



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. Danielle J. Viola
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Other
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 467 Returned: 72 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 24 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 161 Returned: 23 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	98%
Communication	98%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	98%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Danielle J. Viola

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	46	70%	17	26%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	66	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	43	67%	19	30%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	64	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	36	67%	17	31%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	54	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	46	69%	19	28%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	3.63	67	0
Category Total	171	68%	72	29%	4	2%	3	1%	1	0%	3.63	251	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	52	75%	13	19%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.68	69	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	81%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	42	84%	6	12%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.78	50	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	28	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	30	79%	6	16%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	38	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	37	84%	6	14%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	44	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	27	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	33	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	79%	7	17%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	42	0
Category Total	311	81%	59	15%	14	4%	2	1%	0	0%	3.76	386	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	48	70%	20	29%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	3.67	69	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	39	67%	18	31%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	58	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	51	74%	17	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.70	69	0
Category Total	138	70%	55	28%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	3.67	196	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	46	69%	16	24%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	67	0
18. Dignified	55	79%	13	19%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	70	0
19. Courteous	56	80%	12	17%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	70	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	56	81%	11	16%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	69	0
21. Patient	50	71%	16	23%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	70	0
Category Total	263	76%	68	20%	15	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	346	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	49	70%	19	27%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	70	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	51	73%	18	26%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	70	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	46	70%	19	29%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	66	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	54	77%	15	21%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	70	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	46	73%	16	25%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	63	0
Category Total	246	73%	87	26%	6	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	339	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	24	73%	7	21%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
Category Total	24	73%	7	21%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.64	33	



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. Danielle J. Viola

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	14	78%	2	11%	0	0%	2	11%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
Category Total	105	88%	11	9%	2	2%	2	2%	0	0%	3.82	120	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
Category Total	25	78%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	32	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	13	72%	3	17%	0	0%	2	11%	0	0%	3.50	18	0	
13. Dignified	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0	
14. Courteous	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	14	78%	3	17%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0	
16. Patient	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0	
Category Total	74	82%	13	14%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	3.77	90		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	12	71%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0	
Category Total	38	75%	13	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	51		



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. Danielle J. Viola

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	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
Category Total	87	97%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	90	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
14. Dignified	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
15. Courteous	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
17. Patient	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
Category Total	47	94%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	50	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	8	80%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
Category Total	26	87%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	30	