



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. Rodrick Coffey
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2013

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 155 Returned: 32 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 261 Returned: 25 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	95%
Communication	97%	n/a	95%
Temperament	99%	n/a	95%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	95%
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. Rodrick Coffey

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	20	65%	8	26%	0	0%	3	10%	0	0%	3.45	31	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	20	67%	8	27%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.57	30	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	22	76%	6	21%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	21	70%	7	23%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.60	30	0
Category Total	83	69%	29	24%	2	2%	6	5%	0	0%	3.58	120	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	75%	5	16%	2	6%	0	0%	1	3%	3.59	32	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	84%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	79%	4	14%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	3.61	28	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	22	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	85%	3	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	20	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	84%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	25	0
Category Total	180	83%	32	15%	3	1%	1	0%	2	1%	3.78	218	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	26	81%	3	9%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	32	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	22	73%	4	13%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.53	30	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	75%	5	16%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.62	32	0
Category Total	72	77%	12	13%	7	7%	3	3%	0	0%	3.63	94	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	72%	7	22%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	3.59	32	0
18. Dignified	25	78%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	32	0
19. Courteous	25	78%	5	16%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	32	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	81%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	31	0
21. Patient	24	75%	5	16%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	32	0
Category Total	122	77%	28	18%	7	4%	2	1%	0	0%	3.70	159	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	68%	8	26%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	31	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	23	74%	6	19%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	31	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	70%	6	20%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.57	30	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	80%	3	10%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.67	30	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	24	80%	5	17%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
Category Total	113	74%	28	18%	8	5%	3	2%	0	0%	3.65	152	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
Category Total	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	



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. Rodrick Coffey

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	67%	6	25%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	3.46	24	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	59%	6	27%	2	9%	0	0%	1	5%	3.36	22	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	67%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	24	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	60%	5	25%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	3.35	20	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	59%	6	27%	2	9%	0	0%	1	5%	3.36	22	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	58%	5	26%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.32	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	64%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	1	5%	3.41	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	60%	5	25%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	3.35	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	61%	6	26%	2	9%	0	0%	1	4%	3.39	23	0
Category Total	121	62%	49	25%	16	8%	1	1%	9	5%	3.39	196	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	15	63%	6	25%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	53%	5	29%	1	6%	1	6%	1	6%	3.18	17	0
Category Total	24	59%	11	27%	4	10%	1	2%	1	2%	3.37	41	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	13	59%	6	27%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	3.32	22	0	
13. Dignified	15	63%	7	29%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	24	0	
14. Courteous	16	64%	7	28%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.48	25	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	16	64%	6	24%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.44	25	0	
16. Patient	17	68%	5	20%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.48	25	0	
Category Total	77	64%	31	26%	7	6%	1	1%	5	4%	3.44	121		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	56%	8	32%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.36	25	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	68%	5	20%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.52	25	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	58%	6	25%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	3.38	24	0	
Category Total	45	61%	19	26%	6	8%	4	5%	0	0%	3.42	74		