



**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.

### Pima County Voters Only

**Hon. Michael Butler**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2013

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 212 Returned: 58 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 62 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 142 Returned: 42 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	85%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	98%
Communication	93%	100%	99%
Temperament	94%	100%	95%
Admin Performance	95%	100%	99%
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 Butler

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	19	33%	13	23%	15	26%	9	16%	1	2%	2.70	57	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	34%	9	16%	20	36%	7	13%	1	2%	2.68	56	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	35%	15	29%	11	22%	6	12%	1	2%	2.84	51	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	35%	15	28%	12	22%	7	13%	1	2%	2.81	54	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>218</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	28	49%	15	26%	10	18%	2	4%	2	4%	3.14	57	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	29	56%	16	31%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.40	52	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	53%	18	34%	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	26	57%	15	33%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	46	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	27	55%	17	35%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	49	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	56%	14	28%	5	10%	2	4%	1	2%	3.32	50	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	29	56%	16	31%	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	52	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	25	58%	13	30%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	43	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	53%	16	33%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>451</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	22	38%	18	31%	11	19%	6	10%	1	2%	2.93	58	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	51%	10	27%	6	16%	2	5%	0	0%	3.24	37	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	29	51%	18	32%	8	14%	1	2%	1	2%	3.28	57	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>152</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	29	50%	19	33%	8	14%	2	3%	0	0%	3.29	58	0
18. Dignified	30	52%	17	29%	9	16%	2	3%	0	0%	3.29	58	0
19. Courteous	31	53%	20	34%	4	7%	3	5%	0	0%	3.36	58	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	52%	15	26%	9	16%	4	7%	0	0%	3.22	58	0
21. Patient	30	52%	13	22%	9	16%	6	10%	0	0%	3.16	58	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>290</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	23	40%	21	37%	11	19%	2	4%	0	0%	3.14	57	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	39%	19	33%	13	23%	3	5%	0	0%	3.05	57	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	42%	17	34%	11	22%	1	2%	0	0%	3.16	50	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	28	49%	17	30%	9	16%	3	5%	0	0%	3.23	57	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	21	38%	20	36%	10	18%	5	9%	0	0%	3.02	56	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>277</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	14	48%	7	24%	8	28%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>29</b>	



**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 Butler

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	30	83%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.75	36	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	31	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.78	36	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	81%	5	16%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	28	82%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	34	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	27	82%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.70	33	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	30	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.77	35	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	25	83%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	30	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	82%	4	12%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	3.70	33	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>302</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	36	88%	2	5%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.78	41	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	26	84%	3	10%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>72</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	32	84%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.71	38	0
13. Dignified	33	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	39	0
14. Courteous	34	83%	4	10%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	3.71	41	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	33	83%	4	10%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.68	40	0
16. Patient	33	85%	3	8%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%	3.69	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>197</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	83%	5	13%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	40	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	32	82%	4	10%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.72	39	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	33	85%	4	10%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>118</b>	



**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 Butler

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>229</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	22	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>83</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
14. Dignified	24	86%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
15. Courteous	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
17. Patient	25	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>140</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	20	71%	5	18%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	24	86%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	82%	3	11%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>84</b>	