



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. Renee Bennett
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 95 Returned: 26 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 175 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	80%
Communication	91%	n/a	79%
Temperament	93%	n/a	76%
Admin Performance	94%	n/a	83%
Settlement Activities	91%	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. Renee Bennett

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	12	48%	7	28%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%	3.20	25	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	48%	8	32%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	3.20	25	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	13	54%	8	33%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	24	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	52%	8	35%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
Category Total	49	51%	31	32%	13	13%	4	4%	0	0%	3.29	97	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	17	65%	4	15%	1	4%	3	12%	1	4%	3.27	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	79%	3	16%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	71%	3	13%	1	4%	2	8%	1	4%	3.38	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	81%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	76%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	3.48	21	0
Category Total	127	77%	23	14%	5	3%	6	4%	3	2%	3.62	164	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	68%	5	20%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	13	54%	8	33%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.33	24	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	17	65%	5	19%	1	4%	3	12%	0	0%	3.38	26	0
Category Total	47	63%	18	24%	3	4%	7	9%	0	0%	3.40	75	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	17	65%	5	19%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.38	26	0
18. Dignified	22	85%	1	4%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
19. Courteous	21	81%	2	8%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.65	26	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	19	73%	2	8%	2	8%	1	4%	2	8%	3.35	26	0
21. Patient	18	69%	4	15%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
Category Total	97	75%	14	11%	10	8%	6	5%	3	2%	3.51	130	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	73%	4	15%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	26	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	19	73%	4	15%	0	0%	3	12%	0	0%	3.50	26	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	67%	4	17%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.42	24	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	73%	4	15%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	19	76%	4	16%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.64	25	0
Category Total	92	72%	20	16%	8	6%	7	6%	0	0%	3.55	127	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	14	64%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	2	9%	3.32	22	0
Category Total	14	64%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	2	9%	3.32	22	



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. Renee Bennett

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	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	2.80	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	71%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	3.29	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	2.90	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	71%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	3.29	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	56%	1	11%	0	0%	2	22%	1	11%	2.78	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	63%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	3.25	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	57%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	3.14	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	56%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	2.89	9	0
Category Total	46	62%	11	15%	2	3%	6	8%	9	12%	3.07	74	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	6	60%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	3.00	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	4	44%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	1	11%	2.78	9	0
Category Total	10	53%	3	16%	2	11%	2	11%	2	11%	2.89	19	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	50%	2	20%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	2.80	10	0
13. Dignified	6	60%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	3.00	10	0
14. Courteous	6	60%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	3.00	10	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	6	60%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	2.90	10	0
16. Patient	6	60%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	3.00	10	0
Category Total	29	58%	6	12%	3	6%	7	14%	5	10%	2.94	50	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	5	50%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	2.90	10	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	6	60%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	3.10	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	67%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	3.22	9	0
Category Total	17	59%	5	17%	2	7%	2	7%	3	10%	3.07	29	