



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. Kathleen A. Quigley
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2012

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 187 Returned: 36 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 290 Returned: 59 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	98%
Communication	100%	n/a	97%
Temperament	100%	n/a	97%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	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. Kathleen A. Quigley

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	27	75%	9	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	30	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	36	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	29	81%	6	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	36	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	29	81%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	36	0
Category Total	115	80%	28	19%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	144	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	29	81%	5	14%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	36	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	36	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	28	88%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	32	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	30	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	35	0
Category Total	270	87%	40	13%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	312	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
Category Total	92	88%	13	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	105	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	30	83%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	36	0
18. Dignified	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
19. Courteous	33	92%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	36	0
21. Patient	31	86%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	36	0
Category Total	156	87%	21	12%	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	180	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	34	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	36	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	33	92%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	36	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
Category Total	165	93%	11	6%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	178	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
Category Total	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	



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. Kathleen A. Quigley

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	40	70%	8	14%	6	11%	1	2%	2	4%	3.46	57	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	42	76%	10	18%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	55	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	41	76%	10	19%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	54	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	41	77%	10	19%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.72	53	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	39	76%	10	20%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	51	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	39	75%	10	19%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	52	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	43	75%	9	16%	4	7%	0	0%	1	2%	3.63	57	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	38	76%	10	20%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	50	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	41	73%	9	16%	3	5%	1	2%	2	4%	3.54	56	0
Category Total	364	75%	86	18%	27	6%	3	1%	5	1%	3.65	485	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	41	71%	12	21%	3	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.57	58	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	35	67%	12	23%	4	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	52	0
Category Total	76	69%	24	22%	7	6%	2	2%	1	1%	3.56	110	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	39	70%	7	13%	7	13%	1	2%	2	4%	3.43	56	0
13. Dignified	43	77%	7	13%	5	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3.62	56	0
14. Courteous	42	75%	11	20%	2	4%	0	0%	1	2%	3.66	56	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	41	73%	9	16%	3	5%	1	2%	2	4%	3.54	56	0
16. Patient	40	71%	9	16%	6	11%	0	0%	1	2%	3.55	56	0
Category Total	205	73%	43	15%	23	8%	2	1%	7	2%	3.56	280	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	41	72%	8	14%	7	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	57	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	41	72%	10	18%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	57	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	42	74%	9	16%	4	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.58	57	0
Category Total	124	73%	27	16%	17	10%	2	1%	1	1%	3.58	171	