



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. Jay Polk
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Other
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 102 Returned: 29 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 9 Returned: 9 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 111 Returned: 29 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	99%
Communication	96%	100%	94%
Temperament	97%	100%	99%
Admin Performance	99%	96%	98%
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. Jay Polk

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	21	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	26	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	22	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	26	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
Category Total	86	84%	15	15%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	102	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	25	89%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	84%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	87%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	25	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
Category Total	195	86%	24	11%	9	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	228	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	26	90%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.83	29	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	21	84%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	25	89%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.79	28	0
Category Total	72	88%	7	9%	0	0%	2	2%	1	1%	3.79	82	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	25	89%	2	7%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
18. Dignified	27	93%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	29	0
19. Courteous	26	90%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.83	29	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	27	93%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.86	29	0
21. Patient	27	93%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.86	29	0
Category Total	132	92%	7	5%	1	1%	4	3%	0	0%	3.85	144	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	24	86%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	24	86%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	28	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	22	85%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.77	26	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
Category Total	119	86%	15	11%	3	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.83	138	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
Category Total	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	



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. Jay Polk

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	23	82%	4	14%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	24	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	78%	5	19%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	73%	6	23%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.65	26	0
Category Total	184	82%	37	17%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	3.79	224	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	24	86%	2	7%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	21	84%	2	8%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	3.68	25	0
Category Total	45	85%	4	8%	1	2%	3	6%	0	0%	3.72	53	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	27	93%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.83	29	0
13. Dignified	27	93%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	29	0
14. Courteous	27	93%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	29	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	26	93%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.86	28	0
16. Patient	26	93%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
Category Total	133	93%	6	4%	2	1%	1	1%	1	1%	3.88	143	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	24	83%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	26	90%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.83	29	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	86%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	29	0
Category Total	75	86%	8	9%	2	2%	2	2%	0	0%	3.79	87	



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. Jay Polk

2022 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	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	76	94%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	81	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
Category Total	23	85%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
14. Dignified	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
15. Courteous	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
17. Patient	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
Category Total	40	89%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	45	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	6	67%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	3.33	9	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
Category Total	22	81%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.70	27	