



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. Sara Agne
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 112 Returned: 31 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 405 Returned: 87 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	100%
Communication	100%	n/a	99%
Temperament	100%	n/a	99%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	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. Sara Agne

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	23	77%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	30	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	77%	6	20%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	22	76%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	23	77%	6	20%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
Category Total	91	76%	22	18%	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	119	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	21	70%	6	20%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	30	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	79%	4	14%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	29	0
Category Total	198	82%	32	13%	12	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	242	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	23	74%	7	23%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	31	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	21	75%	5	18%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	28	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	77%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
Category Total	68	76%	18	20%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	90	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	22	73%	7	23%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	30	0
18. Dignified	24	77%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	31	0
19. Courteous	23	74%	8	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	22	73%	8	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	30	0
21. Patient	23	74%	8	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
Category Total	114	75%	38	25%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	153	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	20	67%	10	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	30	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	71%	8	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	31	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	20	69%	6	21%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	3.52	29	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	79%	6	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	20	69%	8	28%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
Category Total	105	71%	38	26%	4	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.66	148	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	63%	2	25%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
Category Total	5	62%	2	25%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	



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. Sara Agne

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	51	59%	21	24%	13	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.42	86	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	55	65%	21	25%	9	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	85	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	54	64%	22	26%	9	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	85	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	49	62%	22	28%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	79	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	52	63%	22	27%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	82	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	52	65%	20	25%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	80	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	56	66%	21	25%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	85	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	51	65%	19	24%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	78	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	55	65%	21	25%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	84	0
Category Total	475	64%	189	25%	79	11%	1	0%	0	0%	3.53	744	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	52	60%	20	23%	13	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.43	86	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	48	62%	17	22%	12	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.44	78	0
Category Total	100	61%	37	23%	25	15%	2	1%	0	0%	3.43	164	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	55	64%	19	22%	11	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.49	86	0
13. Dignified	59	68%	18	21%	10	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	87	0
14. Courteous	60	70%	16	19%	9	10%	1	1%	0	0%	3.57	86	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	60	70%	17	20%	8	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.58	86	0
16. Patient	61	70%	16	18%	9	10%	1	1%	0	0%	3.57	87	0
Category Total	295	68%	86	20%	47	11%	4	1%	0	0%	3.56	432	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	59	68%	18	21%	9	10%	1	1%	0	0%	3.55	87	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	63	72%	16	18%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	87	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	65	75%	13	15%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	87	0
Category Total	187	72%	47	18%	26	10%	1	0%	0	0%	3.61	261	