



**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. Katherine M. Cooper**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2011

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 370 Returned: 63 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 32 Returned: 19 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 287 Returned: 66 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	88%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	97%	100%	96%
Communication	89%	98%	92%
Temperament	90%	100%	94%
Admin Performance	95%	100%	96%
Settlement Activities	98%	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. Katherine M. Cooper

2022 Attorney Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	31	52%	17	28%	4	7%	2	3%	6	10%	3.08	60	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	30	51%	17	29%	4	7%	4	7%	4	7%	3.10	59	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	29	53%	18	33%	2	4%	2	4%	4	7%	3.20	55	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	30	51%	16	27%	6	10%	2	3%	5	8%	3.08	59	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>233</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	37	60%	13	21%	4	6%	4	6%	4	6%	3.21	62	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	71%	10	21%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	48	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	37	70%	10	19%	4	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.53	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	80%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	41	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	33	79%	7	17%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	42	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	31	78%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	40	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	37	76%	9	18%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	49	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	32	80%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	40	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	65%	12	24%	4	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.47	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>426</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	40	63%	11	17%	5	8%	5	8%	2	3%	3.30	63	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	31	57%	12	22%	4	7%	4	7%	3	6%	3.19	54	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	39	64%	13	21%	3	5%	3	5%	3	5%	3.34	61	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>178</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	40	63%	12	19%	4	6%	3	5%	4	6%	3.29	63	0
18. Dignified	41	66%	11	18%	5	8%	3	5%	2	3%	3.39	62	0
19. Courteous	41	65%	12	19%	5	8%	2	3%	3	5%	3.37	63	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	41	65%	10	16%	5	8%	1	2%	6	10%	3.25	63	0
21. Patient	41	65%	10	16%	4	6%	2	3%	6	10%	3.24	63	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>314</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	69%	11	18%	8	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	61	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	43	70%	11	18%	4	7%	2	3%	1	2%	3.52	61	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	36	62%	15	26%	3	5%	2	3%	2	3%	3.40	58	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	41	66%	13	21%	4	6%	1	2%	3	5%	3.42	62	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	40	69%	11	19%	4	7%	2	3%	1	2%	3.50	58	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>300</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	30	70%	11	26%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	43	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>43</b>	



**JPR**  
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

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

## Judicial Reports

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

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



## Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Katherine M. Cooper

2022 Litigant Witness Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	47	75%	8	13%	3	5%	2	3%	3	5%	3.49	63	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	51	84%	8	13%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.77	61	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	50	81%	8	13%	1	2%	1	2%	2	3%	3.66	62	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	48	80%	10	17%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	3.70	60	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	48	83%	8	14%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.76	58	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	48	80%	8	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3	5%	3.63	60	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	48	80%	8	13%	1	2%	2	3%	1	2%	3.67	60	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	46	81%	10	18%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.75	57	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	48	80%	9	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	3.65	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>541</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	46	72%	12	19%	1	2%	4	6%	1	2%	3.53	64	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	43	68%	13	21%	2	3%	3	5%	2	3%	3.46	63	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>127</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	44	70%	11	17%	3	5%	3	5%	2	3%	3.46	63	0
13. Dignified	45	71%	12	19%	3	5%	2	3%	1	2%	3.56	63	0
14. Courteous	47	72%	12	18%	3	5%	1	2%	2	3%	3.55	65	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	50	77%	8	12%	2	3%	1	2%	4	6%	3.52	65	0
16. Patient	50	78%	10	16%	1	2%	2	3%	1	2%	3.66	64	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>320</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	49	74%	9	14%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.56	66	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	51	77%	8	12%	6	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3.64	66	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	52	79%	8	12%	2	3%	2	3%	2	3%	3.61	66	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>198</b>	



**JPR**  
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

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

## Judicial Reports

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

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



## Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Katherine M. Cooper

2022 Juror Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>169</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	15	79%	3	16%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	3.68	19	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>57</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
14. Dignified	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
15. Courteous	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
17. Patient	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>95</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	15	79%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>57</b>	