



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.

Pinal County Voters Only

Judge McCarville is the Pinal County Presiding Judge and also performed administrative duties.

Hon. Stephen F. McCarville
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Civil/Criminal
Appointed: 2001

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 163 Returned: 39 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 20 Returned: 11 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 247 Returned: 64 Score (See Footnote)	Presiding Judge Surveys Distributed: 14 Returned: 6 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	98%	100%
Communication	97%	100%	97%	100%
Temperament	97%	100%	98%	100%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	96%	100%
Admin Skills	n/a	n/a	n/a	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	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. Stephen F. McCarville

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	19	58%	12	36%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	33	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	20	63%	9	28%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.50	32	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	68%	8	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	25	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	22	67%	9	27%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.55	33	0
Category Total	78	63%	38	31%	4	3%	2	2%	1	1%	3.54	123	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	23	72%	8	25%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.66	32	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	16	84%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.68	19	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	22	0
Category Total	159	82%	32	17%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	3.80	193	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	25	71%	9	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	35	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	68%	5	20%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	25	76%	7	21%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.67	33	0
Category Total	67	72%	21	23%	2	2%	2	2%	1	1%	3.62	93	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	22	67%	8	24%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.55	33	0
18. Dignified	25	76%	7	21%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.70	33	0
19. Courteous	28	82%	3	9%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.71	34	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	76%	5	15%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
21. Patient	27	82%	4	12%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.73	33	0
Category Total	127	77%	27	16%	7	4%	5	3%	0	0%	3.66	166	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	53%	12	35%	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%	3.35	34	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	25	74%	7	21%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	23	77%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	30	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	71%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	34	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	19	66%	6	21%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.45	29	0
Category Total	109	68%	37	23%	11	7%	4	2%	0	0%	3.56	161	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
Category Total	18	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	



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. Stephen F. McCarville

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	56	88%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	2	3%	3.77	64	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	52	88%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	59	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	54	89%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.84	61	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	50	88%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.82	57	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	53	88%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	60	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	51	88%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	58	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	54	89%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.84	61	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	50	88%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.82	57	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	56	90%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	3.81	62	0
Category Total	476	88%	51	9%	1	0%	0	0%	11	2%	3.82	539	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	53	84%	7	11%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	3.75	63	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	42	84%	4	8%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.72	50	0
Category Total	95	84%	11	10%	4	4%	1	1%	2	2%	3.73	113	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	56	89%	4	6%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	3.79	63	0
13. Dignified	56	89%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	63	0
14. Courteous	56	89%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	63	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	56	89%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	63	0
16. Patient	56	89%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	63	0
Category Total	280	89%	24	8%	5	2%	1	0%	5	2%	3.82	315	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	51	82%	7	11%	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	3.69	62	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	54	87%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	2	3%	3.76	62	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	54	86%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	3	5%	3.70	63	0
Category Total	159	85%	17	9%	4	2%	0	0%	7	4%	3.72	187	

11. Is patient	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
12. Is courteous	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
13. Is accessible	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
14. Responds appropriately to the circumstance	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
Category Total	18	75%	4	17%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	
4. Admin Performance													
15. Is well informed on all aspects of work	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
16. Is willing to make difficult decisions	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
17. Is punctual	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
18. Makes decisions in a timely manner	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
19. Is resourceful in resolving problems	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
20. Exhibits impartiality in administrative decisions	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
21. Makes reasonable and prudent judicial assignments	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
22. Exhibits impartiality in making judicial assignments	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0
23. Exhibits impartiality in allocation of resources	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
24. Provides for appropriate training for judges and staff	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
25. Asks for input before reaching decisions	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	6	0
26. Works diligently	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
27. Considers and implements change	3	50%	2	33%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0
28. Displays organizational integrity	4	80%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0
Category Total	57	69%	13	16%	13	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	83	
5. Admin Skills													
29. Establishes a clear focus for projects for which he/she is responsible	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5	0
30. Has the ability to identify and analyze relevant issues	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
31. Accurately assesses and attempts to secure the resources necessary for the effective functioning of the court system	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
32. Accepts and incorporates diversity	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0

33. Coaches and develops others	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
34. Cooperates with peers	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
35. Cooperates with staff	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
36. Effectively delegates responsibility	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
37. Creates a cooperative environment	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0
Category Total	32	62%	14	27%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	52	



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. Stephen F. McCarville

2020 Juror 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	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	60%	3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
Category Total	58	64%	23	26%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	90	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
Category Total	23	70%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	33	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
14. Dignified	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
15. Courteous	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
17. Patient	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
Category Total	44	80%	6	11%	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	55	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	64%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	11	0
Category Total	21	64%	9	27%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	33	