



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. Jennifer Green
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 209 Returned: 51 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 727 Returned: 185 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	100%
Communication	100%	n/a	98%
Temperament	98%	n/a	99%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	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. Jennifer Green

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	33	69%	12	25%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	48	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	33	69%	13	27%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	48	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	32	71%	11	24%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	45	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	32	70%	12	26%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	46	0
Category Total	130	70%	48	26%	8	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	187	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	40	82%	7	14%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.73	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	38	81%	7	15%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.72	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	38	84%	7	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	37	88%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	42	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	37	86%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	43	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	38	86%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	44	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	38	84%	7	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	37	86%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	43	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	81%	6	13%	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	3.70	47	0
Category Total	341	84%	57	14%	3	1%	2	0%	2	0%	3.81	405	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	40	80%	8	16%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	50	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	36	80%	8	18%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	45	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	42	86%	3	6%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	49	0
Category Total	118	82%	19	13%	7	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	144	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	41	82%	6	12%	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	3.72	50	0
18. Dignified	43	86%	4	8%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	50	0
19. Courteous	42	84%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	50	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	43	86%	5	10%	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%	3.78	50	0
21. Patient	41	82%	4	8%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	50	0
Category Total	210	84%	25	10%	11	4%	4	2%	0	0%	3.76	250	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	66%	12	24%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	50	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	36	72%	12	24%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	50	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	32	67%	13	27%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	48	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	41	84%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	36	72%	9	18%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	50	0
Category Total	178	72%	52	21%	17	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	247	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	65%	4	17%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	23	0
Category Total	15	65%	4	17%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	23	



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. Jennifer Green

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	135	75%	34	19%	8	4%	2	1%	1	1%	3.67	180	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	139	80%	30	17%	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	174	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	144	81%	27	15%	5	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.77	177	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	127	80%	28	18%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	159	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	136	80%	29	17%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	169	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	125	79%	30	19%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	159	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	143	81%	29	16%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	176	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	125	80%	30	19%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	157	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	134	79%	33	19%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	3.76	170	0
Category Total	1208	79%	270	18%	38	2%	4	0%	1	0%	3.76	1521	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	143	80%	29	16%	5	3%	1	1%	1	1%	3.74	179	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	129	78%	28	17%	5	3%	2	1%	2	1%	3.69	166	0
Category Total	272	79%	57	17%	10	3%	3	1%	3	1%	3.72	345	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	146	81%	26	14%	5	3%	3	2%	0	0%	3.75	180	0	
13. Dignified	146	82%	27	15%	6	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	179	0	
14. Courteous	149	83%	23	13%	7	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.78	180	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	147	83%	25	14%	5	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.78	178	0	
16. Patient	142	79%	29	16%	8	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.73	180	0	
Category Total	730	81%	130	14%	31	3%	5	1%	1	0%	3.76	897		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	137	77%	32	18%	9	5%	0	0%	1	1%	3.70	179	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	145	82%	25	14%	7	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	177	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	145	81%	25	14%	7	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.76	178	0	
Category Total	427	80%	82	15%	23	4%	1	0%	1	0%	3.75	534		