



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. Aryeh D. Schwartz
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 272 Returned: 41 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 412 Returned: 67 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	87%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	87%
Communication	90%	n/a	85%
Temperament	91%	n/a	83%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	92%
Settlement Activities	91%	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. Aryeh D. Schwartz

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	19	53%	8	22%	2	6%	4	11%	3	8%	3.00	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	49%	10	29%	3	9%	3	9%	2	6%	3.06	35	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	20	59%	6	18%	5	15%	2	6%	1	3%	3.24	34	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	45%	11	29%	7	18%	3	8%	0	0%	3.11	38	0
Category Total	73	51%	35	24%	17	12%	12	8%	6	4%	3.10	143	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	23	57%	9	23%	4	10%	3	8%	1	3%	3.25	40	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	70%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.53	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	25	64%	6	15%	5	13%	1	3%	2	5%	3.31	39	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	72%	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.56	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	77%	3	12%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.62	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	68%	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.40	25	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	69%	6	19%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.53	32	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	71%	4	17%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.54	24	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	67%	7	21%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	33	0
Category Total	185	68%	48	18%	26	9%	11	4%	4	1%	3.46	274	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	21	53%	11	28%	4	10%	2	5%	2	5%	3.18	40	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	22	58%	7	18%	4	11%	2	5%	3	8%	3.13	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	59%	7	17%	7	17%	2	5%	1	2%	3.24	41	0
Category Total	67	56%	25	21%	15	13%	6	5%	6	5%	3.18	119	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	21	51%	11	27%	3	7%	4	10%	2	5%	3.10	41	0
18. Dignified	24	60%	8	20%	5	13%	3	8%	0	0%	3.32	40	0
19. Courteous	23	57%	10	25%	5	13%	2	5%	0	0%	3.35	40	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	59%	8	20%	3	7%	4	10%	2	5%	3.17	41	0
21. Patient	23	59%	10	26%	4	10%	2	5%	0	0%	3.38	39	0
Category Total	115	57%	47	23%	20	10%	15	7%	4	2%	3.26	201	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	24	59%	10	24%	6	15%	1	2%	0	0%	3.39	41	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	23	56%	10	24%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.34	41	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	22	58%	8	21%	5	13%	3	8%	0	0%	3.29	38	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	63%	7	18%	6	15%	2	5%	0	0%	3.38	40	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	25	66%	4	11%	8	21%	1	3%	0	0%	3.39	38	0
Category Total	119	60%	39	20%	32	16%	8	4%	0	0%	3.36	198	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	13	59%	4	18%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%	3.23	22	0
Category Total	13	59%	4	18%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%	3.23	22	



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. Aryeh D. Schwartz

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	22	38%	17	29%	6	10%	6	10%	7	12%	2.71	58	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	55%	13	25%	6	12%	1	2%	3	6%	3.22	51	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	30	55%	8	15%	5	9%	8	15%	4	7%	2.95	55	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	31	69%	7	16%	4	9%	2	4%	1	2%	3.44	45	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	30	65%	9	20%	4	9%	1	2%	2	4%	3.39	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	26	59%	9	20%	4	9%	3	7%	2	5%	3.23	44	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	31	61%	7	14%	8	16%	2	4%	3	6%	3.20	51	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	29	63%	7	15%	6	13%	2	4%	2	4%	3.28	46	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	29	54%	10	19%	6	11%	3	6%	6	11%	2.98	54	0
Category Total	256	57%	87	19%	49	11%	28	6%	30	7%	3.14	450	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	25	44%	18	32%	6	11%	3	5%	5	9%	2.96	57	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	19	45%	12	29%	4	10%	2	5%	5	12%	2.90	42	0
Category Total	44	44%	30	30%	10	10%	5	5%	10	10%	2.94	99	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	24	43%	13	23%	5	9%	8	14%	6	11%	2.73	56	0
13. Dignified	22	42%	15	28%	9	17%	4	8%	3	6%	2.92	53	0
14. Courteous	26	47%	15	27%	8	15%	2	4%	4	7%	3.04	55	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	27	47%	11	19%	6	11%	7	12%	6	11%	2.81	57	0
16. Patient	26	48%	12	22%	9	17%	1	2%	6	11%	2.94	54	0
Category Total	125	45%	66	24%	37	13%	22	8%	25	9%	2.89	275	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	31	55%	16	29%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	56	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	30	55%	14	25%	7	13%	2	4%	2	4%	3.24	55	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	28	50%	12	21%	9	16%	3	5%	4	7%	3.02	56	0
Category Total	89	53%	42	25%	23	14%	6	4%	7	4%	3.20	167	