



[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. Pamela Hearn Svoboda
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2012

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 240 Returned: 68 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 450 Returned: 96 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	96%
Communication	99%	n/a	98%
Temperament	100%	n/a	98%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	99%
Settlement Activities	100%	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. Pamela Hearn Svoboda

2022 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	34	50%	23	34%	9	13%	2	3%	0	0%	3.31	68	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	35	53%	20	30%	9	14%	2	3%	0	0%	3.33	66	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	35	58%	18	30%	7	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	60	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	33	52%	22	34%	9	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	64	0
Category Total	137	53%	83	32%	34	13%	4	2%	0	0%	3.37	258	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	44	65%	15	22%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	68	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	48	73%	14	21%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.65	66	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	74%	12	18%	4	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.65	65	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	43	72%	14	23%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	60	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	45	71%	14	22%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	63	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	70%	15	25%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	61	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	45	70%	16	25%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	64	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	42	70%	16	27%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	60	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	46	71%	15	23%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	65	0
Category Total	404	71%	131	23%	35	6%	2	0%	0	0%	3.64	572	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	39	57%	22	32%	5	7%	2	3%	0	0%	3.44	68	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	38	63%	18	30%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	60	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	44	65%	20	29%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	68	0
Category Total	121	62%	60	31%	13	7%	2	1%	0	0%	3.53	196	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	53	78%	10	15%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	68	0
18. Dignified	51	75%	12	18%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	68	0
19. Courteous	53	78%	11	16%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	68	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	50	74%	11	16%	6	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.62	68	0
21. Patient	53	78%	11	16%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	68	0
Category Total	260	76%	55	16%	24	7%	1	0%	0	0%	3.69	340	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	49%	21	31%	10	15%	4	6%	0	0%	3.22	68	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	38	56%	17	25%	12	18%	1	1%	0	0%	3.35	68	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	38	59%	19	30%	7	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	64	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	43	63%	19	28%	4	6%	2	3%	0	0%	3.51	68	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	34	51%	18	27%	10	15%	4	6%	1	1%	3.19	67	0
Category Total	186	56%	94	28%	43	13%	11	3%	1	0%	3.35	335	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	60%	8	32%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	0
Category Total	15	60%	8	32%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	



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. Pamela Hearn Svoboda

2022 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	45	51%	28	31%	11	12%	4	4%	1	1%	3.26	89	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	45	53%	27	32%	9	11%	4	5%	0	0%	3.33	85	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	46	53%	26	30%	9	10%	4	5%	1	1%	3.30	86	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	42	52%	24	30%	11	14%	4	5%	0	0%	3.28	81	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	44	52%	25	29%	13	15%	2	2%	1	1%	3.28	85	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	47	55%	24	28%	11	13%	4	5%	0	0%	3.33	86	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	46	52%	25	28%	13	15%	3	3%	1	1%	3.27	88	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	46	53%	25	29%	15	17%	1	1%	0	0%	3.33	87	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	48	54%	22	25%	18	20%	1	1%	0	0%	3.31	89	0
Category Total	409	53%	226	29%	110	14%	27	3%	4	1%	3.30	776	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	49	55%	23	26%	16	18%	1	1%	0	0%	3.35	89	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	43	51%	22	26%	17	20%	1	1%	1	1%	3.25	84	0
Category Total	92	53%	45	26%	33	19%	2	1%	1	1%	3.30	173	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	56	61%	19	21%	15	16%	1	1%	1	1%	3.39	92	0
13. Dignified	53	58%	22	24%	15	16%	0	0%	1	1%	3.38	91	0
14. Courteous	54	59%	21	23%	15	16%	1	1%	1	1%	3.37	92	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	51	56%	21	23%	18	20%	0	0%	1	1%	3.33	91	0
16. Patient	53	58%	19	21%	18	20%	1	1%	1	1%	3.33	92	0
Category Total	267	58%	102	22%	81	18%	3	1%	5	1%	3.36	458	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	53	58%	21	23%	17	18%	0	0%	1	1%	3.36	92	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	53	58%	22	24%	16	17%	0	0%	1	1%	3.37	92	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	52	57%	20	22%	19	21%	0	0%	1	1%	3.33	92	0
Category Total	158	57%	63	23%	52	19%	0	0%	3	1%	3.35	276	