



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Judge Bryson is the Pima County Presiding Judge and performed administrative duties.

Hon. Kyle A. Bryson
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Other
Appointed: 2010

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 6 Returned: 2 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 16 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Presiding Judge Surveys Distributed: 52 Returned: 16 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	n/a	100%
Communication	100%	n/a	n/a	90%
Temperament	100%	n/a	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	n/a	94%
Admin Skills	n/a	n/a	n/a	99%
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	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. Kyle A. Bryson

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	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
Category Total	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
Category Total	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
18. Dignified	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
19. Courteous	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
21. Patient	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
Category Total	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	

11. Is patient	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
12. Is courteous	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
13. Is accessible	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
14. Responds appropriately to the circumstance	10	67%	4	27%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15	0
Category Total	48	80%	10	17%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	60	
4. Admin Performance													
15. Is well informed on all aspects of work	13	81%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
16. Is willing to make difficult decisions	9	56%	1	6%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	3.00	16	0
17. Is punctual	13	81%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
18. Makes decisions in a timely manner	8	50%	2	13%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	2.94	16	0
19. Is resourceful in resolving problems	10	63%	4	25%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
20. Exhibits impartiality in administrative decisions	9	56%	3	19%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	3.25	16	0
21. Makes reasonable and prudent judicial assignments	8	50%	4	25%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	3.12	16	0
22. Exhibits impartiality in making judicial assignments	9	56%	3	19%	4	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	16	0
23. Exhibits impartiality in allocation of resources	10	63%	4	25%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	16	0
24. Provides for appropriate training for judges and staff	10	63%	4	25%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	16	0
25. Asks for input before reaching decisions	10	63%	2	13%	1	6%	3	19%	0	0%	3.19	16	0
26. Works diligently	15	94%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
27. Considers and implements change	10	63%	4	25%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	16	0
28. Displays organizational integrity	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
Category Total	146	65%	37	17%	26	12%	14	6%	0	0%	3.41	223	
5. Admin Skills													
29. Establishes a clear focus for projects for which he/she is responsible	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
30. Has the ability to identify and analyze relevant issues	10	63%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
31. Accurately assesses and attempts to secure the resources necessary for the effective functioning of the court system	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
32. Accepts and incorporates diversity	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0

33. Coaches and develops others	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
34. Cooperates with peers	12	75%	3	19%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
35. Cooperates with staff	13	81%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
36. Effectively delegates responsibility	11	73%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15	0
37. Creates a cooperative environment	12	75%	1	6%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
Category Total	107	76%	20	14%	13	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.65	141	