



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 Ryan-Touhill
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2015

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Ryan-Touhill MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
22 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 298 Returned: 46 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 71 Returned: 35 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 125 Returned: 17 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	91%
Communication	96%	99%	83%
Temperament	95%	100%	82%
Admin Performance	98%	99%	84%
Settlement Activities	91%	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 Ryan-Touhill

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	31	74%	9	21%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	3.62	42	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	32	76%	8	19%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.69	42	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	31	79%	6	15%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.72	39	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	30	73%	9	22%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	3.63	41	0
Category Total	124	76%	32	20%	2	1%	5	3%	1	1%	3.66	164	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	29	66%	9	20%	4	9%	0	0%	2	5%	3.43	44	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	71%	8	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	71%	8	21%	1	3%	0	0%	2	5%	3.53	38	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	23	77%	6	20%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	23	77%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	77%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	73%	8	24%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	33	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	23	74%	7	23%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	31	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	25	71%	9	26%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.63	35	0
Category Total	219	73%	69	23%	9	3%	0	0%	5	2%	3.65	302	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	30	68%	12	27%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.61	44	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	26	68%	10	26%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.55	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	27	61%	12	27%	3	7%	0	0%	2	5%	3.41	44	0
Category Total	83	66%	34	27%	4	3%	2	2%	3	2%	3.52	126	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	27	61%	11	25%	3	7%	1	2%	2	5%	3.36	44	0
18. Dignified	26	58%	15	33%	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	45	0
19. Courteous	27	60%	13	29%	3	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	45	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	27	61%	12	27%	3	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.43	44	0
21. Patient	26	59%	9	20%	6	14%	2	5%	1	2%	3.30	44	0
Category Total	133	60%	60	27%	17	8%	6	3%	6	3%	3.39	222	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	64%	13	29%	2	4%	0	0%	1	2%	3.53	45	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	30	67%	12	27%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	45	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	28	72%	9	23%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.64	39	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	31	69%	9	20%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.53	45	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	29	69%	9	21%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	42	0
Category Total	147	68%	52	24%	13	6%	3	1%	1	0%	3.58	216	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	68%	3	14%	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	3.36	22	0
Category Total	15	68%	3	14%	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	3.36	22	



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 Ryan-Touhill

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	8	50%	3	19%	2	13%	2	13%	1	6%	2.94	16	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	54%	3	23%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	3.23	13	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	7	64%	2	18%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	58%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	3.17	12	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	7	58%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	3.17	12	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	7	54%	2	15%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	3.00	13	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	62%	1	8%	2	15%	1	8%	1	8%	3.08	13	0
Category Total	66	59%	18	16%	18	16%	5	4%	5	4%	3.21	112	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	8	50%	3	19%	3	19%	1	6%	1	6%	3.00	16	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	54%	1	8%	2	15%	1	8%	2	15%	2.77	13	0
Category Total	15	52%	4	14%	5	17%	2	7%	3	10%	2.90	29	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	8	50%	2	13%	2	13%	1	6%	3	19%	2.69	16	0
13. Dignified	10	59%	3	18%	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	3.12	17	0
14. Courteous	9	56%	2	13%	2	13%	3	19%	0	0%	3.06	16	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	10	59%	1	6%	3	18%	2	12%	1	6%	3.00	17	0
16. Patient	9	53%	3	18%	3	18%	1	6%	1	6%	3.06	17	0
Category Total	46	55%	11	13%	11	13%	9	11%	6	7%	2.99	83	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	56%	0	0%	4	25%	1	6%	2	13%	2.81	16	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	53%	2	12%	4	24%	1	6%	1	6%	3.00	17	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	10	63%	0	0%	3	19%	1	6%	2	13%	2.94	16	0
Category Total	28	57%	2	4%	11	22%	3	6%	5	10%	2.92	49	



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 Ryan-Touhill

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	29	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	34	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	29	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	34	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	29	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	34	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	27	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	27	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	28	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
Category Total	253	85%	45	15%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	299	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	24	69%	7	20%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.54	35	0

12. Clearly explained the juror"s responsibilities	31	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	35	0
Category Total	87	83%	14	13%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.78	105	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	29	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0
14. Dignified	29	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0
15. Courteous	30	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	35	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	30	86%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0
17. Patient	29	83%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0
Category Total	147	84%	27	15%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	175	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	21	60%	9	26%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	3.43	35	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	30	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	35	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	30	86%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0
Category Total	81	77%	18	17%	5	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.70	105	