



**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

**Hon. D. Douglas Metcalf**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Civil  
Appointed: 2013

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Metcalf  
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: 158 Returned: 35 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 13 Returned: 7 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 79 Returned: 11 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	97%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	85%	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. D. Douglas Metcalf

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	15	47%	13	41%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.31	32	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	15	48%	11	35%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.29	31	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	13	50%	9	35%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	3.31	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	15	50%	11	37%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.33	30	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>119</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	18	58%	11	35%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	65%	6	30%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	78%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	78%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	71%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	73%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	15	71%	4	19%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>185</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	63%	8	25%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	32	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	54%	10	36%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.39	28	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	61%	9	29%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>91</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	18	58%	8	26%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	31	0
18. Dignified	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
19. Courteous	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
21. Patient	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>155</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	68%	6	19%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	31	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	19	63%	7	23%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	30	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	18	69%	7	27%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.58	26	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	66%	8	28%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.52	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	68%	5	20%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.48	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>141</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	31%	5	38%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	2.77	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>13</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. D. Douglas Metcalf

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>77</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	7	64%	4	36%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>20</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
13. Dignified	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
14. Courteous	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
16. Patient	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>52</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	64%	4	36%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>32</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. D. Douglas Metcalf

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	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	50%	3	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>61</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
14. Dignified	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
15. Courteous	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
17. Patient	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>35</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.14	7	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	43%	4	57%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>21</b>	