



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. John R. Ditsworth

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Juvenile

Appointed: 2001

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Ditsworth MEETS Judicial Performance Standards

32 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'

0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2016	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 116 Returned: 16 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 256 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	98%
Communication	95%	n/a	95%
Temperament	100%	n/a	98%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	94%
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.

20160106. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	0	0%	1	7%	4	29%	4	29%	5	36%	2.93	14	0
20160107. Clear and logical written decisions	0	0%	0	0%	4	36%	3	27%	4	36%	3.00	11	0
20160108. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	1	7%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	5	33%	2.80	15	0
Category Total	1	2%	1	2%	13	32%	11	28%	14	35%	2.90	40	
4. Temperament													
20160109. Understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15	0
20160110. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15	0
20160111. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	4	27%	4	27%	7	47%	3.20	15	0
20160112. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15	0
20160113. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	5	33%	5	33%	3.00	15	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	24	32%	21	28%	30	40%	3.08	75	
5. Admin Performance													
20160114. Punctual in conducting proceedings	0	0%	1	7%	5	33%	4	27%	5	33%	2.87	15	0
20160115. Maintained proper control over courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	6	40%	2	13%	7	47%	3.07	15	0
20160116. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%	3	23%	5	38%	3.00	13	0
20160117. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	1	7%	6	40%	3	20%	5	33%	2.80	15	0
20160118. Efficient management of the calendar	0	0%	1	7%	5	33%	4	27%	5	33%	2.87	15	0
Category Total	0	0%	3	4%	27	37%	16	22%	27	37%	2.92	73	
6. Settlement Activities													
20160119. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	3.50	4	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3	75%	3.50	4	



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. John R. Ditsworth

2016 Litigant Witness Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Integrity													
20160038. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	6	50%	5	42%	3.25	12	0
20160039. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	42%	6	50%	3.42	12	0
20160040. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	42%	6	50%	3.42	12	0
20160041. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%	3	43%	3.43	7	0
20160042. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	40%	6	60%	3.60	10	0
20160043. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	67%	2	33%	3.33	6	0
20160044. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	5	42%	6	50%	3.33	12	0
20160045. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	57%	3	43%	3.43	7	0
20160046. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	40%	6	60%	3.60	10	0
Category Total	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%	41	47%	43	49%	3.42	88	
2. Communication													
20160047. Explained proceedings	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	5	42%	6	50%	3.33	12	0
20160048. Explained reasons for delays	0	0%	0	0%	3	30%	4	40%	3	30%	3.00	10	0
Category Total	0	0%	1	5%	3	14%	9	41%	9	41%	3.18	22	
3. Temperament													
20160049. Understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	4	33%	6	50%	3.33	12	0
20160050. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	42%	6	50%	3.42	12	0
20160051. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	5	42%	6	50%	3.42	12	0

20160052. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	4	33%	7	58%	3.42	12	0
20160053. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	5	42%	5	42%	3.25	12	0
Category Total	0	0%	1	2%	6	10%	23	38%	30	50%	3.37	60	
4. Admin Performance													
20160054. Punctual in conducting proceedings	0	0%	1	8%	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%	2.83	12	0
20160055. Maintained proper control of courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	4	33%	7	58%	3.50	12	0
20160056. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	5	42%	6	50%	3.33	12	0
Category Total	0	0%	2	6%	4	11%	14	39%	16	44%	3.22	36	