



**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. Stephen M. Hopkins**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2015

**32% of the Commission Voted Judge Hopkins MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
7 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
15 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 467 Returned: 45 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 75 Returned: 36 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 249 Returned: 22 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	83%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	100%	98%
Communication	88%	100%	100%
Temperament	79%	100%	98%
Admin Performance	95%	98%	100%
Settlement Activities	76%	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. Stephen M. Hopkins

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	12	29%	15	37%	6	15%	7	17%	1	2%	2.73	41	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	31%	11	28%	10	26%	5	13%	1	3%	2.72	39	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	32%	11	30%	8	22%	5	14%	1	3%	2.76	37	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	15	37%	12	29%	7	17%	6	15%	1	2%	2.83	41	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	15	35%	15	35%	7	16%	2	5%	4	9%	2.81	43	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	38%	16	43%	6	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.16	37	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	38%	14	38%	6	16%	1	3%	2	5%	3.00	37	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	45%	12	39%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	44%	12	38%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.22	32	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	45%	12	39%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	31	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	40%	13	37%	7	20%	1	3%	0	0%	3.14	35	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	44%	11	34%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	3.19	32	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	40%	13	37%	6	17%	2	6%	0	0%	3.11	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>313</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	13	30%	16	36%	9	20%	3	7%	3	7%	2.75	44	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	11	33%	13	39%	6	18%	2	6%	1	3%	2.94	33	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	34%	12	27%	11	25%	3	7%	3	7%	2.75	44	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>121</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	14	34%	14	34%	4	10%	3	7%	6	15%	2.66	41	0
18. Dignified	16	38%	13	31%	4	10%	2	5%	7	17%	2.69	42	0
19. Courteous	17	40%	12	28%	5	12%	2	5%	7	16%	2.70	43	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	40%	13	30%	4	9%	2	5%	7	16%	2.72	43	0
21. Patient	15	36%	13	31%	5	12%	1	2%	8	19%	2.62	42	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>211</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	34%	19	46%	6	15%	2	5%	0	0%	3.10	41	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	39%	17	41%	5	12%	3	7%	0	0%	3.12	41	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	15	41%	14	38%	7	19%	0	0%	1	3%	3.14	37	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	37%	17	41%	6	15%	3	7%	0	0%	3.07	41	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	14	34%	19	46%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.12	41	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>201</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	10	34%	10	34%	2	7%	4	14%	3	10%	2.69	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>29</b>	



**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. Stephen M. Hopkins

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	10	45%	5	23%	6	27%	1	5%	0	0%	3.09	22	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	56%	4	22%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	18	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	11	58%	3	16%	4	21%	1	5%	0	0%	3.26	19	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	59%	3	18%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	59%	3	18%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	59%	3	18%	3	18%	1	6%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	53%	4	24%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	59%	3	18%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	52%	4	19%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	3.19	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>165</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	12	57%	3	14%	6	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	21	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	50%	3	17%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>39</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	11	52%	5	24%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%	3.24	21	0
13. Dignified	11	55%	4	20%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	20	0
14. Courteous	11	55%	4	20%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	3.25	20	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	10	53%	5	26%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	19	0
16. Patient	12	60%	3	15%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	20	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	48%	5	24%	6	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.19	21	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	57%	4	19%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	21	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	57%	4	19%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>63</b>	



**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. Stephen M. Hopkins

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	33	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	32	91%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>318</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	30	86%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	35	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	33	92%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>107</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
14. Dignified	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
15. Courteous	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	33	92%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	36	0
17. Patient	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>180</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	26	72%	8	22%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	3.61	36	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	33	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	35	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>107</b>	