



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. Michael D. Gordon
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2005

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 120 Returned: 31 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 596 Returned: 38 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	99%
Communication	99%	n/a	96%
Temperament	100%	n/a	97%
Admin Performance	97%	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. Michael D. Gordon

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	18	64%	8	29%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	61%	8	29%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	67%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	18	64%	8	29%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
Category Total	71	64%	30	27%	10	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	111	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	21	72%	5	17%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	79%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	83%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	83%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	86%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	83%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	80%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
Category Total	176	81%	23	11%	17	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	216	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	65%	7	27%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	20	69%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	29	0
Category Total	57	68%	18	21%	8	10%	1	1%	0	0%	3.56	84	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	79%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
18. Dignified	22	76%	6	21%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
19. Courteous	23	79%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	21	72%	7	24%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
21. Patient	23	79%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
Category Total	112	77%	28	19%	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	145	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	31%	10	34%	8	28%	2	7%	0	0%	2.90	29	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	55%	8	28%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	29	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	19	68%	6	21%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	72%	5	17%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	10	34%	8	28%	9	31%	2	7%	0	0%	2.90	29	0
Category Total	75	52%	37	26%	28	19%	4	3%	0	0%	3.27	144	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	0
Category Total	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	



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. Michael D. Gordon

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	16	42%	10	26%	10	26%	2	5%	0	0%	3.05	38	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	45%	10	30%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	33	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	47%	10	29%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	34	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	47%	8	27%	8	27%	0	0%	0	0%	3.20	30	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	45%	9	29%	8	26%	0	0%	0	0%	3.19	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	45%	9	29%	8	26%	0	0%	0	0%	3.19	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	47%	10	29%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	34	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	48%	8	28%	7	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	29	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	48%	7	24%	8	28%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	29	0
Category Total	133	46%	81	28%	73	25%	2	1%	0	0%	3.19	289	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	16	43%	13	35%	7	19%	1	3%	0	0%	3.19	37	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	12	40%	9	30%	7	23%	2	7%	0	0%	3.03	30	0
Category Total	28	42%	22	33%	14	21%	3	4%	0	0%	3.12	67	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	19	51%	8	22%	9	24%	0	0%	1	3%	3.19	37	0
13. Dignified	20	53%	8	21%	9	24%	1	3%	0	0%	3.24	38	0
14. Courteous	20	53%	8	21%	9	24%	1	3%	0	0%	3.24	38	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	20	54%	7	19%	8	22%	1	3%	1	3%	3.19	37	0
16. Patient	20	53%	9	24%	8	21%	1	3%	0	0%	3.26	38	0
Category Total	99	53%	40	21%	43	23%	4	2%	2	1%	3.22	188	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	45%	8	21%	12	32%	1	3%	0	0%	3.08	38	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	49%	10	27%	8	22%	1	3%	0	0%	3.22	37	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	50%	11	29%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	3.26	38	0
Category Total	54	48%	29	26%	27	24%	3	3%	0	0%	3.19	113	