



[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

Judge Norris is a member of the JPR Commission and could not vote on her own performance finding.

Hon. Patricia K. Norris

Court of Appeals Division I

Appointed: 2003

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2012	Attorney Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 1305	Distributed: 322
	Returned: 197	Returned: 72
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	96%
Integrity	99%	94%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	99%	n/a
Temperament	99%	n/a
Admin Performance	98%	98%

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. Patricia K. Norris

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	0	0%	3	4%	8	11%	15	21%	44	63%	3.43	70
144. Knowledge of law	0	0%	4	6%	7	10%	13	19%	46	66%	3.44	70
145. Decisions based on laws and facts	2	3%	2	3%	12	17%	9	13%	45	64%	3.33	70
146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	0	0%	18	26%	8	11%	44	63%	3.37	70
Category Total	2	1%	9	3%	45	16%	45	16%	179	64%	3.39	280
2. Integrity												
147. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	2	3%	5	7%	15	22%	45	67%	3.54	67
148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	1	3%	35	90%	3.82	39
149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	2	5%	33	87%	3.79	38
150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	0	0%	31	91%	3.82	34
151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	0	0%	31	91%	3.82	34
152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	3	9%	0	0%	30	91%	3.82	33
153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	2	5%	35	88%	3.80	40
154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	3	11%	1	4%	24	86%	3.75	28
155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	2	5%	36	88%	3.80	41
Category Total	0	0%	2	1%	29	8%	23	6%	300	85%	3.75	354
3. Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument												
156. Attentiveness	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	28	25%	79	70%	3.65	113
157. Demeanor in communications with counsel	0	0%	2	2%	5	5%	29	26%	75	68%	3.59	111
158. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	4.00	1

159. Relevant questions	0	0%	4	4%	3	3%	29	26%	76	68%	3.58	112
160. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	26	24%	76	71%	3.66	107
Category Total	0	0%	6	1%	19	4%	112	25%	307	69%	3.62	444
4. Temperament												
161. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	6	5%	29	26%	76	68%	3.63	111
162. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	5	5%	28	25%	77	70%	3.65	110
163. Patient	0	0%	2	2%	6	5%	28	25%	74	67%	3.58	110
164. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	28	26%	75	69%	3.63	108
Category Total	0	0%	4	1%	20	5%	113	26%	302	69%	3.62	439
5. Admin Performance												
165. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	1	2%	8	13%	18	29%	36	57%	3.41	63
Category Total	0	0%	1	2%	8	13%	18	29%	36	57%	3.41	63



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. Patricia K. Norris

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	3	4%	0	0%	7	10%	13	19%	47	67%	3.44	70	2
78. Knowledge of the law	3	4%	0	0%	8	11%	9	13%	50	71%	3.47	70	2
79. Decisions based on law and facts	3	4%	0	0%	8	11%	12	17%	47	67%	3.43	70	2
80. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	3	4%	0	0%	7	10%	13	19%	47	67%	3.44	70	2
Category Total	12	4%	0	0%	30	11%	47	17%	191	68%	3.45	280	
2. Integrity													
81. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	5%	0	0%	2	3%	7	12%	46	79%	3.60	58	14
82. Equal treatment regardless of gender	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	5	10%	39	81%	3.62	48	24
83. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	5	10%	40	82%	3.61	49	23
84. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	5	10%	39	81%	3.60	48	24
85. Equal treatment regardless of disability	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	5	11%	37	80%	3.61	46	26
86. Equal treatment regardless of age	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	5	11%	37	80%	3.61	46	26
87. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	5	11%	37	80%	3.59	46	26
88. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	5	11%	38	81%	3.60	47	25
89. Basic fairness and impartiality	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	5	11%	37	80%	3.59	46	26
Category Total	24	6%	3	1%	10	2%	47	11%	350	81%	3.60	434	
3. Admin Performance													
90. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	1	2%	0	0%	4	7%	14	26%	35	65%	3.52	54	18
Category Total	1	2%	0	0%	4	7%	14	26%	35	65%	3.52	54	