



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.

Pinal County Voters Only

Hon. Daniel A. Washburn
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 82 Returned: 19 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 478 Returned: 55 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	n/a	96%
Communication	96%	n/a	92%
Temperament	97%	n/a	89%
Admin Performance	95%	n/a	91%
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. Daniel A. Washburn

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	9	47%	5	26%	4	21%	1	5%	0	0%	3.16	19	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	63%	4	21%	2	11%	1	5%	0	0%	3.42	19	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	10	56%	5	28%	2	11%	1	6%	0	0%	3.33	18	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	10	53%	6	32%	2	11%	1	5%	0	0%	3.32	19	0
Category Total	41	55%	20	27%	10	13%	4	5%	0	0%	3.31	75	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	9	47%	3	16%	7	37%	0	0%	0	0%	3.11	19	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	56%	3	17%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	3.22	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	50%	3	17%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	56%	3	19%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	3.25	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	63%	3	19%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	56%	4	22%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	18	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	50%	4	22%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	3.17	18	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	62%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	56%	5	28%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	18	0
Category Total	84	55%	31	20%	36	23%	3	2%	0	0%	3.27	154	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	10	53%	2	11%	5	26%	2	11%	0	0%	3.05	19	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	8	47%	6	35%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	10	53%	6	32%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.37	19	0
Category Total	28	51%	14	25%	11	20%	2	4%	0	0%	3.24	55	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	10	53%	6	32%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.37	19	0
18. Dignified	10	53%	7	37%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	19	0
19. Courteous	10	53%	5	26%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	3.26	19	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	10	53%	5	26%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	3.26	19	0
21. Patient	10	53%	3	16%	5	26%	1	5%	0	0%	3.16	19	0
Category Total	50	53%	26	27%	16	17%	3	3%	0	0%	3.29	95	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	8	42%	5	26%	3	16%	2	11%	1	5%	2.89	19	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	8	42%	7	37%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	19	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	53%	5	26%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	19	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	58%	5	26%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	19	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	8	42%	4	21%	5	26%	0	0%	2	11%	2.84	19	0
Category Total	45	47%	26	27%	19	20%	2	2%	3	3%	3.14	95	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	44%	1	11%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	9	0
Category Total	4	44%	1	11%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	9	



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. Daniel A. Washburn

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	45%	17	32%	6	11%	3	6%	3	6%	3.06	53	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	60%	12	24%	6	12%	0	0%	2	4%	3.36	50	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	60%	12	23%	6	12%	1	2%	2	4%	3.33	52	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	29	59%	12	24%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.39	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	30	60%	12	24%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	60%	12	26%	6	13%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	29	57%	12	24%	7	14%	2	4%	1	2%	3.29	51	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	28	58%	12	25%	7	15%	0	0%	1	2%	3.38	48	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	58%	13	25%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.36	53	0
Category Total	260	57%	114	25%	59	13%	7	2%	13	3%	3.33	453	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	28	52%	15	28%	7	13%	3	6%	1	2%	3.22	54	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	49%	12	26%	8	17%	3	6%	1	2%	3.13	47	0
Category Total	51	50%	27	27%	15	15%	6	6%	2	2%	3.18	101	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	28	53%	9	17%	8	15%	7	13%	1	2%	3.06	53	0
13. Dignified	27	52%	14	27%	8	15%	2	4%	1	2%	3.23	52	0
14. Courteous	27	51%	11	21%	10	19%	4	8%	1	2%	3.11	53	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	29	55%	12	23%	5	9%	4	8%	3	6%	3.13	53	0
16. Patient	29	56%	13	25%	4	8%	5	10%	1	2%	3.23	52	0
Category Total	140	53%	59	22%	35	13%	22	8%	7	3%	3.15	263	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	22	42%	12	23%	11	21%	6	12%	1	2%	2.92	52	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	27	54%	17	34%	4	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.36	50	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	47%	15	28%	8	15%	3	6%	2	4%	3.09	53	0
Category Total	74	48%	44	28%	23	15%	10	6%	4	3%	3.12	155	