



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.

All Arizona Voters

Hon. Ann Scott Timmer
Arizona Supreme Court
Appointed: 2012

100% of the Commission Voted Justice Timmer MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
28 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

[View Decisions](#)

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 551 Returned: 63 Score (See Footnote)	Peer Judge Surveys Distributed: 10 Returned: 5 Score (See Footnote)	Superior Court Judge Surveys Distributed: 26 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	100%	96%
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Communication	100%	100%	n/a
Temperament	100%	100%	n/a
Admin Performance	95%	100%	100%

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. Ann Scott Timmer

2022 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
1. Legal Ability												
1. Legal reasoning ability	21	84%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.72	25
2. Knowledge of law	20	80%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.68	25
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	20	80%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.64	25
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	18	72%	5	20%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.60	25
Category Total	79	79%	13	13%	4	4%	3	3%	1	1%	3.66	100
2. Integrity												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	7	54%	3	23%	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%	3.08	13
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8
Category Total	52	71%	18	25%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	3.63	73

3. Communication												
14. Attentiveness	51	82%	10	16%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	62
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	39	78%	10	20%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	50
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11
17. Relevant questions	48	77%	11	18%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	62
18. Preparation for oral argument	39	78%	10	20%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	50
Category Total	187	80%	42	18%	6	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	235
4. Temperament												
19. Dignified	41	82%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	50
21. Courteous	43	86%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	50
22. Patient	41	82%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	50
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	43	86%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	50
Category Total	168	84%	31	16%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	200
5. Admin Performance												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	14	64%	5	23%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	3.45	22
Category Total	14	64%	5	23%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	3.45	22



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. Ann Scott Timmer

2022 Peer Judge 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	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
2. Knowledge of law	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	20	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	45	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	45	
3. Communication													
14. Attentiveness	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
15. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
16. Relevant questions	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	
4. Temperament													
17. Dignified	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
18. Courteous	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
19. Patient	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
20. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	20	
5. Admin Performance													
21. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
22. Prepared for proceedings	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
23. Works effectively with other judges	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
24. Works effectively with other court personnel	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
25. Effective handling of ongoing workload	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	25	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	25	



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. Ann Scott Timmer

2022 Superior Court Judge 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	83%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
2. Knowledge of the law	10	83%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	10	83%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	10	83%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
Category Total	40	83%	0	0%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	3.62	48	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	71%	0	0%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
Category Total	49	73%	6	9%	12	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	67	
3. Admin Performance													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
Category Total	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	