



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. Ronda Fisk

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Criminal

Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 238 Returned: 49 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 37 Returned: 15 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 51 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	96%
Communication	100%	100%	88%
Temperament	99%	100%	89%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	97%
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. Ronda Fisk

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	25	54%	17	37%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	46	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	25	58%	15	35%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	43	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	24	59%	13	32%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	41	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	26	60%	15	35%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	43	0
Category Total	100	58%	60	35%	13	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	173	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	34	69%	12	24%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	33	77%	8	19%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	43	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	33	75%	7	16%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	44	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	30	77%	7	18%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	39	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	78%	7	18%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	40	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	76%	7	19%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	37	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	76%	7	17%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	41	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	29	76%	7	18%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	38	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	79%	7	17%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	42	0
Category Total	282	76%	69	18%	22	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	373	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	35	73%	11	23%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	48	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	25	68%	11	30%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	37	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	73%	9	19%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	48	0
Category Total	95	71%	31	23%	7	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	133	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	36	73%	9	18%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
18. Dignified	39	80%	8	16%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	49	0
19. Courteous	37	76%	9	18%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.67	49	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	38	78%	9	18%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	49	0
21. Patient	34	69%	11	22%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.59	49	0
Category Total	184	75%	46	19%	12	5%	3	1%	0	0%	3.68	245	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	35	71%	11	22%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	49	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	37	76%	10	20%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	49	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	27	64%	12	29%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	42	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	33	67%	14	29%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	31	66%	14	30%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	47	0
Category Total	163	69%	61	26%	11	5%	1	0%	0	0%	3.64	236	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	29	81%	6	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	36	0
Category Total	29	81%	6	17%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	36	



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. Ronda Fisk

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	3	30%	5	50%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	2.90	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	56%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	57%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	7	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.14	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	38%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	1	13%	2.88	8	0
Category Total	38	52%	22	30%	10	14%	1	1%	2	3%	3.27	73	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	4	44%	3	33%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	3.11	9	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	3	38%	3	38%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	3.00	8	0
Category Total	7	41%	6	35%	2	12%	2	12%	0	0%	3.06	17	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	4	44%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	3.11	9	0
13. Dignified	5	56%	3	33%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	3.33	9	0
14. Courteous	5	56%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
16. Patient	3	30%	5	50%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	2.90	10	0
Category Total	22	47%	17	36%	3	6%	3	6%	2	4%	3.15	47	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	4	40%	4	40%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	6	60%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	3.20	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
Category Total	15	52%	9	31%	4	14%	0	0%	1	3%	3.28	29	



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. Ronda Fisk

2020 Juror 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	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
Category Total	116	87%	18	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	134	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
Category Total	41	91%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	45	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
14. Dignified	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
15. Courteous	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
17. Patient	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
Category Total	70	93%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	75	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
Category Total	39	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	

[Home](#) [Careers](#)
[Site Map](#)[Career](#)

[Opportunities](#)
[Court Vacancies](#)
[Human Resources](#)

[Volunteer](#)
[Volunteer-FCRB](#)
[Volunteer-CASA](#)
[Volunteer-AmeriCorps](#)

Helpful Links
[National Center for State Courts](#)
[State Bar of Arizona](#)
[AZ@ Your Service](#)
[Commission on Judicial Conduct](#)
[Legal Reference & Links](#)
[Educator Links](#)
[Legal Associations](#)
[Arizona Revised Statutes](#)
[Interpreters](#)
[CORP Website](#)
[Self-Service Center](#)
[El Centro de Autoservicio](#)

[Contact Us](#)
[Feedback](#)
[Site Map](#)