



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. Kevin Wein

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Family

Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 126 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 297 Returned: 43 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	99%
Communication	99%	n/a	100%
Temperament	100%	n/a	98%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	99%
Settlement Activities	100%	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. Kevin Wein

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	12	57%	6	29%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.38	21	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	67%	4	19%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.48	21	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	14	70%	4	20%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
Category Total	51	66%	17	22%	7	9%	2	3%	0	0%	3.52	77	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	15	65%	6	26%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	77%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	79%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
Category Total	104	76%	22	16%	10	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	136	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	13	54%	8	33%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	24	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	12	57%	6	29%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.38	21	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	17	71%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
Category Total	42	61%	20	29%	6	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	69	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	15	63%	6	25%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
18. Dignified	16	67%	7	29%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
19. Courteous	16	67%	7	29%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	63%	7	29%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	24	0
21. Patient	15	63%	8	33%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
Category Total	77	64%	35	29%	8	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	120	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	71%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	17	71%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	17	74%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	71%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	14	58%	9	38%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	24	0
Category Total	82	69%	32	27%	5	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	119	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
Category Total	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	



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. Kevin Wein

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	24	57%	12	29%	4	10%	2	5%	0	0%	3.38	42	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	63%	12	30%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	40	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	26	60%	12	28%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.47	43	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	26	67%	10	26%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	39	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	27	68%	10	25%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	40	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	26	65%	11	28%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	40	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	67%	10	24%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	42	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	26	63%	11	27%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	41	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	62%	12	29%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	42	0
Category Total	234	63%	100	27%	32	9%	3	1%	0	0%	3.53	369	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	28	67%	9	21%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	42	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	22	61%	9	25%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	36	0
Category Total	50	64%	18	23%	10	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	78	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	27	63%	10	23%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.47	43	0	
13. Dignified	28	65%	10	23%	4	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3.49	43	0	
14. Courteous	30	70%	9	21%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	43	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	29	67%	10	23%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	43	0	
16. Patient	29	67%	9	21%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	43	0	
Category Total	143	67%	48	22%	20	9%	3	1%	1	0%	3.53	215		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	30	70%	9	21%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	43	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	28	65%	10	23%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.51	43	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	29	67%	10	23%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	43	0	
Category Total	87	67%	29	22%	12	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.57	129		