



[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. Bradley Astrowsky**  
 Maricopa County Superior Court  
 Bench: Family  
 Appointed: 2012

**96% of the Commission Voted Judge Astrowsky MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
 27 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
 1 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 212 Returned: 38 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 3 Returned: 3 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 591 Returned: 90 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	100%	90%
Communication	97%	100%	90%
Temperament	97%	100%	86%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	94%
Settlement Activities	96%	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. Bradley Astrowsky

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	26	68%	9	24%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%	3.53	38	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	27	71%	7	18%	1	3%	3	8%	0	0%	3.53	38	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	28	78%	7	19%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.72	36	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	29	78%	7	19%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.73	37	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>149</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	31	82%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.71	38	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	26	87%	2	7%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	76%	6	16%	2	5%	0	0%	1	3%	3.62	37	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	80%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	23	82%	4	14%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	81%	4	15%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	84%	4	13%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.78	32	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	80%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	79%	4	12%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>275</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	31	82%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.71	38	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	27	73%	8	22%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.62	37	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	32	84%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>113</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	31	84%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.73	37	0
18. Dignified	30	83%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.75	36	0
19. Courteous	31	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.78	36	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	32	86%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.76	37	0
21. Patient	32	86%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.76	37	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>183</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	78%	4	11%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	37	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	31	84%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.76	37	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	30	83%	3	8%	2	6%	0	0%	1	3%	3.69	36	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	31	84%	2	5%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	37	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	29	78%	6	16%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	37	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>184</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	20	71%	6	21%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.57	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>28</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. Bradley Astrowsky

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	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>22</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
14. Dignified	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
15. Courteous	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
17. Patient	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>9</b>	



[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.



## Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Bradley Astrowsky

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	43	56%	11	14%	9	12%	7	9%	7	9%	2.99	77	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	44	68%	10	15%	7	11%	2	3%	2	3%	3.42	65	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	46	62%	10	14%	6	8%	6	8%	6	8%	3.14	74	0

4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	42	70%	10	17%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.50	60	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	45	69%	11	17%	7	11%	0	0%	2	3%	3.49	65	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	41	69%	10	17%	4	7%	2	3%	2	3%	3.46	59	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	44	68%	10	15%	8	12%	1	2%	2	3%	3.43	65	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	40	65%	12	19%	5	8%	1	2%	4	6%	3.34	62	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	41	59%	11	16%	6	9%	6	9%	6	9%	3.07	70	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>597</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	41	55%	17	23%	11	15%	4	5%	2	3%	3.21	75	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	36	60%	8	13%	8	13%	5	8%	3	5%	3.15	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>135</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	35	48%	20	27%	5	7%	9	12%	4	5%	3.00	73	0
13. Dignified	39	54%	17	24%	9	13%	5	7%	2	3%	3.19	72	0
14. Courteous	40	54%	15	20%	11	15%	5	7%	3	4%	3.14	74	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	41	58%	14	20%	5	7%	4	6%	7	10%	3.10	71	0
16. Patient	41	58%	14	20%	6	8%	5	7%	5	7%	3.14	71	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>361</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													

17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	44	61%	12	17%	15	21%	0	0%	1	1%	3.36	72	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	47	66%	10	14%	10	14%	2	3%	2	3%	3.38	71	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	47	64%	8	11%	10	14%	4	5%	4	5%	3.23	73	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>216</b>	