Question 1: 3 points What is your view on the length of time that it took for the case Wikipedia:Arbitration/Requests/Case/Tree shaping?

> *3 points:* Saying that the delay was bad and unacceptable.
> *2 points:* Saying that the delay was bad but justified.
> *0 points:* What was the problem with the delay?
> *-1 points:* I think that this is why it was so long. (and gives a wrong reason)

Question 2: 2 points Do you believe that WikiProjects can enforce standards (such as article layout) on articles, directly and/or indirectly?

> *2 points:* Yes.
> *1.5 points:* Yes, but not exclude others from their discussion.
> *1 point:* Indirectly through a consensus of editors.
> *0 points:* No way.
> *-2 points:* WikiProjects are the bane of all evil.

Question 3: 3 points An editor has made many productive edits to articles on Wikipedia, including several featured articles. This user has not broken policies per se, but is hard to deal with, giving "smart aleck" remarks, ignoring consensus, ignoring what administrators tell them, etc. What are your views on this situation?

> This question is based off several actual editors.
> *3 points:* Block after other avenues have been exhausted.
> *2 points:* Block because they are evading policies.
> *1 point:* Block after a lot of superfluous actions.
> *0 points:* Blocking is not an option.

Question 4: 3 points An editor fails WP:COMPETENCE. What should be done in this situation?

> This question is based off an actual editor.
> *3 points:* Block after other avenues have been exhausted.
> *2 points:* Block after a lot of superfluous actions.
> *0 points:* Blocking is not an option.

Question 5: 2 points Do the circumstances described in questions #3-4 justify a community ban?

> *+1 point:* Editor #3
> *+1 point:* Editor #4

Question 6: 10 points

Part A: 6 points Do you believe that "it takes two to tango"?

> *+6 points:* Sometimes, but not always, with thorough explanation.
> *+4 points:* Yes, because we can always choose how we respond.
> *+3/2/1 points:* (somewhere in between)
> *+0 points:* Always, or never.

Part B: 4 points Would you consider mitigating the sanctions on one user given the actions of another? Eliminating them entirely?

> *+4 points:* Both, under the right circumstances.
> *+2 points:* (somewhere in between)
> *+0 points:* Always, or never.

Question 7: 5 points When do you believe cases should be accepted by ArbCom?

> *5 points:* Arbitration aims to "break the back" of the dispute
> *2 points:* Some sort of other reasoning
> *0 points:* Something totally wrong

Question 8: 5 points When would you vote for the long-term ban of an editor?

> *5 points:* At a certain point, enough is enough
> *2 points:* More on the side of second chances

0 points: More on the side of fifth and sixth chances

Question 9: 5 points If elected to ArbCom, do you plan on being active for the majority of your term?
> *5 points:* Yes (not withstanding short-term absences)
> *4 points:* I'll try, but…. (extenuating circumstances)
> *0 points:* Long-term absences, or no

Question 10: 1 point (This question will be scored only on the basis of your honestly completing it, regardless of the answer) What are the current problems with the Wikipedia community?
> *1 point:* Just answering the question.

Tenure: 2 points Have you been a Wikipedia editor for a decent length of time and made a proportionate amount of edits during that time? (Note: this year soxred93's tool was used to check for this, rather than just grabbing the earliest contribution date).
> *2 points:* Over 3 years of active editing.
> *1 point:* 2-3 years of active editing.
> *0 points:* Under 2 years of active editing.

Administrator: 3 points Are you an administrator? How long have you been an administrator?
> *3 points:* Yes, over 2 years
> *2 points:* Yes
> *0 points:* No

Experience: 2 points Have you participated in a formal committee that will give you experience in ArbCom? Accepted committees include bureaucrat, checkuser, oversight, steward, OTRS, Arbitration Committee (arbitrator or clerk), Audit Subcommittee, ArbCom-appointed cabals, Mediation Committee, and WP:MILHIST coordinator. Some credit was given for real life experience (lawyer).
> *2 points:* Yes
> *1 point:* Law experience
> *0 points:* No

Statement: 2 points Was your statement well thought out? Was it reasonable and not a "let's go sack ArbCom" statement?
> *+1 point*: For the two questions

Civility: 2 points
> *0 points:* Visible problems such as RFC or ArbCom, sock issues, block log
> *1 point:* Not rude
> *2 point:* Thank you. Does not blow up with anger in the responses.