



**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. Michael Z. Rassas**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 195 Returned: 33 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 497 Returned: 74 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	93%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	82%
Communication	96%	n/a	77%
Temperament	97%	n/a	78%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	84%
Settlement Activities	96%	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. Michael Z. Rassas

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	15	48%	9	29%	4	13%	3	10%	0	0%	3.16	31	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	15	48%	9	29%	4	13%	2	6%	1	3%	3.13	31	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	65%	5	19%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	18	60%	7	23%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.40	30	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>118</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	20	65%	6	19%	3	10%	2	6%	0	0%	3.42	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	74%	4	17%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	67%	5	17%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	30	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	76%	3	18%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.65	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	72%	3	17%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	80%	2	13%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	75%	4	17%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.62	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	82%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.71	17	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	71%	5	21%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>199</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	19	59%	8	25%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	32	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	61%	8	29%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	3.43	28	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	59%	7	22%	5	16%	0	0%	1	3%	3.34	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>92</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	19	63%	7	23%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.43	30	0
18. Dignified	20	65%	8	26%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	31	0
19. Courteous	20	65%	9	29%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.55	31	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	21	68%	6	19%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	31	0
21. Patient	20	65%	8	26%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>154</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	58%	10	32%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	31	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	18	62%	9	31%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	29	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	68%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	31	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	20	67%	6	20%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	30	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>152</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	17	68%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	3.40	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>25</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. Michael Z. Rassas

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	27	40%	14	21%	6	9%	10	15%	10	15%	2.57	67	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	52%	11	19%	8	14%	3	5%	6	10%	2.97	58	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	48%	10	15%	7	11%	8	12%	9	14%	2.71	65	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	26	53%	8	16%	9	18%	2	4%	4	8%	3.02	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	28	53%	10	19%	8	15%	2	4%	5	9%	3.02	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	26	55%	8	17%	7	15%	2	4%	4	9%	3.06	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	29	55%	9	17%	9	17%	1	2%	5	9%	3.06	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	48%	11	22%	8	16%	3	6%	4	8%	2.96	50	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	28	51%	9	16%	5	9%	5	9%	8	15%	2.80	55	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>497</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	23	36%	16	25%	12	19%	7	11%	6	9%	2.67	64	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	20	39%	10	20%	8	16%	7	14%	6	12%	2.61	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>115</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	27	43%	13	21%	5	8%	10	16%	8	13%	2.65	63	0
13. Dignified	27	47%	12	21%	7	12%	4	7%	7	12%	2.84	57	0
14. Courteous	28	46%	10	16%	13	21%	6	10%	4	7%	2.85	61	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	28	47%	10	17%	7	12%	6	10%	9	15%	2.70	60	0
16. Patient	26	43%	11	18%	12	20%	6	10%	6	10%	2.74	61	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>302</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	28	45%	12	19%	16	26%	2	3%	4	6%	2.94	62	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	31	51%	10	16%	12	20%	5	8%	3	5%	3.00	61	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	44%	13	21%	7	11%	7	11%	8	13%	2.71	62	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>185</b>	