



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

# **Alaska Judicial Council**

## **Judicial Selection Survey**

### **Palmer Superior Court**

### **Technical Report**

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

*May 20-25, 2024*

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

---

[www.iseralaska.org](http://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: Tom V. Jamgochian: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	16
Table 12: Tom V. Jamgochian: Detailed Responses .....	17
Table 13: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Demographic Description of Respondents .....	18
Table 14: Patrick J. McKay, Jr.: Detailed Responses .....	19

## *Executive Summary*

This report presents findings from a selection survey conducted among Alaska Bar Association members for one judicial vacancy on the Palmer Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Kari Kristiansen. By the application deadline, the Alaska Judicial Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Amanda L. Browning, Tom V. Jamgochian, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., and William T. Montgomery. Amanda L. Browning and William T. Montgomery withdrew their applications because they were appointed to other judgeships; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

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

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

**Table 1**  
**Mean Ratings of Applicants**

	<i>n</i>	<b>Professional Competence</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Integrity</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Fairness</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Judicial Temperament</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Suitability of Experience</b> <i>M</i>	<b>Overall</b> <i>M</i>
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	111	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	126	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0

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

# 2024 Judicial Selection Survey, Palmer 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: Palmer Superior Court and Anchorage District Court. This report presents the findings of the survey for a vacancy on Palmer Superior Court, created by the forthcoming retirement of Judge Kari Kristiansen. By the application deadline, the Council received a total of four applications from the following individuals (presented in alphabetical order): Amanda L. Browning, Tom V. Jamgochian, Patrick J. McKay, Jr., and William T. Montgomery. Amanda L. Browning and William T. Montgomery withdrew their applications because they were appointed to other judgeships; therefore, their survey results are not included in this report.

## *Methodology*

All active in-state members of the Alaska Bar Association were invited to participate in this selection survey. Inactive and retired members and active out-of-state members were also invited to participate in the survey if the Council had email addresses for them. Of the 3,723 individuals invited to participate, most individuals (3,709) 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 705 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; ten 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, 691 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. 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. Therefore, four paper surveys qualified for analysis.

The final analysis included 691 online surveys and four paper surveys, for a total of 695 surveys and a survey return rate of 18.7%. Of the 695 returned surveys, 328 (47.2%) did not rate any of the applicants (four Palmer

Superior Court applicants and six Anchorage District Court applicants); 367 (52.8%) 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>	%
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>52.8</b>
<b>Type of Practice</b>				
No response	4	0.6	2	0.5
Private, solo	130	18.7	51	13.9
Private, 2-5 attorneys	64	9.2	28	7.6
Private, 6+ attorneys	98	14.1	42	11.4
Private, corporate employee	11	1.6	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	63	9.1	60	16.3
Government	187	26.9	137	37.3
Public service agency or organization	27	3.9	19	5.2
Retired	102	14.7	27	7.4
Other	9	1.3	1	0.3
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>				
No response	30	4.3	8	2.2
5 years or fewer	63	9.1	64	17.4
6 to 10 years	70	10.1	47	12.8
11 to 15 years	84	12.1	52	14.2
16 to 20 years	350	50.4	56	15.3
More than 20 years	98	14.1	140	38.1
<b>Cases Handled</b>				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.3
Prosecution	54	7.8	47	12.8
Criminal	69	9.9	62	16.9
Mixed criminal & civil	171	24.6	117	31.9
Civil	353	50.8	127	34.6
Other	44	6.3	13	3.5
<b>Location of Practice</b>				
No response	4	0.6	1	0.3
First District	69	9.9	21	5.7
Second District	10	1.4	7	1.9
Third District	520	74.8	300	81.7
Fourth District	60	8.6	32	8.7
Outside Alaska	32	4.6	6	1.6
<b>Gender</b>				
No response	8	1.2	1	0.3
Male	394	56.7	200	54.5
Female	290	41.7	165	45.0
Another identity	3	0.4	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) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
<b><i>Professional Competence</i></b>	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
<b><i>Integrity</i></b>	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
<b><i>Fairness</i></b>	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
<b><i>Judicial Temperament</i></b>	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
<b><i>Suitability of Experience</i></b>	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
<b><i>Overall Rating</i></b>	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 11-14 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
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	139	20.0	79.9	14.4	5.8
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	150	21.6	84.0	14.0	2.0

**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>
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	135	4.3	5.0	0.9	109	4.3	5.0	1.0
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	149	4.0	4.0	1.2	125	4.0	4.0	1.2

**Table 5**  
***Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating***

	<i>n</i>	<b>Poor</b>		<b>Deficient</b>		<b>Acceptable</b>		<b>Good</b>		<b>Excellent</b>	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	109	-	-	9	8.3	13	11.9	24	22.0	63	57.8
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	125	5	4.0	12	9.6	25	20.0	21	16.8	62	49.6

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>	
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	17	4.1	13	3.5	16	4.5	-	-	23	4.6	32	4.4	2	3.5	6	4.8	-	-	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	13	4.0	10	3.3	11	3.9	-	-	18	3.9	60	4.1	6	3.2	6	4.7	-	-	4.0

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>
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	17	4.4	8	4.4	13	4.3	26	4.2	44	4.3	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	21	4.4	15	3.8	17	3.5	21	3.4	48	4.3	4.0

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>
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	12	4.5	18	4.2	48	4.3	27	4.3	4	4.5	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	29	4.8	28	3.5	40	3.9	26	3.9	2	3.0	4.0

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>	
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	5	4.6	1	5.0	88	4.3	14	4.4	1	2.0	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	4	2.0	2	3.5	112	4.1	6	3.8	1	5.0	4.0

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>	
<b>Tom V. Jamgochian</b>	66	4.3	43	4.3	-	-	4.3
<b>Patrick J. McKay, Jr.</b>	84	4.0	41	4.0	-	-	4.0

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

**Table 11**  
**Tom V. Jamgochian**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	111	79.9
Professional reputation	20	14.4
Other personal contacts	8	5.8
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	92	83.6
Substantial amount of experience	35	31.8
Moderate amount of experience	51	46.4
Limited amount of experience	24	21.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
Private, solo	17	12.2
Private, 2-5 attorneys	14	10.1
Private, 6+ attorneys	18	12.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	34	25.0
Government	45	33.1
Public service agency or organization	4	2.9
Retired	7	5.1
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	3	2.2
5 years or fewer	21	15.1
6 to 10 years	11	7.9
11 to 15 years	19	13.7
16 to 20 years	33	23.7
More than 20 years	52	37.4
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	17	12.2
Criminal	21	15.1
Mixed criminal & civil	60	43.2
Civil	37	26.6
Other	4	2.9
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	9	6.5
Second District	3	2.2
Third District	111	79.9
Fourth District	15	10.8
Outside Alaska	1	0.7
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	78	56.1
Female	61	43.9
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 12**  
**Tom V. Jamgochian**  
**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	139	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
Experience within last 5 years	92	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	18	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.7
Substantial amount of experience	35	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	51	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	24	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
Professional reputation	20	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2
Other personal contacts	8	4.4	4.8	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	17	4.0	4.3	3.9	4.4	4.2	4.1
Private, 2-5 attorneys	13	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.5
Private, 6+ attorneys	16	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	23	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.6
Government	34	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4
Public service agency or organization	2	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Retired	6	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	18	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.4
6 to 10 years	9	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.4
11 to 15 years	13	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
16 to 20 years	26	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
More than 20 years	44	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	13	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Criminal	19	4.2	4.3	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.2
Mixed criminal & civil	48	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3
Civil	27	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
Other	4	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	4.6	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.6
Second District	2	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Third District	89	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Fourth District	14	4.6	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.4
Outside Alaska	1	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	67	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Female	44	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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

**Table 13**  
**Patrick J. McKay, Jr.**  
**Demographic Description of Respondents**

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>All respondents</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience with Applicant</b>		
Direct professional experience	126	84.0
Professional reputation	21	14.0
Other personal contacts	3	2.0
<b>Detailed Experience*</b>		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	113	89.7
Substantial amount of experience	63	50.0
Moderate amount of experience	38	30.2
Limited amount of experience	25	19.8
<b>Type of Practice</b>		
No response	1	0.7
Private, solo	15	10.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	11	7.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	13	8.7
Private, corporate employee	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	22	14.7
Government	72	48.0
Public service agency or organization	7	4.7
Retired	9	6.0
Other	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice</b>		
No response	4	2.7
5 years or fewer	24	16.0
6 to 10 years	19	12.7
11 to 15 years	20	13.3
16 to 20 years	22	14.7
More than 20 years	61	40.7
<b>Cases Handled</b>		
No response	-	-
Prosecution	31	20.7
Criminal	30	20.0
Mixed criminal & civil	49	32.7
Civil	36	24.0
Other	4	2.7
<b>Location of Practice</b>		
No response	-	-
First District	7	4.7
Second District	2	1.3
Third District	130	86.7
Fourth District	9	6.0
Outside Alaska	2	1.3
<b>Gender</b>		
No response	-	-
Male	97	64.7
Female	53	35.3
Another identity	-	-

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

**Table 14**  
**Patrick J. McKay, Jr.**  
**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	150	4.1	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0
<b>Basis for Evaluation</b>							
<b>Direct professional experience</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Experience within last 5 years	113	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Experience not within last 5 years	13	3.7	4.2	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	63	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Moderate amount of experience	38	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9
Limited amount of experience	25	4.0	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8
Professional reputation	21	3.9	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.9
Other personal contacts	3	4.0	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.7
<b>Type of Practice*</b>							
Private, solo	13	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Private, 2-5 attorneys	10	3.7	4.3	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.3
Private, 6+ attorneys	11	4.2	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.9
Private, corporate employee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Judge or judicial officer	18	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.9
Government	61	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Public service agency or organization	6	3.7	4.0	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.2
Retired	6	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.7	4.7
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Length of Alaska Practice*</b>							
5 years or fewer	21	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4
6 to 10 years	16	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8
11 to 15 years	17	3.6	4.1	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5
16 to 20 years	21	3.8	4.1	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.4
More than 20 years	48	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
<b>Cases Handled*</b>							
Prosecution	29	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8
Criminal	28	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5
Mixed criminal & civil	40	4.0	4.3	3.7	4.1	3.8	3.9
Civil	27	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9
Other	2	3.0	5.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0
<b>Location of Practice*</b>							
First District	5	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.0	2.3	2.0
Second District	2	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.5
Third District	112	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1
Fourth District	6	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.0	3.8
Outside Alaska	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Gender*</b>							
Male	84	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.0
Female	42	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Another identity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

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