



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. Janice K. Crawford
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 286 Returned: 60 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 53 Returned: 14 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 54 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	90%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication	92%	100%	100%
Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	100%
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. Janice K. Crawford

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	23	44%	16	31%	6	12%	5	10%	2	4%	3.02	52	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	22	45%	14	29%	7	14%	4	8%	2	4%	3.02	49	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	21	54%	12	31%	3	8%	2	5%	1	3%	3.28	39	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	28	49%	19	33%	7	12%	2	4%	1	2%	3.25	57	0
Category Total	94	48%	61	31%	23	12%	13	7%	6	3%	3.14	197	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	36	62%	9	16%	11	19%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	58	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	80%	1	4%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	25	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	79%	4	12%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	34	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	79%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	79%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	84%	1	4%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	25	81%	3	10%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	83%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	84%	1	4%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
Category Total	207	77%	24	9%	36	13%	1	0%	1	0%	3.62	269	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	31	55%	13	23%	7	13%	5	9%	0	0%	3.25	56	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	25	52%	9	19%	8	17%	5	10%	1	2%	3.08	48	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	38	66%	10	17%	8	14%	1	2%	1	2%	3.43	58	0
Category Total	94	58%	32	20%	23	14%	11	7%	2	1%	3.27	162	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	30	56%	12	22%	9	17%	3	6%	0	0%	3.28	54	0
18. Dignified	36	63%	12	21%	8	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.46	57	0
19. Courteous	38	67%	10	18%	8	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.49	57	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	35	61%	13	23%	6	11%	2	4%	1	2%	3.39	57	0
21. Patient	33	59%	13	23%	10	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	56	0
Category Total	172	61%	60	21%	41	15%	7	2%	1	0%	3.41	281	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	58%	16	28%	8	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	57	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	35	61%	14	25%	8	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	57	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	31	56%	15	27%	8	15%	1	2%	0	0%	3.38	55	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	59%	12	21%	7	12%	5	9%	0	0%	3.29	58	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	31	57%	15	28%	7	13%	0	0%	1	2%	3.39	54	0
Category Total	164	58%	72	26%	38	14%	6	2%	1	0%	3.40	281	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0
Category Total	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	



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. Janice K. Crawford

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	6	60%	2	20%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
Category Total	39	67%	9	16%	10	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	58	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
Category Total	11	69%	3	19%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
13. Dignified	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
14. Courteous	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
16. Patient	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
Category Total	31	67%	14	30%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	46	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	22	76%	7	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	



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. Janice K. Crawford

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	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
Category Total	73	74%	26	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	99	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	8	57%	4	29%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	11	79%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
Category Total	30	71%	9	21%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	42	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
14. Dignified	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
15. Courteous	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
17. Patient	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
Category Total	59	84%	11	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	70	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	10	71%	4	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	10	71%	4	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
Category Total	31	74%	11	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	42	