



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

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Selection Survey

Bethel Superior Court

Technical Report

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

January 22-26, 2024

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: Mark Clark: Demographic Description of Respondents	16
Table 12: Mark Clark: Detailed Responses	17
Table 13: William T. Montgomery: Demographic Description of Respondents	18
Table 14: William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses	19
Table 15: Sam Turner: Demographic Description of Respondents	20
Table 16: Sam Turner: 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 Superior Court created by the appointment of Judge Terrence Haas to the position of public defender. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Mark Clark, William T. Montgomery, and Sam Turner.

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>
Mark Clark	76	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.3
William T. Montgomery	83	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.5
Sam Turner	37	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.9	3.4	3.7

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

2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Bethel 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. 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: Juneau Superior Court, Sitka Superior Court, and Bethel Superior Court. This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Bethel Superior Court created by the appointment of Judge Terrence Haas to the position of public defender. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of three applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Mark Clark, William T. Montgomery, and Sam Turner.

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 3,765 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,751) received only an email invitation to complete the survey online. No individuals received only a paper version of the survey and 14 individuals received both the paper and online versions of the survey.

Respondents initiated 675 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; three surveys were excluded because the respondents did not progress far enough in the survey to reach the certification question; four 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, 668 online surveys qualified for analysis.

Respondents also returned four 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. One 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. Therefore, three paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 668 online surveys and three paper surveys, for a total of 671 surveys and a survey return rate of 17.8%. Of the 671 returned surveys, 265 (39.5%) did not rate any of the 14 applicants (seven Juneau Superior Court applicants, four Sitka Superior Court applicants, and three Bethel Superior Court

applicants); 406 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	671	100	406	100
Type of Practice				
No response	1	0.1	1	0.2
Private, solo	118	17.6	63	15.5
Private, 2-5 attorneys	74	11.0	40	9.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	79	11.8	35	8.6
Private, corporate employee	14	2.1	3	0.7
Judge or judicial officer	62	9.2	55	13.5
Government	182	27.1	150	36.9
Public service agency or organization	29	4.3	21	5.2
Retired	100	14.9	32	7.9
Other	12	1.8	6	1.5
Length of Alaska Practice				
No response	39	5.8	19	4.7
5 years or fewer	89	13.3	71	17.5
6 to 10 years	65	9.7	49	12.1
11 to 15 years	75	11.2	56	13.8
16 to 20 years	69	10.3	44	10.8
More than 20 years	334	49.8	167	41.1
Cases Handled				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.2
Prosecution	45	6.7	36	8.9
Criminal	71	10.6	55	13.5
Mixed criminal & civil	165	24.6	127	31.3
Civil	342	51.0	165	40.6
Other	44	6.6	22	5.4
Location of Practice				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.2
First District	109	16.2	76	18.7
Second District	11	1.6	8	2.0
Third District	446	66.5	271	66.7
Fourth District	71	10.6	41	10.1
Outside Alaska	30	4.5	9	2.2
Gender				
No response	8	1.2	4	1.0
Male	352	52.5	200	49.3
Female	309	46.1	200	49.3
Another identity	2	0.3	2	0.5

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. 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 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 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
Mark Clark	87	13.0	87.4	11.5	1.1
William T. Montgomery	102	15.2	81.4	17.6	1.0
Sam Turner	68	10.1	54.4	26.5	19.1

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>
Mark Clark	87	4.1	4.0	1.0	76	4.3	4.5	0.9
William T. Montgomery	102	4.4	5.0	0.9	83	4.5	5.0	0.9
Sam Turner	66	3.9	4.0	1.2	37	3.7	4.0	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>	%
Mark Clark	76	-	-	5	6.6	7	9.2	26	34.2	38	50.0
William T. Montgomery	83	1	1.2	5	6.0	5	6.0	15	18.1	57	68.7
Sam Turner	37	-	-	9	24.3	4	10.8	13	35.1	11	29.7

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>	
Mark Clark	3	3.7	1	5.0	8	4.4	-	-	7	4.1	55	4.3	2	4.0	-	-	-	-	4.3
William T. Montgomery	7	4.7	4	3.8	3	4.7	-	-	28	5.0	32	4.0	2	5.0	4	4.5	3	5.0	4.5
Sam Turner	1	4.0	1	5.0	3	3.3	-	-	10	3.6	20	3.6	1	5.0	1	5.0	-	-	3.7

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>
Mark Clark	21	4.4	18	4.2	12	4.2	9	4.4	16	4.2	4.3
William T. Montgomery	7	4.7	18	4.1	10	4.0	11	4.3	32	4.8	4.5
Sam Turner	9	3.8	10	3.4	2	3.5	6	3.8	10	3.9	3.7

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>
Mark Clark	19	4.4	17	4.2	29	4.2	10	4.5	1	3.0	4.3
William T. Montgomery	8	4.0	14	4.4	52	4.6	7	4.1	2	5.0	4.5
Sam Turner	4	3.0	12	3.8	16	3.6	3	4.3	2	4.5	3.7

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>	
Mark Clark	3	4.3	2	3.5	57	4.3	13	4.2	1	4.0	4.3
William T. Montgomery	5	4.2	4	4.5	39	4.3	35	4.7	-	-	4.5
Sam Turner	2	3.0	2	4.0	24	3.9	9	3.3	-	-	3.7

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>	
Mark Clark	37	4.3	39	4.2	-	-	4.3
William T. Montgomery	50	4.4	32	4.6	-	-	4.5
Sam Turner	15	4.0	22	3.5	-	-	3.7

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

Table 11
Mark Clark
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	87	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	76	87.4
Professional reputation	10	11.5
Other personal contacts	1	1.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	76	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	42	55.3
Moderate amount of experience	19	25.0
Limited amount of experience	15	19.7
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	3.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	4.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	9	10.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	8	9.2
Government	59	67.8
Public service agency or organization	4	4.6
Retired	-	-
Other	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	24	27.6
6 to 10 years	19	21.8
11 to 15 years	14	16.1
16 to 20 years	11	12.6
More than 20 years	19	21.8
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	21	24.1
Criminal	20	23.0
Mixed criminal & civil	33	37.9
Civil	12	13.8
Other	1	1.1
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	3	3.4
Second District	2	2.3
Third District	67	77.0
Fourth District	14	16.1
Outside Alaska	1	1.1
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	42	48.3
Female	45	51.7
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 12
Mark Clark
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	87	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.9	4.1
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	76	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.3
Experience within last 5 years	76	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	4.3
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	42	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4
Limited amount of experience	15	4.2	4.5	4.3	4.5	3.7	3.9
Professional reputation	10	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.0	3.2
Other personal contacts	1	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	3	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.5	3.7	3.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	8	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.4
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	7	4.4	4.6	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.1
Government	55	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.3
Public service agency or organization	2	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0
Retired	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	21	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.8	4.1	4.4
6 to 10 years	18	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.8	3.9	4.2
11 to 15 years	12	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.7	3.7	4.2
16 to 20 years	9	4.7	4.4	4.8	4.7	4.3	4.4
More than 20 years	16	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.1	4.2
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	19	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.2	4.4
Criminal	17	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.8	3.9	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	29	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.2
Civil	10	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.2	4.5
Other	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.3
Second District	2	4.5	3.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	3.5
Third District	57	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.1	4.3
Fourth District	13	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.6	3.8	4.2
Outside Alaska	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Gender*							
Male	37	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.1	4.3
Female	39	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.6	3.9	4.2
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 13
William T. Montgomery
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	102	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	83	81.4
Professional reputation	18	17.6
Other personal contacts	1	1.0
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	81	97.6
Substantial amount of experience	36	43.4
Moderate amount of experience	31	37.3
Limited amount of experience	16	19.3
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	8	7.8
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.9
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	2.9
Private, corporate employee	2	2.0
Judge or judicial officer	33	32.4
Government	40	39.2
Public service agency or organization	5	4.9
Retired	4	3.9
Other	3	2.9
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	5	4.9
5 years or fewer	8	7.8
6 to 10 years	21	20.6
11 to 15 years	13	12.7
16 to 20 years	13	12.7
More than 20 years	42	41.2
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	7.8
Criminal	17	16.7
Mixed criminal & civil	57	55.9
Civil	15	14.7
Other	5	4.9
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	7	6.9
Second District	4	3.9
Third District	55	53.9
Fourth District	35	34.3
Outside Alaska	1	1.0
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	57	55.9
Female	43	42.2
Another identity	+	+

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

+Too few respondents to report.

Table 14
William T. Montgomery
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	102	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	83	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	81	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Substantial amount of experience	36	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.2	4.6	4.6
Moderate amount of experience	31	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
Limited amount of experience	16	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4
Professional reputation	18	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	7	5.0	4.9	4.9	4.3	4.9	4.7
Private, 2-5 attorneys	4	3.8	4.3	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	28	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0
Government	32	4.2	4.2	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.0
Public service agency or organization	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0
Retired	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other	3	5.0	5.0	4.7	5.0	5.0	5.0
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.3	4.7	4.7
6 to 10 years	18	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.6	4.3	4.1
11 to 15 years	10	4.1	4.3	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.0
16 to 20 years	11	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3
More than 20 years	32	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.8
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	8	4.3	4.4	4.0	3.8	4.3	4.0
Criminal	14	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.6	4.4
Mixed criminal & civil	52	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6
Civil	7	4.6	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.1
Other	2	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Location of Practice*							
First District	5	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.6	4.2
Second District	4	4.5	4.5	4.8	5.0	4.8	4.5
Third District	39	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Fourth District	35	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.7
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	50	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.5	4.4
Female	32	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.7	4.6
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

Table 15
Sam Turner
Demographic Description of Respondents

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	68	100
Experience with Applicant		
Direct professional experience	37	54.4
Professional reputation	18	26.5
Other personal contacts	13	19.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	33	89.2
Substantial amount of experience	19	51.4
Moderate amount of experience	10	27.0
Limited amount of experience	8	21.6
Type of Practice		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	3	4.4
Private, 2-5 attorneys	3	4.4
Private, 6+ attorneys	6	8.8
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	13	19.1
Government	38	55.9
Public service agency or organization	4	5.9
Retired	1	1.5
Other	13	19.1
Length of Alaska Practice		
No response	-	-
5 years or fewer	23	33.8
6 to 10 years	17	25.0
11 to 15 years	5	7.4
16 to 20 years	7	10.3
More than 20 years	16	23.5
Cases Handled		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	8	11.8
Criminal	22	32.4
Mixed criminal & civil	21	30.9
Civil	14	20.6
Other	3	4.4
Location of Practice		
No response	-	-
First District	4	5.9
Second District	2	2.9
Third District	47	69.1
Fourth District	14	20.6
Outside Alaska	1	1.5
Gender		
No response	-	-
Male	27	39.7
Female	41	60.3
Another identity	-	-

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

Table 16
Sam Turner
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	68	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.1	3.5	3.9
Basis for Evaluation							
Direct professional experience	37	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.9	3.4	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	33	4.5	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.4	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	4	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	19	4.4	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.3	3.6
Moderate amount of experience	10	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.9
Limited amount of experience	8	4.6	4.5	4.6	3.9	3.4	3.6
Professional reputation	18	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.1	3.4	3.8
Other personal contacts	13	4.7	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.6
Type of Practice*							
Private, solo	1	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Private, 6+ attorneys	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.0	3.3	3.3
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	10	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.0	3.2	3.6
Government	20	4.5	4.3	4.3	3.8	3.2	3.6
Public service agency or organization	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Retired	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Length of Alaska Practice*							
5 years or fewer	9	4.7	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.8
6 to 10 years	10	4.3	4.1	4.2	3.7	2.9	3.4
11 to 15 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	3.5
16 to 20 years	6	4.3	4.7	4.8	4.2	3.5	3.8
More than 20 years	10	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.0	3.5	3.9
Cases Handled*							
Prosecution	4	4.3	3.8	3.3	3.0	2.7	3.0
Criminal	12	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.3	3.4	3.8
Mixed criminal & civil	16	4.3	4.4	4.4	3.9	3.3	3.6
Civil	3	4.7	4.7	5.0	3.7	3.7	4.3
Other	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Location of Practice*							
First District	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Second District	2	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.0
Third District	24	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.0	3.6	3.9
Fourth District	9	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	2.9	3.3
Outside Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gender*							
Male	15	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.3	3.7	4.0
Female	22	4.4	4.4	4.3	3.7	3.2	3.5
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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