



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. Adam Driggs

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Family

Appointed: 2017

94% of the Commission Voted Judge Driggs MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
31 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
2 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 156 Returned: 36 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 352 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	94%
Communication	95%	n/a	85%
Temperament	97%	n/a	92%
Admin Performance	87%	n/a	89%
Settlement Activities	95%	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. Adam Driggs

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	8	24%	12	36%	8	24%	4	12%	1	3%	2.67	33	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	8	24%	11	33%	8	24%	6	18%	0	0%	2.64	33	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	10	32%	10	32%	10	32%	1	3%	0	0%	2.94	31	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	9	26%	13	37%	11	31%	2	6%	0	0%	2.83	35	0
Category Total	35	27%	46	35%	37	28%	13	10%	1	1%	2.77	132	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	20	56%	9	25%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	36	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	67%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	61%	6	19%	5	16%	0	0%	1	3%	3.35	31	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	64%	7	28%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	16	67%	6	25%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	70%	5	22%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	64%	6	21%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	70%	5	22%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	68%	6	21%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	28	0
Category Total	158	64%	56	23%	30	12%	0	0%	1	0%	3.51	245	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	12	33%	9	25%	13	36%	2	6%	0	0%	2.86	36	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	10	32%	6	19%	12	39%	3	10%	0	0%	2.74	31	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	42%	14	39%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	36	0
Category Total	37	36%	29	28%	32	31%	5	5%	0	0%	2.95	103	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	19	56%	9	26%	6	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	34	0
18. Dignified	21	60%	10	29%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	35	0
19. Courteous	23	64%	10	28%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	36	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	18	51%	5	14%	7	20%	4	11%	1	3%	3.00	35	0
21. Patient	24	67%	7	19%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	36	0
Category Total	105	60%	41	23%	25	14%	4	2%	1	1%	3.39	176	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	16	44%	10	28%	7	19%	1	3%	2	6%	3.03	36	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	15	42%	10	28%	8	22%	3	8%	0	0%	3.03	36	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	12	39%	3	10%	6	19%	4	13%	6	19%	2.35	31	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	31%	12	34%	11	31%	0	0%	1	3%	2.91	35	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	12	34%	6	17%	11	31%	3	9%	3	9%	2.60	35	0
Category Total	66	38%	41	24%	43	25%	11	6%	12	7%	2.80	173	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	7	37%	6	32%	5	26%	1	5%	0	0%	3.00	19	0
Category Total	7	37%	6	32%	5	26%	1	5%	0	0%	3.00	19	



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. Adam Driggs

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	14	58%	4	17%	3	13%	2	8%	1	4%	3.17	24	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	65%	3	15%	3	15%	1	5%	0	0%	3.40	20	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	57%	3	13%	4	17%	2	9%	1	4%	3.09	23	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	71%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	65%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	3.35	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	67%	4	22%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	69%	2	13%	1	6%	2	13%	0	0%	3.38	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	57%	5	24%	3	14%	0	0%	1	5%	3.29	21	0
Category Total	110	64%	29	17%	22	13%	7	4%	4	2%	3.36	172	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	12	50%	6	25%	4	17%	2	8%	0	0%	3.17	24	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	53%	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	2.82	17	0
Category Total	21	51%	8	20%	6	15%	4	10%	2	5%	3.02	41	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	13	54%	5	21%	4	17%	2	8%	0	0%	3.21	24	0
13. Dignified	14	61%	4	17%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
14. Courteous	14	61%	4	17%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	15	63%	3	13%	3	13%	2	8%	1	4%	3.21	24	0
16. Patient	14	61%	4	17%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	3.30	23	0
Category Total	70	60%	20	17%	18	15%	8	7%	1	1%	3.28	117	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	58%	4	17%	3	13%	3	13%	0	0%	3.21	24	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	61%	4	17%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	54%	4	17%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%	3.04	24	0
Category Total	41	58%	12	17%	10	14%	7	10%	1	1%	3.20	71	