



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. Kenneth Lee
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Other
Appointed: 1997

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 128 Returned: 42 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 151 Returned: 31 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	100%
Communication	98%	n/a	96%
Temperament	99%	n/a	97%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	98%
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. Kenneth Lee

2020 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	24	62%	13	33%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	3.51	39	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	59%	10	26%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	39	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	24	67%	11	31%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	24	60%	12	30%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	40	0
Category Total	95	62%	46	30%	9	6%	4	3%	0	0%	3.51	154	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	26	63%	12	29%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	3.51	41	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	75%	7	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	71%	9	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	31	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	79%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	73%	7	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	75%	7	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	71%	9	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	70%	8	27%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	30	0
Category Total	190	73%	68	26%	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%	3.70	262	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	25	60%	14	33%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.50	42	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	22	63%	11	31%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	35	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	28	68%	10	24%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.59	41	0
Category Total	75	64%	35	30%	6	5%	2	2%	0	0%	3.55	118	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	24	62%	10	26%	4	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.46	39	0
18. Dignified	29	73%	10	25%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	40	0
19. Courteous	30	75%	9	23%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	40	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	27	68%	9	23%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.55	40	0
21. Patient	25	68%	10	27%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	37	0
Category Total	135	69%	48	24%	11	6%	2	1%	0	0%	3.61	196	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	27	68%	10	25%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	40	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	26	68%	10	26%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.58	38	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	23	61%	12	32%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	38	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	68%	10	25%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	40	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	25	69%	8	22%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	36	0
Category Total	128	67%	50	26%	12	6%	1	1%	1	1%	3.58	192	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	11	61%	6	33%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
Category Total	11	61%	6	33%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	



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. Kenneth Lee

2020 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	24	77%	6	19%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	31	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	84%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
Category Total	191	84%	35	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	3.83	227	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	22	73%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.63	30	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	13	72%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.56	18	0
Category Total	35	73%	11	23%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	3.60	48	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	24	77%	6	19%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	31	0
13. Dignified	26	84%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	31	0
14. Courteous	26	84%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	31	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	25	81%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.71	31	0
16. Patient	24	77%	6	19%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	31	0
Category Total	125	81%	25	16%	0	0%	0	0%	5	3%	3.71	155	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	81%	4	13%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	23	82%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.71	28	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	77%	5	17%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.63	30	0
Category Total	71	80%	13	15%	3	3%	0	0%	2	2%	3.70	89	