

Judges are evaluated by survey on their judicial performance midway through their term and prior to their retention election. Beginning in 2022, their survey evaluations include midterm and retention feedback. Newly appointed judges serve a two-year term and are evaluated prior to their retention election. The composite percentage table is an average of all evaluators who rated the judge "superior", "very good", or "satisfactory" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Some evaluators select "Can't Rate" on the questionnaire affecting the average response number within their respondent category. The JPR Commission votes whether a judge "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the survey information and any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found on each court's website.

**Commission on Judicial Performance Review
Composite Percentage - Average of all Evaluation Categories**

Superior Court in Maricopa County

Hon. James Knapp

2024		
Evaluation Category	Total Survey Responses	Average Percentage of Satisfactory or Above
Legal Ability	40	95%
Integrity	68	97%
Communication Skills	76	98%
Judicial Temperament	78	97%
Administrative Performance	78	99%
Settlement Activities	20	90%

Responses based upon 86 returned survey questionnaires from a distribution of 377 questionnaires. Survey respondents may not necessarily answer all survey questions.

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 68					Assignment: Family					Cycle: Retention Review													
Hon. James Knapp	ATTORNEY					LIT/WIT/PRO PER					JUROR													
	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	31	Resp	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	37	Resp	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	0	Resp	Mean
Section I: Legal Ability	18	7	2	1	1	29	3.4																	
Legal reasoning ability	19	6	2	1	1	29	3.4																	
Knowledge of substantive law	18	7	1	1	2	29	3.3																	
Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	8	3	1	0	28	3.4																	
Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	8	2	1	1	29	3.3																	
Section II: Integrity	15	5	1	1	0	22	3.5	26	4	4	0	1	35	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Basic fairness and impartiality	19	8	2	1	1	31	3.4	24	6	5	1	1	37	3.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of race	15	5	2	0	1	23	3.4	27	5	3	0	1	36	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	5	0	3	1	28	3.4	26	5	3	1	1	36	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	4	2	0	0	17	3.5	26	4	4	0	1	35	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	4	2	0	0	20	3.6	27	4	4	0	1	36	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	4	1	0	0	17	3.6	27	3	4	0	1	35	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of age	17	4	1	1	0	23	3.6	26	4	4	0	1	35	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	4	1	0	0	16	3.6	25	3	4	0	1	33	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Equal treatment regardless of economic status	15	5	1	0	1	22	3.5	25	5	1	1	1	33	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Section III: Communication Skills	19	7	3	1	0	30	3.5	25	7	3	1	0	35	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Clear and logical communications																								
Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	7	3	1	0	31	3.5																	
Clear and logical written decisions	17	8	3	1	0	29	3.4																	
Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	21	6	3	1	0	31	3.5																	
Explained proceedings (to the jury)								27	7	3	0	0	37	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Explained reason for delays								23	6	3	1	0	33	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities															0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Section IV: Judicial temperament	22	6	2	0	0	31	3.6	28	5	2	1	1	37	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Understanding and compassion	22	6	1	1	1	31	3.5	27	4	3	1	1	36	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Dignified	22	6	3	0	0	31	3.6	29	4	2	1	1	37	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Courteous	22	6	3	0	0	31	3.6	29	4	2	1	1	37	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	22	5	2	1	1	31	3.5	28	5	2	1	1	37	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Patient	22	6	3	0	0	31	3.6	28	7	1	0	0	36	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	23	4	3	0	0	30	3.6	29	6	1	0	0	37	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Punctual in conducting proceedings	24	4	3	0	0	31	3.7	30	5	2	0	0	37	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Maintained proper control of courtroom	24	4	3	0	0	31	3.7	30	6	1	0	0	37	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	4	3	0	0	28	3.6																	
Was prepared for the proceedings	24	4	2	1	0	31	3.6	28	8	1	0	0	37	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Respectful treatment of staff																								
Cooperation with peers																								
Efficient management of calendar	22	5	2	0	1	30	3.6																	
Section VI: Settlement Activities	14	3	1	1	1	20	3.4																	
Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	14	3	1	1	1	20	3.4																	

UN=Unacceptable, PO=Poor,
SA=Satisfactory, VG=Very Good,
SU=Superior

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court users from 8/2023 -11/2023
Juror Surveys from 9/2021-9/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 68					Assignment: Family					Cycle: Retention Review								
	ATTORNEY					31	LIT/WIT/PROPER					37	JUROR					0	
Hon. James Knapp	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean	SU	VG	SA	PO	UN	Mean	
Section I: Legal Ability	61%	25%	7%	3%	3%	3.4													
Legal reasoning ability	66%	21%	7%	3%	3%	3.4													
Knowledge of substantive law	62%	24%	3%	3%	7%	3.3													
Knowledge of rules of evidence	57%	29%	11%	4%	0%	3.4													
Knowledge of rules of procedure	59%	28%	7%	3%	3%	3.3													
Section II: Integrity	68%	22%	6%	3%	2%	3.5	74%	12%	10%	1%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Basic fairness and impartiality	61%	26%	6%	3%	3%	3.4	65%	16%	14%	3%	3%	3.4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of race	65%	22%	9%	0%	4%	3.4	75%	14%	8%	0%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of gender	68%	18%	0%	11%	4%	3.4	72%	14%	8%	3%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of religion	65%	24%	12%	0%	0%	3.5	74%	11%	11%	0%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of national origin	70%	20%	10%	0%	0%	3.6	75%	11%	11%	0%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of disability	71%	24%	6%	0%	0%	3.6	77%	9%	11%	0%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of age	74%	17%	4%	4%	0%	3.6	74%	11%	11%	0%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	3.6	76%	9%	12%	0%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Equal treatment regardless of economic status	68%	23%	5%	0%	5%	3.5	76%	15%	3%	3%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Section III: Communication Skills	64%	23%	10%	3%	0%	3.5	71%	19%	9%	1%	0%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Clear and logical communications																			
Clear and logical oral communications and directions	65%	23%	10%	3%	0%	3.5													
Clear and logical written decisions	59%	28%	10%	3%	0%	3.4													
Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	68%	19%	10%	3%	0%	3.5													
Explained proceedings (to the jury)							73%	19%	8%	0%	0%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Explained reason for delays							70%	18%	9%	3%	0%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities													0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Section IV: Judicial temperament	71%	19%	8%	1%	1%	3.6	77%	13%	5%	2%	2%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Understanding and compassion	71%	19%	3%	3%	3%	3.5	75%	11%	8%	3%	3%	3.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Dignified	71%	19%	10%	0%	0%	3.6	78%	11%	5%	3%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Courteous	71%	19%	10%	0%	0%	3.6	78%	11%	5%	3%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	71%	16%	6%	3%	3%	3.5	76%	14%	5%	3%	3%	3.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Patient	71%	19%	10%	0%	0%	3.6	78%	19%	3%	0%	0%	3.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Section V: Administrative Performance	76%	14%	9%	1%	1%	3.6	79%	17%	4%	0%	0%	3.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Punctual in conducting proceedings	77%	13%	10%	0%	0%	3.7	81%	14%	5%	0%	0%	3.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Maintained proper control of courtroom	77%	13%	10%	0%	0%	3.7	81%	16%	3%	0%	0%	3.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	75%	14%	11%	0%	0%	3.6													
Was prepared for the proceedings	77%	13%	6%	3%	0%	3.6	76%	22%	3%	0%	0%	3.7	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.0	
Respectful treatment of staff																			
Cooperation with peers																			
Efficient management of calendar	73%	17%	7%	0%	3%	3.6													
Section VI: Settlement Activities	70%	15%	5%	5%	5%	3.4													
Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	70%	15%	5%	5%	5%	3.4													

UN=Unacceptable, PO=Poor,
 SA=Satisfactory, VG=Very Good,
 SU=Superior

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court
 users from 8/2023 -11/2023
 Juror Surveys from 9/2021-9/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 18					Fall 2023	
	PEER JUDGE					Total	Mean
Hon. James Knapp	EX	VG	AC	PO	FA		
Section I: Legal Ability	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Decisions based on law and facts	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Section II: Integrity	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Unbiased and impartial	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Section III: Communication Skills	10	1	0	0	0	11	4.9
Communication skills	10	1	0	0	0	11	4.9
Section IV: Judicial temperament	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Respectful to all individuals	10	0	0	0	0	10	5.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	11	0	0	0	0	11	5.0
Works effectively with other judges	12	0	0	0	0	12	5.0
Works effectively with court personnel	9	0	0	0	0	9	5.0
Efficient management of calendar	10	0	0	0	0	10	5.0
Does a fair share of work	12	0	0	0	0	12	5.0

FA=Failing, PO=Poor,
 AC=Acceptable, VG=Very Good,
 EX=Excellent

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court
 users from 09/2023 - 11/2023

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Superior Court

Name of Judge:	Total Surveys: 18					Fall 2023
	PEER JUDGE					Mean
Hon. James Knapp	EX	VG	AC	PO	FA	
Section I: Legal Ability	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Decisions based on law and facts	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Knowledge of rules of evidence	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Knowledge of rules of procedure	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section II: Integrity	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Unbiased and impartial	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section III: Communication Skills	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	4.9
Communication skills	91%	9%	0%	0%	0%	4.9
Section IV: Judicial temperament	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Respectful to all individuals	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Section V: Administrative Performance	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Works effectively with other judges	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Works effectively with court personnel	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Efficient management of calendar	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0
Does a fair share of work	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.0

FA=Failing, PO=Poor,
AC=Acceptable, VG=Very Good,
EX=Excellent

Category summaries are averages and may not add up due to rounding.

Surveys were distributed to court users from 09/2023 - 11/2023