



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. Jo Lynn Gentry

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Juvenile

Appointed: 2005

81% of the Commission Voted Judge Gentry MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
26 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
6 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 102 Returned: 27 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 827 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	88%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	83%	n/a	97%
Communication	86%	n/a	92%
Temperament	64%	n/a	91%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	95%
Settlement Activities	83%	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. Jo Lynn Gentry

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	7	27%	6	23%	8	31%	4	15%	1	4%	2.54	26	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	8	31%	5	19%	11	42%	2	8%	0	0%	2.73	26	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	8	32%	4	16%	11	44%	2	8%	0	0%	2.72	25	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	8	30%	6	22%	9	33%	4	15%	0	0%	2.67	27	0
Category Total	31	30%	21	20%	39	38%	12	12%	1	1%	2.66	104	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	8	31%	6	23%	4	15%	5	19%	3	12%	2.42	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	46%	5	21%	5	21%	2	8%	1	4%	2.96	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	11	46%	4	17%	6	25%	2	8%	1	4%	2.92	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	50%	4	18%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	3.09	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	50%	4	18%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	3.09	22	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	45%	4	18%	4	18%	2	9%	2	9%	2.82	22	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	48%	4	17%	6	26%	2	9%	0	0%	3.04	23	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	50%	4	20%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	3.05	20	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	31%	5	19%	4	15%	4	15%	5	19%	2.27	26	0
Category Total	91	44%	40	19%	43	21%	22	11%	13	6%	2.83	209	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	8	30%	6	22%	9	33%	4	15%	0	0%	2.67	27	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	9	39%	4	17%	8	35%	2	9%	0	0%	2.87	23	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	6	22%	6	22%	10	37%	4	15%	1	4%	2.44	27	0
Category Total	23	30%	16	21%	27	35%	10	13%	1	1%	2.65	77	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	4	15%	5	19%	7	26%	6	22%	5	19%	1.89	27	0
18. Dignified	8	30%	5	19%	6	22%	5	19%	3	11%	2.37	27	0
19. Courteous	6	22%	5	19%	6	22%	8	30%	2	7%	2.19	27	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	7	26%	5	19%	7	26%	5	19%	3	11%	2.30	27	0
21. Patient	4	15%	4	15%	8	30%	9	33%	2	7%	1.96	27	0
Category Total	29	21%	24	18%	34	25%	33	24%	15	11%	2.14	135	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	33%	7	26%	11	41%	0	0%	0	0%	2.93	27	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	9	33%	7	26%	11	41%	0	0%	0	0%	2.93	27	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	8	32%	3	12%	14	56%	0	0%	0	0%	2.76	25	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	41%	5	19%	11	41%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	27	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	11	41%	6	22%	8	30%	2	7%	0	0%	2.96	27	0
Category Total	48	36%	28	21%	55	41%	2	2%	0	0%	2.92	133	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	2.83	6	0
Category Total	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	2.83	6	



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. Jo Lynn Gentry

2020 Litigant Witness 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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	35	67%	10	19%	2	4%	2	4%	3	6%	3.38	52	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	69%	11	22%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.57	49	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	35	70%	11	22%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.58	50	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	35	71%	10	20%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.59	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	34	69%	11	22%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.57	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	35	70%	10	20%	3	6%	1	2%	1	2%	3.54	50	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	71%	10	21%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.58	48	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	34	69%	10	20%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.55	49	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	69%	10	21%	3	6%	1	2%	1	2%	3.52	48	0
Category Total	309	70%	93	21%	27	6%	4	1%	11	2%	3.54	444	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	33	66%	8	16%	4	8%	3	6%	2	4%	3.34	50	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	30	67%	7	16%	5	11%	2	4%	1	2%	3.40	45	0
Category Total	63	66%	15	16%	9	9%	5	5%	3	3%	3.37	95	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	32	62%	13	25%	2	4%	1	2%	4	8%	3.31	52	0
13. Dignified	35	69%	10	20%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	3.47	51	0
14. Courteous	34	65%	11	21%	2	4%	1	2%	4	8%	3.35	52	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	35	69%	9	18%	2	4%	2	4%	3	6%	3.39	51	0
16. Patient	33	65%	10	20%	3	6%	1	2%	4	8%	3.31	51	0
Category Total	169	66%	53	21%	12	5%	6	2%	17	7%	3.37	257	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	37	73%	6	12%	4	8%	3	6%	1	2%	3.47	51	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	38	75%	7	14%	4	8%	0	0%	2	4%	3.55	51	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	36	71%	8	16%	5	10%	1	2%	1	2%	3.51	51	0
Category Total	111	73%	21	14%	13	8%	4	3%	4	3%	3.51	153	