



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. Joseph C. Kreamer
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 110 Returned: 35 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 580 Returned: 101 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	100%
Communication	99%	n/a	100%
Temperament	100%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	99%
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. Joseph C. Kreamer

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	28	90%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	26	81%	4	13%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	32	0
Category Total	112	86%	15	12%	3	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	130	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	32	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	30	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	31	0
Category Total	274	99%	4	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.99	278	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	32	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	34	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	28	93%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	30	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	30	88%	2	6%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
Category Total	90	92%	6	6%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	3.89	98	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	30	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	34	0
18. Dignified	32	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	34	0
19. Courteous	29	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	33	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	32	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	34	0
21. Patient	31	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	35	0
Category Total	154	91%	16	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	170	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	27	77%	3	9%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	3.60	35	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	31	89%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	35	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	29	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	33	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	31	89%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	35	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	27	82%	2	6%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.67	33	0
Category Total	145	85%	15	9%	9	5%	2	1%	0	0%	3.77	171	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
Category Total	20	83%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	



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. Joseph C. Kreamer

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	74	76%	19	20%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	97	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	74	80%	16	17%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	93	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	74	78%	17	18%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	95	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	68	79%	15	17%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	86	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	73	79%	14	15%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	92	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	69	81%	13	15%	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.76	85	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	72	78%	16	17%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	92	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	68	80%	14	16%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	85	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	75	81%	13	14%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	93	0
Category Total	647	79%	137	17%	33	4%	1	0%	0	0%	3.75	818	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	80	80%	14	14%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	100	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	64	71%	18	20%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	90	0
Category Total	144	76%	32	17%	14	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	190	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	80	79%	16	16%	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	101	0
13. Dignified	82	82%	15	15%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	100	0
14. Courteous	83	83%	14	14%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	100	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	80	81%	15	15%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	99	0
16. Patient	82	83%	13	13%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.78	99	0
Category Total	407	82%	73	15%	18	4%	1	0%	0	0%	3.78	499	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	72	72%	20	20%	6	6%	1	1%	1	1%	3.61	100	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	81	83%	16	16%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	98	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	82	82%	15	15%	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.78	100	0
Category Total	235	79%	51	17%	9	3%	2	1%	1	0%	3.73	298	