



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. Ronee Korbin Steiner
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 387 Returned: 53 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 34 Returned: 11 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 405 Returned: 54 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	93%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	100%	91%
Communication	90%	100%	94%
Temperament	94%	100%	88%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	94%
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. Ronee Korbin Steiner

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	33	66%	5	10%	8	16%	3	6%	1	2%	3.32	50	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	32	67%	5	10%	8	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.35	48	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	28	61%	6	13%	9	20%	2	4%	1	2%	3.26	46	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	32	65%	6	12%	8	16%	2	4%	1	2%	3.35	49	0
Category Total	125	65%	22	11%	33	17%	9	5%	4	2%	3.32	193	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	35	67%	6	12%	7	13%	3	6%	1	2%	3.37	52	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	76%	4	9%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.53	45	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	33	72%	4	9%	5	11%	3	7%	1	2%	3.41	46	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	79%	3	7%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	42	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	33	75%	4	9%	6	14%	1	2%	0	0%	3.57	44	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	32	74%	5	12%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	43	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	33	77%	4	9%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	43	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	33	79%	3	7%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	42	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	34	74%	4	9%	6	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.50	46	0
Category Total	300	74%	37	9%	49	12%	13	3%	4	1%	3.53	403	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	33	63%	9	17%	5	10%	5	10%	0	0%	3.35	52	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	33	67%	5	10%	6	12%	4	8%	1	2%	3.33	49	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	67%	6	12%	6	12%	3	6%	2	4%	3.33	52	0
Category Total	101	66%	20	13%	17	11%	12	8%	3	2%	3.33	153	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	34	68%	6	12%	7	14%	3	6%	0	0%	3.42	50	0
18. Dignified	35	70%	6	12%	7	14%	2	4%	0	0%	3.48	50	0
19. Courteous	35	70%	5	10%	6	12%	4	8%	0	0%	3.42	50	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	36	72%	6	12%	5	10%	2	4%	1	2%	3.48	50	0
21. Patient	33	66%	6	12%	7	14%	4	8%	0	0%	3.36	50	0
Category Total	173	69%	29	12%	32	13%	15	6%	1	0%	3.43	250	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	39	76%	5	10%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	51	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	38	78%	4	8%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	38	79%	4	8%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	48	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	38	78%	4	8%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.61	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	39	80%	3	6%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
Category Total	192	78%	20	8%	32	13%	2	1%	0	0%	3.63	246	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	26	70%	4	11%	5	14%	2	5%	0	0%	3.46	37	0
Category Total	26	70%	4	11%	5	14%	2	5%	0	0%	3.46	37	



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. Ronee Korbin Steiner

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	32	62%	8	15%	4	8%	3	6%	5	10%	3.13	52	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	71%	6	13%	3	6%	3	6%	2	4%	3.40	48	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	67%	9	19%	3	6%	2	4%	2	4%	3.40	48	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	31	69%	7	16%	5	11%	0	0%	2	4%	3.44	45	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	68%	7	15%	4	9%	2	4%	2	4%	3.38	47	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	31	67%	8	17%	4	9%	1	2%	2	4%	3.41	46	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	30	67%	8	18%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.44	45	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	29	66%	7	16%	5	11%	2	5%	1	2%	3.39	44	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	63%	9	18%	3	6%	3	6%	3	6%	3.27	49	0
Category Total	282	67%	69	16%	36	8%	17	4%	20	5%	3.36	424	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	37	69%	7	13%	7	13%	0	0%	3	6%	3.39	54	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	33	66%	9	18%	5	10%	0	0%	3	6%	3.38	50	0
Category Total	70	67%	16	15%	12	12%	0	0%	6	6%	3.38	104	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	32	60%	8	15%	5	9%	5	9%	3	6%	3.15	53	0
13. Dignified	35	66%	7	13%	5	9%	2	4%	4	8%	3.26	53	0
14. Courteous	34	63%	8	15%	6	11%	3	6%	3	6%	3.24	54	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	34	65%	8	15%	4	8%	4	8%	2	4%	3.31	52	0
16. Patient	32	62%	9	17%	4	8%	4	8%	3	6%	3.21	52	0
Category Total	167	63%	40	15%	24	9%	18	7%	15	6%	3.23	264	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	72%	8	15%	5	9%	1	2%	1	2%	3.53	53	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	38	72%	7	13%	6	11%	0	0%	2	4%	3.49	53	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	36	67%	10	19%	2	4%	3	6%	3	6%	3.35	54	0
Category Total	112	70%	25	16%	13	8%	4	2%	6	4%	3.46	160	



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. Ronee Korbin Steiner

2022 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	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
Category Total	94	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.99	95	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	0
Category Total	32	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	33	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
14. Dignified	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
15. Courteous	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
17. Patient	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
Category Total	55	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	55	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	0
Category Total	31	94%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	33	