



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. Kathleen Mead
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2013

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 313 Returned: 48 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 32 Returned: 6 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 247 Returned: 18 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	95%
Communication	99%	100%	97%
Temperament	100%	100%	92%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	96%
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. Kathleen Mead

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	19	45%	18	43%	4	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.31	42	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	46%	17	41%	3	7%	2	5%	0	0%	3.29	41	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	45%	17	43%	5	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	40	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	21	47%	19	42%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	45	0
Category Total	77	46%	71	42%	17	10%	3	2%	0	0%	3.32	168	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	26	57%	16	35%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	67%	12	29%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	67%	12	29%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	42	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	69%	9	25%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	26	67%	11	28%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	39	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	69%	9	25%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	68%	11	27%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	41	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	26	68%	10	26%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	38	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	65%	12	30%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	40	0
Category Total	238	66%	102	28%	20	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	360	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	25	57%	16	36%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	44	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	18	56%	8	25%	5	16%	0	0%	1	3%	3.31	32	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	26	58%	15	33%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	45	0
Category Total	69	57%	39	32%	12	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.45	121	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	26	55%	17	36%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	47	0
18. Dignified	30	65%	13	28%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	46	0
19. Courteous	31	66%	13	28%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	47	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	65%	14	30%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	46	0
21. Patient	29	62%	15	32%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	47	0
Category Total	146	63%	72	31%	15	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	233	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	26	57%	16	35%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	46	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	27	59%	16	35%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	46	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	20	57%	12	34%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	35	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	55%	16	36%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	44	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	23	53%	17	40%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	43	0
Category Total	120	56%	77	36%	17	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	214	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	50%	12	33%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	36	0
Category Total	18	50%	12	33%	6	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	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. Kathleen Mead

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	11	65%	3	18%	1	6%	0	0%	2	12%	3.24	17	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	71%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	2	12%	3.29	17	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	69%	3	19%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.50	16	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	71%	2	12%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	3.35	17	0
Category Total	104	72%	25	17%	9	6%	2	1%	5	3%	3.52	145	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	9	53%	4	24%	3	18%	1	6%	0	0%	3.24	17	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	8	57%	1	7%	5	36%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	14	0
Category Total	17	55%	5	16%	8	26%	1	3%	0	0%	3.23	31	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	10	59%	4	24%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
13. Dignified	11	69%	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
14. Courteous	12	71%	2	12%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	3.41	17	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	12	71%	2	12%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	3.35	17	0
16. Patient	13	76%	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.53	17	0
Category Total	58	69%	12	14%	7	8%	6	7%	1	1%	3.43	84	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	59%	4	24%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	17	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	71%	3	18%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.53	17	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	10	59%	4	24%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
Category Total	32	63%	11	22%	6	12%	2	4%	0	0%	3.43	51	



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. Kathleen Mead

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	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
Category Total	47	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	47	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
Category Total	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	18	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
14. Dignified	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
15. Courteous	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
17. Patient	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
Category Total	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
Category Total	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	