



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Paul E. Tang

Pima County Superior Court

Bench: Criminal

Appointed: 2001

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Tang MEETS Judicial Performance Standards

32 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'

0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2016	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys	Presiding Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 158 Returned: 38 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 53 Returned: 28 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 56 Returned: 17 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 13 Returned: 8 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	86%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	100%	99%	93%
Communication	83%	100%	97%	79%
Temperament	80%	98%	92%	100%
Admin Performance	96%	100%	98%	90%
Admin Skills	n/a	n/a	n/a	85%
Settlement Activities	94%	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.



20160106. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	2	5%	6	16%	12	32%	9	24%	8	22%	2.41	37	0
20160107. Clear and logical written decisions	0	0%	3	11%	9	32%	10	36%	6	21%	2.68	28	0
20160108. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	1	3%	5	14%	8	22%	14	38%	9	24%	2.68	37	0
Category Total	3	3%	14	14%	29	28%	33	32%	23	23%	2.58	102	
4. Temperament													
20160109. Understanding and compassion	2	5%	6	16%	11	30%	9	24%	9	24%	2.46	37	0
20160110. Dignified	2	5%	5	14%	12	32%	8	22%	10	27%	2.51	37	0
20160111. Courteous	2	5%	4	11%	8	22%	14	38%	9	24%	2.65	37	0
20160112. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	2	6%	6	17%	8	23%	9	26%	10	29%	2.54	35	0
20160113. Patient	4	11%	4	11%	12	32%	10	27%	7	19%	2.32	37	0
Category Total	12	7%	25	14%	51	28%	50	27%	45	25%	2.50	183	
5. Admin Performance													
20160114. Punctual in conducting proceedings	0	0%	1	3%	12	32%	14	38%	10	27%	2.89	37	0
20160115. Maintained proper control over courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	11	30%	12	32%	14	38%	3.08	37	0
20160116. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	2	6%	10	31%	10	31%	10	31%	2.88	32	0
20160117. Was prepared for the proceedings	1	3%	1	3%	10	27%	13	35%	12	32%	2.92	37	0
20160118. Efficient management of the calendar	0	0%	3	9%	8	23%	13	37%	11	31%	2.91	35	0
Category Total	1	1%	7	4%	51	29%	62	35%	57	32%	2.94	178	
6. Settlement Activities													
20160119. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	0	0%	1	6%	6	35%	5	29%	5	29%	2.82	17	0
Category Total	0	0%	1	6%	6	35%	5	29%	5	29%	2.82	17	

_____ . _____



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. Paul E. Tang

2016 Juror 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. Integrity													
20160057. Basic fairness and impartiality	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	4	16%	20	80%	3.68	25	0
20160058. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%	21	88%	3.88	24	0
20160059. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	17%	20	83%	3.83	24	0
20160060. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	18	90%	3.90	20	0
20160061. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%	20	87%	3.87	23	0
20160062. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	19	95%	3.95	20	0
20160063. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%	21	88%	3.88	24	0
20160064. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	17	89%	3.89	19	0
20160065. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	17%	19	83%	3.83	23	0
Category Total	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	26	13%	175	87%	3.85	202	
2. Communication													
20160066. Explained proceedings to the jury	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	22	92%	3.92	24	0
20160067. Explained reasons for delays	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%	20	83%	3.79	24	0
20160068. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	22	92%	3.92	24	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	7	10%	64	89%	3.88	72	
3. Temperament													
20160069. Understanding and Compassion	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	2	8%	21	88%	3.83	24	0

20160070. Dignified	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3	12%	21	84%	3.76	25	0
20160071. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3	12%	21	84%	3.80	25	0
20160072. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	13%	21	88%	3.88	24	0
20160073. Patient	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	4	16%	20	80%	3.72	25	0
Category Total	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%	15	12%	104	85%	3.80	123	
4. Admin Performance													
20160074. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	6	24%	18	72%	3.68	25	0
20160075. Maintained proper control of courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3	12%	21	84%	3.80	25	0
20160076. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	4	16%	20	80%	3.76	25	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	3	4%	13	17%	59	79%	3.75	75	



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. Paul E. Tang

2016 Litigant Witness 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. Integrity													
20160038. Basic fairness and impartiality	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3	18%	13	76%	3.59	17	0
20160039. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160040. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160041. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	21%	11	79%	3.79	14	0
20160042. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160043. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160044. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160045. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
20160046. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	20%	12	80%	3.80	15	0
Category Total	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	27	20%	108	79%	3.77	136	
2. Communication													
20160047. Explained proceedings	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	3.53	17	0
20160048. Explained reasons for delays	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	4	27%	9	60%	3.47	15	0
Category Total	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	7	22%	21	66%	3.50	32	
3. Temperament													
20160049. Understanding and compassion	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3	18%	12	71%	3.41	17	0
20160050. Dignified	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	3.47	17	0
20160051. Courteous	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3	18%	12	71%	3.41	17	0

20160052. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	3	18%	12	71%	3.47	17	0
20160053. Patient	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	4	24%	11	65%	3.41	17	0
Category Total	5	6%	2	2%	3	4%	16	19%	59	69%	3.44	85	
4. Admin Performance													
20160054. Punctual in conducting proceedings	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	2	12%	14	82%	3.76	17	0
20160055. Maintained proper control of courtroom	0	0%	0	0%	2	12%	2	12%	13	76%	3.65	17	0
20160056. Was prepared for the proceedings	0	0%	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	13	76%	3.53	17	0
Category Total	0	0%	1	2%	5	10%	5	10%	40	78%	3.65	51	



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. Paul E. Tang

2016 Presiding 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. Integrity													
20160001. Exhibits professional conduct	0	0%	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%	3	38%	2.75	8	0
20160002. Exhibits equal treatment to all	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%	3	38%	3.00	8	0
20160003. Exhibits fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	4	50%	3	38%	3.25	8	0
20160004. Exhibits personal integrity	0	0%	0	0%	2	25%	3	38%	3	38%	3.12	8	0
20160005. Exhibits conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	3	38%	2	25%	2.50	8	0
Category Total	1	2%	2	5%	10	25%	13	32%	14	35%	2.92	40	
2. Communication													
20160006. Gives clear and logical oral communications / directions	1	13%	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%	2	25%	2.25	8	0
20160007. Listens effectively	1	13%	2	25%	2	25%	1	13%	2	25%	2.12	8	0
20160008. Keeps everyone appropriately informed	0	0%	1	13%	3	38%	2	25%	2	25%	2.62	8	0
20160009. Produces clear and logical written communication	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	2	29%	2.29	7	0
20160010. Responds in a timely manner	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	3	38%	2	25%	2.88	8	0
Category Total	3	8%	5	13%	13	33%	8	21%	10	26%	2.44	39	
3. Temperament													
20160011. Is patient	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	3.00	7	0
20160012. Is courteous	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	2.86	7	0
20160013. Is accessible	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	3	43%	3	43%	3.29	7	0

20160014. Responds appropriately to the circumstance	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	3.00	7	0
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	8	29%	11	39%	9	32%	3.04	28	
4. Admin Performance													
20160015. Is well informed on all aspects of work	0	0%	1	13%	2	25%	3	38%	2	25%	2.75	8	0
20160016. Is willing to make difficult decisions	0	0%	1	13%	3	38%	2	25%	2	25%	2.62	8	0
20160017. Is punctual	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	1	17%	3	50%	3.17	6	0
20160018. Makes decisions in a timely manner	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	2.83	6	0
20160019. Is resourceful in resolving problems	0	0%	1	14%	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	2.71	7	0
20160020. Exhibits impartiality in administrative decisions	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	2	33%	3.17	6	0
20160021. Makes reasonable and prudent judicial assignments	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	2.83	6	0
20160022. Exhibits impartiality in making judicial assignments	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	3	60%	3.40	5	0
20160023. Exhibits impartiality in allocation of resources	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	2	40%	3.00	5	0
20160024. Provides for appropriate training for judges and staff	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	1	17%	2	33%	2.67	6	0
20160025. Asks for input before reaching decisions	0	0%	2	25%	2	25%	1	13%	3	38%	2.62	8	0
20160026. Works diligently	0	0%	0	0%	3	38%	2	25%	3	38%	3.00	8	0
20160027. Considers and implements change	0	0%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	2.50	8	0
20160028. Displays organizational integrity	0	0%	0	0%	3	43%	2	29%	2	29%	2.86	7	0
Category Total	0	0%	9	10%	29	31%	24	26%	32	34%	2.84	94	
5. Admin Skills													
20160029. Establishes a clear focus for projects for which he/she is responsible	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	2.33	6	0
20160030. Has the ability to identify and analyze relevant issues	1	13%	1	13%	2	25%	2	25%	2	25%	2.38	8	0
20160031. Accurately assesses and attempts to secure the resources necessary for the effective functioning of the court system	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%	2	29%	2	29%	2.57	7	0
20160032. Accepts and incorporates diversity	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	3.00	7	0
20160033. Coaches and develops others	1	14%	1	14%	2	29%	1	14%	2	29%	2.29	7	0
20160034. Cooperates with peers	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	3.00	7	0
20160035. Cooperates with staff	0	0%	0	0%	2	29%	3	43%	2	29%	3.00	7	0
20160036. Effectively delegates responsibility	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	3.00	6	0
20160037. Creates a cooperative environment	0	0%	1	14%	2	29%	2	29%	2	29%	2.71	7	0
Category Total	3	5%	6	10%	16	26%	19	31%	18	29%	2.69	62	