



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. Patricia Starr

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Other

Appointed: 2014

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 42 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 78 Returned: 15 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 31 Returned: 9 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	99%
Communication	97%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	100%
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. Patricia Starr

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	3.27	11	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	3.27	11	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	7	58%	4	33%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
Category Total	25	58%	13	30%	3	7%	2	5%	0	0%	3.42	43	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
Category Total	39	74%	13	25%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	53	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	7	64%	2	18%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	11	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	6	55%	4	36%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	3.36	11	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
Category Total	19	58%	11	33%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.45	33	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
18. Dignified	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
19. Courteous	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
21. Patient	6	55%	4	36%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	11	0
Category Total	32	59%	18	33%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	54	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	6	55%	5	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	70%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
Category Total	31	58%	20	38%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.53	53	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	



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. Patricia Starr

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	4	44%	4	44%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	43%	3	43%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	0
Category Total	28	39%	30	42%	13	18%	1	1%	0	0%	3.18	72	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	4	50%	3	38%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	8	0
Category Total	9	53%	6	35%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	17	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.12	8	0
13. Dignified	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
14. Courteous	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	4	44%	4	44%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	0
16. Patient	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
Category Total	19	43%	16	36%	9	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.23	44	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	4	44%	4	44%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	0
Category Total	13	48%	9	33%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	27	



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. Patricia Starr

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
Category Total	122	93%	9	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	131	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	12	80%	1	7%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
Category Total	38	86%	4	9%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	44	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
14. Dignified	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
15. Courteous	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
17. Patient	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
Category Total	75	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	75	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
Category Total	42	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	42	