



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. Kristin Culbertson
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 266 Returned: 67 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 693 Returned: 85 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	91%
Communication	91%	n/a	93%
Temperament	78%	n/a	89%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	96%
Settlement Activities	98%	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. Kristin Culbertson

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	52%	16	25%	12	19%	2	3%	1	2%	3.22	64	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	32	50%	15	23%	13	20%	3	5%	1	2%	3.16	64	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	34	58%	13	22%	10	17%	1	2%	1	2%	3.32	59	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	35	56%	15	24%	12	19%	0	0%	1	2%	3.32	63	0
Category Total	134	54%	59	24%	47	19%	6	2%	4	2%	3.25	250	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	37	57%	8	12%	8	12%	10	15%	2	3%	3.05	65	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	63%	9	19%	8	17%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	48	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	35	63%	10	18%	7	13%	2	4%	2	4%	3.32	56	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	29	63%	10	22%	6	13%	0	0%	1	2%	3.43	46	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	29	64%	9	20%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	45	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	30	63%	9	19%	8	17%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	48	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	65%	9	19%	7	15%	0	0%	1	2%	3.44	48	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	28	65%	8	19%	6	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.44	43	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	65%	9	18%	8	16%	0	0%	1	2%	3.43	51	0
Category Total	282	63%	81	18%	63	14%	13	3%	11	2%	3.36	450	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	33	51%	13	20%	14	22%	5	8%	0	0%	3.14	65	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	30	51%	16	27%	11	19%	2	3%	0	0%	3.25	59	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	34	51%	6	9%	17	25%	6	9%	4	6%	2.90	67	0
Category Total	97	51%	35	18%	42	22%	13	7%	4	2%	3.09	191	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	24	36%	10	15%	14	21%	15	23%	3	5%	2.56	66	0
18. Dignified	30	45%	13	20%	14	21%	7	11%	2	3%	2.94	66	0
19. Courteous	28	42%	10	15%	15	22%	10	15%	4	6%	2.72	67	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	31	47%	12	18%	10	15%	9	14%	4	6%	2.86	66	0
21. Patient	19	29%	12	18%	16	25%	13	20%	5	8%	2.42	65	0
Category Total	132	40%	57	17%	69	21%	54	16%	18	5%	2.70	330	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	37	56%	20	30%	8	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.41	66	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	42	64%	13	20%	9	14%	2	3%	0	0%	3.44	66	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	36	57%	16	25%	11	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	63	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	41	62%	10	15%	12	18%	2	3%	1	2%	3.33	66	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	37	56%	15	23%	13	20%	1	2%	0	0%	3.33	66	0
Category Total	193	59%	74	23%	53	16%	6	2%	1	0%	3.38	327	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	26	57%	6	13%	13	28%	1	2%	0	0%	3.24	46	0
Category Total	26	57%	6	13%	13	28%	1	2%	0	0%	3.24	46	



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. Kristin Culbertson

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	44	56%	22	28%	4	5%	2	3%	6	8%	3.23	78	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	47	63%	19	25%	3	4%	2	3%	4	5%	3.37	75	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	49	64%	18	24%	2	3%	3	4%	4	5%	3.38	76	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	44	68%	14	22%	3	5%	2	3%	2	3%	3.48	65	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	46	66%	15	21%	4	6%	2	3%	3	4%	3.41	70	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	67%	14	22%	2	3%	2	3%	3	5%	3.44	64	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	49	68%	15	21%	2	3%	3	4%	3	4%	3.44	72	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	44	69%	13	20%	1	2%	2	3%	4	6%	3.42	64	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	47	64%	15	21%	3	4%	5	7%	3	4%	3.34	73	0
Category Total	413	65%	145	23%	24	4%	23	4%	32	5%	3.39	637	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	42	55%	19	25%	11	14%	2	3%	3	4%	3.23	77	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	37	55%	17	25%	8	12%	2	3%	3	4%	3.24	67	0
Category Total	79	55%	36	25%	19	13%	4	3%	6	4%	3.24	144	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	41	53%	22	29%	5	6%	4	5%	5	6%	3.17	77	0
13. Dignified	45	59%	20	26%	4	5%	4	5%	3	4%	3.32	76	0
14. Courteous	42	55%	23	30%	2	3%	3	4%	6	8%	3.21	76	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	45	62%	17	23%	4	5%	3	4%	4	5%	3.32	73	0
16. Patient	42	55%	18	24%	5	7%	5	7%	6	8%	3.12	76	0
Category Total	215	57%	100	26%	20	5%	19	5%	24	6%	3.22	378	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	50	68%	17	23%	6	8%	0	0%	1	1%	3.55	74	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	53	72%	13	18%	6	8%	0	0%	2	3%	3.55	74	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	45	59%	19	25%	7	9%	3	4%	2	3%	3.34	76	0
Category Total	148	66%	49	22%	19	8%	3	1%	5	2%	3.48	224	