



**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.

### Maricopa County Voters Only

**Hon. Bruce R. Cohen**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Civil  
Appointed: 2005

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 226 Returned: 55 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 87 Returned: 18 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 92 Returned: 39 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	93%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	98%
Communication	96%	100%	97%
Temperament	100%	100%	97%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	n/a

#### 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.



**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. Bruce R. Cohen

2020 Attorney Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	34	65%	10	19%	3	6%	5	10%	0	0%	3.40	52	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	35	70%	8	16%	2	4%	4	8%	1	2%	3.44	50	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	30	83%	3	8%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.72	36	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	38	76%	5	10%	4	8%	3	6%	0	0%	3.56	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>188</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	42	79%	8	15%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.72	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	79%	5	18%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	40	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	78%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	27	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	21	78%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	27	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	77%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	30	83%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	36	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	76%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	76%	6	18%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>296</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	40	75%	8	15%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.62	53	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	33	66%	11	22%	3	6%	2	4%	1	2%	3.46	50	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	43	81%	8	15%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.75	53	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>156</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	45	87%	5	10%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
18. Dignified	46	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	54	0
19. Courteous	47	87%	6	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	54	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	43	84%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	51	0
21. Patient	44	86%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>262</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	37	70%	11	21%	4	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	53	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	42	84%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	50	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	46	84%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.78	55	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	43	83%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.77	52	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	40	80%	9	18%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>260</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	10	67%	3	20%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>15</b>	



12. Understanding and compassion	35	95%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.86	37	0
13. Dignified	36	97%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.89	37	0
14. Courteous	35	95%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.89	37	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	34	89%	2	5%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.76	38	0
16. Patient	33	92%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.83	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>185</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	87%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	38	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	34	92%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	37	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	35	92%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>113</b>	



**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. Bruce R. Cohen

2020 Juror Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>147</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>54</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
14. Dignified	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
15. Courteous	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
17. Patient	16	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	17	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>89</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>54</b>	