



**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. Jennifer B. Campbell**  
Court of Appeals Division I  
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 495 Returned: 39 Score (See Footnote)	Superior Court Judge Surveys Distributed: 113 Returned: 31 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	71%	99%
Integrity	90%	98%
Communication	90%	n/a
Temperament	93%	n/a
Admin Performance	87%	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.



**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. Jennifer B. Campbell

2020 Attorney Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>												
1. Legal reasoning ability	8	47%	2	12%	1	6%	5	29%	1	6%	2.65	17
2. Knowledge of law	8	47%	2	12%	3	18%	3	18%	1	6%	2.76	17
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	8	47%	2	12%	1	6%	4	24%	2	12%	2.59	17
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	8	47%	2	12%	3	18%	3	18%	1	6%	2.76	17
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	7	54%	1	8%	1	8%	3	23%	1	8%	2.77	13
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	4	50%	1	13%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	3.00	8
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	50%	1	13%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	3.00	8
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	4	50%	1	13%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	4	57%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	3.00	7
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	15	60%	7	28%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.36	25
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	14	61%	6	26%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.35	23
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2
17. Relevant questions	15	60%	7	28%	0	0%	2	8%	1	4%	3.32	25
18. Preparation for oral argument	13	57%	7	30%	0	0%	2	9%	1	4%	3.26	23
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	16	73%	4	18%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%	3.50	22
21. Courteous	16	73%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	3.55	22
22. Patient	16	73%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	3.55	22
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	68%	5	23%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%	3.45	22
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	8	53%	0	0%	5	33%	2	13%	0	0%	2.93	15
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>15</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. Jennifer B. Campbell

2020 Superior Court Judge 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	19	63%	7	23%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	30	0
2. Knowledge of the law	19	63%	8	27%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.50	30	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	19	63%	7	23%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	30	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>119</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	19	79%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	81%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	82%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	79%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	79%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	79%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	79%	1	7%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	3.57	14	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	79%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>142</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	78%	4	15%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>27</b>	