



**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. Rusty D. Crandell**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2020

**90% of the Commission Voted Judge Crandell  
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
18 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
2 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 60 Returned: 13 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 676 Returned: 102 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
	Legal Ability	67%	n/a
Integrity	68%	n/a	84%
Communication	68%	n/a	83%
Temperament	70%	n/a	79%
Admin Performance	77%	n/a	86%
Settlement Activities	64%	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. Rusty D. Crandell

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	5	38%	1	8%	2	15%	2	15%	3	23%	2.23	13	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	3	23%	2	15%	3	23%	2	15%	3	23%	2.00	13	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	2	20%	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	2.30	10	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	3	25%	2	17%	3	25%	2	17%	2	17%	2.17	12	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>2.17</b>	<b>48</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	4	31%	2	15%	1	8%	3	23%	3	23%	2.08	13	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	50%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	2	25%	2.62	8	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	4	36%	2	18%	1	9%	2	18%	2	18%	2.36	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	43%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	2	29%	2.43	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	57%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	3.00	7	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3.00	5	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	4	67%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3.17	6	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3.00	5	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%	3	30%	2	20%	2.10	10	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>72</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	3	23%	3	23%	4	31%	2	15%	1	8%	2.38	13	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	3	23%	3	23%	1	8%	5	38%	1	8%	2.15	13	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	4	33%	2	17%	3	25%	2	17%	1	8%	2.50	12	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>38</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	4	33%	3	25%	3	25%	0	0%	2	17%	2.58	12	0
18. Dignified	4	31%	3	23%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%	2.38	13	0
19. Courteous	6	46%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%	2	15%	2.85	13	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	5	42%	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	3	25%	2.17	12	0
21. Patient	5	38%	3	23%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%	2.46	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>63</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	23%	3	23%	6	46%	0	0%	1	8%	2.54	13	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	3	23%	5	38%	3	23%	1	8%	1	8%	2.62	13	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	5	38%	3	23%	2	15%	1	8%	2	15%	2.62	13	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	5	38%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%	2.46	13	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	2	22%	2	22%	2.22	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>61</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	45%	1	9%	1	9%	2	18%	2	18%	2.45	11	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>11</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. Rusty D. Crandell

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	41	45%	13	14%	12	13%	12	13%	14	15%	2.60	92	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	45	60%	7	9%	15	20%	5	7%	3	4%	3.15	75	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	54%	6	7%	12	13%	11	12%	12	13%	2.75	89	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	43	64%	6	9%	13	19%	3	4%	2	3%	3.27	67	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	45	63%	8	11%	13	18%	2	3%	4	6%	3.22	72	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	45	64%	7	10%	11	16%	3	4%	4	6%	3.23	70	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	49	64%	7	9%	13	17%	2	3%	5	7%	3.22	76	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	45	63%	7	10%	11	15%	4	6%	5	7%	3.15	72	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	43	58%	7	9%	8	11%	6	8%	10	14%	2.91	74	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>687</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	52	57%	10	11%	15	16%	6	7%	9	10%	2.98	92	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	42	60%	9	13%	7	10%	4	6%	8	11%	3.04	70	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>162</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	48	53%	9	10%	9	10%	14	15%	11	12%	2.76	91	0
13. Dignified	52	59%	9	10%	10	11%	11	13%	6	7%	3.02	88	0
14. Courteous	53	59%	10	11%	13	14%	9	10%	5	6%	3.08	90	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	51	56%	5	5%	11	12%	10	11%	14	15%	2.76	91	0
16. Patient	53	59%	8	9%	15	17%	7	8%	7	8%	3.03	90	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>450</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	51	57%	12	13%	18	20%	4	4%	5	6%	3.11	90	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	54	60%	8	9%	17	19%	8	9%	3	3%	3.13	90	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	52	58%	8	9%	11	12%	9	10%	10	11%	2.92	90	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>270</b>	