



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Utqiagvik Superior Court

Technical Report

Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional
Rosylind Frazier, M.S., Senior Research Professional
Kate Saft, Undergraduate Research Assistant

December 17, 2018

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

<https://iseralaska.org/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Applicants	2
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics.....	4
Instrumentation	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety.....	5
Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding.....	6
Data Management	6
Results.....	6
<i>Summary Tables</i>	
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings sby 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: Erin White Bradley: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	16
Table 12: Erin White Bradley: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: David L. Roghair: Demographic Description of Respondents.....	18
Table 14: David L. Roghair: Detailed Responses.....	19
Table 15: Dianne Thoben: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Dianne Thoben: Detailed Responses	21
Table 17: Nelson Traverso: Demographic Description of Respondents	22
Table 18: Nelson Traverso: Detailed Responses	23

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for 1 judicial vacancy on the Utqiagvik Superior Court created by the retirement of Judge Angela Greene. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of 5 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Erin White Bradley, Robert J. Campbell, David L. Roghair, Dianne Thoben, and Nelson Traverso. Robert J. Campbell withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

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

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

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall Rating
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Erin White Bradley	71	3.2	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.2
David L. Roghair	68	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1
Dianne Thoben	40	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.3
Nelson Traverso	70	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4

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

Judicial Selection Survey: Utqiagvik Superior Court

Introduction

The State of Alaska Constitution and laws mandate that the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) evaluate all applicants for a judicial vacancy. The Council nominates the two or more most qualified applicants to the governor who must appoint from the Council's list. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Judicial Council distributed surveys to Alaska Bar Association members and asked them to rate applicants on six characteristics: *Professional Competence, Integrity, Fairness, Judicial Temperament, Suitability of this Applicant's Experience for this Vacancy, and Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of practice, length of Alaska practice, types of cases handled, primary location of practice, and gender.

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

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Anchorage District Court, Kodiak Superior Court, Palmer Superior Court, and Utqiagvik Superior Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for Utqiagvik Superior Court, created by the retirement of Judge Angela Greene. By the application deadline, the Council had received a total of 5 applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Erin White Bradley, Robert J. Campbell, David L. Roghair, Dianne Thoben, and Nelson Traverso. Robert J. Campbell withdrew his application. Therefore, his survey results are not included in this report.

Methodology

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,280 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,258) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. Twenty-two individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 34 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 1,004 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; 9 surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online surveys were returned by individuals who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 961 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned 11 paper surveys. Attorneys are required to sign the paper surveys to verify that they are the person completing the survey. No paper survey was excluded because they were unsigned. No paper surveys were excluded because the respondents did not respond to the question certifying that they had complied with the ethical standards set out in Professional Rule 8.2. No paper surveys were returned by individuals who also completed the online survey. Therefore, 11 paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 961 online surveys and 11 paper surveys, for a total of 972 surveys and a survey return rate of 29.6%. Of the 972 returned surveys, 269 did not rate any of the 33 applicants (nine Anchorage District Court applicants, six Kodiak Superior Court applicants, thirteen Palmer Superior Court applicants, five Utqiagvik Superior Court applicants); 703 (72.3%) 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	
		n	%	n	%
		972	100	703	100
Type of Practice					
	No response	4	0.4	4	0.6
	Private, solo	191	19.7	119	16.9
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	131	13.5	97	13.8
	Private, 6+ attorneys	99	10.2	75	10.7
	Private, corporate employee	24	2.5	14	2.0
	Judge or judicial officer	88	9.1	77	11.0
	Government	293	30.1	238	33.9
	Public service agency or organization	25	2.6	15	2.1
	Retired	21	2.2	12	1.7
	Other	96	9.9	52	7.4
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	9	0.9	8	1.1
	5 years or fewer	119	12.2	87	12.4
	6 to 10 years	143	14.7	113	16.1
	11 to 15 years	127	13.1	101	14.4
	16 to 20 years	90	9.3	63	9.0
	More than 20 years	484	49.8	331	47.1
Cases Handled					
	No response	4	0.4	4	0.6
	Prosecution	81	8.3	74	10.5
	Criminal	105	10.8	84	11.9
	Mixed criminal & civil	201	20.7	166	23.6
	Civil	490	50.4	322	45.8
	Other	91	9.4	53	7.5
Location of Practice					
	No response	5	0.5	5	0.7
	First District	94	9.7	41	5.8
	Second District	20	2.1	13	1.8
	Third District	716	73.7	552	78.5
	Fourth District	88	9.1	69	9.8
	Outside Alaska	49	5.0	23	3.3
Gender					
	No response	9	0.9	6	0.9
	Male	571	58.7	407	57.9
	Female	392	40.3	290	41.3

Instrumentation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Confidentiality and Data Safety

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

Assurance of Non-Duplicate Responding

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

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

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

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

Data Management

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

Results

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

Respondents’ Level of Experience with Each Applicant

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

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

Ratings of Applicants

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

For each individual applicant, Tables 11-18 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>	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...			
		% of all respondents who rated applicant	Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Erin White Bradley	89	9.2	79.8	16.9	3.4
David L. Roghair	79	8.1	86.1	10.1	3.8
Dianne Thoben	44	4.5	90.9	4.5	4.5
Nelson Traverso	98	10.1	71.4	21.4	7.1

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>
Erin White Bradley	87	3.3	3.0	1.3	69	3.2	3.0	1.2
David L. Roghair	78	4.1	4.0	1.1	69	4.1	4.0	1.0
Dianne Thoben	44	3.3	3.0	1.2	40	3.3	3.0	1.2
Nelson Traverso	95	4.4	5.0	0.8	68	4.4	5.0	0.8

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	Poor			Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Erin White Bradley	69	5	7.2	16	23.2	19	27.5	15	21.7	14	20.3
David L. Roghair	69	2	2.9	3	4.3	9	13.0	24	34.8	31	44.9
Dianne Thoben	40	2	5.0	9	22.5	10	25.0	12	30.0	7	17.5
Nelson Traverso	68	-	-	3	4.4	5	7.4	23	33.8	37	54.4

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

Table 6
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice

	Private, solo		Private, 2-5 attorneys		Private, 6+ attorneys		Private, corporate employee		Judge or judicial officer		Government		Public service agency/org		Retired		Other		Overall
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Erin White Bradley	10	3.7	4	3.5	4	3.3	1	3.0	11	3.1	31	3.3	-	-	-	-	7	2.7	3.2
David L. Roghair	8	4.0	7	3.9	2	5.0	-	-	21	4.3	25	4.0	2	4.5	1	5.0	3	4.3	4.1
Dianne Thoben	8	3.4	4	3.3	-	-	-	-	12	3.3	15	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.3
Nelson Traverso	9	4.4	7	4.7	6	4.7	-	-	14	4.5	20	4.2	1	4.0	1	5.0	10	4.2	4.4

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

Table 7
Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice

	5 years or fewer		6 to 10 years		11 to 15 years		16 to 20 years		21 years or more		Overall <i>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>	
Erin White Bradley	5	4.6	7	3.0	9	2.8	8	3.3	38	3.2	3.2
David L. Roghair	6	4.2	11	4.1	16	4.1	6	4.5	30	4.1	4.1
Dianne Thoben	1	3.0	9	3.7	7	2.9	7	2.9	15	3.5	3.3
Nelson Traverso	1	5.0	4	4.8	12	3.8	6	4.8	43	4.5	4.4

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

Table 8
Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled

	Prosecution		Criminal		Mixed criminal/civil		Civil		Other		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Erin White Bradley	20	3.3	19	3.2	20	3.2	7	3.1	1	5.0	3.2
David L. Roghair	10	3.8	5	3.8	34	4.2	16	4.3	4	4.5	4.1
Dianne Thoben	3	2.7	8	4.0	17	3.4	10	2.8	2	3.5	3.3
Nelson Traverso	10	3.9	3	4.7	30	4.4	16	4.5	8	4.9	4.4

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall
	<i>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>
Erin White Bradley	2	4.5	-	-	63	3.2	2	2.5	1	5.0	3.2
David L. Roghair	3	3.7	9	4.6	27	4.0	28	4.2	1	5.0	4.1
Dianne Thoben	16	3.3	2	2.0	20	3.4	2	4.0	-	-	3.3
Nelson Traverso	5	4.6	-	-	21	4.0	39	4.6	1	5.0	4.4

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Erin White Bradley	41	3.1	26	3.4	3.2
David L. Roghair	43	4.1	26	4.2	4.1
Dianne Thoben	20	3.5	19	3.1	3.3
Nelson Traverso	43	4.6	24	4.1	4.4

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

Table 11
Erin White Bradley
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	89	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	71	79.8
Professional reputation	15	16.9
Other personal contacts	3	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	49	69.0
Substantial amount of experience	38	53.5
Moderate amount of experience	19	26.8
Limited amount of experience	14	19.7
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
Private, solo	16	18.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	9	10.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	7.9
Private, corporate employee	1	1.1
Judge or judicial officer	12	13.5
Government	35	39.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	-	-
Other	8	9.0
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.2
5 years or fewer	5	5.6
6 to 10 years	8	9.0
11 to 15 years	12	13.5
16 to 20 years	11	12.4
More than 20 years	51	57.3
Cases Handled		
No response	2	2.2
Prosecution	22	24.7
Criminal	21	23.6
Mixed criminal & civil	23	25.8
Civil	18	20.2
Other	3	3.4
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.1
First District	2	2.2
Second District	-	-
Third District	83	93.3
Fourth District	2	2.2
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	2	2.2
Male	53	59.6
Female	34	38.2

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

Table 12
Erin White Bradley
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	89	3.3	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	71	3.2	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.3	3.2
Experience within last 5 years	49	3.2	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.3
Experience not within last 5 years	22	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.2	3.2
Substantial amount of experience	38	3.3	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.4
Moderate amount of experience	19	2.7	3.8	3.6	3.3	2.9	2.8
Limited amount of experience	14	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.4
Professional reputation	15	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.7
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.0	3.7
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	3.4	4.1	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	3.3	3.8	4.3	3.5	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	1	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Judge or judicial officer	12	3.4	3.8	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.1
Government	31	3.2	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.3
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	7	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.4	2.9	2.7
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.0	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
6 to 10 years	7	3.0	3.6	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.0
11 to 15 years	9	2.9	3.9	3.9	3.2	2.9	2.8
16 to 20 years	9	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3
More than 20 years	39	3.2	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	20	3.1	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.3
Criminal	21	3.2	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	20	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.2
Civil	7	3.1	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.1	3.1
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	65	3.1	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.2
Fourth District	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.5
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	42	3.0	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.2	3.1
Female	27	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.4

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

Table 13
David L. Roghair
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	79	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	68	86.1
Professional reputation	8	10.1
Other personal contacts	3	3.8
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	61	89.7
Substantial amount of experience	18	26.5
Moderate amount of experience	21	30.9
Limited amount of experience	29	42.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	9	11.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	5.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	25	31.6
Government	28	35.4
Public service agency or organization	2	2.5
Retired	1	1.3
Other	4	5.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	7	8.9
6 to 10 years	12	15.2
11 to 15 years	17	21.5
16 to 20 years	8	10.1
More than 20 years	35	44.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	10	12.7
Criminal	6	7.6
Mixed criminal & civil	35	44.3
Civil	22	27.8
Other	6	7.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.8
Second District	9	11.4
Third District	34	43.0
Fourth District	30	38.0
Outside Alaska	2	2.5
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	47	59.5
Female	32	40.5

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

Table 14
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 <i>M</i>
All respondents	79	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	68	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	61	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	18	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	21	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Limited amount of experience	29	4.1	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	8	3.6	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	21	4.1	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.3
Government	25	3.8	4.1	4.0	4.2	3.9	4.0
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.0	4.2
6 to 10 years	11	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1
11 to 15 years	16	3.8	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1
16 to 20 years	6	4.2	4.5	4.7	4.8	4.2	4.5
More than 20 years	29	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.1
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	3.6	4.2	3.6	4.1	3.8	3.8
Criminal	5	3.5	4.0	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	33	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.2
Civil	16	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.3	4.3
Other	4	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.7
Second District	9	4.2	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.6
Third District	26	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.0
Fourth District	28	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.2
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	42	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.1
Female	26	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2

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

Table 15
Dianne Thoben
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	44	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	40	90.9
Professional reputation	2	4.5
Other personal contacts	2	4.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	92.5
Substantial amount of experience	10	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	18	45.0
Limited amount of experience	12	30.0
Type of Practice		
No response	1	2.3
Private, solo	8	18.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	5	11.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	27.3
Government	16	36.4
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	2.3
5 years or fewer	1	2.3
6 to 10 years	11	25.0
11 to 15 years	7	15.9
16 to 20 years	7	15.9
More than 20 years	17	38.6
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	3	6.8
Criminal	8	18.2
Mixed criminal & civil	17	38.6
Civil	13	29.5
Other	3	6.8
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	17	38.6
Second District	2	4.5
Third District	23	52.3
Fourth District	2	4.5
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	2.3
Male	21	47.7
Female	22	50.0

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

Table 16
Dianne Thoben
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	44	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.3	3.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	40	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.3
Experience within last 5 years	37	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.4
Experience not within last 5 years	3	3.0	3.7	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	10	3.4	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.5	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	18	3.4	3.7	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.3
Limited amount of experience	12	3.3	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.2	3.3
Professional reputation	2	3.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.5	3.0
Other personal contacts	2	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	8	3.5	3.7	4.1	3.9	3.4	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.3
Government	15	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.2
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
6 to 10 years	9	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
11 to 15 years	7	2.7	3.0	3.9	3.1	3.0	2.9
16 to 20 years	7	3.1	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.1	2.9
More than 20 years	15	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.4	3.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	3	3.0	2.7	3.7	3.3	2.5	2.7
Criminal	8	4.0	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	17	3.4	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.4
Civil	10	2.9	3.2	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.8
Other	2	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	3.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	16	3.4	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.3
Second District	2	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	1.5	2.0
Third District	20	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.4
Fourth District	2	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	20	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.4	3.5
Female	19	3.2	3.4	3.9	3.3	3.2	3.1

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

Table 17
Nelson Traverso
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	98	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	70	71.4
Professional reputation	21	21.4
Other personal contacts	7	7.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	47	67.1
Substantial amount of experience	21	30.0
Moderate amount of experience	30	42.9
Limited amount of experience	18	25.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	17.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	13.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	7	7.1
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	16	16.3
Government	27	27.6
Public service agency or organization	1	1.0
Retired	1	1.0
Other	16	16.3
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	2.0
5 years or fewer	5	5.1
6 to 10 years	7	7.1
11 to 15 years	12	12.2
16 to 20 years	6	6.1
More than 20 years	66	67.3
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.0
Prosecution	11	11.2
Criminal	11	11.2
Mixed criminal & civil	38	38.8
Civil	27	27.6
Other	10	10.2
Location of Practice		
No response	2	2.0
First District	7	7.1
Second District	1	1.0
Third District	40	40.8
Fourth District	46	46.9
Outside Alaska	2	2.0
Gender		
No response	1	1.0
Male	60	61.2
Female	37	37.8

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

Table 18
Nelson Traverso
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Professional Competence <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Fairness <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Suitability of Experience <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	98	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	70	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	47	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	23	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	21	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	30	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3
Limited amount of experience	18	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Professional reputation	21	4.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	7	4.1	4.6	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.6
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	10	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	8	4.6	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	14	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5
Government	20	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.2
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	10	4.2	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
11 to 15 years	12	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8
16 to 20 years	6	5.0	4.7	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
More than 20 years	44	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	10	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9
Criminal	4	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Mixed criminal & civil	30	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.4
Civil	17	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5
Other	8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.9
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	22	4.0	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.0
Fourth District	40	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Gender*							
Male	44	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6
Female	25	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1

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