



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, Research Professional

May 19-23, 2025

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

www.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
Table 3: Level of Experience with Applicants	8
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	9
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	10
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	11
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	12
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	13
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	14
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	15
Table 11: Joy Anderson: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Joy Anderson: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: Colleen Baxter: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: Colleen Baxter: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Matthew W. Faulks: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Matthew W. Faulks: Detailed Responses	21

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 three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Joy Anderson, Colleen Baxter, and Matthew W. Faulks.

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

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Joy Anderson	22	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.6
Colleen Baxter	42	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	23	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.8

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

2025 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. 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 Superior 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 three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Joy Anderson, Colleen Baxter, and Matthew W. Faulks.

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 3,808 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,795) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. One individual received only a paper version of the survey and 12 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 515 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; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; three surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No online survey was returned by an individual who also completed a paper survey. Therefore, 506 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned two 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 it was unsigned. No paper survey was excluded because the respondent 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. One paper survey was signed and returned without a printed name or address on the return envelope. The signature on that survey had no discernable letters, and the respondent could not be identified. That survey was excluded from data entry and analysis. Therefore, one paper survey qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 506 online surveys and one paper survey, for a total of 507 surveys and a survey return rate of 13.31%. Of the 507 returned surveys, 214 (42.2%) did not rate any of the nine applicants (six Anchorage Superior Court applicants and three Bethel District Court applicants); 293 (57.8%) respondents evaluated one or more applicants. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2
Respondent Characteristics

		All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Applicant	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents		507	100	293	57.8
Type of Practice					
	No response	3	0.6	2	0.7
	Private, solo	78	15.4	25	8.5
	Private, 2-5 attorneys	58	11.4	25	8.5
	Private, 6+ attorneys	70	13.8	39	13.3
	Private, corporate employee	17	3.4	11	3.8
	Judge or judicial officer	52	10.3	47	16.0
	Government	118	23.3	91	31.1
	Public service agency or organization	24	4.7	20	6.8
	Retired	74	14.6	28	9.6
	Other	13	2.6	5	1.7
Length of Alaska Practice					
	No response	26	5.1	9	3.1
	5 years or fewer	55	10.8	32	10.9
	6 to 10 years	45	8.9	30	10.2
	11 to 15 years	56	11.0	46	15.7
	16 to 20 years	45	8.9	32	10.9
	More than 20 years	280	55.2	144	49.1
Cases Handled					
	No response	9	1.8	2	0.7
	Prosecution	32	6.3	28	9.6
	Criminal	30	5.9	24	8.2
	Mixed criminal & civil	124	24.5	87	29.7
	Civil	276	54.4	139	47.4
	Other	36	7.1	13	4.4
Location of Practice					
	No response	5	1.0	1	0.3
	First District	52	10.3	17	5.8
	Second District	14	2.8	12	4.1
	Third District	350	69.0	230	78.5
	Fourth District	56	11.0	29	9.9
	Outside Alaska	30	5.9	4	1.4
Gender					
	No response	6	1.2	2	0.7
	Male	288	56.8	153	52.2
	Female	212	41.8	138	47.1
	Another identity	1	0.2	-	-

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the applicants for the vacancy, questions about demographic information for each respondent, six evaluation items for each applicant, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each applicant.

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 locked office. 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. One paper survey was signed and returned without a printed name or address on the return envelope. The signature on this survey had no discernable letters, and the respondent could not be identified. 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. 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 data was entered using an electronic system similar to the online survey that prevents out-of-range responses. After the paper surveys were entered, a second staff member verified all entries and corrected any mistakes, using paper data as verification. 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. 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 11-16 provide a demographic summary of respondents and detailed information on ratings provided by respondent characteristic.

Table 3
Level of Experience with the Applicants

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated applicant	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Joy Anderson	29	5.7	75.9	17.2	6.9
Colleen Baxter	55	10.8	76.4	18.2	5.5
Matthew W. Faulks	24	4.7	95.8	4.2	-

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>
Joy Anderson	29	4.6	5.0	0.6	22	4.6	5.0	0.6
Colleen Baxter	53	4.3	5.0	1.2	40	4.3	5.0	1.3
Matthew W. Faulks	23	2.8	3.0	1.1	22	2.8	3.0	1.1

Table 5
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Joy Anderson	22	-	-	-	-	1	4.5	6	27.3	15	68.2
Colleen Baxter	40	3	7.5	3	7.5	2	5.0	3	7.5	29	72.5
Matthew W. Faulks	22	2	9.1	8	36.4	6	27.3	4	18.2	2	9.1

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>
Joy Anderson	1	5.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	1	5.0	4	4.0	4	4.3	8	4.9	-	-	-	-	4.6
Colleen Baxter	5	3.6	3	4.0	2	3.5	1	5.0	15	4.8	11	3.9	-	-	3	5.0	-	-	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	-	-	1	2.0	-	-	-	-	5	2.6	13	3.1	3	2.3	-	-	-	-	2.8

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>
Joy Anderson	4	5.0	3	4.7	8	4.4	2	4.5	5	4.8	4.6
Colleen Baxter	6	4.3	3	2.7	6	4.0	5	4.4	19	4.6	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	7	3.1	6	2.7	5	2.6	2	2.5	2	3.0	2.8

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>	
Joy Anderson	-	-	1	4.0	8	4.3	10	4.9	3	5.0	4.6
Colleen Baxter	5	4.4	2	5.0	21	4.1	10	4.4	2	4.5	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	5	2.4	3	3.3	9	3.0	4	2.5	1	3.0	2.8

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>	
Joy Anderson	-	-	1	5.0	13	4.7	8	4.5	-	-	4.6
Colleen Baxter	1	5.0	9	4.6	24	4.3	6	3.7	-	-	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	1	3.0	2	2.5	5	3.4	14	2.6	-	-	2.8

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
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Joy Anderson	7	4.4	15	4.7	-	-	4.6
Colleen Baxter	23	4.6	17	3.9	-	-	4.3
Matthew W. Faulks	10	2.9	12	2.8	-	-	2.8

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

Table 11
Joy Anderson
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	22	75.9
Professional reputation	5	17.2
Other personal contacts	2	6.9
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	95.5
Substantial amount of experience	9	40.9
Moderate amount of experience	6	27.3
Limited amount of experience	7	31.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	1	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	6.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	6.9
Private, corporate employee	2	6.9
Judge or judicial officer	4	13.8
Government	10	34.5
Public service agency or organization	8	27.6
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	6	20.7
6 to 10 years	6	20.7
11 to 15 years	8	27.6
16 to 20 years	3	10.3
More than 20 years	6	20.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	2	6.9
Criminal	1	3.4
Mixed criminal & civil	9	31.0
Civil	14	48.3
Other	3	10.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	3.4
Second District	1	3.4
Third District	17	58.6
Fourth District	10	34.5
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	9	31.0
Female	20	69.0
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Joy Anderson
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	29	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	22	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.4	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.4	4.7
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0
Limited amount of experience	7	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.7	4.0	4.3
Professional reputation	5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.4
Other personal contacts	2	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	4	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0	3.0	4.0
Government	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.8	4.0	4.3
Public service agency or organization	8	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8	5.0	4.9
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0
6 to 10 years	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.7
11 to 15 years	8	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.1	4.4
16 to 20 years	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5
More than 20 years	5	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.4	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Criminal	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0
Mixed criminal & civil	8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.9	3.8	4.3
Civil	10	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.9
Other	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Second District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	13	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.7
Fourth District	8	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.1	4.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.0	4.4
Female	15	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.7
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Colleen Baxter
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	55	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	42	76.4
Professional reputation	10	18.2
Other personal contacts	3	5.5
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	38	92.7
Substantial amount of experience	14	34.1
Moderate amount of experience	16	39.0
Limited amount of experience	11	26.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	8	14.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	5.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	7.3
Private, corporate employee	1	1.8
Judge or judicial officer	18	32.7
Government	17	30.9
Public service agency or organization	-	-
Retired	4	7.3
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	1	1.8
5 years or fewer	7	12.7
6 to 10 years	4	7.3
11 to 15 years	8	14.5
16 to 20 years	6	10.9
More than 20 years	29	52.7
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	7	12.7
Criminal	2	3.6
Mixed criminal & civil	27	49.1
Civil	17	30.9
Other	2	3.6
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	2	3.6
Second District	10	18.2
Third District	37	67.3
Fourth District	6	10.9
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	27	49.1
Female	28	50.9
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Colleen Baxter
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	55	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	42	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	38	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	3	4.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	14	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.2
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4
Limited amount of experience	11	4.3	4.3	4.4	3.9	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	10	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2
Other personal contacts	3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.3
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	5	4.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.5
Private, corporate employee	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Judge or judicial officer	15	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.8	4.8
Government	12	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.3
6 to 10 years	4	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
11 to 15 years	6	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0
16 to 20 years	5	4.2	4.0	4.6	4.0	4.4	4.4
More than 20 years	20	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4
Criminal	2	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0
Mixed criminal & civil	22	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
Civil	11	4.7	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
Other	2	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Second District	10	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.6
Third District	25	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	6	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	24	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	18	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.9
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Matthew W. Faulks
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	24	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	23	95.8
Professional reputation	1	4.2
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	23	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	39.1
Moderate amount of experience	10	43.5
Limited amount of experience	4	17.4
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	12.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	20.8
Government	13	54.2
Public service agency or organization	3	12.5
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	7	29.2
6 to 10 years	6	25.0
11 to 15 years	6	25.0
16 to 20 years	3	12.5
More than 20 years	2	8.3
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	5	20.8
Criminal	3	12.5
Mixed criminal & civil	11	45.8
Civil	4	16.7
Other	1	4.2
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	1	4.2
Second District	2	8.3
Third District	7	29.2
Fourth District	14	58.3
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	11	45.8
Female	13	54.2
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Matthew W. Faulks
Detailed Responses

		Professional Competence	Integrity	Fairness	Judicial Temperament	Suitability of Experience	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
All respondents	24	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.8
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	23	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.8
Experience within last 5 years	23	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	9	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.0
Moderate amount of experience	10	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.3	2.6	2.8
Limited amount of experience	4	2.3	3.3	3.7	2.3	2.8	2.3
Professional reputation	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Other personal contacts	-						
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	5	2.8	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.4	2.6
Government	13	3.0	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.1
Public service agency or organization	3	2.0	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.3
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.1
6 to 10 years	6	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.7
11 to 15 years	5	2.8	3.4	3.2	2.8	2.4	2.6
16 to 20 years	3	2.3	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	2.5
More than 20 years	2	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	5	2.4	2.6	3.0	2.6	2.2	2.4
Criminal	3	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.3
Mixed criminal & civil	10	2.9	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.0	3.0
Civil	4	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	2.5
Other	1	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	2	2.5	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	2.5
Third District	6	3.0	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.4
Fourth District	14	2.6	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.6	2.6
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	11	2.9	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.0	2.9
Female	12	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.7	2.8
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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