



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. J Alan Goodwin
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 77 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 265 Returned: 30 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	96%
Communication	100%	n/a	95%
Temperament	100%	n/a	91%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	94%
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. J Alan Goodwin

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	6	55%	3	27%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	11	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	3.27	11	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	10	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	5	45%	3	27%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	3.09	11	0
Category Total	22	51%	12	28%	7	16%	2	5%	0	0%	3.26	43	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	5	42%	5	42%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	12	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	3	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	3	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	1	25%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	4	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	3	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0
Category Total	20	41%	22	45%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.27	49	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	6	50%	4	33%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	12	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	6	55%	4	36%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	11	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
Category Total	20	57%	11	31%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	35	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	7	58%	3	25%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	12	0
18. Dignified	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
19. Courteous	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
21. Patient	7	58%	4	33%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
Category Total	40	67%	14	23%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	60	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	7	58%	3	25%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	12	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	58%	2	17%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	3.25	12	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	6	55%	2	18%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	3.27	11	0
Category Total	37	63%	11	19%	10	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.42	59	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
Category Total	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	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. J Alan Goodwin

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	8	31%	6	23%	9	35%	1	4%	2	8%	2.65	26	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	36%	7	32%	7	32%	0	0%	0	0%	3.05	22	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	28%	8	32%	9	36%	1	4%	0	0%	2.84	25	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	35%	8	35%	7	30%	0	0%	0	0%	3.04	23	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	32%	7	32%	8	36%	0	0%	0	0%	2.95	22	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	26%	6	32%	8	42%	0	0%	0	0%	2.84	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	38%	8	33%	6	25%	1	4%	0	0%	3.04	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	35%	6	30%	6	30%	0	0%	1	5%	2.90	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	38%	6	25%	7	29%	1	4%	1	4%	2.88	24	0
Category Total	68	33%	62	30%	67	33%	4	2%	4	2%	2.91	205	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	9	39%	8	35%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	3.09	23	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	43%	5	24%	6	29%	1	5%	0	0%	3.05	21	0
Category Total	18	41%	13	30%	11	25%	2	5%	0	0%	3.07	44	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	7	28%	8	32%	5	20%	4	16%	1	4%	2.64	25	0
13. Dignified	8	33%	8	33%	6	25%	2	8%	0	0%	2.92	24	0
14. Courteous	7	29%	9	38%	7	29%	1	4%	0	0%	2.92	24	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	8	32%	8	32%	6	24%	2	8%	1	4%	2.80	25	0
16. Patient	9	38%	8	33%	7	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.08	24	0
Category Total	39	32%	41	34%	31	25%	9	7%	2	2%	2.87	122	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	11	48%	6	26%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	3.17	23	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	10	45%	7	32%	5	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.23	22	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	39%	7	30%	4	17%	3	13%	0	0%	2.96	23	0
Category Total	30	44%	20	29%	14	21%	4	6%	0	0%	3.12	68	