



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. Alison S. Bachus
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 119 Returned: 31 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 183 Returned: 23 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	100%
Communication	95%	n/a	100%
Temperament	97%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	100%
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. Alison S. Bachus

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	14	50%	10	36%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	28	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	50%	10	36%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.32	28	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	62%	7	27%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	61%	8	29%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
Category Total	61	55%	35	32%	11	10%	3	3%	0	0%	3.40	110	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	17	61%	7	25%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	71%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	14	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	60%	8	32%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	64%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	64%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	69%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	69%	4	25%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	69%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	58%	4	21%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	3.32	19	0
Category Total	100	64%	40	26%	14	9%	2	1%	0	0%	3.53	156	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	61%	6	21%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	3.39	28	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	63%	5	19%	3	11%	1	4%	1	4%	3.33	27	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	20	69%	4	14%	4	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	29	0
Category Total	54	64%	15	18%	11	13%	3	4%	1	1%	3.40	84	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	14	47%	6	20%	9	30%	1	3%	0	0%	3.10	30	0
18. Dignified	18	62%	8	28%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	29	0
19. Courteous	17	57%	8	27%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	30	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	57%	8	27%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.37	30	0
21. Patient	15	52%	8	28%	4	14%	2	7%	0	0%	3.24	29	0
Category Total	81	55%	38	26%	25	17%	4	3%	0	0%	3.32	148	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	20	67%	5	17%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	3.43	30	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	21	70%	6	20%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	30	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	19	66%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	3.38	29	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	70%	4	13%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	30	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	63%	4	15%	4	15%	0	0%	2	7%	3.26	27	0
Category Total	98	67%	24	16%	18	12%	3	2%	3	2%	3.45	146	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	11	50%	6	27%	3	14%	2	9%	0	0%	3.18	22	0
Category Total	11	50%	6	27%	3	14%	2	9%	0	0%	3.18	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. Alison S. Bachus

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	15	83%	1	6%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	83%	2	11%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	82%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	81%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	78%	3	17%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
Category Total	120	82%	19	13%	8	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	147	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	88%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
Category Total	30	94%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	32	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
13. Dignified	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
14. Courteous	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
16. Patient	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
Category Total	74	92%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	80	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
Category Total	42	88%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	48	