



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. Todd Lang

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Family

Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 119 Returned: 34 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 351 Returned: 35 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	92%
Communication	99%	n/a	95%
Temperament	99%	n/a	89%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	92%
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. Todd Lang

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	20	59%	9	26%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	34	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	18	55%	9	27%	6	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	33	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	62%	7	24%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	29	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	58%	10	30%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.42	33	0
Category Total	75	58%	35	27%	17	13%	2	2%	0	0%	3.42	129	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	23	68%	7	21%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.53	34	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	89%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	25	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	88%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.69	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	94%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	15	83%	2	11%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	81%	3	14%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	94%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	79%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
Category Total	163	83%	21	11%	11	6%	1	1%	1	1%	3.75	197	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	25	74%	4	12%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	34	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	70%	6	22%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	27	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	25	76%	4	12%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	3.58	33	0
Category Total	69	73%	14	15%	10	11%	0	0%	1	1%	3.60	94	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	22	67%	10	30%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
18. Dignified	24	71%	8	24%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
19. Courteous	25	74%	7	21%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	74%	8	24%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
21. Patient	26	81%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	32	0
Category Total	122	73%	38	23%	6	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.68	167	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	74%	5	15%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	34	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	24	71%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	34	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	20	65%	10	32%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	31	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	76%	4	12%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	23	70%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	33	0
Category Total	118	71%	33	20%	15	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	166	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	20	80%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
Category Total	20	80%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	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. Todd Lang

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	22	65%	4	12%	3	9%	2	6%	3	9%	3.18	34	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	78%	2	7%	2	7%	1	4%	1	4%	3.52	27	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	67%	3	9%	3	9%	2	6%	3	9%	3.18	33	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	83%	2	9%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	83%	2	9%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	83%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	83%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	83%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	80%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	2	8%	3.48	25	0
Category Total	183	77%	19	8%	17	7%	9	4%	9	4%	3.51	237	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	25	74%	4	12%	3	9%	1	3%	1	3%	3.50	34	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	21	81%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.65	26	0
Category Total	46	77%	7	12%	4	7%	1	2%	2	3%	3.57	60	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	23	68%	4	12%	2	6%	1	3%	4	12%	3.21	34	0
13. Dignified	22	65%	6	18%	3	9%	0	0%	3	9%	3.29	34	0
14. Courteous	24	71%	4	12%	3	9%	0	0%	3	9%	3.35	34	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	23	68%	5	15%	2	6%	1	3%	3	9%	3.29	34	0
16. Patient	25	74%	3	9%	3	9%	0	0%	3	9%	3.38	34	0
Category Total	117	69%	22	13%	13	8%	2	1%	16	9%	3.31	170	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	26	76%	2	6%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	3.53	34	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	24	71%	3	9%	4	12%	1	3%	2	6%	3.35	34	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	73%	2	6%	4	12%	0	0%	3	9%	3.33	33	0
Category Total	74	73%	7	7%	12	12%	3	3%	5	5%	3.41	101	