



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 Mandell
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 75 Returned: 15 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 183 Returned: 25 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	100%
Communication	89%	n/a	100%
Temperament	85%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	100%
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 Mandell

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	7	47%	5	33%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	3.20	15	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	8	57%	5	36%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	14	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	8	53%	5	33%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	8	53%	5	33%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
Category Total	31	53%	20	34%	7	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.37	59	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	10	67%	2	13%	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	67%	2	13%	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	77%	1	8%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	3.54	13	0
Category Total	81	83%	8	8%	4	4%	5	5%	0	0%	3.68	98	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	10	67%	1	7%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	10	67%	2	13%	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	9	60%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	1	7%	3.13	15	0
Category Total	29	64%	5	11%	6	13%	4	9%	1	2%	3.27	45	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	8	53%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	2.93	15	0
18. Dignified	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0
19. Courteous	10	67%	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%	0	0%	3.20	15	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	9	60%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	3.20	15	0
21. Patient	8	53%	2	13%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	2.93	15	0
Category Total	44	59%	9	12%	10	14%	9	12%	2	3%	3.14	74	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	9	60%	5	33%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	15	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	9	60%	4	27%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.33	15	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	8	53%	4	27%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	8	53%	5	33%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	7	54%	5	38%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.31	13	0
Category Total	41	56%	23	32%	6	8%	1	1%	2	3%	3.37	73	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
Category Total	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	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 Mandell

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	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	86%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	86%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	18	86%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	92%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	88%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
Category Total	178	86%	16	8%	11	5%	1	0%	0	0%	3.80	206	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	22	92%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	20	95%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
Category Total	42	93%	0	0%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	45	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	20	80%	1	4%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	25	0
13. Dignified	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
14. Courteous	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	21	84%	0	0%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	25	0
16. Patient	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
Category Total	104	84%	7	6%	13	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	124	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	22	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
Category Total	64	85%	5	7%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	75	