



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. Daniel J. Kiley
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2010

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Kiley
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**
33 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 221 Returned: 62 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 27 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 56 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	96%
Communication	96%	100%	95%
Temperament	97%	100%	95%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	92%	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. Daniel J. Kiley

2020 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	36	62%	15	26%	3	5%	4	7%	0	0%	3.43	58	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	36	61%	15	25%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.41	59	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	34	71%	9	19%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.56	48	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	37	65%	12	21%	7	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.49	57	0
Category Total	143	64%	51	23%	18	8%	9	4%	1	0%	3.47	222	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	38	66%	14	24%	4	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.50	58	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	82%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	34	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	76%	7	19%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.62	37	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	26	84%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	26	81%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.72	32	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	82%	5	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	82%	7	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	38	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	32	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.78	37	0
Category Total	254	79%	56	17%	4	1%	2	1%	6	2%	3.71	322	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	38	63%	12	20%	9	15%	1	2%	0	0%	3.45	60	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	35	70%	7	14%	3	6%	4	8%	1	2%	3.42	50	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	43	73%	11	19%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	59	0
Category Total	116	69%	30	18%	17	10%	5	3%	1	1%	3.51	169	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	33	58%	13	23%	9	16%	2	4%	0	0%	3.35	57	0
18. Dignified	35	59%	14	24%	10	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	59	0
19. Courteous	38	64%	10	17%	10	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.44	59	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	38	64%	11	19%	6	10%	4	7%	0	0%	3.41	59	0
21. Patient	35	59%	13	22%	10	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.39	59	0
Category Total	179	61%	61	21%	45	15%	8	3%	0	0%	3.40	293	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	70%	16	27%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.65	60	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	42	72%	14	24%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.67	58	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	37	67%	10	18%	7	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.51	55	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	42	70%	13	22%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	60	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	37	70%	13	25%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	53	0
Category Total	200	70%	66	23%	15	5%	5	2%	0	0%	3.61	286	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	7	54%	2	15%	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13	0
Category Total	7	54%	2	15%	3	23%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13	



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. Daniel J. Kiley

2020 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	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.18	11	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	50%	3	30%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	3.00	10	0
Category Total	48	56%	33	39%	1	1%	1	1%	2	2%	3.46	85	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	6	50%	2	17%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	3.08	12	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
Category Total	11	58%	4	21%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	3.32	19	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	7	64%	2	18%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	3.36	11	0
13. Dignified	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
14. Courteous	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	8	67%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	3.17	12	0
16. Patient	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
Category Total	44	75%	8	14%	4	7%	1	2%	2	3%	3.54	59	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	75%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	0
Category Total	27	75%	6	17%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	36	



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. Daniel J. Kiley

2020 Juror 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	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
Category Total	174	90%	20	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	194	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	22	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	24	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	22	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	24	0
Category Total	62	87%	7	10%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	71	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
14. Dignified	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
15. Courteous	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
17. Patient	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
Category Total	103	87%	15	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	118	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	18	75%	4	17%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
Category Total	60	83%	9	12%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	72	