



**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. Catherine M. Woods**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2011

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Woods 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: 263 Returned: 50 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 23 Returned: 23 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 235 Returned: 50 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	91%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication	91%	100%	99%
Temperament	94%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	92%	100%	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. Catherine M. Woods

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	18	41%	15	34%	7	16%	2	5%	2	5%	3.02	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	18	41%	16	36%	6	14%	2	5%	2	5%	3.05	44	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	45%	12	32%	6	16%	1	3%	2	5%	3.08	38	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	20	45%	15	34%	5	11%	2	5%	2	5%	3.11	44	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>170</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	50%	17	35%	4	8%	2	4%	1	2%	3.27	48	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	63%	9	26%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	35	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	55%	12	32%	5	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	38	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	71%	5	18%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	21	64%	9	27%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	33	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	67%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	30	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	60%	9	26%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	3.40	35	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	60%	8	23%	4	11%	2	6%	0	0%	3.37	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>311</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	18	38%	19	40%	5	11%	3	6%	2	4%	3.02	47	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	14	44%	10	31%	5	16%	2	6%	1	3%	3.06	32	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	23	48%	19	40%	3	6%	2	4%	1	2%	3.27	48	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>127</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	22	47%	15	32%	6	13%	2	4%	2	4%	3.13	47	0
18. Dignified	23	48%	15	31%	8	17%	1	2%	1	2%	3.21	48	0
19. Courteous	26	54%	15	31%	4	8%	2	4%	1	2%	3.31	48	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	26	54%	11	23%	7	15%	2	4%	2	4%	3.19	48	0
21. Patient	25	53%	16	34%	4	9%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	47	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>238</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	23	48%	17	35%	4	8%	3	6%	1	2%	3.21	48	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	20	43%	16	34%	8	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.11	47	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	56%	10	23%	7	16%	1	2%	1	2%	3.28	43	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	54%	15	31%	4	8%	1	2%	2	4%	3.29	48	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	47%	10	21%	8	17%	6	13%	1	2%	2.98	47	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>233</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>12</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. Catherine M. Woods

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	38	76%	5	10%	6	12%	0	0%	1	2%	3.58	50	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	39	78%	6	12%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	50	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	40	83%	4	8%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	48	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	41	82%	5	10%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	50	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	41	82%	4	8%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	40	85%	3	6%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	40	80%	5	10%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	50	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	39	80%	5	10%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	49	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	37	77%	5	10%	5	10%	0	0%	1	2%	3.60	48	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>442</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	37	79%	5	11%	4	9%	0	0%	1	2%	3.64	47	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	80%	4	11%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>82</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	38	84%	3	7%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	45	0
13. Dignified	37	79%	5	11%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	47	0
14. Courteous	37	79%	3	6%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	47	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	37	79%	5	11%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	47	0
16. Patient	37	79%	5	11%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	47	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>233</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	79%	6	13%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	48	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	35	81%	5	12%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	43	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	41	85%	4	8%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	48	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>139</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. Catherine M. Woods

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	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	73%	6	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	73%	6	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>193</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	17	74%	6	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>69</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	18	82%	4	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
14. Dignified	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
15. Courteous	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
17. Patient	17	74%	6	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>114</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	17	74%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	74%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>69</b>	