



**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**  
27 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2018	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Superior Court Judge Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 901 Returned: 138 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 251 Returned: 50 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	91%	93%
Integrity	97%	99%
Communication	97%	n/a
Temperament	95%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	97%

#### 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

2018 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.		
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>												
20180143. Legal reasoning ability	4	6%	1	1%	7	10%	20	29%	37	54%	3.23	69
20180144. Knowledge of law	2	3%	3	4%	7	10%	17	25%	40	58%	3.30	69
20180145. Decisions based on laws and facts	4	6%	4	6%	9	13%	15	21%	38	54%	3.13	70
20180146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	4	6%	2	3%	7	10%	19	28%	37	54%	3.20	69
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>277</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
20180147. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	3%	3	5%	7	11%	13	21%	37	60%	3.29	62
20180148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	6	16%	27	73%	3.62	37
20180149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	2	4%	0	0%	6	13%	9	19%	31	65%	3.40	48
20180150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	6	16%	29	76%	3.68	38
20180151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	6	17%	26	72%	3.61	36
20180152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	6	17%	26	72%	3.61	36
20180153. Equal treatment regardless of age	1	3%	0	0%	4	11%	7	18%	26	68%	3.50	38
20180154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	6	17%	25	71%	3.60	35

20180155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	5%	1	2%	3	7%	7	17%	29	69%	3.43	42
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>372</b>
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>												
20180156. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	17	28%	17	28%	26	43%	3.15	60
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>4. Communication</b>												
20180166. Attentiveness	0	0%	3	4%	2	3%	17	25%	47	68%	3.57	69
20180167. Deameanor in communications with counsel	1	2%	2	3%	5	8%	18	28%	39	60%	3.42	65
20180168. Relevant questions	0	0%	1	1%	7	10%	13	19%	47	69%	3.56	68
20180169. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	2	3%	3	5%	14	22%	46	71%	3.60	65
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>5. Temperament</b>												
20180170. Dignified	1	2%	1	2%	4	6%	18	27%	42	64%	3.50	66
20180171. Courteous	1	2%	3	5%	5	8%	15	23%	41	63%	3.42	65
20180172. Patient	2	3%	1	2%	6	9%	16	25%	40	62%	3.40	65
20180173. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	1	2%	2	3%	4	6%	12	19%	45	70%	3.53	64
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>6. Communication</b>												
20180256. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	3.67	3
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3</b>



**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

2018 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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
20180077. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	4	8%	10	20%	12	24%	23	47%	3.10	49	0
20180078. Knowledge of the law	0	0%	3	6%	7	14%	14	29%	25	51%	3.24	49	0
20180079. Decisions based on law and facts	1	2%	3	6%	9	18%	13	27%	23	47%	3.10	49	0
20180080. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	3	6%	8	16%	14	29%	24	49%	3.20	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>196</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
20180081. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	2	5%	6	15%	7	18%	25	63%	3.38	40	0
20180082. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	10	29%	21	60%	3.49	35	0
20180083. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	4	11%	9	26%	22	63%	3.51	35	0
20180084. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	10	29%	20	59%	3.47	34	0
20180085. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	9	26%	21	62%	3.50	34	0
20180086. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	10	29%	20	59%	3.47	34	0
20180087. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	9	26%	21	62%	3.50	34	0

20180088. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	10	30%	19	58%	3.45	33	0
20180089. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	4	12%	9	26%	21	62%	3.50	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>313</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
20180090. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	1	3%	10	26%	8	21%	20	51%	3.21	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>39</b>	