



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.

Coconino County Voters Only

Hon. Elaine Fridlund-Horne

Coconino
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2010

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Fridlund-Horne MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
20 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 80 Returned: 20 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 454 Returned: 70 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	80%
Communication	100%	n/a	81%
Temperament	100%	n/a	75%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	84%
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. Elaine Fridlund-Horne

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	9	53%	7	41%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	17	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	71%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	9	53%	7	41%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	17	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
Category Total	43	62%	24	35%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	69	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	10	56%	8	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	67%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	69%	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	65%	6	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	17	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	71%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	0
Category Total	100	70%	42	29%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	143	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	8	47%	6	35%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	10	56%	5	28%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	18	0
Category Total	28	53%	18	34%	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	53	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
18. Dignified	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
19. Courteous	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
21. Patient	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
Category Total	74	82%	16	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	90	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	9	50%	9	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	6	35%	4	24%	6	35%	1	6%	0	0%	2.88	17	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	67%	6	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
Category Total	47	53%	33	37%	8	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.42	89	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	6	46%	7	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	13	0
Category Total	6	46%	7	54%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	13	



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. Elaine Fridlund-Horne

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	36%	16	28%	5	9%	7	12%	9	16%	2.57	58	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	40%	14	29%	5	10%	5	10%	5	10%	2.77	48	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	42%	12	22%	5	9%	6	11%	9	16%	2.62	55	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	44%	10	26%	6	15%	2	5%	4	10%	2.87	39	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	18	43%	11	26%	7	17%	3	7%	3	7%	2.90	42	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	43%	10	24%	6	14%	1	2%	7	17%	2.74	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	45%	10	21%	8	17%	4	9%	4	9%	2.85	47	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	46%	10	24%	7	17%	2	5%	3	7%	2.98	41	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	43%	11	21%	7	13%	3	6%	9	17%	2.68	53	0
Category Total	179	42%	104	24%	56	13%	33	8%	53	12%	2.76	425	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	22	39%	15	27%	9	16%	7	13%	3	5%	2.82	56	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	15	35%	10	23%	9	21%	3	7%	6	14%	2.58	43	0
Category Total	37	37%	25	25%	18	18%	10	10%	9	9%	2.72	99	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	24	42%	12	21%	4	7%	7	12%	10	18%	2.58	57	0	
13. Dignified	26	46%	11	20%	7	13%	5	9%	7	13%	2.79	56	0	
14. Courteous	25	42%	15	25%	7	12%	6	10%	6	10%	2.80	59	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	27	47%	8	14%	7	12%	9	16%	7	12%	2.67	58	0	
16. Patient	28	49%	9	16%	6	11%	9	16%	5	9%	2.81	57	0	
Category Total	130	45%	55	19%	31	11%	36	13%	35	12%	2.73	287		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	22	40%	14	25%	10	18%	6	11%	3	5%	2.84	55	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	25	45%	13	23%	11	20%	3	5%	4	7%	2.93	56	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	22	40%	13	24%	10	18%	5	9%	5	9%	2.76	55	0	
Category Total	69	42%	40	24%	31	19%	14	8%	12	7%	2.84	166		