



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. Joshua D. Rogers
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 356 Returned: 54 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 925 Returned: 79 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	n/a	99%
Communication	93%	n/a	96%
Temperament	96%	n/a	97%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	98%
Settlement Activities	94%	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. Joshua D. Rogers

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	29	59%	12	24%	7	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.41	49	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	28	57%	12	24%	5	10%	3	6%	1	2%	3.29	49	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	30	61%	11	22%	6	12%	1	2%	1	2%	3.39	49	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	28	56%	16	32%	5	10%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	50	0
Category Total	115	58%	51	26%	23	12%	5	3%	3	2%	3.37	197	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	34	63%	10	19%	8	15%	0	0%	2	4%	3.37	54	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	31	74%	7	17%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	67%	10	21%	4	8%	0	0%	2	4%	3.46	48	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	74%	6	18%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	76%	7	17%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	41	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	24	73%	6	18%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	30	71%	6	14%	5	12%	0	0%	1	2%	3.52	42	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	26	72%	7	19%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	67%	8	17%	6	13%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	46	0
Category Total	264	70%	67	18%	39	10%	0	0%	6	2%	3.55	376	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	30	56%	13	24%	8	15%	2	4%	1	2%	3.28	54	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	31	63%	8	16%	6	12%	2	4%	2	4%	3.31	49	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	33	61%	12	22%	5	9%	1	2%	3	6%	3.31	54	0
Category Total	94	60%	33	21%	19	12%	5	3%	6	4%	3.30	157	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	33	62%	11	21%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.40	53	0
18. Dignified	35	67%	12	23%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	52	0
19. Courteous	37	69%	10	19%	6	11%	0	0%	1	2%	3.52	54	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	36	68%	7	13%	6	11%	1	2%	3	6%	3.36	53	0
21. Patient	34	63%	11	20%	5	9%	3	6%	1	2%	3.37	54	0
Category Total	175	66%	51	19%	29	11%	5	2%	6	2%	3.44	266	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	35	66%	11	21%	6	11%	1	2%	0	0%	3.51	53	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	37	70%	9	17%	5	9%	0	0%	2	4%	3.49	53	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	26	52%	12	24%	9	18%	1	2%	2	4%	3.18	50	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	62%	12	23%	6	12%	0	0%	2	4%	3.38	52	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	30	60%	11	22%	7	14%	1	2%	1	2%	3.36	50	0
Category Total	160	62%	55	21%	33	13%	3	1%	7	3%	3.39	258	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	22	67%	5	15%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	3.42	33	0
Category Total	22	67%	5	15%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	3.42	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. Joshua D. Rogers

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	41	54%	26	34%	6	8%	1	1%	2	3%	3.36	76	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	43	63%	17	25%	7	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.49	68	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	47	64%	18	24%	8	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.50	74	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	44	67%	17	26%	4	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	66	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	44	67%	17	26%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	66	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	42	66%	17	27%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	64	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	45	65%	19	28%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	69	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	43	65%	16	24%	6	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.53	66	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	43	62%	19	28%	5	7%	1	1%	1	1%	3.48	69	0
Category Total	392	63%	166	27%	51	8%	5	1%	4	1%	3.52	618	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	42	56%	20	27%	11	15%	1	1%	1	1%	3.35	75	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	37	55%	17	25%	9	13%	2	3%	2	3%	3.27	67	0
Category Total	79	56%	37	26%	20	14%	3	2%	3	2%	3.31	142	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	44	59%	18	24%	9	12%	0	0%	3	4%	3.35	74	0	
13. Dignified	50	68%	17	23%	5	7%	0	0%	2	3%	3.53	74	0	
14. Courteous	52	68%	15	20%	7	9%	0	0%	2	3%	3.51	76	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	48	64%	18	24%	6	8%	1	1%	2	3%	3.45	75	0	
16. Patient	48	64%	19	25%	8	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	75	0	
Category Total	242	65%	87	23%	35	9%	1	0%	9	2%	3.48	374		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	46	62%	19	26%	8	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	74	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	48	66%	19	26%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	73	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	44	59%	20	27%	6	8%	2	3%	2	3%	3.38	74	0	
Category Total	138	62%	58	26%	20	9%	3	1%	2	1%	3.48	221		