UAA Institute of Social and Economic Research
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Bethel District Court

Technical Report

Ashley Schroeder, MPH, Research Professional
Ashley Hannigan, MA, MPH, Research Professional

February 16-20, 2026

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Bethel District Court created by the appointment of Judge William T. Montgomery to the Bethel Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Joy Anderson, David R. Boyer, Jason Conrad, and Roberta C. Erwin.

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.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of Applicants

	n	Professional Competence *M*	Integrity *M*	Fairness *M*	Judicial Temperament *M*	Suitability of Experience *M*	Overall *M*
Joy Anderson	37	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.6
David R. Boyer	37	3.5	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9
Jason Conrad	27	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	63	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6

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

2026 Judicial Selection Survey, Bethel District 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 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. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

A single selection survey was conducted for the following judicial vacancies: Anchorage District Court and Bethel District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Bethel District Court, created by the appointment of Judge William T. Montgomery to the Bethel Superior Court. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Joy Anderson, David R. Boyer, Jason Conrad, and Roberta C. Erwin.

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 3,812 individuals invited to participate, all individuals received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received a paper version of the survey.

Respondents initiated 670 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; four surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; one survey was excluded because the respondent did not answer any other questions but the certification question. Therefore, 665 online surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 665 online surveys for a survey return rate of 17.4%. Of the 665 returned surveys, 271 (40.8%) did not rate any of the 14 applicants (ten Anchorage District Court applicants and four Bethel District Court applicants); 394 (59.2%) 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	
		n	*%*	*n*	*%*
	All respondents	**665**	**100**	**394**	**59.2**
Type of Practice					
	No response	2	0.3	1	0.3
	Private, solo	124	18.6	56	14.2
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	68	10.2	37	9.4
	Private, 6+ attorneys	88	13.2	49	12.4
	Private, corporate employee	17	2.6	5	1.3
	Judge or judicial officer	58	8.7	47	11.9
	Government	176	26.5	145	36.8
	Public service agency or organization	27	4.1	21	5.3
	Retired	95	14.3	26	6.6
	Other	10	1.5	7	1.8
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	32	4.8	9	2.3
	5 years or fewer	77	11.6	53	13.5
	6 to 10 years	56	8.4	47	11.9
	11 to 15 years	92	13.8	79	20.1
	16 to 20 years	73	11.0	54	13.7
	More than 20 years	335	50.4	152	38.6
Cases Handled					
	No response	5	0.8	1	0.3
	Prosecution	38	5.7	36	9.1
	Criminal	66	9.9	55	14.0
	Mixed criminal & civil	165	24.8	107	27.2
	Civil	341	51.3	175	44.4
	Other	50	7.5	20	5.1
Location of Practice					
	No response	6	0.9	4	1.0
	First District	71	10.7	24	6.1
	Second District	13	2.0	9	2.3
	Third District	478	71.9	312	79.2
	Fourth District	71	10.7	38	9.6
	Outside Alaska	26	3.9	7	1.8
Gender					
	No response	9	1.4	4	1.0
	Male	362	54.4	199	50.5
	Female	292	43.9	190	48.2
	Another identity	2	0.3	1	0.3

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.

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) *Poor*	(2) *Deficient*	(3) *Acceptable*	(4) *Good*	(5) *Excellent*
Professional Competence	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
Integrity	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
Fairness	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
Judicial Temperament	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
Suitability of Experience	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
Overall Rating	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. 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 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 survey respondents regarding how to handle the survey.

For the online data collection, each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once. ISER analyzed frequencies of the unique identifier variable to identify any duplicate responses. Five duplicate surveys were identified. Of the duplicates, the most complete survey data was 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.

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 the Applicants

	n	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on… Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Joy Anderson	57	8.6	68.4	31.6	-
David R. Boyer	41	6.2	92.7	4.9	2.4
Jason Conrad	30	4.5	90.0	10.0	-
Roberta C. Erwin	89	13.4	71.9	24.7	3.4

Table 4
Summary of Overall Ratings

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	n	***M***	***Mdn***	***SD***	***n***	***M***	***Mdn***	***SD***
Joy Anderson	54	4.6	5.0	0.7	37	4.6	5.0	0.6
David R. Boyer	40	3.9	4.0	1.2	37	3.9	4.0	1.2
Jason Conrad	30	2.3	2.0	1.1	27	2.4	2.0	1.2
Roberta C. Erwin	85	3.6	4.0	1.4	63	3.6	4.0	1.3

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

		Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
	n	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Joy Anderson	37	-	-	-	-	2	5.4	9	24.3	26	70.3
David R. Boyer	37	1	2.7	5	13.5	8	21.6	7	18.9	16	43.2
Jason Conrad	27	7	25.9	10	37.0	4	14.8	5	18.5	1	3.7
Roberta C. Erwin	63	5	7.9	12	19.0	7	11.1	17	27.0	22	34.9

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		Other		Overall
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*M*
Joy Anderson	1	4.0	4	4.8	1	5.0	-	-	6	5.0	10	4.3	11	4.6	2	5.0	2	5.0	4.6
David R. Boyer	-	-	6	3.0	-	-	-	-	7	4.9	19	3.8	3	3.7	1	3.0	1	4.0	3.9
Jason Conrad	2	3.0	4	2.3	-	-	-	-	3	2.3	16	2.3	1	2.0	-	-	1	3.0	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	16	4.3	12	3.3	2	4.5	2	4.5	14	3.0	5	3.6	2	3.0	9	3.6	1	4.0	3.6

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
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*M*
Joy Anderson	1	4.0	5	4.8	14	4.4	6	4.8	11	4.8	4.6
David R. Boyer	4	4.3	9	3.6	11	4.1	5	2.6	8	4.5	3.9
Jason Conrad	6	2.2	6	2.0	5	2.2	4	2.3	6	3.2	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	3	3.7	-	-	4	3.8	6	2.8	46	3.7	3.6

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
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*M*
Joy Anderson	-	-	3	3.7	11	4.8	20	4.8	3	4.3	4.6
David R. Boyer	5	3.4	3	3.3	20	3.9	8	4.5	1	3.0	3.9
Jason Conrad	9	2.4	4	2.0	14	2.4	-	-	-	-	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	-	-	-	-	23	3.4	33	3.8	7	3.7	3.6

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
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*M*
Joy Anderson	2	5.0	2	5.0	26	4.7	6	4.5	-	-	4.6
David R. Boyer	1	3.0	1	4.0	11	3.4	24	4.1	-	-	3.9
Jason Conrad	1	4.0	1	2.0	9	2.6	16	2.2	-	-	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	2	2.0	-	-	60	3.7	-	-	-	-	3.6

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

Table 10
Mean Overall Ratings by Gender

	Male		Female		Another identity		Overall
	n	*M*	*n*	*M*	*n*	*M*	*M*
Joy Anderson	12	4.5	24	4.7	1	+	4.6
David R. Boyer	21	3.9	16	3.9	-	-	3.9
Jason Conrad	17	2.8	10	1.7	-	-	2.4
Roberta C. Erwin	28	4.1	34	3.2	-	-	3.6

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

Table 11
Joy Anderson
Demographic Description of Respondents

		n	*%*
	All respondents	**57**	**100**
Experience with Applicant			
	Direct professional experience	39	68.4
	Professional reputation	18	31.6
	Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	94.9
	Substantial amount of experience	14	35.9
	Moderate amount of experience	14	35.9
	Limited amount of experience	11	28.2
Type of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	Private, solo	1	1.8
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	10.5
	Private, 6+ attorneys	3	5.3
	Private, corporate employee	2	3.5
	Judge or judicial officer	7	12.3
	Government	19	33.3
	Public service agency or organization	13	22.8
	Retired	3	5.3
	Other	3	5.3
Length of Alaska Practice			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	6	10.5
	6 to 10 years	8	14.0
	11 to 15 years	17	29.8
	16 to 20 years	10	17.5
	More than 20 years	16	28.1
Cases Handled			
	No response	-	-
	Prosecution	4	7.0
	Criminal	3	5.3
	Mixed criminal & civil	17	29.8
	Civil	30	52.6
	Other	3	5.3
Location of Practice			
	No response	1	1.8
	First District	3	5.3
	Second District	3	5.3
	Third District	38	66.7
	Fourth District	12	21.1
	Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender			
	No response	-	-
	Male	21	36.8
	Female	34	59.6
	Another identity	1	1.8

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

Table 12
Joy Anderson
Detailed Responses

	n	Professional Competence *M*	Integrity *M*	Fairness *M*	Judicial Temperament *M*	Suitability of Experience *M*	Overall *M*
All respondents	57	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.2	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	**39**	**4.5**	**4.8**	**4.8**	**4.8**	**4.3**	**4.6**
Experience within last 5 years	37	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.3	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	14	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.6	4.9
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.1	4.6
Limited amount of experience	11	4.3	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.0	4.2
Professional reputation	18	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.2	5.0
Government	12	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6	3.8	4.3
Public service agency or organization	11	4.3	4.9	4.9	5.0	4.4	4.6
Retired	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
6 to 10 years	5	4.6	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.4	4.8
11 to 15 years	15	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.1	4.4
16 to 20 years	6	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.8
More than 20 years	11	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	3	4.3	4.7	4.3	5.0	3.0	3.7
Mixed criminal & civil	11	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.8
Civil	22	4.5	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.4	4.8
Other	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	28	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7
Fourth District	6	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0	3.7	4.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	13	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8	4.1	4.5
Female	25	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3	4.7
Another identity	1	+	+	+	+	+	+

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

Table 13
David R. Boyer
Demographic Description of Respondents

		n	*%*
	All respondents	**41**	**100**
Experience with Applicant			
	Direct professional experience	38	92.7
	Professional reputation	2	4.9
	Other personal contacts	1	2.4
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	37	97.4
	Substantial amount of experience	16	42.1
	Moderate amount of experience	17	44.7
	Limited amount of experience	5	13.2
Type of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	Private, solo	-	-
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	14.6
	Private, 6+ attorneys	1	2.4
	Private, corporate employee	-	-
	Judge or judicial officer	7	17.1
	Government	22	53.7
	Public service agency or organization	3	7.3
	Retired	1	2.4
	Other	1	2.4
Length of Alaska Practice			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	5	12.2
	6 to 10 years	10	24.4
	11 to 15 years	11	26.8
	16 to 20 years	6	14.6
	More than 20 years	9	22.0
Cases Handled			
	No response	-	-
	Prosecution	7	17.1
	Criminal	3	7.3
	Mixed criminal & civil	21	51.2
	Civil	8	19.5
	Other	2	4.9
Location of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	First District	1	2.4
	Second District	1	2.4
	Third District	14	34.1
	Fourth District	25	61.0
	Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender			
	No response	-	-
	Male	23	56.1
	Female	18	43.9
	Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
David R. Boyer
Detailed Responses

	n	Professional Competence *M*	Integrity *M*	Fairness *M*	Judicial Temperament *M*	Suitability of Experience *M*	Overall *M*
All respondents	41	3.6	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.8	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	**38**	**3.5**	**4.2**	**4.1**	**4.1**	**3.8**	**3.9**
Experience within last 5 years	37	3.5	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.9	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	16	3.8	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.9	3.9
Moderate amount of experience	17	3.5	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9
Limited amount of experience	5	2.8	4.0	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.3
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	6	3.3	4.3	3.8	4.0	2.8	3.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.9
Government	20	3.3	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.8
Public service agency or organization	3	3.3	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7
Retired	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	4.0	4.8	3.7	4.3	3.7	4.3
6 to 10 years	10	2.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6
11 to 15 years	11	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.1	4.1
16 to 20 years	5	2.6	4.0	3.4	3.3	2.6	2.6
More than 20 years	8	4.0	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.6	4.5
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	2.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.4
Criminal	3	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	20	3.6	4.4	4.1	4.3	3.8	3.9
Civil	8	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.5
Other	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Third District	12	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.4
Fourth District	24	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.1
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	21	3.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.9
Female	17	3.4	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Jason Conrad
Demographic Description of Respondents

		n	*%*
	All respondents	**30**	**100**
Experience with Applicant			
	Direct professional experience	27	90.0
	Professional reputation	3	10.0
	Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100
	Substantial amount of experience	15	55.6
	Moderate amount of experience	9	33.3
	Limited amount of experience	3	11.1
Type of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	Private, solo	2	6.7
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	13.3
	Private, 6+ attorneys	1	3.3
	Private, corporate employee	-	-
	Judge or judicial officer	3	10.0
	Government	17	56.7
	Public service agency or organization	1	3.3
	Retired	1	3.3
	Other	1	3.3
Length of Alaska Practice			
	No response	-	-
	5 years or fewer	6	20.0
	6 to 10 years	7	23.3
	11 to 15 years	5	16.7
	16 to 20 years	5	16.7
	More than 20 years	7	23.3
Cases Handled			
	No response	-	-
	Prosecution	11	36.7
	Criminal	4	13.3
	Mixed criminal & civil	15	50.0
	Civil	-	-
	Other	-	-
Location of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	First District	1	3.3
	Second District	1	3.3
	Third District	12	40.0
	Fourth District	16	53.3
	Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender			
	No response	-	-
	Male	18	60.0
	Female	12	40.0
	Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Jason Conrad
Detailed Responses

	n	Professional Competence *M*	Integrity *M*	Fairness *M*	Judicial Temperament *M*	Suitability of Experience *M*	Overall *M*
All respondents	30	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.3	2.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	**27**	**2.7**	**3.2**	**2.9**	**2.5**	**2.4**	**2.4**
Experience within last 5 years	27	2.7	3.2	2.9	2.5	2.4	2.4
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	15	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.3	2.5	2.4
Moderate amount of experience	9	2.6	3.4	3.0	3.0	2.3	2.3
Limited amount of experience	3	2.3	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.0	2.3
Professional reputation	3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	2	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	2.3	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	3	2.3	3.7	3.7	3.0	2.3	2.3
Government	16	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.3
Public service agency or organization	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.0	2.5	2.2
6 to 10 years	6	2.2	2.3	2.2	1.7	2.0	2.0
11 to 15 years	5	2.4	3.2	2.6	2.0	1.8	2.2
16 to 20 years	4	2.3	3.5	3.3	3.3	2.5	2.3
More than 20 years	6	3.5	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	9	2.9	3.2	3.0	2.3	2.7	2.4
Criminal	4	2.3	3.0	2.3	2.0	1.3	2.0
Mixed criminal & civil	14	2.6	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.4
Civil	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Second District	1	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0
Third District	9	2.7	3.6	3.2	3.4	2.4	2.6
Fourth District	16	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.1	2.2	2.2
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	17	3.1	3.6	3.4	2.8	2.6	2.8
Female	10	1.9	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 17
Roberta C. Erwin
Demographic Description of Respondents

		n	*%*
	All respondents	**89**	**100**
Experience with Applicant			
	Direct professional experience	64	71.9
	Professional reputation	22	24.7
	Other personal contacts	3	3.4
Detailed Experience*			
	Recent experience (within last 5 years)	35	54.7
	Substantial amount of experience	14	21.9
	Moderate amount of experience	30	46.9
	Limited amount of experience	20	31.3
Type of Practice			
	No response	-	-
	Private, solo	24	27.0
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	15	16.9
	Private, 6+ attorneys	6	6.7
	Private, corporate employee	2	2.2
	Judge or judicial officer	16	18.0
	Government	9	10.1
	Public service agency or organization	4	4.5
	Retired	12	13.5
	Other	1	1.1
Length of Alaska Practice			
	No response	5	5.6
	5 years or fewer	3	3.4
	6 to 10 years	3	3.4
	11 to 15 years	6	6.7
	16 to 20 years	10	11.2
	More than 20 years	62	69.7
Cases Handled			
	No response	-	-
	Prosecution	1	1.1
	Criminal	-	-
	Mixed criminal & civil	35	39.3
	Civil	43	48.3
	Other	10	11.2
Location of Practice			
	No response	1	1.1
	First District	2	2.2
	Second District	1	1.1
	Third District	82	92.1
	Fourth District	2	2.2
	Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender			
	No response	2	2.2
	Male	41	46.1
	Female	46	51.7
	Another identity	-	-

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

Table 18
Roberta C. Erwin
Detailed Responses

	n	Professional Competence *M*	Integrity *M*	Fairness *M*	Judicial Temperament *M*	Suitability of Experience *M*	Overall *M*
All respondents	89	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	**64**	**3.8**	**3.9**	**3.8**	**3.7**	**3.7**	**3.6**
Experience within last 5 years	35	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5
Experience not within last 5 years	29	4.0	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8
Substantial amount of experience	14	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.2
Moderate amount of experience	30	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7
Limited amount of experience	20	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	22	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.3
Other personal contacts	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	16	4.5	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3
Private, 2-5 attorneys	12	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Private, corporate employee	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5
Judge or judicial officer	15	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.0
Government	5	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.6
Public service agency or organization	2	3.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.0
Retired	9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.6
Other	1	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	3	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.3	3.7
6 to 10 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11 to 15 years	4	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8
16 to 20 years	6	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.2	3.7	2.8
More than 20 years	47	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mixed criminal & civil	24	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.4
Civil	33	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8
Other	7	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.7
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.0
Second District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Third District	61	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Fourth District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	29	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.1
Female	34	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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