



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

Apache, Coconino, La Paz, Mohave, Navajo, Yavapai and Yuma Voters Only

Hon. Andrew W. Gould

Court of Appeals Division I
Appointed: 2012

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Gould
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**
29 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2014	Attorney Surveys	Peer Judge Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 490 Returned: 107 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 15 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 124 Returned: 41 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	100%	99%
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication	98%	100%	n/a
Temperament	98%	100%	n/a
Admin Performance	94%	100%	100%

FOOTNOTE:

Judges are evaluated on their judicial performance midway through their term and prior to their retention election. Beginning in 2022, their survey evaluation scores include midterm scores and retention scores. Newly appointed judges serve a two-year term and are evaluated prior to their retention election on their retention scores. The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "superior", "very good", or "satisfactory" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials or no survey responses were returned). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information, as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

297. Attentiveness	1	2%	0	0%	7	11%	11	18%	43	69%	3.53	62
298. Demeanor in communications with counsel	1	2%	0	0%	6	10%	17	27%	39	62%	3.48	63
299. Relevant questions	1	2%	1	2%	12	19%	14	22%	36	56%	3.30	64
300. Preparation for oral argument	2	3%	0	0%	7	12%	12	20%	39	65%	3.43	60
Category Total	5	2%	1	0%	32	13%	54	22%	157	63%	3.43	249
5. Temperament												
301. Dignified	1	2%	0	0%	8	13%	7	11%	47	75%	3.57	63
302. Courteous	1	2%	0	0%	7	11%	7	11%	48	76%	3.60	63
303. Patient	1	2%	0	0%	6	10%	8	13%	46	75%	3.61	61
304. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	1	2%	0	0%	6	10%	10	16%	44	72%	3.57	61
Category Total	4	2%	0	0%	27	11%	32	13%	185	75%	3.59	248



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Andrew W. Gould

2014 Peer Judge Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Legal Ability													
348. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	58%	5	42%	3.42	12	0
349. Knowledge of law	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	58%	5	42%	3.42	12	0
350. Decisions based on law and facts	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	42%	7	58%	3.58	12	0
351. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	50%	6	50%	3.50	12	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	25	52%	23	48%	3.48	48	
2. Integrity													
352. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
353. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
354. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
355. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
356. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
357. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
358. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
359. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
360. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	11	92%	3.92	12	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	8%	99	92%	3.92	108	
3. Communication													
361. Attentiveness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	9	82%	3.82	11	0
362. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	30%	7	70%	3.70	10	0

363. Relevant questions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	36%	7	64%	3.64	11	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	28%	23	72%	3.72	32	
4. Temperament													
364. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%	9	69%	3.69	13	0
365. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	2	17%	9	75%	3.67	12	0
366. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	4	33%	7	58%	3.50	12	0
367. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	10	83%	3.83	12	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	12	24%	35	71%	3.67	49	
5. Admin Performance													
368. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	42%	6	50%	3.42	12	0
369. Prepared for proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	10	83%	3.83	12	0
370. Works effectively with other judges	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	3	25%	7	58%	3.42	12	0
371. Works effectively with other court personnel	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	2	17%	8	67%	3.50	12	0
372. Effective handling of ongoing workload	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	27%	8	73%	3.73	11	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	5	8%	15	25%	39	66%	3.58	59	



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Andrew W. Gould

2014 Superior Court Judge Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Legal Ability													
242. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	12	32%	25	66%	3.63	38	0
243. Knowledge of the law	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	11	29%	26	68%	3.66	38	0
244. Decisions based on law and facts	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	9	24%	28	74%	3.68	38	0
245. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	11	29%	26	68%	3.63	38	0
Category Total	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	43	28%	105	69%	3.65	152	
2. Integrity													
246. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	3	12%	21	81%	3.73	26	0
247. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
248. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
249. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
250. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
251. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
252. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
253. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
254. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	17	81%	3.76	21	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	10	5%	27	14%	157	81%	3.76	194	
3. Admin Performance													
255. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	8	28%	20	69%	3.66	29	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	8	28%	20	69%	3.66	29	