

Judges are evaluated by survey on their judicial performance midway through their term and prior to their retention election. Beginning in 2022, their survey evaluations include midterm and retention feedback. Newly appointed judges serve a two-year term and are evaluated prior to their retention election. The composite percentage table is an average of all evaluators who rated the judge "superior", "very good", or "satisfactory" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Some evaluators select "Can't Rate" on the questionnaire affecting the average response number within their respondent category. The JPR Commission votes whether a judge "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the survey information and any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found on each court's website.

**Commission on Judicial Performance Review
Composite Percentage - Average of all Evaluation Categories**

Superior Court in Pima County

Hon. Richard Gordon

2024		
Evaluation Category	Total Survey Responses	Average Percentage of Satisfactory or Above
Legal Ability	70	95%
Integrity	136	97%
Communication Skills	156	96%
Judicial Temperament	166	96%
Administrative Performance	163	96%
Settlement Activities	35	97%

Responses based upon 172 returned survey questionnaires from a distribution of 1235 questionnaires. Survey respondents may not necessarily answer all survey questions.

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge: **Hon. Richard Gordon** Total Surveys: **169** Assignment: **Criminal** Cycle: **2021 & 2023**

Name of Judge	ATTORNEY					77		LIT/WIT/PRO PER					71		JUROR					21	
	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Resp	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Resp	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Resp	Mean
Hon. Richard Gordon																					
Section I: Legal Ability	38	22	4	2	1	67	3.4														
Legal reasoning ability	37	25	2	3	1	68	3.4														
Knowledge of substantive law	39	22	5	2	1	69	3.4														
Knowledge of rules of evidence	36	19	5	1	1	62	3.4														
Knowledge of rules of procedure	39	22	5	3	1	70	3.4														
Section II: Integrity	39	9	3	0	1	53	3.6	40	12	6	1	2	61	3.4	19	0	0	0	0	19	4.0
Basic fairness and impartiality	48	16	7	2	2	75	3.4	41	15	10	2	3	71	3.3	19	2	0	0	0	21	3.9
Equal treatment regardless of race	39	8	5	0	1	53	3.6	42	13	5	0	3	63	3.4	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of gender	40	9	4	0	2	55	3.5	42	14	6	0	2	64	3.5	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of religion	37	6	2	0	1	46	3.7	38	10	4	0	2	54	3.5	18	0	0	0	0	18	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of national origin	38	6	3	0	1	48	3.7	40	12	5	1	2	60	3.5	19	0	0	0	0	19	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of disability	37	7	1	0	1	46	3.7	38	10	6	1	2	57	3.4	17	0	0	0	0	17	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of age	41	9	3	0	2	55	3.6	42	11	5	0	3	61	3.5	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	35	8	1	1	1	46	3.6	37	11	5	0	1	54	3.5	18	0	0	0	0	18	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of economic status	40	8	3	0	2	53	3.6	41	8	8	2	2	61	3.4	19	0	0	0	0	19	4.0
Section III: Communication Skills	44	18	7	0	1	70	3.5	37	15	7	3	2	63	3.3	18	1	1	0	0	20	3.9
Clear and logical communications																					
Clear and logical oral communications and directions	46	19	8	0	1	74	3.5														
Clear and logical written decisions	38	16	6	1	1	62	3.4														
Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	48	18	6	0	1	73	3.5														
Explained proceedings (to the jury)								40	18	6	2	2	68	3.4	20	1	0	0	0	21	4.0
Explained reason for delays								34	11	7	3	2	57	3.3	16	2	2	0	0	20	3.7
Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities															19	1	0	0	0	20	4.0
Section IV: Judicial temperament	51	16	5	0	2	74	3.5	46	13	5	2	2	69	3.5	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Understanding and compassion	47	20	4	0	2	73	3.5	45	14	6	2	2	69	3.4	21	0	0	0	0	21	4.0
Dignified	54	14	5	0	2	75	3.6	45	15	4	2	2	68	3.5	19	1	0	0	0	20	4.0
Courteous	53	17	3	0	2	75	3.6	51	11	4	2	2	70	3.5	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	51	16	4	1	2	74	3.5	45	13	6	4	1	69	3.4	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Patient	52	13	7	0	2	74	3.5	46	14	6	2	1	69	3.5	19	0	0	0	0	19	4.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	48	18	6	1	1	74	3.5	41	14	6	1	3	66	3.3	18	2	1	0	0	20	3.9
Punctual in conducting proceedings	44	25	4	0	2	75	3.5	42	15	6	1	2	66	3.4	16	4	1	0	0	21	3.7
Maintained proper control of courtroom	49	21	4	0	1	75	3.6	42	12	5	1	4	64	3.4	20	0	0	0	0	20	4.0
Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	49	16	5	2	1	73	3.5														
Was prepared for the proceedings	52	14	8	1	1	76	3.5	40	14	7	2	4	67	3.3	18	1	1	0	0	20	3.9
Respectful treatment of staff																					
Cooperation with peers																					
Efficient management of calendar	44	14	10	1	1	70	3.4														
Section VI: Settlement Activities	22	6	6	0	1	35	3.4														
Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	22	6	6	0	1	35	3.4														

UN=Unacceptable, PO=Poor,
SA=Satisfactory, VG=Very Good,
SU=Superior

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court users from 02/2021 -09/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 169					Assignment: Criminal					Cycle: 2021 & 2023							
	ATTORNEY					77	LIT/WIT/PROPER					71	JUROR					21
Hon. Richard Gordon	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean
Section I: Legal Ability	56%	33%	6%	3%	1%	3.4												
Legal reasoning ability	54%	37%	3%	4%	1%	3.4												
Knowledge of substantive law	57%	32%	7%	3%	1%	3.4												
Knowledge of rules of evidence	58%	31%	8%	2%	2%	3.4												
Knowledge of rules of procedure	56%	31%	7%	4%	1%	3.4												
Section II: Integrity	74%	16%	6%	1%	3%	3.6	66%	19%	10%	1%	4%	3.4	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Basic fairness and impartiality	64%	21%	9%	3%	3%	3.4	58%	21%	14%	3%	4%	3.3	90%	10%	0%	0%	0%	3.9
Equal treatment regardless of race	74%	15%	9%	0%	2%	3.6	67%	21%	8%	0%	5%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of gender	73%	16%	7%	0%	4%	3.5	66%	22%	9%	0%	3%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of religion	80%	13%	4%	0%	2%	3.7	70%	19%	7%	0%	4%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of national origin	79%	13%	6%	0%	2%	3.7	67%	20%	8%	2%	3%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of disability	80%	15%	2%	0%	2%	3.7	67%	18%	11%	2%	4%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of age	75%	16%	5%	0%	4%	3.6	69%	18%	8%	0%	5%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	76%	17%	2%	2%	2%	3.6	69%	20%	9%	0%	2%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Equal treatment regardless of economic status	75%	15%	6%	0%	4%	3.6	67%	13%	13%	3%	3%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Section III: Communication Skills	63%	25%	10%	0%	1%	3.5	59%	23%	10%	4%	3%	3.3	90%	7%	3%	0%	0%	3.9
Clear and logical communications																		
Clear and logical oral communications and directions	62%	26%	11%	0%	1%	3.5												
Clear and logical written decisions	61%	26%	10%	2%	2%	3.4												
Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	66%	25%	8%	0%	1%	3.5												
Explained proceedings (to the jury)							59%	26%	9%	3%	3%	3.4	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Explained reason for delays							60%	19%	12%	5%	4%	3.3	80%	10%	10%	0%	0%	3.7
Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities													95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Section IV: Judicial temperament	69%	22%	6%	0%	3%	3.5	67%	19%	8%	3%	2%	3.5	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Understanding and compassion	64%	27%	5%	0%	3%	3.5	65%	20%	9%	3%	3%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Dignified	72%	19%	7%	0%	3%	3.6	66%	22%	6%	3%	3%	3.5	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Courteous	71%	23%	4%	0%	3%	3.6	73%	16%	6%	3%	3%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	69%	22%	5%	1%	3%	3.5	65%	19%	9%	6%	1%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Patient	70%	18%	9%	0%	3%	3.5	67%	20%	9%	3%	1%	3.5	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	64%	24%	8%	1%	2%	3.5	63%	21%	9%	2%	5%	3.3	89%	8%	3%	0%	0%	3.9
Punctual in conducting proceedings	59%	33%	5%	0%	3%	3.5	64%	23%	9%	2%	3%	3.4	76%	19%	5%	0%	0%	3.7
Maintained proper control of courtroom	65%	28%	5%	0%	1%	3.6	66%	19%	8%	2%	6%	3.4	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.0
Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	67%	22%	7%	3%	1%	3.5												
Was prepared for the proceedings	68%	18%	11%	1%	1%	3.5	60%	21%	10%	3%	6%	3.3	90%	5%	5%	0%	0%	3.9
Respectful treatment of staff																		
Cooperation with peers																		
Efficient management of calendar	63%	20%	14%	1%	1%	3.4												
Section VI: Settlement Activities	63%	17%	17%	0%	3%	3.4												
Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	63%	17%	17%	0%	3%	3.4												

UN=Unacceptable, PO=Poor,
 SA=Satisfactory, VG=Very Good,
 SU=Superior

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court users from 02/2021 - 09/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 3					Fall 2023	
	PEER JUDGE					Total	Mean
Hon. Richard Gordon	EX	VG	AC	PO	FA		
Section I: Legal Ability	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Decisions based on law and facts	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Section II: Integrity	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Unbiased and impartial	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Section III: Communication Skills	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Communication skills	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Section IV: Judicial temperament	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Respectful to all individuals	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Works effectively with other judges	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Works effectively with court personnel	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Efficient management of calendar	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
Does a fair share of work	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.0

FA=Failing, PO=Poor,
AC=Acceptable, VG=Very Good,
EX=Excellent

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court
users from 09/2023 - 11/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 3					Fall 2023
	PEER JUDGE					Mean
Hon. Richard Gordon	EX	VG	AC	PO	FA	
Section I: Legal Ability	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Decisions based on law and facts	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section II: Integrity	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Unbiased and impartial	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section III: Communication Skills	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Communication skills	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section IV: Judicial temperament	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Respectful to all individuals	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Works effectively with other judges	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Works effectively with court personnel	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Efficient management of calendar	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Does a fair share of work	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0

FA=Failing, PO=Poor,
AC=Acceptable, VG=Very Good,
EX=Excellent

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court users from 09/2023 - 11/2023