



**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. Casey McGinley**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Juvenile  
Appointed: 2018

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge McGinley  
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: 118 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: 289 Returned: 82 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	98%
Communication	100%	n/a	97%
Temperament	99%	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. Casey McGinley

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%	9	31%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	66%	8	28%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	22	79%	5	18%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	22	76%	6	21%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>115</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	22	76%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	86%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	29	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	83%	4	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	24	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	26	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	24	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>241</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	22	76%	6	21%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	20	80%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	83%	1	3%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>83</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	79%	4	14%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
18. Dignified	23	79%	3	10%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
19. Courteous	25	86%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	86%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
21. Patient	22	76%	5	17%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>145</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	23	79%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	24	83%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	29	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	79%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	24	83%	4	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>143</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	12	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>12</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. Casey McGinley

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	58	72%	17	21%	3	4%	2	2%	1	1%	3.59	81	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	57	75%	14	18%	3	4%	2	3%	0	0%	3.66	76	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	59	76%	14	18%	3	4%	1	1%	1	1%	3.65	78	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	53	74%	13	18%	5	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	72	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	56	74%	14	18%	5	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	76	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	55	74%	13	18%	5	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.65	74	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	58	75%	14	18%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.68	77	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	58	77%	12	16%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.69	75	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	59	77%	13	17%	3	4%	2	3%	0	0%	3.68	77	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>686</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	59	73%	16	20%	4	5%	1	1%	1	1%	3.62	81	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	45	69%	14	22%	3	5%	2	3%	1	2%	3.54	65	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>146</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	61	75%	14	17%	4	5%	1	1%	1	1%	3.64	81	0
13. Dignified	61	75%	14	17%	5	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.67	81	0
14. Courteous	60	73%	16	20%	5	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.65	82	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	62	76%	13	16%	4	5%	2	2%	1	1%	3.62	82	0
16. Patient	61	75%	14	17%	5	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.67	81	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>407</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	62	77%	13	16%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	81	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	62	77%	13	16%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	81	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	60	75%	14	18%	4	5%	2	3%	0	0%	3.65	80	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>242</b>	