



**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. Teresa A. Sanders**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Civil  
Appointed: 2001

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 196 Returned: 39 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 9 Returned: 7 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 22 Returned: 8 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	91%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Communication	92%	100%	100%
Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	95%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	91%	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. Teresa A. Sanders

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	16	44%	8	22%	9	25%	2	6%	1	3%	3.00	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	40%	8	23%	9	26%	4	11%	0	0%	2.91	35	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	52%	7	30%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	3.30	23	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	50%	9	26%	5	15%	1	3%	2	6%	3.12	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>128</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	19	56%	10	29%	1	3%	3	9%	1	3%	3.26	34	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	65%	5	29%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	76%	4	19%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.62	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	69%	5	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	70%	5	22%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	3.48	23	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	59%	6	27%	0	0%	1	5%	2	9%	3.23	22	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>176</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	18	53%	9	26%	4	12%	2	6%	1	3%	3.21	34	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	47%	7	22%	7	22%	2	6%	1	3%	3.03	32	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	21	62%	6	18%	5	15%	1	3%	1	3%	3.32	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	68%	5	15%	5	15%	0	0%	1	3%	3.44	34	0
18. Dignified	24	69%	6	17%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	3.49	35	0
19. Courteous	26	74%	4	11%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	3.54	35	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	69%	5	14%	4	11%	1	3%	1	3%	3.43	35	0
21. Patient	25	71%	5	14%	3	9%	1	3%	1	3%	3.49	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>174</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	22	65%	7	21%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	34	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	65%	6	18%	4	12%	1	3%	1	3%	3.38	34	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	27	82%	1	3%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	62%	6	18%	6	18%	1	3%	0	0%	3.38	34	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	69%	4	13%	3	9%	3	9%	0	0%	3.41	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>167</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.18	11	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>11</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. Teresa A. Sanders

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>59</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>14</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
13. Dignified	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
14. Courteous	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
16. Patient	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>39</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	88%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	8	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>24</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. Teresa A. Sanders

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>57</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</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>21</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
14. Dignified	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
15. Courteous	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
17. Patient	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>35</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	7	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</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>21</b>	