



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. Scott Blaney

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Family

Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 124 Returned: 21 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 322 Returned: 11 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	89%
Communication	100%	n/a	81%
Temperament	98%	n/a	84%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	85%
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. Scott Blaney

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	11	55%	9	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	20	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	11	55%	9	45%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	20	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	9	53%	7	41%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	17	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	57%	8	38%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	21	0
Category Total	43	55%	33	42%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	78	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	14	67%	6	29%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	62%	4	31%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	63%	6	32%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	69%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	13	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	64%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	67%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
Category Total	87	66%	35	27%	9	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	131	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	11	65%	5	29%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	14	67%	7	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
Category Total	40	68%	17	29%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	59	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	13	65%	6	30%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
18. Dignified	15	71%	5	24%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
19. Courteous	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	14	67%	6	29%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
21. Patient	15	71%	5	24%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
Category Total	72	69%	27	26%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	3.62	104	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	15	79%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	19	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	16	76%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
Category Total	76	75%	20	20%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	102	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	64%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
Category Total	9	64%	4	29%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	



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. Scott Blaney

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	9	82%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.27	11	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	82%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.27	11	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	73%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.36	11	0
Category Total	80	81%	1	1%	7	7%	0	0%	11	11%	3.40	99	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	8	73%	0	0%	1	9%	1	9%	1	9%	3.18	11	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	70%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	3.00	10	0
Category Total	15	71%	0	0%	2	10%	1	5%	3	14%	3.10	21	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	8	73%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.18	11	0
13. Dignified	8	73%	0	0%	2	18%	0	0%	1	9%	3.27	11	0
14. Courteous	8	73%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	2	18%	3.09	11	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	9	82%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.27	11	0
16. Patient	9	82%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.27	11	0
Category Total	42	76%	1	2%	3	5%	0	0%	9	16%	3.22	55	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	64%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.09	11	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	82%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.45	11	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	8	73%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	3.18	11	0
Category Total	24	73%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	5	15%	3.24	33	