



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. Maurice Portley

Court of Appeals Division I
Appointed: 2003

97% of the Commission Voted Judge Portley MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
29 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
1 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2012	Attorney Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 1416	Distributed: 340
	Returned: 192	Returned: 74
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	94%
Integrity	100%	97%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	98%	n/a
Temperament	99%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	100%

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. Maurice Portley

2012 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
1. Legal Ability												
143. Legal reasoning ability	2	3%	5	7%	6	8%	21	28%	40	54%	3.24	74
144. Knowledge of law	2	3%	5	7%	5	7%	21	29%	40	55%	3.26	73
145. Decisions based on laws and facts	2	3%	7	9%	3	4%	27	36%	35	47%	3.16	74
146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	4	6%	5	7%	5	7%	17	24%	41	57%	3.19	72
Category Total	10	3%	22	8%	19	6%	86	29%	156	53%	3.22	293
2. Integrity												
147. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	15	23%	47	72%	3.68	65
148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	41	93%	3.93	44
149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	13%	42	88%	3.88	48
150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	37	93%	3.92	40
151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	39	93%	3.93	42
152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	33	92%	3.92	36
153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	40	93%	3.93	43
154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	33	92%	3.92	36
155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	3	8%	34	87%	3.82	39
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	5	1%	42	11%	346	88%	3.87	393
3. Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument												
156. Attentiveness	0	0%	4	3%	5	4%	49	40%	63	52%	3.41	121
157. Demeanor in communications with counsel	0	0%	2	2%	9	8%	34	30%	68	60%	3.49	113
158. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	3.50	2

159. Relevant questions	0	0%	2	2%	12	10%	47	41%	54	47%	3.33	115
160. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	2	2%	12	11%	36	34%	56	53%	3.38	106
Category Total	0	0%	10	2%	38	8%	167	37%	242	53%	3.40	457
4. Temperament												
161. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	5	4%	37	32%	74	64%	3.59	116
162. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	9	8%	27	24%	77	68%	3.60	113
163. Patient	0	0%	2	2%	5	4%	31	27%	75	66%	3.58	113
164. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	2	2%	0	0%	5	4%	30	26%	77	68%	3.58	114
Category Total	2	0%	2	0%	24	5%	125	27%	303	66%	3.59	456
5. Admin Performance												
165. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	14	21%	23	34%	31	46%	3.25	68
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	14	21%	23	34%	31	46%	3.25	68



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. Maurice Portley

2012 Superior Court Judge Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Legal Ability													
77. Legal reasoning ability	2	3%	2	3%	6	8%	13	18%	49	68%	3.46	72	2
78. Knowledge of the law	2	3%	2	3%	6	8%	11	15%	51	71%	3.49	72	2
79. Decisions based on law and facts	2	3%	2	3%	10	14%	11	15%	47	65%	3.38	72	2
80. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	2	3%	2	3%	7	10%	12	17%	49	68%	3.44	72	2
Category Total	8	3%	8	3%	29	10%	47	16%	196	68%	3.44	288	
2. Integrity													
81. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	5	8%	56	86%	3.74	65	9
82. Equal treatment regardless of gender	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	5	8%	53	85%	3.73	62	12
83. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	3%	0	0%	4	7%	2	3%	52	87%	3.70	60	14
84. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	50	86%	3.72	58	16
85. Equal treatment regardless of disability	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	50	86%	3.72	58	16
86. Equal treatment regardless of age	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	50	86%	3.72	58	16
87. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	52	87%	3.73	60	14
88. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	52	87%	3.73	60	14
89. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	4	7%	53	87%	3.74	61	13
Category Total	18	3%	0	0%	20	4%	36	7%	468	86%	3.73	542	
3. Admin Performance													
90. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	7	15%	36	78%	3.72	46	28
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	7	15%	36	78%	3.72	46	