



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 J. Herrod
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 426 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 493 Returned: 39 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	89%
Communication	99%	n/a	84%
Temperament	98%	n/a	90%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	90%
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 J. Herrod

2022 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	25	57%	12	27%	6	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.39	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	24	55%	12	27%	7	16%	1	2%	0	0%	3.34	44	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	25	60%	11	26%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	42	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	24	53%	14	31%	5	11%	2	4%	0	0%	3.33	45	0
Category Total	98	56%	49	28%	24	14%	4	2%	0	0%	3.38	175	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	31	61%	12	24%	7	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	51	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	29	63%	11	24%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	46	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	30	65%	9	20%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	46	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	27	68%	7	18%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	40	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	28	64%	10	23%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	44	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	29	69%	7	17%	6	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	42	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	62%	11	24%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	45	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	27	68%	7	18%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	40	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	28	61%	11	24%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	46	0
Category Total	257	64%	85	21%	57	14%	1	0%	0	0%	3.50	400	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	29	62%	11	23%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	47	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	26	65%	8	20%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	40	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	27	56%	16	33%	4	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3.44	48	0
Category Total	82	61%	35	26%	17	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.47	135	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	33	65%	11	22%	5	10%	2	4%	0	0%	3.47	51	0
18. Dignified	33	65%	14	27%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	51	0
19. Courteous	33	65%	14	27%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	51	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	32	64%	15	30%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	50	0
21. Patient	32	63%	15	29%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	51	0
Category Total	163	64%	69	27%	18	7%	4	2%	0	0%	3.54	254	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	31	61%	16	31%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	51	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	29	57%	17	33%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	51	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	27	61%	15	34%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	44	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	30	59%	16	31%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	51	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	30	60%	14	28%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	50	0
Category Total	147	60%	78	32%	22	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	247	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	60%	7	35%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	20	0
Category Total	12	60%	7	35%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	20	



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 J. Herrod

2022 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	55%	6	16%	5	13%	0	0%	6	16%	2.95	38	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	63%	4	11%	6	17%	1	3%	2	6%	3.23	35	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	64%	4	12%	5	15%	2	6%	1	3%	3.27	33	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	69%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	3	10%	3.34	29	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	65%	4	13%	5	16%	1	3%	1	3%	3.32	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	69%	4	14%	3	10%	0	0%	2	7%	3.38	29	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	62%	6	18%	4	12%	0	0%	3	9%	3.24	34	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	61%	4	13%	4	13%	0	0%	4	13%	3.10	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	61%	4	12%	4	12%	1	3%	4	12%	3.06	33	0
Category Total	184	63%	41	14%	37	13%	5	2%	26	9%	3.20	293	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	20	59%	8	24%	1	3%	2	6%	3	9%	3.18	34	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	17	57%	6	20%	2	7%	1	3%	4	13%	3.03	30	0
Category Total	37	58%	14	22%	3	5%	3	5%	7	11%	3.11	64	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	24	65%	6	16%	2	5%	1	3%	4	11%	3.22	37	0
13. Dignified	24	67%	6	17%	4	11%	0	0%	2	6%	3.39	36	0
14. Courteous	24	65%	7	19%	3	8%	1	3%	2	5%	3.35	37	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	22	59%	6	16%	4	11%	0	0%	5	14%	3.08	37	0
16. Patient	23	61%	8	21%	4	11%	1	3%	2	5%	3.29	38	0
Category Total	117	63%	33	18%	17	9%	3	2%	15	8%	3.26	185	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	55%	7	18%	5	13%	1	3%	4	11%	3.05	38	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	23	61%	8	21%	6	16%	0	0%	1	3%	3.37	38	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	61%	5	13%	5	13%	1	3%	4	11%	3.11	38	0
Category Total	67	59%	20	18%	16	14%	2	2%	9	8%	3.18	114	