

CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting
16000 N. Civic Center Plaza
Surprise, AZ 85374
Thursday, January 14, 2021 @ 6:00 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS



NOTICE: In an effort to protect health and safety of city employees, residents, and visitors, the Council Chambers will be closed to the public during this meeting. The public may access the meeting by viewing a live stream or broadcast of the meeting. To watch live, please visit www.surpriseaz.gov/surprisetv, the Surprise City Gov Facebook page at www.facebook.com/cityofsurprise. Cox channel 11 and Century Link channel 8513 will also carry the meeting live.

For instructions on how to comment on agenda items and public hearings, please go to <https://bit.ly/3g47YTK>

- A. Call To Order
- B. Roll Call
- C. Pledge of Allegiance
- D. Current Events and Reports
- E. Staff Reports
- F. Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Agenda

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

Public comment will be taken through email or via phone. To submit email comments, including Call to the Public for non-agenda items, please email maria.aranda@surpriseaz.gov. Comments for Call to the Public must be submitted prior to the start of the meeting. To comment on agenda items, emails must be submitted prior to the time(s) designated for public comment by the Commission Chair during the meeting or before the agenda item has otherwise concluded.

To comment live by phone for Call to the Public for non-agenda items or for agenda items, please call 623-222-3528 prior to, or during, the meeting to have your name placed on a callback list. If you reach voicemail, please leave your name and phone number. The Commission Secretary will call those wishing to comment from the dais during the meeting, and the call will be streamed through the Council Chamber audio system. Only calls received before Call to the Public for non-agenda items or before or during the time(s) designated for public comment by the Commission Chair during the meeting on the subject agenda item will be accepted and streamed. No calls will be accepted after the time(s) designated by the Commission Chair for public comment or after an agenda item has otherwise concluded.

CONSENT AGENDA:

- 1. Citywide Consideration and action pertaining to approval of the September 2, 2020 Judicial Selection Advisory Commission meeting minutes. Human Resources

REGULAR AGENDA ITEM - NON-PUBLIC HEARING:

- | | | | |
|----|----------|---|-----------------|
| 2. | Citywide | Discussion and review of the reappointment process and timeline for Presiding Judge Louis Frank Dominguez. | None |
| | | | Human Resources |
| 3. | Citywide | Discussion and review of the reappointment process and timeline for Associate Judge Catherine Ann Gaudreau. | None |
| | | | Human Resources |
| 4. | Citywide | Discussion and possible action scheduling a future public input meeting and directing city staff to conduct a judicial performance survey of the current Presiding Judge, including inquiring on pending and past disciplinary actions and soliciting information on administrative performance from the Surprise City Court. | None |
| | | | Human Resources |
| 5. | Citywide | Discussion and possible action scheduling a future public input meeting and directing city staff to conduct a judicial performance survey of the current Associate Judge, including inquiring on pending or past disciplinary actions and soliciting information on administrative performance from the Surprise City Court. | None |
| | | | Human Resources |

G. Other Business and Future Agenda Items

H. Executive Session

For information purposes: Upon a public majority vote of a quorum (“Commission”), the Commission may hold an executive session, which will not be open to the public, but for only the following purposes: discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(2));

or discussion or consultation for legal advice with the attorney or attorneys of the public body (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3)).

Confidentiality Requirements: Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(C)(D), any person receiving executive session information pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02 shall not disclose that information except to the Attorney General or County Attorney or by agreement of the Commission, or as otherwise ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

The Commission may vote to hold an executive session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the Commission’s attorney on any matter listed on the agenda pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).

I. Adjournment

SHERRY ANN AGUILAR, CITY CLERK, MMC

POSTED: January 6, 2021 at 8:00 AM

SPECIAL NOTE: PERSONS WITH SPECIAL ACCESSIBILITY NEEDS, INCLUDING LARGE PRINT MATERIALS OR INTERPRETER, SHOULD CONTACT THE CITY CLERK’S OFFICE @ 623.222.1200 OR TTY 623.222.1002, BY NO LATER THAN 24 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING TIME.



CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting

Council Meeting Date: January 14, 2021
Submitting Department: Human Resources
Staff Recommendations:

Contact Person:
District: Citywide

Consent: Yes Regular: No Public Hearing: No Report/Discussion: No

Agenda Wording:

Consideration and action pertaining to approval of the September 2, 2020 Judicial Selection Advisory Commission meeting minutes.

Motion:

I move to approve the September 2, 2020 meeting minutes.

Background:

Objective Analysis:

Policy Compliant:

Financial Impact:

None

Budget Impact:

FTE Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. JSAC Meeting Minutes 2020.09.02
-

CITY OF SURPRISE
JUDICIAL SELECTION ADVISORY COMMISSION (JSAC) MINUTES

16000 N. Civic Center Plaza

Surprise, AZ 85374

Wednesday, September 2, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

- A. Call to Order at 6:03 p.m.
- B. Roll Call - Members present: Chair Swann, Vice-Chair Gaunt, Commissioners Carey, Hanzel, Jessen, Lang and Stutzman.
- C. Pledge of Allegiance
- D. Current Events and Reports – None
- E. Staff Reports – None
- F. Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Agenda

Call to the Public: No public members were present.

Consent Agenda:

- 1. Consideration and action pertaining to approval of the March 14, 2019 Judicial Selection Advisory Commission meeting minutes – APPROVED with spelling correction
M: Stutzman 2nd: Jessen Votes: 7 Yes Votes

Regular Agenda:

- 2. Discussion and review pertaining to the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Procedural Rules – NO ACTION
- 3. Consideration and action pertaining to the nomination and election of a Chair for the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission.
Commissioner Jessen nominated Peter Swann as Chair; no competing nominations
M: Jessen 2nd: Stutzman Votes: 7 Yes Votes
- 4. Consideration and action pertaining to the nomination and election of a Vice-Chair for the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission.
Commissioner Jessen nominated Todd Lang as Vice-Chair; no competing nominations
M: Jessen 2nd: Stutzman Votes: 7 Yes Votes
- 5. Discussion and action pertaining to setting a meeting date in January 2021 to begin

the reappointment process for Presiding Judge and Associate Judge whose terms end on June 30, 2021.

Chair Swann proposed scheduling the meeting for January 7, 2021. No objections; meeting set for January 7, 2021.

G. Other Business and Future Agenda Items - NONE

H. Executive Session - NONE

I. Adjournment M: Jessen 2nd: Stutzman Vote: Chair adjourned meeting at 6:07 p.m.

Peter Swann, JSAC Chair

ATTEST:

Maria Aranda, JSAC Secretary

CERTIFICATION:

I, Maria Aranda, Secretary for the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission of the City of Surprise, Maricopa County, Arizona, do hereby verify that these are the true and correct minutes of the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting of September 2, 2020.

Maria Aranda, JSAC Secretary



CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting

Council Meeting Date: January 14, 2021
Submitting Department: Human Resources
Staff Recommendations: None

Contact Person:
District: Citywide

Consent: No Regular: Yes Public Hearing: No Report/Discussion: No

Agenda Wording:

Discussion and review of the reappointment process and timeline for Presiding Judge Louis Frank Dominguez.

Motion:

For discussion only.

Background:

Pursuant to Surprise Code Section 30-43 (b), the chair of the commission shall call for a meeting of the commission to begin the selection process for the appointment or reappointment of a current judge position no later than January 31 of the year in which the term of the current judge end or within 30 days of being notified that a vacancy exists, whichever is earlier. Presiding Judge Louis Frank Dominguez's current appointment expires June 30, 2021.

Objective Analysis:

This item will be a discussion regarding the reappointment process and timeline for Presiding Judge Louis Frank Dominguez.

Policy Compliant:

This meeting is compliant with the requirements under Section 30-43 (b) of the Surprise Municipal Code.

Financial Impact:

None

Budget Impact:

FTE Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. City of Surprise Code of Ordinances Chapter 30 City Court Article III - Judicial Selection Advisory Commission



ARTICLE III. - JUDICIAL SELECTION ADVISORY COMMISSION

Sec. 30-40. - Establishment; purpose.

The judicial selection advisory commission is hereby established. The purpose of the judicial selection advisory commission is to evaluate and make recommendations with regard to the selection of the best qualified individuals for the position of presiding and associate city judge, and the performance of incumbent presiding and associate city judges applying for reappointment.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)

Sec. 30-41. - Membership.

- (a) The judicial selection advisory commission shall be composed of the following:
- (1) An appellate court judge to be recommended for appointment by the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court;
 - (2) A Superior Court Judge of Maricopa County to be recommended for appointment by the presiding judge of the Maricopa Superior Court;
 - (3) A member of the State Bar of Arizona who shall be appointed from among three nominees recommended by the state bar board of governors;
 - (4) A member of the Maricopa County Bar Association who shall be appointed from among three nominees recommended by the county bar board of directors;
 - (5) And three public members who are residents of the city, who shall be appointed pursuant to section 2-296. None of the public members shall be an employee of the city.
 - (6) There shall be no ex-officio members of the commission.
- (b) All members of the judicial selection advisory commission shall be residents of Maricopa County.
- (c) Voting members shall serve staggered terms of four years, which shall expire on July 1. In order to create staggered terms, the following members shall be appointed to an initial term that shall expire on the second July 1 following the appointment: the appellate court judge member, the state bar of Arizona member, and one public member.

- (d) [Reserved.]
- (e) Members shall serve without salary or compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel and out of pocket expenses on the same basis as employees pursuant to City Code section 3-60.
- (f) Unless otherwise expressly stated in this article, the bylaws contained in 2-295 shall govern the operation of the commission.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09; Ord. No. 2011-07, § 9, 2-22-2011)

Sec. 30-42 - Disclosure of conflict, ineligibility to vote.

- (a) At the earliest possible opportunity, a member shall disclose to the commission at a public meeting:
 - (1) Any relationship with an applicant (such as business, personal, or attorney-client) that results in an actual conflict of interest or prejudice;
 - (2) All applicants who constitute "relatives" under the Arizona Conflict of Interest Law (A.R.S. § 38-501 et seq.), as amended;
 - (3) All efforts to recruit a specific applicant/s; and
 - (4) Any information that could reasonably create the appearance of conflict of interest or appearance of prejudice.
- (b) Any member with a relationship with an applicant required to be disclosed under subsection (a)(1) and (a)(2) above shall be ineligible to vote.
- (c) Any member that discloses information as required under subsection (a)(3) and (a)(4) above may be declared ineligible to vote on a specific recommendation if such member announces an intent to abstain from voting on the item, or a majority of voting members present affirmatively vote to declare an actual conflict or prejudice to exist on the item.
- (d) Member participation in the selection and recommendation process under this Article shall not be limited on any application submitted by persons the member recruited to apply, as long as the member has disclosed to all commission members the nature of their efforts to recruit the applicant, and the member is not otherwise prohibited from participating under this section.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)

Sec. 30-43 - Meetings.

- (a) The commission shall hold no less than one meeting each year for the purpose of reviewing the commission's operating procedures.
- (b) The chair of the commission shall also call for a meeting of the commission to begin the selection process for the appointment or reappointment of a current judge position no later than January 31 of the year in which the term of the current judge ends or within 30 days of being notified that a vacancy exists, whichever is earlier.
- (c) A quorum shall be four voting members.
- (d) The affirmative vote of a majority of the voting members present at a meeting and eligible to vote shall be required to take action, unless otherwise set forth herein.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)

Sec. 30-44. - Selection process.

- (a) *Generally.*
 - (1) All members shall consider all applicants in an impartial, objective manner, based only on the applicant's merit and without regard for race, religion, political affiliation or gender of the candidate.
 - (2) In considering initial appointments or reappointments, the commission shall utilize the Arizona Supreme Court's Uniform Rules of Procedure for Commissions on Appellate and Trial Court Appointments, Rules 6, 7, 8, and 9; and the American Bar Associations Standing Committee on Judicial Independence, Report of the Commission on State Judicial Selection Standards, as guides.
 - (3) For each applicant, the commission shall inquire of the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct and the Arizona State Bar for information on pending or past disciplinary actions.
 - (4) Consistent with and in addition to the requirements of this chapter, the commission is authorized to develop such procedures as it deems reasonable to select and retain outstanding judges on the basis of merit.
 - (5) Costs associated with the selection and recommendation process shall be reported to council and shall be paid by the city at the direction of council.
- (b) *Application and advertising.*
 - (1)

All applicants for appointment or reappointment shall complete an application containing such information as the commission and human resource department deems necessary and appropriate to comply with the law and to provide relevant information about the ability of the applicant to perform the duties of a judge.

- (2) Applicants shall be given a meaningful opportunity to supplement their applications with a reasonable number of letters of recommendation.
 - (3) The commission, with the assistance of the commission secretary shall advertise each vacant judge position consistent with Chapter 3 of this Code, and in a manner designed to provide reasonable notice of the opening, but shall at least publish notice once in the Arizona Attorney magazine, or similar monthly publication; or, alternatively, in a professional newspaper once a week for two successive weeks.
 - (4) The commission, with the assistance of the commission secretary, shall solicit public and professional comment in a manner designed to elicit constructive appraisals of a judge's qualification and prior performance, but shall at least publish notice of the potential reappointment once in the Arizona Attorney magazine, or similar monthly publication; or, alternatively, in a daily or weekly newspaper of general circulation once a week for two successive weeks.
 - (5) Commission members shall actively seek and encourage well-qualified individuals to apply.
- (c) *Investigation and evaluation of qualifications.*
- (1) In addition to any other material submitted to the commission, the commission shall consider the administrative performance and work load of the applicant, to the extent such does not conflict with judicial independence, including but not limited to: case aging, case load, the time to rule on matters, and rulings that have been reversed or affirmed on appeal.
 - (2) The commission shall not limit its investigation of applicants to documents and material submitted to the commission, but shall hold public hearings, personal interviews, and conduct such investigations into the background, performance, and qualifications of the applicants as the commission deems necessary and appropriate.
 - (3) The commission shall conduct at least one public hearing soliciting public input concerning the appointment or reappointment of a judge.

(d) *Interviews.*

- (1) The commission shall personally interview at least three candidates for initial appointment as a city judge.
- (2) The interview shall consist of an applicant presentation and commission follow-up questions and be limited to 90 minutes.
- (3) Interview questions shall be drafted by the commission in advance with assistance from the commission secretary. Each applicant shall be given the interview questions and a copy of the material submitted to the commission in relation to the applicant, prior to the interview.
- (4) Each applicant will be given an opportunity to present answers to the interview questions and response to materials submitted. The commission shall then ask follow-up questions if necessary.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)

Sec. 30-45. - Recommendation process.

- (a) The commission shall vote on the candidates in an open meeting.
- (b) Recommendations shall be made in writing no later than April 1, or within two business days of the final vote.
- (c) The recommendation for initial appointment shall contain the names of the three best-qualified candidates in alphabetical order and summarize the qualifications of each final candidate.
- (d) The recommendation for reappointment shall specifically state that the commission does or does not recommend reappointment of the judge, and summarize the reasons for the recommendation.
- (e) Recommendations for appointment or reappointment shall be delivered as soon as possible after the vote of the commission as follows:
 - (1) Recommendations regarding the appointment or reappointment of the presiding judge shall be delivered to the city council.
 - (2) Recommendations regarding the reappointment of associate judges shall be made to the city council.
 - (3)

Recommendations regarding the initial appointment of associate judges shall be made to the presiding judge. The presiding judge shall then personally interview each applicant submitted by the commission and recommend one candidate to city council for appointment no later than May 1, or within ten business days of the receipt of the recommendation by the commission.

- (f) Recommendations for appointment by the commission shall be used to fill any vacancies that arise within four months of the initial recommendation for appointment.
- (g) The names of final candidates and their applications shall be disseminated to the public or the media upon request, at any time after the recommendation is made. The release of this information shall be subject to redaction of home addresses, telephone numbers or other personal or confidential information.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)

Sec. 30-46. - Council decision.

The city council may accept or reject the recommendation submitted pursuant to this article. The city council may also refer a specific appointment or reappointment back to the commission for more investigation and findings.

(Ord. No. 09-41, § 2(Exh. A), 12-10-09)



CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting

Council Meeting Date: January 14, 2021
Submitting Department: Human Resources
Staff Recommendations: None

Contact Person:
District: Citywide

Consent: No Regular: Yes Public Hearing: No Report/Discussion: No

Agenda Wording:

Discussion and review of the reappointment process and timeline for Associate Judge Catherine Ann Gaudreau.

Motion:

For discussion only.

Background:

Pursuant to Surprise Code Section 30-43 (b), the chair of the commission shall call for a meeting of the commission to begin the selection process for the appointment of reappointment of a current judge position no later than January 31 of the year in which the term of the current judge ends or within 30 days of being notified that a vacancy exists, whichever is earlier. Associate Judge Catherine Anne Gaudreau's current appointment expires June 30, 2021.

Objective Analysis:

This item is a discussion regarding the reappointment process and timeline for Associate Judge Catherine Ann Gaudreau.

Policy Compliant:

This meeting is compliant with the requirements under Section 30-43 (b) of the Surprise Municipal Code.

Financial Impact:

None

Budget Impact:

FTE Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:



CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting

Council Meeting Date: January 14, 2021
Submitting Department: Human Resources
Staff Recommendations: None

Contact Person:
District: Citywide

Consent: No Regular: Yes Public Hearing: No Report/Discussion: No

Agenda Wording:

Discussion and possible action scheduling a future public input meeting and directing city staff to conduct a judicial performance survey of the current Presiding Judge, including inquiring on pending and past disciplinary actions and soliciting information on administrative performance from the Surprise City Court.

Motion:

I move to schedule a public input meeting on and to direct staff to conduct a judicial performance review of the incumbent Presiding Judge.

Background:

Surprise City Code 30-44 describes the selection process for the City Judge position. The code authorizes the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission to "develop procedures as it deems reasonable to select and retain outstanding judges on the basis of merit." This agenda item is intended to discuss the selection process and to authorize city staff to gather information that will be presented to the Commission for use in the reappointment process.

Objective Analysis:

Policy Compliant:

Financial Impact:

None.

Budget Impact:

FTE Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Judge Dominguez Survey-WIP-2017.01.18





City of Surprise Judicial Evaluation Survey

**NAME OF JUDGE: LOUIS FRANK DOMINGUEZ, PRESIDING JUDGE
SURPRISE CITY COURT**

The results of the survey will be reviewed by the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission and submitted to the Surprise City Council. Surveys must be received **no later than Monday, March 20, 2017.**

Please rate this judge according to the performance standards below. If you are not able to rate this judge in a particular area mark "no information".

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The judge shall administer justice fairly, ethically, uniformly, promptly, and efficiently. The judge shall be free from personal bias in decision making, shall decide cases based on proper application of law and procedure to the facts and shall issue prompt, clear rulings and decisions that demonstrate competent legal analysis. The judge shall act with dignity, courtesy, and patience, and shall effectively manage the courtroom and discharge the administrative responsibilities of the office.

Section I: Integrity & Fairness	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Information
1. The Judge treated everyone the same without regard to age/race/gender/economic status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. The Judge displayed basic fairness and impartiality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The Judge listened to all sides of the story before rendering a decision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The Judge had the information necessary to make good decisions about the case	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The Judge provided clear instructions and answered all questions pertaining to the case	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. The Judge exhibited personal integrity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section I Comments

Section II: Communication Skills & Understanding of the Law	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Information
7. The Judge Gives clear and logical oral communications/instructions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The Judge demonstrated a satisfactory knowledge of the law and procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section II Comments

Section III: Judicial Temperament	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Information
9. The Judge displays understanding and compassion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. The Judge treats everyone in the courtroom with courtesy and respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section III Comments

Section IV: Administrative Performance & Leadership	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Information
11. The Judge is punctual in conducting proceedings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. The Judge maintains proper control over courtroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. The Judge is a diligent worker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. The Judge consistently treats court staff with respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. The Judge interacts with other Judges in a constructive manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. The Judge promotes the exchange of ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. The Judge is receptive to feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section IV Comments

Section V: Background Information
--

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>A. Your role in the court business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Litigant to a court case <input type="radio"/> Witness in a court case <input type="radio"/> Lawyer <input type="radio"/> Juror <input type="radio"/> Staff | <p>B. Type of business that brought you before the court:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Civil Traffic <input type="radio"/> Criminal <input type="radio"/> Order of Protection/Injunction against Harassment |
|--|--|

Please return survey to one of the following:

- Court Drop-off Box
- Via email at: hr@surpriseaz.gov
- Via mail to: Judicial Selection Advisory Commission, Attn. JSAC Secretary, 16000 N. Civic Center Plaza, Surprise, AZ 85374



CITY OF SURPRISE
Judicial Selection Advisory Commission Meeting

Council Meeting Date: January 14, 2021
Submitting Department: Human Resources
Staff Recommendations: None

Contact Person:
District: Citywide

Consent: No Regular: Yes Public Hearing: No Report/Discussion: No

Agenda Wording:

Discussion and possible action scheduling a future public input meeting and directing city staff to conduct a judicial performance survey of the current Associate Judge, including inquiring on pending or past disciplinary actions and soliciting information on administrative performance from the Surprise City Court.

Motion:

I move to schedule a public input meeting on and to direct staff to conduct a judicial performance review of the incumbent Associate Judge.

Background:

Surprise City Code 30-44 describes the selection process for the City Judge position. The code authorizes the Judicial Selection Advisory Commission to "develop procedures as it deems reasonable to select and retain outstanding judges on the basis of merit." This agenda item is intended to discuss the selection process and to authorize city staff to gather information that will be presented to the Commission for use in the reappointment process.

Objective Analysis:

Policy Compliant:

Financial Impact:

None.

Budget Impact:

FTE Impact:

ATTACHMENTS:
