



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Kotzebue Superior Court

Technical Report

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

May 18, 2026

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	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating	9
Table 6: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Practice	10
Table 7: Mean Overall Ratings by Length of Alaska Practice	11
Table 8: Mean Overall Ratings by Type of Caseload Handled	12
Table 9: Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice	13
Table 10: Mean Overall Ratings by Gender	14
Table 11: Daniel DalleMolle: Demographic Description of Respondents	15
Table 12: Daniel DalleMolle: Detailed Responses.....	16
Table 13: Nicholas Adam Defreitas: Demographic Description of Respondents	17
Table 14: Nicholas Adam Defreitas: Detailed Responses	18

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Kotzebue Superior Court created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Paul A. Roetman. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of two applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Nicholas Adam Defreitas, and Daniel DalleMolle.

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

	<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>
Daniel DalleMolle	51	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	35	3.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.5

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

2026 Judicial Selection Survey, Kotzebue 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 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: Alaska Court of Appeals, Kotzebue Superior Court, Anchorage Superior Court, and Anchorage District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Kotzebue Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of The Honorable Judge Paul A. Roetman. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of two applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Daniel DalleMolle and Nicholas Adam Defreitas.

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. An email invitation to complete the survey online was sent to 3,817 individuals.

Respondents initiated 793 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; eleven surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; six surveys were excluded because the respondents did not answer any other questions but the certification question. No duplicate survey responses were submitted. Therefore, 776 online surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis revealed a survey return rate of 20.3%. Of the 776 returned surveys, 375 (48.3%) did not rate any of the twenty applicants (four Alaska Court of Appeals applicants, two Kotzebue Superior Court applicants, three Anchorage Superior Court applicants, and 11 Anchorage District Court applicants); 401 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	776	100	401	51.7
Type of Practice				
No response	2	0.3	2	0.5
Private, solo	131	16.9	46	11.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	76	9.8	31	7.7
Private, 6+ attorneys	97	12.5	49	12.2
Private, corporate employee	21	2.7	4	1.0
Judge or judicial officer	72	9.3	60	15.0
Government	218	28.1	155	38.7
Public service agency or organization	35	4.5	18	4.5
Retired	115	14.8	32	8.0
Other	9	1.2	4	1.0
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	64	8.2	24	6.0
5 years or fewer	118	15.2	63	15.7
6 to 10 years	67	8.6	46	11.5
11 to 15 years	101	13.0	72	18.0
16 to 20 years	80	10.3	55	13.7
More than 20 years	346	44.6	141	35.2
Cases Handled				
No response	4	0.5	2	0.5
Prosecution	47	6.1	33	8.2
Criminal	88	11.3	68	17.0
Mixed criminal & civil	187	24.1	109	27.2
Civil	401	51.7	175	43.6
Other	49	6.3	14	3.5
Location of Practice				
No response	4	0.5	2	0.5
First District	89	11.5	30	7.5
Second District	20	2.6	14	3.5
Third District	556	71.6	297	74.1
Fourth District	79	10.2	50	12.5
Outside Alaska	28	3.6	8	2.0
Gender				
No response	5	0.6	3	0.7
Male	423	54.5	193	48.1
Female	342	44.1	204	50.9
Another identity	6	0.8	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.

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. 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. Based on these instructions, ISER implemented procedures to ensure that only one survey was counted for each respondent. Each individual's unique identifier was entered with the data, providing the ability to check for duplication with the completed online surveys.

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. 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 procedures to ensure the accuracy of data entry. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis.

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 11-14 provide a demographics 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
Daniel DalleMolle	63	8.1	81.0	19.0	-
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	41	5.3	85.4	14.6	-

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>
Daniel DalleMolle	63	4.5	5.0	0.7	51	4.6	5.0	0.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	41	3.6	4.0	1.2	35	3.5	3.0	1.2

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>	%
Daniel DalleMolle	51	-	-	-	-	4	7.8	13	25.5	34	4.4
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	35	1	0.1	6	0.8	11	1.4	7	0.9	10	1.3

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>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>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Daniel DalleMolle	7	4.6	1	5.0	3	4.7	-	-	8	4.5	26	4.7	1	4.0	4	4.3	-	-	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	-	-	-	-	1	4.0	-	-	12	4.3	21	3.1	-	-	-	-	1	2.0	3.5

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>	
Daniel DalleMolle	5	4.8	10	4.8	13	4.8	8	4.6	13	4.0	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	6	3.8	10	3.2	5	3.4	8	4.0	5	3.8	3.5

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>
Daniel DalleMolle	6	4.2	14	4.8	23	4.4	5	5.0	2	5.0	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	2	3.0	10	3.2	15	4.0	5	3.8	3	2.3	3.5

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

Table 9
Mean Overall Ratings by Location of Practice

	First District		Second District		Third District		Fourth District		Outside Alaska		Overall <i>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Daniel DalleMolle	6	4.7	11	4.8	29	4.5	4	4.5	-	-	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	2	3.5	8	3.8	17	3.2	8	4.1	-	-	3.5

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>M</i>
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	
Daniel DalleMolle	28	4.6	22	4.5	-	-	4.6
Nicholas Adam Defreitas	13	4.2	22	3.2	-	-	3.5

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

Table 11:
Daniel DalleMolle
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	63	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	51	81.0
Professional reputation	12	19.0
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	41	80.4
Substantial amount of experience	21	41.2
Moderate amount of experience	16	31.4
Limited amount of experience	14	27.5
Type of Practice		
No response	1	1.6
Private, solo	8	12.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	2	3.2
Private, 6+ attorneys	4	6.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	12.7
Government	34	54.0
Public service agency or organization	2	3.2
Retired	4	6.3
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	3.2
5 years or fewer	9	14.3
6 to 10 years	14	22.2
11 to 15 years	15	23.8
16 to 20 years	9	14.3
More than 20 years	14	22.2
Cases Handled		
No response	1	1.6
Prosecution	7	11.1
Criminal	19	30.2
Mixed criminal & civil	24	38.1
Civil	9	14.3
Other	3	4.8
Location of Practice		
No response	1	1.6
First District	9	14.3
Second District	13	20.6
Third District	33	52.4
Fourth District	7	11.1
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	1	1.6
Male	33	52.4
Female	29	46.0
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12:
Daniel DalleMolle
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	63	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	51	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	41	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	10	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	21	4.6	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Limited amount of experience	14	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3
Professional reputation	12	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.5
Government	26	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7
Public service agency or organization	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Retired	4	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.3
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	5	4.8	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8
6 to 10 years	10	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
11 to 15 years	13	4.4	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8
16 to 20 years	8	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.6
More than 20 years	13	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	6	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Criminal	14	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.0	4.9	4.8
Mixed criminal & civil	23	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4
Civil	5	4.6	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	6	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7
Second District	11	4.7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.8
Third District	29	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Fourth District	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	28	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
Female	22	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
Nicholas Adam Defreitas
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	35	85.4
Professional reputation	6	14.6
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	32	91.4
Substantial amount of experience	12	35.3
Moderate amount of experience	18	52.9
Limited amount of experience	4	11.8
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	-	-
Private, 6+ attorneys	2	4.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	31.7
Government	24	58.5
Public service agency or organization	1	2.4
Retired	-	-
Other	1	2.4
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	2	4.9
5 years or fewer	8	19.5
6 to 10 years	12	29.3
11 to 15 years	6	14.6
16 to 20 years	8	19.5
More than 20 years	5	12.2
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	2	4.9
Criminal	11	26.8
Mixed criminal & civil	19	46.3
Civil	6	14.6
Other	3	7.3
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	7.3
Second District	8	19.5
Third District	20	48.8
Fourth District	10	24.4
Outside Alaska	-	-
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	18	43.9
Female	23	56.1
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 14
Nicholas Adam Defreitas
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	41	3.5	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.6
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	35	3.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.5
Experience within last 5 years	32	3.4	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6
Experience not within last 5 years	3	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.7	2.7	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	12	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.3
Moderate amount of experience	18	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.1	3.7	3.7
Limited amount of experience	4	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	6	4.0	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 2-5 attorneys	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private, 6+ attorneys	1	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	12	4.1	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.3
Government	21	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.1
Public service agency or organization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	2.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	6	4.0	4.5	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
6 to 10 years	10	2.7	3.5	3.4	3.3	2.9	3.2
11 to 15 years	5	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.4
16 to 20 years	8	3.5	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
More than 20 years	5	3.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	2	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0
Criminal	10	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.2
Mixed criminal & civil	15	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0
Civil	5	3.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	3.8	3.8
Other	3	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.3	2.3
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5
Second District	8	3.5	4.3	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8
Third District	17	3.1	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.1	3.2
Fourth District	8	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	13	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.1	4.2
Female	22	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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