



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. Frank W. Moskowitz
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 553 Returned: 83 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 74 Returned: 33 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 326 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	88%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	97%
Communication	96%	100%	98%
Temperament	94%	100%	91%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	98%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Frank W. Moskowitz

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	32	43%	17	23%	18	24%	8	11%	0	0%	2.97	75	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	28	38%	19	26%	16	22%	11	15%	0	0%	2.86	74	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	30	43%	14	20%	17	24%	9	13%	0	0%	2.93	70	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	31	40%	17	22%	22	29%	7	9%	0	0%	2.94	77	0
Category Total	121	41%	67	23%	73	25%	35	12%	0	0%	2.93	296	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	47	58%	16	20%	15	19%	3	4%	0	0%	3.32	81	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	49	64%	13	17%	15	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	77	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	62%	13	17%	13	17%	2	3%	1	1%	3.36	77	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	46	64%	12	17%	14	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	72	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	48	64%	13	17%	14	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	75	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	48	65%	12	16%	14	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	74	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	49	64%	13	17%	15	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	77	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	43	62%	12	17%	14	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	69	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	48	63%	13	17%	15	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	76	0
Category Total	426	63%	117	17%	129	19%	5	1%	1	0%	3.42	678	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	40	50%	19	24%	17	21%	4	5%	0	0%	3.19	80	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	31	49%	16	25%	13	21%	3	5%	0	0%	3.19	63	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	47	60%	18	23%	11	14%	2	3%	0	0%	3.41	78	0
Category Total	118	53%	53	24%	41	19%	9	4%	0	0%	3.27	221	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	48	60%	18	23%	10	13%	3	4%	1	1%	3.36	80	0
18. Dignified	47	59%	18	23%	12	15%	2	3%	1	1%	3.35	80	0
19. Courteous	45	57%	19	24%	12	15%	2	3%	1	1%	3.33	79	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	45	56%	17	21%	12	15%	6	8%	0	0%	3.26	80	0
21. Patient	42	53%	17	21%	15	19%	4	5%	2	3%	3.16	80	0
Category Total	227	57%	89	22%	61	15%	17	4%	5	1%	3.29	399	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	47	59%	19	24%	14	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	80	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	44	56%	21	27%	11	14%	3	4%	0	0%	3.34	79	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	39	53%	19	26%	14	19%	2	3%	0	0%	3.28	74	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	44	56%	18	23%	14	18%	2	3%	0	0%	3.33	78	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	44	56%	19	24%	15	19%	1	1%	0	0%	3.34	79	0
Category Total	218	56%	96	25%	68	17%	8	2%	0	0%	3.34	390	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	37	63%	11	19%	9	15%	2	3%	0	0%	3.41	59	0
Category Total	37	63%	11	19%	9	15%	2	3%	0	0%	3.41	59	



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. Frank W. Moskowitz

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	13	46%	9	32%	5	18%	0	0%	1	4%	3.18	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	58%	6	23%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	26	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	65%	5	19%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.42	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	67%	6	25%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	15	65%	6	26%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	64%	6	27%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	65%	5	19%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	68%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	64%	6	24%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.44	25	0
Category Total	138	62%	54	24%	24	11%	4	2%	2	1%	3.45	222	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	17	65%	6	23%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	26	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	12	60%	6	30%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	20	0
Category Total	29	63%	12	26%	4	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	46	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	15	54%	5	18%	5	18%	2	7%	1	4%	3.11	28	0
13. Dignified	13	48%	6	22%	6	22%	1	4%	1	4%	3.07	27	0
14. Courteous	14	50%	9	32%	2	7%	2	7%	1	4%	3.18	28	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	15	54%	6	21%	4	14%	2	7%	1	4%	3.14	28	0
16. Patient	15	54%	6	21%	5	18%	1	4%	1	4%	3.18	28	0
Category Total	72	52%	32	23%	22	16%	8	6%	5	4%	3.14	139	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	13	50%	7	27%	6	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.27	26	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	67%	5	19%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	27	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	63%	4	15%	5	19%	0	0%	1	4%	3.33	27	0
Category Total	48	60%	16	20%	14	18%	1	1%	1	1%	3.36	80	



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. Frank W. Moskowitz

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	27	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	88%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	32	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	23	82%	5	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	25	83%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	30	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	26	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
Category Total	234	85%	41	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	275	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	27	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	33	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	31	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	33	0
Category Total	88	89%	10	10%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	99	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	28	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	31	0
14. Dignified	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0
15. Courteous	29	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0
17. Patient	27	84%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	32	0
Category Total	144	89%	16	10%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	162	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	29	91%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	32	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	31	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	33	0
Category Total	90	92%	7	7%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	98	