



**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. Scott McDonald**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Juvenile  
Appointed: 2018

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge McDonald 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: 112 Returned: 29 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 495 Returned: 52 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	99%
Communication	100%	n/a	100%
Temperament	99%	n/a	96%
Admin Performance	99%	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. Scott McDonald

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	19	66%	5	17%	4	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.45	29	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	59%	9	31%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.45	29	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	59%	10	34%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	29	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	66%	8	28%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.55	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>116</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	17	61%	8	29%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	68%	8	29%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	28	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	70%	6	22%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	73%	6	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	18	69%	7	27%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	67%	7	29%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	71%	7	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	71%	7	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>234</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	61%	10	36%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	68%	7	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	18	64%	6	21%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>78</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	18	64%	7	25%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	28	0
18. Dignified	19	68%	9	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0
19. Courteous	20	71%	8	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	28	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	19	68%	7	25%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
21. Patient	19	68%	5	18%	2	7%	1	4%	1	4%	3.43	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>140</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	20	74%	6	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	19	70%	6	22%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	27	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	17	63%	9	33%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	27	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	20	74%	6	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	20	74%	6	22%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>135</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>10</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. Scott McDonald

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	33	65%	7	14%	8	16%	1	2%	2	4%	3.33	51	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	69%	7	14%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	49	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	33	69%	6	13%	8	17%	0	0%	1	2%	3.46	48	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	70%	6	13%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	47	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	34	71%	6	13%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	48	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	70%	6	13%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	71%	6	13%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	48	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	31	67%	7	15%	8	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	46	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	67%	8	16%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.47	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>433</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	34	67%	12	24%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	51	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	26	60%	11	26%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	43	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>94</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	33	65%	11	22%	5	10%	1	2%	1	2%	3.45	51	0
13. Dignified	35	70%	8	16%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.54	50	0
14. Courteous	36	71%	9	18%	3	6%	3	6%	0	0%	3.53	51	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	36	71%	8	16%	5	10%	2	4%	0	0%	3.53	51	0
16. Patient	35	69%	9	18%	5	10%	2	4%	0	0%	3.51	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>254</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	36	71%	10	20%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	51	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	36	71%	8	16%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	51	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	37	74%	9	18%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>152</b>	