ARIZONA COMMISSION ON
JPR
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

2006 REVIEW OF JUDGES' PERFORMANCE

The information in this pamphlet is provided to help you decide how you want to vote on the judges listed on the 2006 ballot.

- Information on the Arizona Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges begins on Page 2.
- Information on the Pima County Superior Court judges begins on Page 6.
- Information on the Maricopa County Superior Court judges begins on Page 10.
- A JUDGE CHECKLIST is provided on the back inside cover of the pamphlet, Page 26.
- After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the checklist.
- Use the checklist when marking your ballot.

For more information about the judge review process or the JPR Commission, please contact:

Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review
1501 West Washington Street
Suite 227
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

E-mail: jpr@courts.az.gov

Internet: www.azjudges.info or www.azjudgereviews.info

Telephone: (602) 364-0098

This publication can be provided in alternative formats upon request.

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE, COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:
Hurwitz, Andrew D.
McGregor, Ruth V.

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:
Kessler, Donn G.
Norris, Patricia K.
Portley, Maurice

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:
Brammer, Jr., J. William
Eckerstrom, Peter J.
Espinosa, Philip G.
Howard, Joseph W.

JUSTICE/JUDGE REVIEWS

ALL ARIZONA VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

HURWITZ, ANDREW D.
Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 291* *Surveys Returned: 117*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 34* *Surveys Returned: 14*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**97%**	**100%**
Integrity	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**97%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**100%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

McGREGOR, RUTH V.
Chief Justice
Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Chief Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 54* *Surveys Returned: 30*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 685* *Surveys Returned: 364*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 124* *Surveys Returned: 44*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	92%	100%
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	99%	97%
Administrative Skills	99%	N/A	N/A

MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES

KESSLER, DONN G.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 629* *Surveys Returned: 144*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 167* *Surveys Returned: 36*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

NORRIS, PATRICIA K.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 463* *Surveys Returned: 100*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 123* *Surveys Returned: 39*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	88%	97%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	93%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

PORTLEY, MAURICE.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 663 Surveys Returned: 187*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 75*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**97%**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**95%**	**98%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

PIMA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION II JUDGES

BRAMMER, JR., J. WILLIAM
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1997

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 525 Surveys Returned: 406*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 186 Surveys Returned: 155*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**89%**	**99%**
Integrity	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**96%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

ECKERSTROM, PETER J.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 157 Surveys Returned: 56*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 18 Surveys Returned: 6*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**90%**	**88%**
Integrity	**99%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

ESPINOSA, PHILIP G.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1992

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 454* *Surveys Returned: 318*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 175* *Surveys Returned: 116*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**88%**	**94%**
Integrity	**96%**	**99%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**88%**	**94%**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**

COCHISE/GILA/GRAHAM/GREENLEE/PINAL/SANTA CRUZ COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION II JUDGE

HOWARD, JOSEPH W.
Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1997

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 438* *Surveys Returned: 356*	Superior Court Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 193* *Surveys Returned: 137*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**87%**	**99%**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**97%**
Administrative S kills	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – PIMA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Michael D. Alfred
Ted B. Borek
Christopher C. Browning
Hector E. Campoy
Terry Chandler
Michael Cruikshank
John E. Davis
Charles V. Harrington
John F. Kelly
Richard D. Nichols

PIMA JUDGE REVIEWS

ALFRED, MICHAEL D.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1992

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 142 Surveys Returned: 51*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 32 Surveys Returned: 2*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 5*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**90%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**91%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**80%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**78%**	**86%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**92%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**88%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

BOREK, TED B.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

NOTE: Judge Borek is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on his own performance finding.

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 185 Surveys Returned: 39*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 118 Surveys Returned: 41*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 117 Surveys Returned: 43*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**99%**	**99%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 193 Surveys Returned: 26*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 70 Surveys Returned: 11*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 16 Surveys Returned: 10*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**89%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**90%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**90%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**97%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**92%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

CAMPOY, HECTOR E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 168 Surveys Returned: 41*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 198 Surveys Returned: 53*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 34*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**99%**	**99%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

CHANDLER, TERRY
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2004

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 98 Surveys Returned: 34*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 578 Surveys Returned: 119*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

CRUIKSHANK, MICHAEL
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal, Presiding Judge - Criminal Department
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 12*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 220 Surveys Returned: 45*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 142 Surveys Returned: 44*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 87 Surveys Returned: 33*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	93%	98%	99%
Judicial Temperament	100%	95%	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	98%	99%
Settlement Activities	N/A	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	98%	N/A	N/A	N/A

DAVIS, JOHN E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1996

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 240 Surveys Returned: 73*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 52 Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 18 Surveys Returned: 6*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	85%	100%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

HARRINGTON, CHARLES V.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil, Presiding Judge – Civil Department
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 5*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 207 Surveys Returned: 68*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 14*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 6*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

KELLY, JOHN F.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1988

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 181 Surveys Returned: 57*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 14*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 2*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	82%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

NICHOLS, RICHARD D.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 121 Surveys Returned: 33*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 154 Surveys Returned: 21*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	92%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	95%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT – MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY

RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Aceto, Mark F.	Anderson, Arthur T.	Barton, Janet E.	Budoff, Robert
Burke, Edward O.	Chavez, Harriett E.	Dairman, Dennis W.	Davis, Norman J.
Donahoe, Gary E.	Downie, Margaret H.	Duncan, Sally S.	Fenzel, Alfred M.
Foster, George H.	Gaines, Pendleton	Gama, J. Richard	Gaylord, John M.
Grant, Larry	Granville, Warren J.	Hauser, Brian R.	Heilman, Joseph B.
Hicks, Bethany G.	Hoag, M. Jean	Holt, Cathy M.	Hotham, Jeffrey A.
Houser, Robert C.	Hyatt, Carey S.	Ishikawa, Brian K.	Jones, Michael D.
Keppel, James H.	Lee, Raymond	Mangum, J. Kenneth	Mroz, Rosa P.
Mundell, Barbara R.	O'Connor, Karen L.	O'Toole, Thomas W.	Rayes, Douglas L.
Rea, John C.	Reinstein, Peter C.	Ronan, Emmet J.	Schwartz, Jonathan H.
Swann, Peter B.	Talamante, David M.	Verdin, Maria del Mar	Wilkinson, Michael O.
Willett, Eileen S.			

MARICOPA JUDGE REVIEWS

ACETO, MARK F.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 182* *Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 45* *Surveys Returned: 12*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 35* *Surveys Returned: 17*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

ANDERSON, ARTHUR T.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 152 Surveys Returned: 53*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 356 Surveys Returned: 35*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**89%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**95%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

BARTON, JANET E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 256 Surveys Returned: 58*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 69 Surveys Returned: 12*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 20*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**90%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**94%**	**96%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**88%**	**100%**	**99%**
Judicial Temperament	**78%**	**96%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**97%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**89%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

BUDOFF, ROBERT
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 124 Surveys Returned: 47*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 347 Surveys Returned: 48*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

BURKE, EDWARD O.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 167* *Surveys Returned: 36*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 96* *Surveys Returned: 8*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 105* *Surveys Returned: 40*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	81%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	85%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	95%	99%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

CHAVEZ, HARRIETT E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil/Family/Probate
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 118* *Surveys Returned: 40*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 350* *Surveys Returned: 53*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	89%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	90%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	88%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	89%	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

DAIRMAN, DENNIS W.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1992

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 127* *Surveys Returned: 19*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 58* *Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 53* *Surveys Returned: 13*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	86%	100%	95%
Judicial Temperament	95%	95%	96%
Administrative Performance	87%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

DAVIS, NORMAN J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family, Presiding Judge – Family Department
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 38 Surveys Returned: 15*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 7*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 122 Surveys Returned: 16*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

DONAHOE, GARY E.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 38*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 88 Surveys Returned: 20*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 83 Surveys Returned: 46*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	100%
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

DOWNIE, MARGARET H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Associate Presiding Judge
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 133 Surveys Returned: 59*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 134 Surveys Returned: 35*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 14 Surveys Returned: 1*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	96%	No Ratings	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	96%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	99%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

DUNCAN, SALLY S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 210 Surveys Returned: 64*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 242 Surveys Returned: 21*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**95%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**95%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**93%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**92%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FENZEL, ALFRED M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 18*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 114 Surveys Returned: 13*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOSTER, GEORGE H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 109 Surveys Returned: 28*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 272 Surveys Returned: 45*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**92%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**99%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**89%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**97%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**93%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

GAINES, PENDLETON
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

NOTE: Judge Gaines is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on his own performance finding.

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 342* *Surveys Returned: 120*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 112* *Surveys Returned: 23*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 46* *Surveys Returned: 20*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**99%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**96%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**99%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

GAMA, J. RICHARD.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 263* *Surveys Returned: 48*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 43* *Surveys Returned: 7*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 64* *Surveys Returned: 44*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**97%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**83%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**98%**	**100%**	**98%**
Settlement Activities	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

GAYLORD, JOHN M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 91* *Surveys Returned: 23*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 681* *Surveys Returned: 103*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**94%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**94%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**92%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

GRANT, LARRY
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 129* *Surveys Returned: 40*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 337* *Surveys Returned: 34*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**85%**	**91%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**90%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**92%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

GRANVILLE, WARREN J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 138* *Surveys Returned: 36*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 44* *Surveys Returned: 6*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 44* *Surveys Returned: 23*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**96%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

HAUSER, BRIAN R.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 179* *Surveys Returned: 32*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 93* *Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 75* *Surveys Returned: 22*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**97%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**99%**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**97%**
Settlement Activities	**97%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

HEILMAN, JOSEPH B.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil/Family/Probate
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 71* *Surveys Returned: 27*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 292* *Surveys Returned: 20*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	90%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	92%	85%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HICKS, BETHANY G.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 236* *Surveys Returned: 41*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 83* *Surveys Returned: 2*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 92* *Surveys Returned: 53*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	62%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	73%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	82%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	87%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	77%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HOAG, M. JEAN
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 94* *Surveys Returned: 23*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 136* *Surveys Returned: 29*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

HOLT, CATHY M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 215* *Surveys Returned: 33*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 41* *Surveys Returned: 2*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 80* *Surveys Returned: 31*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**100%**	**95%**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**100%**	**95%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

HOTHAM, JEFFREY A.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1987

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 173* *Surveys Returned: 42*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 306* *Surveys Returned: 32*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**93%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**92%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**90%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**89%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

HOUSER, ROBERT C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2002

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 325* *Surveys Returned: 78*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 95* *Surveys Returned: 24*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 17* *Surveys Returned: 10*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**96%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**97%**	**92%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**98%**	**91%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**97%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

HYATT, CAREY S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 20* *Surveys Returned: 5*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 426* *Surveys Returned: 49*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**90%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**80%**	**88%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**83%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**75%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

ISHIKAWA, BRIAN K.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 260* *Surveys Returned: 61*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 24* *Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 46* *Surveys Returned: 15*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**97%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**91%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

JONES, MICHAEL D.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 150* *Surveys Returned: 37*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 58* *Surveys Returned: 12*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 19* *Surveys Returned: 11*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**96%**	**98%**
Communication Skills	**95%**	**92%**	**91%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**91%**	**98%**
Administrative Performance	**96%**	**88%**	**94%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

KEPPEL, JAMES H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal, Presiding Judge – Criminal Department
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 50 Surveys Returned: 22*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 206 Surveys Returned: 53*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 6 Surveys Returned: 1*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 148 Surveys Returned: 21*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

LEE, RAYMOND
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 61*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 451 Surveys Returned: 76*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MANGUM, J. KENNETH
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1990

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 98 Surveys Returned: 26*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 230 Surveys Returned: 29*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

MROZ, ROSA P.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 143* *Surveys Returned: 43*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 351* *Surveys Returned: 45*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	93%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	95%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	97%	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MUNDELL, BARBARA RODRIGUEZ
Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Judge
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 237* *Surveys Returned: 88*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9* *Surveys Returned: 1*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 34* *Surveys Returned: 1*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A

O'CONNOR, KAREN L.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil, Presiding Judge – Probate/Mental Health Department
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 14* *Surveys Returned: 11*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 72* *Surveys Returned: 25*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 88* *Surveys Returned: 13*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 27* *Surveys Returned: 8*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	86%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	91%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	86%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	93%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

O'TOOLE, THOMAS W.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1984

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 201* *Surveys Returned: 34*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 68* *Surveys Returned: 5*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 78* *Surveys Returned: 35*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**98%**
Judicial Temperament	**95%**	**100%**	**99%**
Administrative Performance	**100%**	**100%**	**95%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

RAYES, DOUGLAS L.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 204* *Surveys Returned: 50*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 92* *Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 56* *Surveys Returned: 13*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**98%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**97%**	**100%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

REA, JOHN C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 194* *Surveys Returned: 57*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 501* *Surveys Returned: 48*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**89%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**92%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**90%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

REINSTEIN, PETER C.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 246 Surveys Returned: 69*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 7*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 7*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	92%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	94%	100%
Settlement Activities	87%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

RONAN, EMMET J.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile, Presiding Judge – Juvenile Department
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted Yes
0 Commissioners Voted No

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses *Surveys Distributed: 20 Surveys Returned: 9*	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 49 Surveys Returned: 11*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 146 Surveys Returned: 24*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 2*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	87%	100%	100%	90%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	94%	99%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

SCHWARTZ, JONATHAN H.
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 126 Surveys Returned: 29*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 120 Surveys Returned: 13*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 4*
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	86%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	89%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	71%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	77%	97%	92%
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

SWANN, PETER B.
Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 284* *Surveys Returned: 84*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 46* *Surveys Returned: 10*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 18* *Surveys Returned: 12*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**99%**	**100%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**98%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**96%**	**100%**
Settlement Activities	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

TALAMANTE, DAVID M.
Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 206* *Surveys Returned: 34*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 101* *Surveys Returned: 14*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 95* *Surveys Returned: 33*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**96%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**98%**	**100%**	**100%**
Communication Skills	**98%**	**93%**	**100%**
Judicial Temperament	**99%**	**98%**	**100%**
Administrative Performance	**93%**	**94%**	**97%**
Settlement Activities	**99%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

VERDIN, MARIA DEL MAR
Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

NOTE: Judge Verdin is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on her own performance finding.

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 99* *Surveys Returned: 19*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 303* *Surveys Returned: 34*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**99%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**100%**	**100%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**97%**	**94%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

WILKINSON, MICHAEL O.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1987

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 142* *Surveys Returned: 33*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 421* *Surveys Returned: 32*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**100%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**100%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**96%**	**94%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**97%**	**93%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**99%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**94%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

WILLETT, EILEEN S.
Assignment During Survey Period: Family
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses *Surveys Distributed: 139* *Surveys Returned: 44*	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses *Surveys Distributed: 249* *Surveys Returned: 24*	Juror Responses *Surveys Distributed: 0* *Surveys Returned: 0*
	Score (See Footnote)	**Score (See Footnote)**	**Score (See Footnote)**
Legal Ability	**91%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Integrity	**96%**	**98%**	**N/A**
Communication Skills	**93%**	**96%**	**N/A**
Judicial Temperament	**94%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Administrative Performance	**93%**	**95%**	**N/A**
Settlement Activities	**90%**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Administrative Skills	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" 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). 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.

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON
JPR
JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW JUDGE CHECKLIST

This page is provided to assist you when voting on the judges and justices standing for retention. Remove the sheet from your pamphlet, mark your vote on the checklist, and take the checklist with you when voting.

Arizona Supreme Court
(All Voters)

Hurwitz, Andrew D.	Yes __	No __
McGregor, Ruth V.	Yes __	No __

Court of Appeals Division I
(Maricopa County Voters)

Kessler, Donn G.	Yes __	No __
Norris, Patricia K.	Yes __	No __
Portley, Maurice	Yes __	No __

Court of Appeals Division II
(Pima County Voters)

Brammer, Jr., J. William	Yes __	No __
Eckerstrom, Peter J.	Yes __	No __
Espinosa, Philip G.	Yes __	No __

(Cochise/Gila/Graham/Greenlee/ Pinal/Santa Cruz County Voters)

Howard, Joseph W.	Yes __	No __

Pima County Superior Court
(Pima County Voters)

Alfred, Michael D.	Yes __	No __
Borek, Ted B.	Yes __	No __
Browning, Christopher C.	Yes __	No __
Campoy, Hector E.	Yes __	No __
Chandler, Terry	Yes __	No __
Cruikshank, Michael	Yes __	No __
Davis, John E.	Yes __	No __
Harrington, Charles V.	Yes __	No __
Kelly, John F.	Yes __	No __
Nichols, Richard D.	Yes __	No __

Maricopa County Superior Court
(Maricopa County Voters)

Aceto, Mark F.	Yes __	No __
Anderson, Arthur T.	Yes __	No __
Barton, Janet E.	Yes __	No __
Budoff, Robert	Yes __	No __
Burke, Edward O.	Yes __	No __
Chavez, Harriett E.	Yes __	No __
Dairman, Dennis W.	Yes __	No __
Davis, Norman J.	Yes __	No __
Donahoe, Gary E.	Yes __	No __
Downie, Margaret H.	Yes __	No __
Duncan, Sally S.	Yes __	No __
Fenzel, Alfred M.	Yes __	No __
Foster, George H.	Yes __	No __
Gaines, Pendleton	Yes __	No __
Gama, J. Richard	Yes __	No __
Gaylord, John M.	Yes __	No __
Grant, Larry	Yes __	No __
Granville, Warren J.	Yes __	No __
Hauser, Brian R.	Yes __	No __
Heilman, Joseph B.	Yes __	No __
Hicks, Bethany G.	Yes __	No __
Hoag, M. Jean	Yes __	No __
Holt, Cathy M.	Yes __	No __
Hotham, Jeffrey A.	Yes __	No __
Houser, Robert C.	Yes __	No __
Hyatt, Carey S.	Yes __	No __
Ishikawa, Brian K.	Yes __	No __
Jones, Michael D.	Yes __	No __
Keppel, James H.	Yes __	No __
Lee, Raymond	Yes __	No __
Mangum, J. Kenneth	Yes __	No __
Mroz, Rosa P.	Yes __	No __
Mundell, Barbara Rodriguez	Yes __	No __
O'Connor, Karen L.	Yes __	No __
O'Toole, Thomas W.	Yes __	No __
Rayes, Douglas L.	Yes __	No __
Rea, John C.	Yes __	No __
Reinstein, Peter C.	Yes __	No __
Ronan, Emmet J.	Yes __	No __
Schwartz, Jonathan H.	Yes __	No __
Swann, Peter B.	Yes __	No __
Talamante, David M.	Yes __	No __
Verdin, Maria del Mar	Yes __	No __
Wilkinson, Michael O.	Yes __	No __
Willett, Eileen S.	Yes __	No __