



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. Robert I. Brooks
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 111 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 591 Returned: 113 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	94%
Communication	99%	n/a	95%
Temperament	100%	n/a	94%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	97%
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. Robert I. Brooks

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	19	70%	5	19%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	27	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	21	78%	2	7%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.59	27	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	19	73%	6	23%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	73%	6	23%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
Category Total	78	74%	19	18%	8	8%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	106	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	18	67%	8	30%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	27	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	74%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	27	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	71%	6	21%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	28	0
Category Total	178	73%	49	20%	17	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	244	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	63%	7	26%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	27	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	71%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	17	61%	7	25%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
Category Total	51	65%	17	22%	10	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	79	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	19	68%	7	25%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
18. Dignified	20	71%	7	25%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0
19. Courteous	19	68%	6	21%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	20	71%	5	18%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
21. Patient	19	68%	5	18%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	28	0
Category Total	97	69%	30	21%	13	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	140	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	16	57%	10	36%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	57%	9	32%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	15	63%	6	25%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	68%	7	25%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	61%	7	25%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
Category Total	83	61%	39	29%	14	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	136	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	10	71%	2	14%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
Category Total	10	71%	2	14%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	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. Robert I. Brooks

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	56	56%	22	22%	12	12%	7	7%	3	3%	3.21	100	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	56	60%	21	22%	12	13%	2	2%	3	3%	3.33	94	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	58	60%	22	23%	12	13%	1	1%	3	3%	3.36	96	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	50	58%	19	22%	13	15%	2	2%	2	2%	3.31	86	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	51	60%	19	22%	13	15%	1	1%	1	1%	3.39	85	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	53	60%	20	23%	10	11%	1	1%	4	5%	3.33	88	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	55	59%	22	23%	12	13%	2	2%	3	3%	3.32	94	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	48	60%	18	23%	12	15%	0	0%	2	3%	3.38	80	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	55	59%	20	22%	9	10%	5	5%	4	4%	3.26	93	0
Category Total	482	59%	183	22%	105	13%	21	3%	25	3%	3.32	816	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	60	59%	21	21%	15	15%	3	3%	2	2%	3.33	101	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	46	55%	20	24%	12	14%	4	5%	1	1%	3.28	83	0
Category Total	106	58%	41	22%	27	15%	7	4%	3	2%	3.30	184	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	52	53%	28	28%	12	12%	6	6%	1	1%	3.25	99	0
13. Dignified	56	58%	25	26%	12	12%	1	1%	3	3%	3.34	97	0
14. Courteous	56	56%	27	27%	12	12%	2	2%	3	3%	3.31	100	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	58	58%	24	24%	8	8%	6	6%	4	4%	3.26	100	0
16. Patient	56	57%	30	31%	8	8%	2	2%	2	2%	3.39	98	0
Category Total	278	56%	134	27%	52	11%	17	3%	13	3%	3.31	494	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	57	58%	22	22%	17	17%	0	0%	2	2%	3.35	98	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	63	65%	17	18%	15	15%	2	2%	0	0%	3.45	97	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	62	64%	25	26%	6	6%	2	2%	2	2%	3.47	97	0
Category Total	182	62%	64	22%	38	13%	4	1%	4	1%	3.42	292	