6	42	37.2	44	38.9

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>	
John C. Cagle	9	4.0	5	3.4	4	2.5	-	-	9	4.1	40	4.3	1	4.0	1	3.0	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	22	4.5	17	4.5	7	4.0	3	5.0	38	4.4	27	4.3	3	4.7	6	4.7	4.4
Josie Garton	8	3.6	6	4.8	7	4.9	2	4.0	11	4.7	55	4.5	5	4.8	2	3.5	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	17	4.7	35	4.5	13	4.6	2	4.5	13	4.6	7	4.1	-	-	3	5.0	4.6
Andrew Peterson	14	3.7	14	3.7	11	3.7	3	4.7	16	3.9	51	4.4	-	-	3	4.3	4.1

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
John C. Cagle	8	4.6	17	4.2	12	4.2	11	4.5	22	3.5	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	10	4.2	7	4.4	19	4.5	11	4.3	78	4.5	4.4
Josie Garton	15	4.7	26	4.8	11	4.0	9	4.4	39	4.3	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	-	-	4	4.5	4	4.8	9	4.6	73	4.5	4.6
Andrew Peterson	4	4.8	27	4.1	20	4.3	17	4.0	44	4.0	4.1

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>	
John C. Cagle	21	4.8	14	3.9	28	3.8	6	3.2	1	4.0	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	-	-	8	4.9	49	4.3	63	4.4	7	4.9	4.4
Josie Garton	5	3.4	39	4.8	32	4.5	22	4.2	2	4.5	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	-	-	2	4.5	15	4.1	64	4.6	11	4.8	4.6
Andrew Peterson	22	4.7	16	3.7	41	3.8	30	4.1	4	4.5	4.1

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>	
John C. Cagle	3	4.3	1	5.0	65	4.0	-	-	1	5.0	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	3	4.7	1	5.0	118	4.4	5	4.8	-	-	4.4
Josie Garton	9	4.4	2	5.0	84	4.5	3	4.3	2	5.0	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	8	4.6	-	-	83	4.5	1	5.0	-	-	4.6
Andrew Peterson	10	4.1	1	5.0	101	4.1	-	-	1	3.0	4.1

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>
John C. Cagle	50	4.0	19	4.2	4.1
Una Sonia Gandbhir	64	4.4	61	4.5	4.4
Josie Garton	56	4.4	42	4.5	4.5
Thomas A. Matthews	75	4.5	16	4.6	4.6
Andrew Peterson	73	4.1	38	4.1	4.1

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

Table 11
John C. Cagle
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	90	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	72	80.0
Professional reputation	17	18.9
Other personal contacts	1	1.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	72	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	29	40.3
Moderate amount of experience	27	37.5
Limited amount of experience	16	22.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	11	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	6.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	6.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	13.3
Government	51	56.7
Public service agency or organization	1	1.1
Retired	2	2.2
Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	11	12.2
6 to 10 years	22	24.4
11 to 15 years	13	14.4
16 to 20 years	13	14.4
More than 20 years	31	34.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	25	27.8
Criminal	18	20.0
Mixed criminal & civil	33	36.7
Civil	12	13.3
Other	2	2.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	5	5.6
Second District	3	3.3
Third District	81	90.0
Fourth District	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	1	1.1
Male	59	65.6
Female	30	33.3

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

Table 12
John C. Cagle
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	90	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	72	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	72	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	29	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	27	4.1	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.9
Limited amount of experience	16	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9
Professional reputation	17	3.8	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.5	3.6
Other personal contacts	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.3	3.8	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	2.3	2.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	9	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.1
Government	41	4.3	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.3
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Retired	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	8	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
6 to 10 years	17	4.2	4.7	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.2
11 to 15 years	12	4.0	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.2
16 to 20 years	12	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
More than 20 years	23	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	22	4.7	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.6	4.8
Criminal	15	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.9
Mixed criminal & civil	28	4.1	4.4	4.2	4.1	3.6	3.8
Civil	6	3.3	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.2
Other	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	67	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.0
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	51	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.9	4.0
Female	20	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.2

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

Table 13
Una Sonia Gandhir
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	181	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	129	71.3
Professional reputation	36	19.9
Other personal contacts	16	8.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	111	86.0
Substantial amount of experience	36	27.9
Moderate amount of experience	53	41.1
Limited amount of experience	39	30.2
Type of Practice		
No response	2	1.1
Private, solo	33	18.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	28	15.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	8.8
Private, corporate employee	5	2.8
Judge or judicial officer	42	23.2
Government	38	21.0
Public service agency or organization	6	3.3
Retired	8	4.4
Other	3	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	4	2.2
5 years or fewer	10	5.5
6 to 10 years	18	9.9
11 to 15 years	25	13.8
16 to 20 years	15	8.3
More than 20 years	109	60.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	0.6
Prosecution	1	0.6
Criminal	19	10.5
Mixed criminal & civil	62	34.3
Civil	89	49.2
Other	9	5.0
Location of Practice		
No response	1	0.6
First District	5	2.8
Second District	1	0.6
Third District	165	91.2
Fourth District	8	4.4
Outside Alaska	1	0.6
Gender		
No response	3	1.7
Male	92	50.8
Female	86	47.5

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

Table 14
Una Sonia Gandhir
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	181	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	129	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	111	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.5	4.9	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	53	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5
Limited amount of experience	39	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.5
Professional reputation	36	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3
Other personal contacts	16	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	23	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.9	4.0
Private, corporate employee	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	38	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.1	4.4
Government	27	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.3
Public service agency or organization	3	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7
Retired	6	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.7
Other	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	10	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.5	4.1	4.2
6 to 10 years	7	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	19	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.5
16 to 20 years	11	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3
More than 20 years	80	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	8	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.5	4.9
Mixed criminal & civil	50	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.3
Civil	64	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
Other	7	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.9
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	120	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Fourth District	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.8
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	65	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Female	62	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5

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

Table 15
Josie Garton
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	145	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	101	69.7
Professional reputation	30	20.7
Other personal contacts	14	9.7
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	92	91.1
Substantial amount of experience	42	41.6
Moderate amount of experience	38	37.6
Limited amount of experience	19	18.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	12	8.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	11.0
Private, corporate employee	3	2.1
Judge or judicial officer	19	13.1
Government	71	49.0
Public service agency or organization	6	4.1
Retired	2	1.4
Other	5	3.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	17	11.7
6 to 10 years	32	22.1
11 to 15 years	22	15.2
16 to 20 years	14	9.7
More than 20 years	60	41.4
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	9	6.2
Criminal	43	29.7
Mixed criminal & civil	45	31.0
Civil	45	31.0
Other	3	2.1
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	12	8.3
Second District	2	1.4
Third District	125	86.2
Fourth District	3	2.1
Outside Alaska	3	2.1
Gender		
No response	2	1.4
Male	76	52.4
Female	67	46.2

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

Table 16
Josie Garton
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	145	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	101	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	92	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	9	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	3.6	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	42	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.4
Limited amount of experience	19	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	30	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0
Other personal contacts	14	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.0	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.3	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.7	4.9
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.0
Judge or judicial officer	11	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.3	4.7
Government	55	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Public service agency or organization	5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.8
Retired	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Other	4	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.8
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	15	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	26	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.6	4.8
11 to 15 years	11	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.6	3.5	4.0
16 to 20 years	9	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	3.9	4.4
More than 20 years	40	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.0	4.3
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.4	3.4	3.4
Criminal	39	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	32	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.5
Civil	23	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.2
Other	2	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	9	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4
Second District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0
Third District	85	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5
Fourth District	3	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.3	4.3
Outside Alaska	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	57	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.1	4.4
Female	42	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5

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

Table 17
Thomas A. Matthews
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	115	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	92	80.0
Professional reputation	18	15.7
Other personal contacts	5	4.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	75	81.5
Substantial amount of experience	32	34.8
Moderate amount of experience	38	41.3
Limited amount of experience	20	21.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	22	19.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	41	35.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	17	14.8
Private, corporate employee	3	2.6
Judge or judicial officer	15	13.0
Government	11	9.6
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	4	3.5
Other	2	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	1.7
5 years or fewer	-	-
6 to 10 years	5	4.3
11 to 15 years	7	6.1
16 to 20 years	14	12.2
More than 20 years	87	75.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	1	0.9
Criminal	2	1.7
Mixed criminal & civil	23	20.0
Civil	78	67.8
Other	11	9.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	8	7.0
Second District	-	-
Third District	105	91.3
Fourth District	1	0.9
Outside Alaska	1	0.9
Gender		
No response	1	0.9
Male	91	79.1
Female	23	20.0

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

Table 18
Thomas A. Matthews
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	115	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	92	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	75	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	15	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3
Substantial amount of experience	32	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	20	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	18	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	5	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	17	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	35	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	13	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Government	7	4.1	4.4	4.1	4.4	3.7	4.1
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.3	5.0
Other	2	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6 to 10 years	4	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.5
11 to 15 years	4	4.5	5.0	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.8
16 to 20 years	9	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.6	4.4	4.6
More than 20 years	73	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	2	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5
Mixed criminal & civil	15	4.2	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Civil	64	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6
Other	11	4.8	5.0	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.8
Location of Practice*							
First District	8	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	83	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Fourth District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	75	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5
Female	16	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.6

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

Table 19
Andrew Peterson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	139	100.0
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	116	83.5
Professional reputation	13	9.4
Other personal contacts	10	7.2
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	99	85.3
Substantial amount of experience	36	31.0
Moderate amount of experience	45	38.8
Limited amount of experience	35	30.2
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	16	11.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	18	12.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	9.4
Private, corporate employee	7	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	21	15.1
Government	60	43.2
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	3	2.2
Other	1	0.7
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	0.7
5 years or fewer	6	4.3
6 to 10 years	33	23.7
11 to 15 years	26	18.7
16 to 20 years	19	13.7
More than 20 years	54	38.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	24	17.3
Criminal	17	12.2
Mixed criminal & civil	46	33.1
Civil	47	33.8
Other	5	3.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	11	7.9
Second District	1	0.7
Third District	125	89.9
Fourth District	1	0.7
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
Gender		
No response	3	2.2
Male	83	59.7
Female	53	38.1

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

Table 20
Andrew Peterson
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	139	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	116	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	99	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	17	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	45	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.1	3.7	4.0
Limited amount of experience	35	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9
Professional reputation	13	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Other personal contacts	10	3.8	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	14	3.9	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.7
Private, corporate employee	4	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3	4.7
Judge or judicial officer	17	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.9
Government	51	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.4
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3
Other	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8
6 to 10 years	27	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.0	4.1
11 to 15 years	21	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.0	4.3
16 to 20 years	17	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0
More than 20 years	46	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	22	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.8	4.5	4.7
Criminal	16	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.7
Mixed criminal & civil	43	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.8
Civil	31	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1
Other	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.8	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	10	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.1
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	104	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Gender*							
Male	74	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1
Female	40	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.9	4.1

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