



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: Family
Appointed: 2001

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 96 Returned: 26 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 80 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	89%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	95%	n/a	95%
Communication	89%	n/a	100%
Temperament	85%	n/a	90%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	100%
Settlement Activities	94%	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. Paul E. Tang

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	9	36%	10	40%	4	16%	1	4%	1	4%	3.00	25	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	11	44%	7	28%	3	12%	3	12%	1	4%	2.96	25	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	42%	10	38%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	3.15	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	46%	8	31%	3	12%	2	8%	1	4%	3.08	26	0
Category Total	43	42%	35	34%	13	13%	8	8%	3	3%	3.05	102	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	11	44%	7	28%	4	16%	2	8%	1	4%	3.00	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	56%	7	39%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	10	48%	8	38%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.29	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	60%	5	33%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	15	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	61%	6	33%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	62%	4	31%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	3.46	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	52%	8	38%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	3.38	21	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	62%	4	31%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	52%	8	38%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	3.33	21	0
Category Total	89	54%	57	35%	11	7%	7	4%	1	1%	3.37	165	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	13	50%	7	27%	4	15%	1	4%	1	4%	3.15	26	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	13	54%	7	29%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.25	24	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	58%	6	23%	1	4%	4	15%	0	0%	3.23	26	0
Category Total	41	54%	20	26%	7	9%	6	8%	2	3%	3.21	76	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	12	48%	5	20%	4	16%	3	12%	1	4%	2.96	25	0
18. Dignified	12	50%	4	17%	6	25%	1	4%	1	4%	3.04	24	0
19. Courteous	13	52%	3	12%	6	24%	2	8%	1	4%	3.00	25	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	48%	5	20%	5	20%	2	8%	1	4%	3.00	25	0
21. Patient	12	48%	4	16%	2	8%	5	20%	2	8%	2.76	25	0
Category Total	61	49%	21	17%	23	19%	13	10%	6	5%	2.95	124	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	13	52%	9	36%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	25	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	15	60%	8	32%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	14	58%	8	33%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	14	56%	9	36%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	25	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	10	43%	11	48%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	23	0
Category Total	66	54%	45	37%	11	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	122	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	11	65%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	3.35	17	0
Category Total	11	65%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	1	6%	3.35	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

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	6	60%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	7	70%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	7	70%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	3.30	10	0
Category Total	63	78%	1	1%	13	16%	4	5%	0	0%	3.52	81	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	6	67%	1	11%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
Category Total	13	68%	2	11%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	19	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	50%	2	20%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	3.10	10	0
13. Dignified	7	70%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
14. Courteous	7	70%	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	10	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	7	70%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.40	10	0
16. Patient	6	60%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
Category Total	32	64%	4	8%	9	18%	5	10%	0	0%	3.26	50	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	8	80%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	70%	1	10%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
Category Total	22	73%	2	7%	6	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	30	