



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Danelle Liwski
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 344 Returned: 90 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 28 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 405 Returned: 67 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	99%
Communication	99%	100%	98%
Temperament	97%	100%	99%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	99%
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. Danelle Liwski

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	38	42%	37	41%	12	13%	1	1%	2	2%	3.20	90	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	37	42%	35	40%	14	16%	0	0%	2	2%	3.19	88	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	35	42%	35	42%	13	15%	0	0%	1	1%	3.23	84	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	38	43%	38	43%	11	12%	0	0%	2	2%	3.24	89	0
Category Total	148	42%	145	41%	50	14%	1	0%	7	2%	3.21	351	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	48	53%	29	32%	10	11%	3	3%	0	0%	3.36	90	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	51	61%	24	29%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	83	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	50	61%	24	29%	7	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.50	82	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	48	71%	15	22%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	68	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	50	65%	19	25%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	77	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	46	64%	17	24%	8	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.50	72	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	49	60%	22	27%	10	12%	0	0%	1	1%	3.44	82	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	48	69%	16	23%	6	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	70	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	49	61%	21	26%	9	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.48	80	0
Category Total	439	62%	187	27%	71	10%	6	1%	1	0%	3.50	704	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	43	48%	36	40%	10	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.34	90	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	41	57%	22	31%	8	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.43	72	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	47	52%	33	37%	10	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	90	0
Category Total	131	52%	91	36%	28	11%	2	1%	0	0%	3.39	252	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	49	54%	27	30%	10	11%	3	3%	1	1%	3.33	90	0
18. Dignified	54	60%	27	30%	8	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	90	0
19. Courteous	56	62%	24	27%	7	8%	2	2%	1	1%	3.47	90	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	53	59%	24	27%	11	12%	2	2%	0	0%	3.42	90	0
21. Patient	55	61%	25	28%	6	7%	3	3%	1	1%	3.44	90	0
Category Total	267	59%	127	28%	42	9%	11	2%	3	1%	3.43	450	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	52	58%	30	33%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	90	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	52	58%	29	32%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	90	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	48	56%	29	34%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	85	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	52	58%	31	34%	6	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	90	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	49	55%	32	36%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	89	0
Category Total	253	57%	151	34%	39	9%	1	0%	0	0%	3.48	444	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	41	57%	21	29%	7	10%	2	3%	1	1%	3.38	72	0
Category Total	41	57%	21	29%	7	10%	2	3%	1	1%	3.38	72	



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. Danelle Liwski

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	47	72%	13	20%	4	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	65	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	48	76%	12	19%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	63	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	76%	11	17%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.68	63	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	44	73%	12	20%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.65	60	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	45	74%	12	20%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	61	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	46	75%	12	20%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	61	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	44	72%	13	21%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	61	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	42	72%	12	21%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	58	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	46	74%	12	19%	3	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.65	62	0
Category Total	410	74%	109	20%	30	5%	4	1%	1	0%	3.67	554	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	48	77%	9	15%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	62	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	40	71%	10	18%	4	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.57	56	0
Category Total	88	75%	19	16%	9	8%	2	2%	0	0%	3.64	118	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	52	80%	9	14%	3	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.71	65	0
13. Dignified	54	83%	7	11%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.75	65	0
14. Courteous	55	85%	7	11%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	65	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	51	80%	8	13%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	64	0
16. Patient	52	81%	6	9%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3.70	64	0
Category Total	264	82%	37	11%	19	6%	2	1%	1	0%	3.74	323	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	51	81%	8	13%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	63	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	50	81%	8	13%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.73	62	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	52	83%	6	10%	4	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.71	63	0
Category Total	153	81%	22	12%	11	6%	1	1%	1	1%	3.73	188	



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. Danelle Liwski

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	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	86	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	86	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	26	87%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	30	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
14. Dignified	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
15. Courteous	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
17. Patient	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	49	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	50	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	29	97%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	30	