



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Wayne Yehling
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 127 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 221 Returned: 37 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	98%
Communication	96%	n/a	100%
Temperament	99%	n/a	98%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	n/a

FOOTNOTE:

Judges are evaluated on their judicial performance midway through their term and prior to their retention election. Beginning in 2022, their survey evaluation scores include midterm scores and retention scores. Newly appointed judges serve a two-year term and are evaluated prior to their retention election on their retention scores. The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "superior", "very good", or "satisfactory" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials or no survey responses were returned). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information, as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Wayne Yehling

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	20	54%	14	38%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.43	37	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	62%	11	30%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.51	37	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	22	59%	12	32%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	37	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	22	59%	12	32%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	37	0
Category Total	87	59%	49	33%	10	7%	2	1%	0	0%	3.49	148	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	65%	10	27%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	71%	9	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	35	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	26	70%	10	27%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.65	37	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	22	73%	7	23%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.67	30	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	25	74%	8	24%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	76%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	33	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	26	76%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	34	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	80%	6	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	30	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	74%	8	23%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.69	35	0
Category Total	223	73%	74	24%	4	1%	4	1%	0	0%	3.69	305	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	54%	10	27%	6	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.32	37	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	57%	11	37%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	30	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	65%	9	24%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	3.49	37	0
Category Total	61	59%	30	29%	9	9%	4	4%	0	0%	3.42	104	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	26	70%	6	16%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
18. Dignified	24	65%	10	27%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
19. Courteous	27	73%	8	22%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	37	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	26	70%	8	22%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	37	0
21. Patient	25	68%	10	27%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	37	0
Category Total	128	69%	42	23%	13	7%	2	1%	0	0%	3.60	185	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	27	73%	8	22%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	37	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	28	76%	7	19%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	3.65	37	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	65%	10	27%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	68%	7	19%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	37	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	26	70%	8	22%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	37	0
Category Total	130	70%	40	22%	13	7%	2	1%	0	0%	3.61	185	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	67%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	18	0
Category Total	12	67%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	18	



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. Wayne Yehling

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	15	54%	7	25%	5	18%	1	4%	0	0%	3.29	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	63%	6	22%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	27	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	63%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	1	4%	3.41	27	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	65%	6	23%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	65%	6	23%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	65%	6	23%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	65%	6	23%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	63%	5	21%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	59%	7	26%	3	11%	0	0%	1	4%	3.37	27	0
Category Total	148	62%	55	23%	30	13%	1	0%	3	1%	3.45	237	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	16	62%	8	31%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	16	62%	8	31%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	26	0
Category Total	32	62%	16	31%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	52	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	17	63%	8	30%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
13. Dignified	18	67%	7	26%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
14. Courteous	18	67%	7	26%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	27	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	18	67%	7	26%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
16. Patient	17	63%	7	26%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	27	0
Category Total	88	65%	36	27%	8	6%	3	2%	0	0%	3.55	135	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	67%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	67%	7	26%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	27	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	63%	7	26%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	27	0
Category Total	53	65%	20	25%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	81	