



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.

Coconino County Voters Only

Hon. Dan R. Slayton

Coconino
Bench: Civil/Criminal
Appointed: 2010

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

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 55 Returned: 18 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 14 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 174 Returned: 40 Score (See Footnote)	Presiding Judge Surveys Distributed: 6 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	84%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	95%	n/a
Communication	78%	100%	92%	n/a
Temperament	89%	100%	97%	n/a
Admin Performance	99%	100%	99%	n/a
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	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. Dan R. Slayton

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	2	11%	9	50%	4	22%	2	11%	1	6%	2.50	18	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	1	6%	11	61%	3	17%	2	11%	1	6%	2.50	18	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	1	6%	11	65%	2	12%	2	12%	1	6%	2.53	17	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	2	12%	10	59%	3	18%	1	6%	1	6%	2.65	17	0
Category Total	6	9%	41	59%	12	17%	7	10%	4	6%	2.54	70	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	3	18%	8	47%	5	29%	1	6%	0	0%	2.76	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	41%	6	35%	3	18%	0	0%	1	6%	3.06	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	41%	7	41%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	36%	7	50%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	33%	7	47%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.13	15	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	38%	7	54%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	38%	8	50%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	16	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	33%	6	50%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	36%	7	50%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	14	0
Category Total	47	35%	63	47%	23	17%	1	1%	1	1%	3.14	135	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	2	13%	11	69%	0	0%	3	19%	0	0%	2.75	16	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	0	0%	8	62%	1	8%	3	23%	1	8%	2.23	13	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	2	13%	8	50%	3	19%	1	6%	2	13%	2.44	16	0
Category Total	4	9%	27	60%	4	9%	7	16%	3	7%	2.49	45	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	5	31%	5	31%	4	25%	1	6%	1	6%	2.75	16	0
18. Dignified	6	38%	8	50%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.19	16	0
19. Courteous	3	19%	9	56%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	2.88	16	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	5	31%	9	56%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	3.00	16	0
21. Patient	3	19%	6	38%	4	25%	3	19%	0	0%	2.56	16	0
Category Total	22	28%	37	46%	12	15%	7	9%	2	2%	2.88	80	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	8	53%	5	33%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	7	47%	7	47%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	2	14%	10	71%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	14	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	40%	6	40%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	3.13	15	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	10	67%	3	20%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	15	0
Category Total	33	45%	31	42%	9	12%	1	1%	0	0%	3.30	74	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0
Category Total	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	



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. Dan R. Slayton

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	24	62%	8	21%	3	8%	2	5%	2	5%	3.28	39	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	66%	7	18%	3	8%	1	3%	2	5%	3.37	38	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	25	69%	6	17%	3	8%	0	0%	2	6%	3.44	36	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	23	70%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	33	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	69%	7	20%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	3.51	35	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	70%	8	24%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	25	69%	6	17%	3	8%	0	0%	2	6%	3.44	36	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	69%	6	19%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	3.50	32	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	65%	7	21%	3	9%	1	3%	1	3%	3.41	34	0
Category Total	213	67%	62	20%	26	8%	4	1%	11	3%	3.46	316	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	24	71%	4	12%	3	9%	2	6%	1	3%	3.41	34	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	79%	2	7%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
Category Total	47	75%	6	10%	5	8%	4	6%	1	2%	3.49	63	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	25	68%	7	19%	2	5%	2	5%	1	3%	3.43	37	0
13. Dignified	26	70%	6	16%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
14. Courteous	24	63%	8	21%	6	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	38	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	26	68%	6	16%	4	11%	0	0%	2	5%	3.42	38	0
16. Patient	26	72%	6	17%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	36	0
Category Total	127	68%	33	18%	20	11%	3	2%	3	2%	3.49	186	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	55%	11	29%	6	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	38	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	26	72%	8	22%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	36	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	68%	8	22%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	3.51	37	0
Category Total	72	65%	27	24%	11	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.52	111	



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. Dan R. Slayton

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	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	88%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	8	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
Category Total	62	84%	12	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	74	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
Category Total	20	67%	9	30%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	30	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
14. Dignified	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
15. Courteous	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
17. Patient	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
Category Total	37	74%	12	24%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	50	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
Category Total	25	83%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	30	