



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. Peter B. Swann

Court of Appeals Division I
Appointed: 2008

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2012	Attorney Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 913 Returned: 238 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 186 Returned: 79 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	86%	94%
Integrity	97%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	98%	n/a
Temperament	94%	n/a
Admin Performance	96%	100%

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. Peter B. Swann

2012 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
1. Legal Ability												
143. Legal reasoning ability	4	3%	14	11%	19	15%	24	19%	65	52%	3.05	126
144. Knowledge of law	2	2%	4	3%	26	22%	25	21%	63	53%	3.19	120
145. Decisions based on laws and facts	8	6%	16	13%	15	12%	20	16%	67	53%	2.97	126
146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	6	5%	16	13%	16	13%	22	18%	64	52%	2.98	124
Category Total	20	4%	50	10%	76	15%	91	18%	259	52%	3.05	496
2. Integrity												
147. Basic fairness and impartiality	4	4%	11	10%	7	6%	18	16%	73	65%	3.28	113
148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	10	19%	39	74%	3.66	53
149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%	11	20%	40	73%	3.65	55
150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	9	18%	37	74%	3.66	50
151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	9	18%	37	74%	3.66	50
152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	9	18%	37	74%	3.66	50
153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%	9	17%	41	76%	3.69	54
154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	8%	9	18%	37	74%	3.66	50
155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	5	9%	11	20%	40	71%	3.62	56
Category Total	4	1%	11	2%	40	8%	95	18%	381	72%	3.58	531
3. Communication Skills and Deportment at Oral Argument												
156. Attentiveness	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	27	25%	74	70%	3.65	106
157. Demeanor in communications with counsel	2	2%	3	3%	4	4%	26	25%	71	67%	3.52	106
158. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	4.00	2

159. Relevant questions	2	2%	3	3%	3	3%	29	27%	71	66%	3.52	108
160. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	26	26%	70	69%	3.64	101
Category Total	4	1%	6	1%	17	4%	108	26%	288	68%	3.58	423
4. Temperament												
161. Dignified	2	2%	3	3%	4	4%	23	21%	75	70%	3.55	107
162. Courteous	3	3%	3	3%	3	3%	23	21%	75	70%	3.53	107
163. Patient	5	5%	3	3%	2	2%	28	27%	66	63%	3.41	104
164. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	4	4%	4	4%	1	1%	21	20%	77	72%	3.52	107
Category Total	14	3%	13	3%	10	2%	95	22%	293	69%	3.51	425
5. Admin Performance												
165. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	4	4%	29	26%	28	25%	50	45%	3.12	111
Category Total	0	0%	4	4%	29	26%	28	25%	50	45%	3.12	111



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. Peter B. Swann

2012 Superior Court Judge Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Legal Ability													
77. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	6	8%	4	5%	8	10%	59	77%	3.56	77	2
78. Knowledge of the law	0	0%	3	4%	7	9%	8	10%	59	77%	3.60	77	2
79. Decisions based on law and facts	2	3%	2	3%	6	8%	8	10%	59	77%	3.56	77	2
80. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	4	5%	6	8%	8	10%	59	77%	3.58	77	2
Category Total	2	1%	15	5%	23	7%	32	10%	236	77%	3.57	308	
2. Integrity													
81. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	5	8%	54	87%	3.82	62	17
82. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	40	93%	3.88	43	36
83. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	3	7%	39	89%	3.84	44	35
84. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	40	93%	3.88	43	36
85. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	41	93%	3.89	44	35
86. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	40	93%	3.88	43	36
87. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	40	93%	3.88	43	36
88. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	1	2%	40	93%	3.88	43	36
89. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	1	2%	42	93%	3.89	45	34
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	19	5%	15	4%	376	92%	3.87	410	
3. Admin Performance													
90. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	6	12%	3	6%	43	83%	3.71	52	27
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	6	12%	3	6%	43	83%	3.71	52	