



**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. Jennifer M. Perkins**  
Court of Appeals Division I  
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Superior Court Judge Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 334 Returned: 34 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 83 Returned: 38 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	88%	87%
Integrity	95%	91%
Communication	100%	n/a
Temperament	97%	n/a
Admin Performance	81%	92%

#### 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 M. Perkins

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	13	76%	1	6%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	3.47	17
2. Knowledge of law	12	71%	2	12%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	3.41	17
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	13	76%	2	12%	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%	3.53	17
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	13	76%	1	6%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	3.47	17
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	9	64%	3	21%	0	0%	2	14%	0	0%	3.36	14
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	82%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	0	0%	3.45	11
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1
17. Relevant questions	11	73%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15
18. Preparation for oral argument	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	12	71%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17
21. Courteous	11	69%	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16
22. Patient	11	73%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	10	63%	3	19%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	3.25	16
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	11	69%	1	6%	1	6%	2	13%	1	6%	3.19	16
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>16</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 M. Perkins

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	16	47%	9	26%	5	15%	3	9%	1	3%	3.06	34	0
2. Knowledge of the law	17	50%	9	26%	3	9%	4	12%	1	3%	3.09	34	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	17	52%	8	24%	4	12%	4	12%	0	0%	3.15	33	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	16	48%	9	27%	4	12%	4	12%	0	0%	3.12	33	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>134</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	17	68%	6	24%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	3.52	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	56%	6	38%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	11	58%	6	32%	0	0%	2	11%	0	0%	3.37	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	53%	6	35%	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	53%	6	35%	0	0%	2	12%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	56%	6	38%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	53%	6	40%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	50%	6	38%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	3.25	16	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	59%	6	35%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.47	17	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	12	50%	8	33%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.25	24	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>24</b>	