



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. Karen A. Mullins
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2006

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 98 Returned: 27 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 635 Returned: 86 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	93%
Communication	99%	n/a	86%
Temperament	93%	n/a	84%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	92%
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. Karen A. Mullins

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	10	37%	12	44%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.15	27	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	9	33%	13	48%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.11	27	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	10	42%	11	46%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	24	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	13	50%	10	38%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	26	0
Category Total	42	40%	46	44%	14	13%	2	2%	0	0%	3.23	104	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	48%	8	30%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	3.22	27	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	52%	8	32%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	25	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	58%	9	35%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	67%	4	22%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	50%	9	38%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	24	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	60%	7	35%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	20	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	50%	10	42%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	50%	10	38%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	26	0
Category Total	117	55%	70	33%	22	10%	2	1%	0	0%	3.43	211	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	15	56%	7	26%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.37	27	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	60%	7	28%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	13	48%	9	33%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.26	27	0
Category Total	43	54%	23	29%	12	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.37	79	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	8	30%	12	44%	4	15%	3	11%	0	0%	2.93	27	0
18. Dignified	13	48%	8	30%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	3.22	27	0
19. Courteous	11	41%	9	33%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	3.07	27	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	13	48%	9	33%	3	11%	2	7%	0	0%	3.22	27	0
21. Patient	10	37%	7	26%	8	30%	2	7%	0	0%	2.93	27	0
Category Total	55	41%	45	33%	25	19%	10	7%	0	0%	3.07	135	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	15	58%	7	27%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	26	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	17	65%	7	27%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	12	48%	11	44%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.36	25	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	16	62%	9	35%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	15	58%	8	31%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
Category Total	75	58%	42	33%	11	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.48	129	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
Category Total	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	



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. Karen A. Mullins

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	53	62%	15	17%	4	5%	9	10%	5	6%	3.19	86	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	52	68%	15	20%	5	7%	3	4%	1	1%	3.50	76	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	53	68%	15	19%	5	6%	3	4%	2	3%	3.46	78	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	51	70%	15	21%	3	4%	2	3%	2	3%	3.52	73	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	52	68%	15	20%	4	5%	4	5%	1	1%	3.49	76	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	54	71%	13	17%	4	5%	4	5%	1	1%	3.51	76	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	55	69%	15	19%	5	6%	3	4%	2	3%	3.48	80	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	50	72%	12	17%	3	4%	1	1%	3	4%	3.52	69	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	51	69%	14	19%	4	5%	3	4%	2	3%	3.47	74	0
Category Total	471	68%	129	19%	37	5%	32	5%	19	3%	3.45	688	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	52	62%	11	13%	11	13%	5	6%	5	6%	3.19	84	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	45	58%	10	13%	9	12%	7	9%	6	8%	3.05	77	0
Category Total	97	60%	21	13%	20	12%	12	7%	11	7%	3.12	161	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	58	67%	9	10%	5	6%	8	9%	6	7%	3.22	86	0	
13. Dignified	56	66%	13	15%	5	6%	6	7%	5	6%	3.28	85	0	
14. Courteous	59	69%	8	9%	8	9%	5	6%	6	7%	3.27	86	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	60	71%	5	6%	4	5%	8	9%	8	9%	3.19	85	0	
16. Patient	56	67%	9	11%	4	5%	4	5%	11	13%	3.13	84	0	
Category Total	289	68%	44	10%	26	6%	31	7%	36	8%	3.22	426		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	57	66%	11	13%	11	13%	2	2%	5	6%	3.31	86	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	61	71%	9	10%	10	12%	4	5%	2	2%	3.43	86	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	59	70%	9	11%	8	10%	3	4%	5	6%	3.36	84	0	
Category Total	177	69%	29	11%	29	11%	9	4%	12	5%	3.37	256		