



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. Lisa Ann Vandenberg
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 105 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 256 Returned: 21 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	93%	n/a	90%
Communication	99%	n/a	95%
Temperament	87%	n/a	87%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	94%
Settlement Activities	95%	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. Lisa Ann Vandenberg

2020 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	12	44%	6	22%	6	22%	1	4%	2	7%	2.93	27	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	13	48%	6	22%	5	19%	1	4%	2	7%	3.00	27	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	46%	9	35%	2	8%	1	4%	2	8%	3.08	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	13	48%	8	30%	3	11%	2	7%	1	4%	3.11	27	0
Category Total	50	47%	29	27%	16	15%	5	5%	7	7%	3.03	107	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	48%	6	22%	5	19%	2	7%	1	4%	3.04	27	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	67%	1	6%	3	17%	2	11%	0	0%	3.28	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	54%	3	13%	5	21%	3	13%	0	0%	3.08	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	67%	0	0%	4	27%	1	7%	0	0%	3.27	15	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	69%	0	0%	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	3.25	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	77%	0	0%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	63%	1	6%	5	31%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	16	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	77%	0	0%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	55%	3	15%	5	25%	0	0%	1	5%	3.15	20	0
Category Total	100	62%	14	9%	36	22%	10	6%	2	1%	3.23	162	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	16	62%	6	23%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	58%	6	23%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	26	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	58%	5	19%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	3.31	26	0
Category Total	46	59%	17	22%	14	18%	1	1%	0	0%	3.38	78	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	15	56%	5	19%	3	11%	3	11%	1	4%	3.11	27	0
18. Dignified	16	59%	4	15%	3	11%	3	11%	1	4%	3.15	27	0
19. Courteous	16	59%	3	11%	5	19%	2	7%	1	4%	3.15	27	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	56%	5	19%	3	11%	2	7%	2	7%	3.07	27	0
21. Patient	15	58%	3	12%	6	23%	1	4%	1	4%	3.15	26	0
Category Total	77	57%	20	15%	20	15%	11	8%	6	4%	3.13	134	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	16	62%	5	19%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	3.31	26	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	64%	3	12%	6	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	25	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	14	54%	7	27%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	26	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	58%	6	23%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	26	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	16	64%	4	16%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	3.40	25	0
Category Total	77	60%	25	20%	23	18%	2	2%	1	1%	3.37	128	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	40%	5	25%	6	30%	0	0%	1	5%	2.95	20	0
Category Total	8	40%	5	25%	6	30%	0	0%	1	5%	2.95	20	



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. Lisa Ann Vandenberg

2020 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	9	45%	6	30%	2	10%	2	10%	1	5%	3.00	20	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	50%	5	25%	2	10%	1	5%	2	10%	3.00	20	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	50%	5	25%	2	10%	2	10%	1	5%	3.05	20	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	56%	4	25%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.31	16	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	59%	4	24%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	53%	5	29%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	56%	5	28%	2	11%	1	6%	0	0%	3.33	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	56%	4	25%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.31	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	50%	5	28%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	3.17	18	0
Category Total	85	52%	43	27%	18	11%	12	7%	4	2%	3.19	162	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	11	52%	5	24%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%	3.24	21	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	53%	5	29%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.29	17	0
Category Total	20	53%	10	26%	6	16%	2	5%	0	0%	3.26	38	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	12	60%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	2	10%	3.15	20	0	
13. Dignified	12	60%	4	20%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	3.30	20	0	
14. Courteous	12	57%	4	19%	2	10%	2	10%	1	5%	3.14	21	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	11	58%	5	26%	1	5%	0	0%	2	11%	3.21	19	0	
16. Patient	11	55%	5	25%	1	5%	0	0%	3	15%	3.05	20	0	
Category Total	58	58%	22	22%	7	7%	5	5%	8	8%	3.17	100		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	11	52%	5	24%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%	3.14	21	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	60%	4	20%	3	15%	0	0%	1	5%	3.30	20	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	57%	4	19%	4	19%	0	0%	1	5%	3.24	21	0	
Category Total	35	56%	13	21%	10	16%	1	2%	3	5%	3.23	62		