



**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. Dean M. Fink**

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Other

Appointed: 2007

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Fink  
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**

27 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'

0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 400 Returned: 66 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 37 Returned: 27 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 252 Returned: 31 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	94%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	96%
Communication	95%	100%	96%
Temperament	96%	100%	96%
Admin Performance	98%	99%	96%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Dean M. Fink

2022 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	42	66%	12	19%	5	8%	4	6%	1	2%	3.41	64	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	39	62%	13	21%	7	11%	3	5%	1	2%	3.37	63	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	39	65%	13	22%	4	7%	3	5%	1	2%	3.43	60	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	40	63%	16	25%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.44	64	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>251</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	44	68%	15	23%	1	2%	4	6%	1	2%	3.49	65	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	41	71%	13	22%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	58	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	72%	12	20%	3	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.58	60	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	40	77%	10	19%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	41	73%	12	21%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	56	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	41	75%	12	22%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	55	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	44	73%	12	20%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	60	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	42	78%	10	19%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	54	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	40	68%	14	24%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	59	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>519</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	47	73%	9	14%	4	6%	4	6%	0	0%	3.55	64	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	40	70%	11	19%	3	5%	3	5%	0	0%	3.54	57	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	46	72%	10	16%	6	9%	2	3%	0	0%	3.56	64	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>185</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	49	75%	9	14%	3	5%	3	5%	1	2%	3.57	65	0
18. Dignified	47	72%	12	18%	3	5%	3	5%	0	0%	3.58	65	0
19. Courteous	49	75%	9	14%	5	8%	2	3%	0	0%	3.62	65	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	47	72%	10	15%	4	6%	4	6%	0	0%	3.54	65	0
21. Patient	49	75%	9	14%	6	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	65	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>325</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	46	71%	10	15%	7	11%	2	3%	0	0%	3.54	65	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	48	74%	10	15%	6	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	65	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	46	75%	9	15%	3	5%	3	5%	0	0%	3.61	61	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	48	74%	11	17%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	65	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	47	72%	11	17%	6	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	65	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>321</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	26	70%	9	24%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.62	37	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>37</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. Dean M. Fink

2022 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	24	86%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.75	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	92%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.79	24	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	88%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.77	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	91%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.78	23	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	23	92%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.80	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	91%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.77	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	23	88%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.77	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	87%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.74	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	91%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.78	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>220</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	24	86%	3	11%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	17	81%	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	3.57	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>49</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	26	93%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.82	28	0
13. Dignified	26	93%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.82	28	0
14. Courteous	26	93%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.82	28	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	26	93%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.82	28	0
16. Patient	25	93%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.81	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>139</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	68%	4	14%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	24	89%	2	7%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	86%	2	7%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>83</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. Dean M. Fink

2022 Juror 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	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	27	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	26	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	25	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>236</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	25	93%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	27	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	22	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>81</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	25	93%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	27	0
14. Dignified	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
15. Courteous	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	93%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	27	0
17. Patient	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>135</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	21	78%	3	11%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.63	27	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	26	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>80</b>	