

TO: Lynn Mounsey, Executive Director, Spokane County Bar Association
FROM: David C. Brody, Professor
RE: 2016 Spokane County Bar Association, Judicial Candidate Bar Poll
Date: August 9, 2016

The following results can be reported for the 2016 Judicial Candidate Bar Poll. A total of 362 attorneys accessed the survey, with 302 submitting questionnaires rating three candidates for two seats on the Spokane County Superior Court. Members of the bar were asked to evaluate each candidate with respect to the following five criteria.

Legal Ability Analytical ability, an interest in legal scholarship, qualities of wisdom, intellect, common sense, knowledge of rules and procedures, and a commitment to keeping up with changes in the law constitute important criteria.

Judicial Temperament Respect for the judicial process, ability to work with others, ability to be respectful to all counsel and litigants, and the ability to treat all participants with dignity and fairness.

Integrity Free from impropriety and favoritism, disregard of possible public criticism, fair and open-minded, committed to equal justice under the law, and does not engage in unethical or unprofessional conduct.

Relevant Legal Experience The candidate possesses appropriate prior courtroom experience.

Suitability Is this candidate qualified for the position for which they seek?

For each criterion candidates were rated along the following four-point scale:

- 1 Not Qualified
- 2 Qualified
- 3 Well Qualified
- 4 Exceptionally Well Qualified

For each question, attorneys had the option of responding that they possessed “insufficient information” about a candidate to respond, thereby allowing respondents to avoid rating candidates with whom they are not sufficiently familiar.

The results reported below consist of a) average ratings for each candidate for the five stated categories, and b) specific responses received for each candidate under each criterion.

Average Ratings Received in Each Category

Average scores, ranging from 1 through 4, received by the candidates for each of the five categories are reported below. Responses of “insufficient information” were not included in calculating average ratings.

	Legal Ability	Judicial Temperament	Integrity	Relevant Legal Experience	Suitability
<u>Department 10</u>					
Linda Tompkins	2.48	2.91	3.02	2.78	2.54
<u>Department 11</u>					
Tim Fennessy	2.78	2.87	2.98	2.89	2.79
Greg Sypolt	3.42	3.38	3.51	3.54	3.47

Detailed Results Obtained by Linda Tompkins

Legal Ability Average = 2.48

Not Qualified	70	23.8%
Qualified	93	31.6%
Well Qualified	51	17.3%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	80	27.2%
Insufficient Information	5	
Total Providing Ratings	294	

Judicial Temperament Average = 2.91

Not Qualified	30	10.2%
Qualified	81	27.6%
Well Qualified	66	22.5%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	116	39.6%
Insufficient Information	5	
Total Providing Ratings	293	

Integrity Average = 3.02

Not Qualified	25	8.6%
Qualified	69	23.7%
Well Qualified	72	24.7%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	125	43.0%
Insufficient Information	6	
Total Providing Ratings	291	

Detailed Results Obtained by Linda Tompkins cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 2.78

Not Qualified	33	11.5%
Qualified	96	33.4%
Well Qualified	58	20.2%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	100	34.8%
Insufficient Information	7	
Total Providing Ratings	287	

Suitability Average = 2.54

Not Qualified	73	24.9%
Qualified	77	26.3%
Well Qualified	54	18.4%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	89	30.4%
Insufficient Information	3	
Total Providing Ratings	293	

Detailed Results Obtained by Tim Fennessy

Legal Ability Average = 2.78

Not Qualified	19	8.2%
Qualified	80	34.5%
Well Qualified	65	28.0%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	68	29.3%
Insufficient Information	59	
Total Providing Ratings	232	

Judicial Temperament Average = 2.87

Not Qualified	16	7.8%
Qualified	66	32.0%
Well Qualified	52	25.2%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	72	35.0%
Insufficient Information	91	
Total Providing Ratings	206	

Integrity Average = 2.98

Not Qualified	22	10.2%
Qualified	50	23.3%
Well Qualified	53	24.7%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	90	41.9%
Insufficient Information	80	
Total Providing Ratings	215	

Detailed Results Obtained by Tim Fennessy cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 2.89

Not Qualified	20	8.4%
Qualified	57	24.1%
Well Qualified	88	37.1%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	72	30.4%
Insufficient Information	60	
Total Providing Ratings	237	

Suitability Average = 2.79

Not Qualified	21	9.1%
Qualified	72	31.0%
Well Qualified	74	31.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	65	28.0%
Insufficient Information	65	
Total Providing Ratings	232	

Detailed Results Obtained by Greg Sypolt

Legal Ability Average = 3.42

Not Qualified	5	1.7%
Qualified	38	12.9%
Well Qualified	79	26.8%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	173	58.6%
Insufficient Information	6	
Total Providing Ratings	295	

Judicial Temperament Average = 3.38

Not Qualified	5	1.7%
Qualified	42	14.3%
Well Qualified	82	27.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	165	56.1%
Insufficient Information	7	
Total Providing Ratings	294	

Integrity Average = 3.51

Not Qualified	5	1.7%
Qualified	30	10.3%
Well Qualified	67	23.1%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	188	64.8%
Insufficient Information	7	
Total Providing Ratings	290	

Detailed Results Obtained by Greg Sypolt cont.

Relevant Legal Experience Average = 3.54

Not Qualified	4	1.4%
Qualified	23	7.9%
Well Qualified	75	25.9%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	188	64.8%
Insufficient Information	6	
Total Providing Ratings	290	

Suitability Average = 3.47

Not Qualified	6	2.0%
Qualified	32	10.9%
Well Qualified	74	25.3%
Exceptionally Well Qualified	181	61.8%
Insufficient Information	5	
Total Providing Ratings	293	