



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. Kevin D. White
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Other
Appointed: 2005

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge White
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**
27 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 189 Returned: 57 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 15 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 957 Returned: 174 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	98%	99%
Communication	99%	100%	98%
Temperament	97%	97%	99%
Admin Performance	96%	100%	98%
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. Kevin D. White

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	34	63%	14	26%	4	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.48	54	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	35	65%	14	26%	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	54	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	33	69%	10	21%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	48	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	33	61%	15	28%	5	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.48	54	0
Category Total	135	64%	53	25%	19	9%	3	1%	0	0%	3.52	210	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	36	65%	11	20%	7	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.49	55	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	35	73%	6	13%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	48	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	68%	10	20%	5	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.54	50	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	30	81%	4	11%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	37	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	79%	5	13%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	39	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	79%	6	14%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	42	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	35	76%	7	15%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	46	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	29	81%	4	11%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	36	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	36	75%	6	13%	5	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	48	0
Category Total	299	75%	59	15%	39	10%	4	1%	0	0%	3.63	401	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	33	59%	15	27%	7	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	56	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	28	65%	12	28%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	43	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	40	71%	10	18%	5	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.59	56	0
Category Total	101	65%	37	24%	15	10%	2	1%	0	0%	3.53	155	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	37	66%	14	25%	3	5%	2	4%	0	0%	3.54	56	0
18. Dignified	41	73%	10	18%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	56	0
19. Courteous	42	75%	8	14%	5	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	56	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	40	71%	9	16%	5	9%	2	4%	0	0%	3.55	56	0
21. Patient	38	68%	9	16%	7	13%	2	4%	0	0%	3.48	56	0
Category Total	198	71%	50	18%	24	9%	8	3%	0	0%	3.56	280	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	30	57%	11	21%	9	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.26	53	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	33	61%	16	30%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.50	54	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	30	59%	15	29%	4	8%	2	4%	0	0%	3.43	51	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	37	69%	16	30%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	54	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	32	59%	10	19%	7	13%	4	7%	1	2%	3.26	54	0
Category Total	162	61%	68	26%	25	9%	9	3%	2	1%	3.42	266	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	72%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	25	0
Category Total	18	72%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	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. Kevin D. White

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	130	76%	32	19%	6	4%	1	1%	2	1%	3.68	171	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	132	80%	24	15%	7	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.74	164	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	132	80%	25	15%	7	4%	1	1%	1	1%	3.72	166	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	124	81%	22	14%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	153	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	125	81%	23	15%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	155	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	127	81%	23	15%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	157	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	129	80%	26	16%	5	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	161	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	122	81%	21	14%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	150	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	124	79%	25	16%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.74	156	0
Category Total	1145	80%	221	15%	55	4%	2	0%	10	1%	3.74	1433	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	133	80%	24	14%	8	5%	1	1%	1	1%	3.72	167	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	115	78%	20	14%	8	5%	3	2%	1	1%	3.67	147	0
Category Total	248	79%	44	14%	16	5%	4	1%	2	1%	3.69	314	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	134	81%	24	14%	6	4%	1	1%	1	1%	3.74	166	0
13. Dignified	137	83%	22	13%	6	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.77	166	0
14. Courteous	134	81%	24	15%	6	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.76	165	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	135	82%	19	12%	9	5%	2	1%	0	0%	3.74	165	0
16. Patient	136	82%	22	13%	7	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.76	166	0
Category Total	676	82%	111	13%	34	4%	4	0%	3	0%	3.75	828	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	121	73%	30	18%	8	5%	5	3%	2	1%	3.58	166	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	136	83%	21	13%	5	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.79	163	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	134	81%	22	13%	8	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.75	165	0
Category Total	391	79%	73	15%	21	4%	6	1%	3	1%	3.71	494	



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. Kevin D. White

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	8	67%	2	17%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	3.42	12	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	75%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
Category Total	78	77%	13	13%	8	8%	2	2%	0	0%	3.65	101	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	58%	4	33%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
Category Total	23	64%	10	28%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	36	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	8	73%	2	18%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
14. Dignified	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
15. Courteous	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
17. Patient	8	67%	2	17%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	3.42	12	0
Category Total	42	71%	9	15%	6	10%	2	3%	0	0%	3.54	59	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	8	67%	1	8%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	12	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
Category Total	26	72%	3	8%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	36	