



**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.

### Apache, Coconino, La Paz, Mohave, Navajo, Yavapai and Yuma Voters Only

**Hon. Steven Williams**  
Court of Appeals Division I  
Appointed: 2019

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

[View Decisions](#)

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Peer Judge Surveys</b>	<b>Superior Court Judge Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 290 Returned: 32 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 15 Returned: 9 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 59 Returned: 14 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	92%	100%	91%
Integrity	97%	100%	99%
Communication	94%	100%	n/a
Temperament	92%	100%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	100%	92%

**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. Steven Williams

2022 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior    **VG** = Very Good    **SA** = Satisfactory    **PO** = Poor    **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>												
1. Legal reasoning ability	13	59%	6	27%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	3.41	22
2. Knowledge of law	12	55%	7	32%	1	5%	2	9%	0	0%	3.32	22
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	14	64%	5	23%	1	5%	2	9%	0	0%	3.41	22
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	13	59%	5	23%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	3.32	22
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	12	67%	5	28%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.56	18
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	71%	3	21%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	3.57	14
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	75%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	67%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.42	12

<b>Category Total</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	9	53%	5	29%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	3.24	17
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	5	38%	5	38%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	3.00	13
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5
17. Relevant questions	8	47%	6	35%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	3.18	17
18. Preparation for oral argument	4	33%	5	42%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	2.92	12
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	5	38%	6	46%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13
21. Courteous	5	38%	6	46%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13
22. Patient	5	38%	6	46%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	4	31%	7	54%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.00	13
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	13	62%	4	19%	4	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	21
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>21</b>



**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. Steven Williams

2022 Peer Judge 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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
2. Knowledge of law	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>36</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>81</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Attentiveness	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
15. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
16. Relevant questions	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Dignified	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
18. Courteous	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
19. Patient	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
20. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>36</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
21. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
22. Prepared for proceedings	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
23. Works effectively with other judges	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	0
24. Works effectively with other court personnel	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8	0
25. Effective handling of ongoing workload	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>43</b>	



**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. Steven Williams

2022 Superior Court Judge 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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	9	64%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.36	14	0
2. Knowledge of the law	9	64%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.36	14	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	9	64%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.36	14	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	9	64%	3	21%	0	0%	1	7%	1	7%	3.29	14	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>56</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	12	86%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>93</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	77%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.54	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>13</b>	