



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. Tracey Westerhausen
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2019

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 214 Returned: 59 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 12 Returned: 4 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	84%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	100%
Communication	86%	n/a	100%
Temperament	95%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	91%	n/a	100%
Settlement Activities	77%	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. Tracey Westerhausen

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	22	41%	17	31%	4	7%	5	9%	6	11%	2.81	54	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	18	35%	17	33%	8	16%	2	4%	6	12%	2.76	51	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	24	62%	6	15%	4	10%	3	8%	2	5%	3.21	39	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	23	42%	18	33%	6	11%	3	5%	5	9%	2.93	55	0
Category Total	87	44%	58	29%	22	11%	13	7%	19	10%	2.91	199	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	31	61%	11	22%	5	10%	1	2%	3	6%	3.29	51	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	82%	3	9%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	3.67	33	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	91%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	89%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.74	27	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	83%	1	4%	1	4%	2	9%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	87%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.68	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	90%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	85%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.62	26	0
Category Total	213	82%	21	8%	14	5%	7	3%	6	2%	3.64	261	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	30	55%	12	22%	6	11%	4	7%	3	5%	3.13	55	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	45%	10	24%	4	10%	2	5%	7	17%	2.76	42	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	64%	10	18%	4	7%	3	5%	3	5%	3.29	55	0
Category Total	84	55%	32	21%	14	9%	9	6%	13	9%	3.09	152	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	35	66%	10	19%	5	9%	2	4%	1	2%	3.43	53	0
18. Dignified	37	67%	11	20%	5	9%	0	0%	2	4%	3.47	55	0
19. Courteous	39	71%	11	20%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	55	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	39	71%	7	13%	2	4%	2	4%	5	9%	3.33	55	0
21. Patient	39	71%	9	16%	6	11%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	55	0
Category Total	189	69%	48	18%	22	8%	6	2%	8	3%	3.48	273	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	34	62%	12	22%	6	11%	0	0%	3	5%	3.35	55	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	35	65%	11	20%	5	9%	1	2%	2	4%	3.41	54	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	30	59%	6	12%	6	12%	5	10%	4	8%	3.04	51	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	38	69%	7	13%	5	9%	2	4%	3	5%	3.36	55	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	29	59%	7	14%	9	18%	1	2%	3	6%	3.18	49	0
Category Total	166	63%	43	16%	31	12%	9	3%	15	6%	3.27	264	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	62%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	2.92	13	0
Category Total	8	62%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	2.92	13	



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. Tracey Westerhausen

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	19	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	19	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	3	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
13. Dignified	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
14. Courteous	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
16. Patient	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
Category Total	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
Category Total	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	