



**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. Theodore Campagnolo**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Civil  
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 343 Returned: 49 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 30 Returned: 19 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 85 Returned: 9 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	91%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	89%
Communication	93%	100%	80%
Temperament	94%	100%	85%
Admin Performance	97%	100%	92%
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. Theodore Campagnolo

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	23	52%	10	23%	7	16%	3	7%	1	2%	3.16	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	45%	13	31%	5	12%	5	12%	0	0%	3.10	42	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	19	59%	8	25%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	32	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	22	54%	8	20%	6	15%	5	12%	0	0%	3.15	41	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>159</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	25	56%	11	24%	5	11%	3	7%	1	2%	3.24	45	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	77%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	68%	5	18%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	28	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	78%	3	17%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	74%	3	16%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	19	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	79%	3	11%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	18	75%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.54	24	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>215</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	21	44%	17	35%	7	15%	1	2%	2	4%	3.12	48	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	40%	15	36%	5	12%	2	5%	3	7%	2.98	42	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	26	55%	17	36%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.45	47	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>137</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	57%	8	20%	6	15%	2	5%	1	3%	3.25	40	0
18. Dignified	30	68%	9	20%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	44	0
19. Courteous	28	62%	11	24%	4	9%	2	4%	0	0%	3.44	45	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	28	64%	8	18%	3	7%	3	7%	2	5%	3.30	44	0
21. Patient	26	59%	10	23%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	3.36	44	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>217</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	31	66%	14	30%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	47	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	26	60%	12	28%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.47	43	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	59%	12	29%	4	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.44	41	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	57%	13	28%	5	11%	2	4%	0	0%	3.37	46	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	21	55%	12	32%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	3.37	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>215</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	1	8%	7	54%	5	38%	0	0%	0	0%	2.69	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>13</b>	



**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. Theodore Campagnolo

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	6	67%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	3.22	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	67%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	1	11%	3.11	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>73</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	2.86	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>15</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	63%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.12	8	0
13. Dignified	5	63%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.12	8	0
14. Courteous	4	50%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.00	8	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	5	63%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	2.88	8	0
16. Patient	5	63%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.12	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>40</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	6	75%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	75%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>24</b>	



**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. Theodore Campagnolo

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	16	84%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	19	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>168</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>53</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
14. Dignified	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
15. Courteous	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
17. Patient	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>90</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>54</b>	