



**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.

### Pinal County Voters Only

Judge Olson is a member of the JPR Commission and could not vote on his own performance finding .

### Hon. Robert Carter Olson

Pinal County Superior Court

Bench: Civil/Criminal

Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2012	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>	<b>Presiding Judge Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 207 Returned: 60 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 51 Returned: 13 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 42 Returned: 16 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	97%	96%
Communication Skills	100%	92%	96%
Temperament	100%	95%	95%
Admin Performance	98%	97%	94%
Admin Skills	n/a	n/a	95%
Settlement Activities	95%	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. Robert Carter Olson

2012 Attorney Survey Responses

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

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
93. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	1	2%	8	16%	17	34%	24	48%	3.28	50	10
94. Knowledge of substantive law	0	0%	2	4%	8	18%	14	31%	21	47%	3.20	45	15
95. Knowledge of rules of evidence	0	0%	2	5%	8	19%	10	24%	22	52%	3.24	42	18
96. Knowledge of rules of procedure	0	0%	1	2%	9	18%	14	27%	27	53%	3.31	51	9
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>188</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
97. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%	16	29%	35	64%	3.56	55	5
98. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	8	24%	21	64%	3.48	33	27
99. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	8	22%	25	68%	3.57	37	23
100. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	4	13%	6	20%	20	67%	3.53	30	30
101. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	4	13%	7	23%	20	65%	3.52	31	29
102. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	3	10%	7	23%	21	68%	3.58	31	29
103. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	9	25%	24	67%	3.58	36	24
104. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	1	3%	3	10%	6	21%	19	66%	3.48	29	31
105. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	9	24%	25	68%	3.59	37	23
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>319</b>	
<b>3. Communication Skills</b>													
106. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	0	0%	0	0%	5	9%	18	32%	33	59%	3.50	56	4
107. Clear and logical written decisions	0	0%	0	0%	5	10%	18	38%	25	52%	3.42	48	12

108. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	14	25%	39	70%	3.64	56	4
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>160</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
109. Understanding and compassion	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	14	26%	37	70%	3.66	53	7
110. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	12	21%	41	73%	3.68	56	4
111. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	10	18%	43	77%	3.71	56	4
112. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	13	24%	39	71%	3.65	55	5
113. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	13	24%	39	72%	3.69	54	6
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>274</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
114. Punctual in conducting proceedings	0	0%	1	2%	11	20%	17	30%	27	48%	3.25	56	4
115. Maintained proper control over courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	8	15%	14	26%	31	58%	3.43	53	7
116. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	2	4%	9	17%	17	31%	26	48%	3.24	54	6
117. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	9	16%	15	27%	32	57%	3.41	56	4
118. Efficient management of the calendar	0	0%	3	6%	8	15%	18	34%	24	45%	3.19	53	7
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>272</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
119. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	0	0%	1	5%	4	18%	4	18%	13	59%	3.32	22	38
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>22</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. Robert Carter Olson

2012 Litigant Witness Survey Responses

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

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
38. Basic fairness and impartiality	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%	7	54%	3.31	13	0
39. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	3.80	10	3
40. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	33%	8	67%	3.67	12	1
41. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	7	70%	3.50	10	3
42. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	3.80	10	3
43. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	3.80	10	3
44. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	3.80	10	3
45. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	8	80%	3.80	10	3
46. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	8	73%	3.45	11	2
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>96</b>	
<b>2. Communication Skills</b>													
47. Explained proceedings	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	10	77%	3.46	13	0
48. Explained reasons for delays	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	8	73%	3.45	11	2
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>24</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
49. Understanding and compassion	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	9	69%	3.46	13	0
50. Dignified	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	3	23%	9	69%	3.54	13	0
51. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	9	69%	3.62	13	0
52. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3	23%	9	69%	3.46	13	0

53. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	31%	9	69%	3.69	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>65</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
54. Punctual in conducting proceedings	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	8	62%	3.31	13	0
55. Maintained proper control of courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3	23%	9	69%	3.62	13	0
56. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	10	83%	3.83	12	1
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>38</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. Robert Carter Olson

2012 Presiding Judge Survey Responses

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

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Exhibits professional conduct	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	2	13%	12	75%	3.62	16	0
2. Exhibits equal treatment to all	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	2	13%	10	67%	3.40	15	1
3. Exhibits fairness and impartiality	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	3	20%	9	60%	3.33	15	1
4. Exhibits personal integrity	0	0%	1	6%	2	13%	3	19%	10	63%	3.38	16	0
5. Exhibits conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	3	19%	3	19%	10	63%	3.44	16	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>78</b>	
<b>2. Communication Skills</b>													
6. Gives clear and logical oral communications / directions	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	6	40%	7	47%	3.33	15	1
7. Listens effectively	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	3	20%	10	67%	3.47	15	1
8. Keeps everyone appropriately informed	0	0%	0	0%	4	29%	3	21%	7	50%	3.21	14	2
9. Produces clear and logical written communication	0	0%	0	0%	2	14%	4	29%	8	57%	3.43	14	2
10. Responds in a timely manner	0	0%	2	13%	3	20%	5	33%	5	33%	2.87	15	1
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>73</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
11. Is patient	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	4	25%	10	63%	3.50	16	0
12. Is courteous	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	3	19%	11	69%	3.50	16	0
13. Is accessible	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	5	33%	8	53%	3.33	15	1
14. Responds appropriately to the circumstance	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	4	27%	9	60%	3.40	15	1
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>62</b>	

<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
15. Is well informed on all aspects of work	0	0%	0	0%	3	19%	3	19%	10	63%	3.44	16	0
16. Is willing to make difficult decisions	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	5	31%	9	56%	3.38	16	0
17. Is punctual	0	0%	2	13%	4	27%	4	27%	5	33%	2.80	15	1
18. Makes decisions in a timely manner	0	0%	2	13%	3	20%	3	20%	7	47%	3.00	15	1
19. Is resourceful in resolving problems	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	2	13%	11	73%	3.53	15	1
20. Exhibits impartiality in administrative decisions	0	0%	1	7%	3	20%	3	20%	8	53%	3.20	15	1
21. Makes reasonable and prudent judicial assignments	0	0%	1	7%	4	27%	2	13%	8	53%	3.13	15	1
22. Exhibits impartiality in making judicial assignments	0	0%	1	6%	3	19%	4	25%	8	50%	3.19	16	0
23. Exhibits impartiality in allocation of resources	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	4	27%	8	53%	3.27	15	1
24. Provides for appropriate training for judges and staff	0	0%	1	6%	3	19%	3	19%	9	56%	3.25	16	0
25. Asks for input before reaching decisions	0	0%	2	13%	3	19%	4	25%	7	44%	3.00	16	0
26. Works diligently	0	0%	0	0%	3	19%	4	25%	9	56%	3.38	16	0
27. Considers and implements change	0	0%	1	6%	3	19%	2	13%	10	63%	3.31	16	0
28. Displays organizational integrity	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	5	31%	9	56%	3.44	16	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>218</b>	
<b>5. Admin Skills</b>													
29. Establishes a clear focus for projects for which he/she is responsible	0	0%	1	7%	3	21%	3	21%	7	50%	3.14	14	2
30. Has the ability to identify and analyze relevant issues	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	2	13%	12	80%	3.73	15	1
31. Accurately assesses and attempts to secure the resources necessary for the effective functioning of the court system	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3	19%	12	75%	3.69	16	0
32. Accepts and incorporates diversity	0	0%	2	14%	2	14%	2	14%	8	57%	3.14	14	2
33. Coaches and develops others	0	0%	2	13%	3	20%	3	20%	7	47%	3.00	15	1
34. Cooperates with peers	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	3	19%	11	69%	3.50	16	0
35. Cooperates with staff	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	4	27%	9	60%	3.47	15	1
36. Effectively delegates responsibility	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	3	20%	7	47%	3.13	15	1
37. Creates a cooperative environment	0	0%	1	6%	2	13%	3	19%	10	63%	3.38	16	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>136</b>	