



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. Joseph S. Kiefer
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2019

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 133 Returned: 25 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 358 Returned: 72 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	90%
Communication	97%	n/a	81%
Temperament	91%	n/a	82%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	88%
Settlement Activities	100%	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. Joseph S. Kiefer

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	12	50%	5	21%	7	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	24	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	13	54%	4	17%	7	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	24	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	55%	4	18%	6	27%	0	0%	0	0%	3.27	22	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	50%	6	25%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	3.21	24	0
Category Total	49	52%	19	20%	25	27%	1	1%	0	0%	3.23	94	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	12	52%	6	26%	3	13%	1	4%	1	4%	3.17	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	63%	4	21%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.37	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	57%	5	24%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	3.24	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	73%	1	9%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	63%	3	19%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.38	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	7	58%	2	17%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	12	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	60%	3	20%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	15	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	75%	1	8%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	59%	3	18%	3	18%	1	6%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
Category Total	89	61%	28	19%	22	15%	4	3%	3	2%	3.34	146	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	10	42%	7	29%	7	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	24	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	10	50%	5	25%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	3.20	20	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	11	48%	6	26%	5	22%	0	0%	1	4%	3.13	23	0
Category Total	31	46%	18	27%	16	24%	1	1%	1	1%	3.15	67	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	12	55%	6	27%	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	3.23	22	0
18. Dignified	14	61%	5	22%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
19. Courteous	15	63%	4	17%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	3.33	24	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	68%	3	14%	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	3.36	22	0
21. Patient	14	61%	4	17%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	3.30	23	0
Category Total	70	61%	22	19%	12	11%	8	7%	2	2%	3.32	114	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	11	48%	7	30%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	3.22	23	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	11	48%	8	35%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	23	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	45%	4	18%	5	23%	1	5%	2	9%	2.86	22	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	50%	8	36%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	22	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	12	55%	5	23%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	3.27	22	0
Category Total	55	49%	32	29%	20	18%	3	3%	2	2%	3.21	112	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0
Category Total	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	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. Joseph S. Kiefer

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	27	45%	14	23%	9	15%	6	10%	4	7%	2.90	60	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	31	56%	10	18%	9	16%	3	5%	2	4%	3.18	55	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	55%	9	16%	6	11%	5	9%	5	9%	3.00	56	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	28	65%	8	19%	5	12%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	43	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	29	63%	9	20%	6	13%	2	4%	0	0%	3.41	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	24	62%	9	23%	3	8%	2	5%	1	3%	3.36	39	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	58%	12	25%	5	10%	2	4%	1	2%	3.33	48	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	60%	10	25%	3	8%	2	5%	1	3%	3.35	40	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	30	58%	10	19%	6	12%	2	4%	4	8%	3.15	52	0
Category Total	252	57%	91	21%	52	12%	25	6%	19	4%	3.21	439	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	31	52%	11	18%	7	12%	6	10%	5	8%	2.95	60	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	29	55%	7	13%	7	13%	4	8%	6	11%	2.92	53	0
Category Total	60	53%	18	16%	14	12%	10	9%	11	10%	2.94	113	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	26	44%	13	22%	7	12%	8	14%	5	8%	2.80	59	0
13. Dignified	31	53%	10	17%	11	19%	0	0%	7	12%	2.98	59	0
14. Courteous	29	49%	11	19%	11	19%	1	2%	7	12%	2.92	59	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	32	54%	7	12%	6	10%	7	12%	7	12%	2.85	59	0
16. Patient	33	56%	8	14%	7	12%	4	7%	7	12%	2.95	59	0
Category Total	151	51%	49	17%	42	14%	20	7%	33	11%	2.90	295	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	50%	12	21%	8	14%	2	3%	7	12%	2.93	58	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	35	61%	8	14%	10	18%	4	7%	0	0%	3.30	57	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	30	54%	11	20%	7	13%	3	5%	5	9%	3.04	56	0
Category Total	94	55%	31	18%	25	15%	9	5%	12	7%	3.09	171	