



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Janet Calkins Bostwick

Pima County Superior Court

Bench: Juvenile

Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 230 Returned: 48 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 28 Returned: 4 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 186 Returned: 34 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	98%
Communication	96%	100%	96%
Temperament	100%	100%	96%
Admin Performance	96%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	93%	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. Janet Calkins Bostwick

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	23	52%	14	32%	6	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.34	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	22	50%	13	30%	8	18%	1	2%	0	0%	3.27	44	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	21	55%	11	29%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.37	38	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	23	53%	13	30%	6	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.35	43	0
Category Total	89	53%	51	30%	25	15%	4	2%	0	0%	3.33	169	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	26	57%	16	35%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	3.43	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	23	70%	10	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	33	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	25	69%	10	28%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	36	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	69%	8	28%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	61%	11	35%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	66%	9	31%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	69%	10	29%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	67%	9	30%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	30	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	60%	13	37%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.54	35	0
Category Total	197	65%	96	32%	8	3%	3	1%	0	0%	3.60	304	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	25	56%	15	33%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.40	45	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	24	65%	7	19%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.46	37	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	30	67%	10	22%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.51	45	0
Category Total	79	62%	32	25%	11	9%	5	4%	0	0%	3.46	127	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	28	62%	15	33%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	45	0
18. Dignified	29	63%	15	33%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	46	0
19. Courteous	31	67%	13	28%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	46	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	29	64%	13	29%	2	4%	0	0%	1	2%	3.53	45	0
21. Patient	31	67%	13	28%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	46	0
Category Total	148	65%	69	30%	10	4%	0	0%	1	0%	3.59	228	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	27	59%	13	28%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	46	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	30	68%	8	18%	5	11%	0	0%	1	2%	3.50	44	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	28	64%	9	20%	4	9%	2	5%	1	2%	3.39	44	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	30	65%	11	24%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	46	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	30	65%	8	17%	5	11%	2	4%	1	2%	3.39	46	0
Category Total	145	64%	49	22%	24	11%	5	2%	3	1%	3.45	226	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	57%	4	29%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	3.36	14	0
Category Total	8	57%	4	29%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	3.36	14	



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. Janet Calkins Bostwick

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	14	50%	11	39%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.36	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	63%	8	33%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	54%	10	38%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.42	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	54%	9	38%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.42	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	58%	8	33%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	54%	8	33%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.38	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	15	60%	8	32%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	57%	8	35%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	52%	9	33%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.33	27	0
Category Total	125	56%	79	35%	16	7%	5	2%	0	0%	3.44	225	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	14	50%	11	39%	2	7%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	50%	8	29%	5	18%	1	4%	0	0%	3.25	28	0
Category Total	28	50%	19	34%	7	12%	1	2%	1	2%	3.29	56	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	13	46%	11	39%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.29	28	0	
13. Dignified	13	46%	12	43%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.32	28	0	
14. Courteous	14	50%	10	36%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	28	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	14	50%	11	39%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	3.32	28	0	
16. Patient	16	59%	9	33%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	27	0	
Category Total	70	50%	53	38%	11	8%	5	4%	0	0%	3.35	139		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	54%	10	38%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	54%	9	35%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	26	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	54%	9	35%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.35	26	0	
Category Total	42	54%	28	36%	6	8%	2	3%	0	0%	3.41	78		



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. Janet Calkins Bostwick

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	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
Category Total	36	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	36	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
Category Total	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
14. Dignified	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
15. Courteous	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
17. Patient	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
Category Total	16	80%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	20	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	3	75%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
Category Total	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	