



**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. Cassie Woo**

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Juvenile

Appointed: 2019

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

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 106 Returned: 31 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 467 Returned: 63 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	97%	n/a	96%
Communication	99%	n/a	90%
Temperament	96%	n/a	93%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	96%
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. Cassie Woo

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	16	57%	9	32%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	16	57%	9	32%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.43	28	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	63%	7	26%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	27	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	61%	8	29%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>111</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	18	64%	6	21%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	67%	5	19%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.44	27	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	18	67%	5	19%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.48	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	68%	5	20%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	68%	5	20%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	72%	5	20%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	25	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	74%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	18	67%	6	22%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.52	27	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>231</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	61%	8	29%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	65%	7	27%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>83</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	17	63%	5	19%	2	7%	3	11%	0	0%	3.33	27	0
18. Dignified	17	65%	8	31%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	26	0
19. Courteous	17	63%	8	30%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	63%	8	30%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.52	27	0
21. Patient	15	58%	9	35%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>133</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	66%	6	21%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	29	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	72%	6	21%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	72%	6	21%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	20	69%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	29	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>145</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>8</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. Cassie Woo

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	28	48%	19	33%	6	10%	4	7%	1	2%	3.19	58	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	26	48%	19	35%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.26	54	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	29	53%	17	31%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.31	55	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	24	53%	14	31%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.31	45	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	50%	15	31%	8	17%	0	0%	1	2%	3.27	48	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	52%	15	31%	7	15%	0	0%	1	2%	3.31	48	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	51%	17	32%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.28	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	23	51%	14	31%	7	16%	0	0%	1	2%	3.29	45	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	52%	16	31%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.29	52	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>458</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	23	42%	19	35%	7	13%	5	9%	1	2%	3.05	55	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	15	35%	17	40%	7	16%	3	7%	1	2%	2.98	43	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>98</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	22	39%	21	38%	8	14%	1	2%	4	7%	3.00	56	0
13. Dignified	25	45%	19	35%	8	15%	2	4%	1	2%	3.18	55	0
14. Courteous	25	44%	18	32%	10	18%	2	4%	2	4%	3.09	57	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	23	41%	20	36%	8	14%	2	4%	3	5%	3.04	56	0
16. Patient	24	43%	20	36%	8	14%	3	5%	1	2%	3.12	56	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>280</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	26	47%	17	31%	9	16%	2	4%	1	2%	3.18	55	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	30	53%	14	25%	11	19%	1	2%	1	2%	3.25	57	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	28	51%	14	25%	11	20%	1	2%	1	2%	3.22	55	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>167</b>	