Judicial Training Methods
Guidelines for Evaluation of Judicial Training Practices

European Judicial Training Network

2017

Copyright Note

Disclaimer

European Judicial Training Network

With the support of the European Union

Table of Contents

Guideline for evaluation

General information about the handbook

The EJTN (European Judicial Training Network) evaluation guideline is an attempt to support judicial training providers in their work to evaluate training activities. The guideline informs on previous work in the area done by EJTN, refers to EJTN activities on evaluation methodology and contains facts on the challenging art of evaluation.

However, the overall purpose of the EJTN evaluation guideline is to be a **useful tool**, which means being easy to use and hands-on as well as giving practical examples.

The guideline does not differ between face to face-training and e-learning or blended learning, since the **effects** of training are evaluated, not the methods. The guideline only considers evaluating **continuous training**.

These Guidelines have been conceived and drafted by an expert group composed by Ms. Caroline Holst Åhbeck, Ms. Nathalie Glime and Ms. Otilia Pacurari and coordinated by Mr. Luca Perilli, Convener of the EJTN Working Group "Judicial Training Methods". The work with the guideline is intended to be **an ongoing process.**

Introduction. Evaluation and the EJTN

Evaluation is an essential part of a systematic approach to training.

Having a professional approach towards training begins with identifying the *learning needs* and the *learning objectives*. By analysing the *learning needs* you determine the gap between people's existing knowledge and skills and those that are needed in the organisation, and the training provider can plan the training. The intended *learning objectives* describe what participants should know or be able to do at the end of the training that they did not know, or could not do before. The learning objectives should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and timely, that is *SMART* learning objectives.

Already when developing and designing a training activity, the learning objectives should be taken into account. The learning objectives are closely related to teaching- and delivery methods, therefore, when planning an activity, the training provider should also decide on suitable *delivery methods* for achieving the required outcomes/objectives. In addition, the context and meaning of evaluation should be considered in order to set the evaluation objectives and choose the appropriate evaluation tools. Designing the evaluation alongside the learning objectives will make it easier to decide which data needs to be collected and how to do so. Nevertheless, before designing an evaluation, the following questions frame the decisions about what **evaluation tools** to use:

- **Why** do we evaluate?
- **What** do we evaluate?
- **Who** does the evaluation?
- **When** do we evaluate?

The **European Judicial Training Network** has since some time focused on evaluation of judicial training.

During 2015 and 2016, its working group **Judicial Training Methods (JTM**) arranged two seminars on evaluation that were of significance to the work on the guideline. The themes of both seminars were to measure learning results and training effects, both in the short and long-term perspectives. The first event focused on *The Challenge of Proper Evaluation and Assessment at the Reactionary Level* while the second one focused on *The Particular Challenge of Long-Term Evaluation and Assessment.* The fist seminar provided a reference state of play on evaluation at reaction level (Level 1) across European countries. The participants attending the first event received six months later a questionnaire aiming to re-evaluate that event in the long-term perspective. The result of the questionnaire was illustrated at the audience of the second training event, which focused on the long-term evaluation (Level 2-4).

The works performed by the EJTN, before, during and after the two seminars brought two concrete outcomes: a model tool on the post-evaluation of the seminar (that can be found here) and an electronic questionnaire for the long-term evaluation (here) currently in use for the participants to the EJTN Criminal project.

The EJTN further collected and elaborated best practices of judicial evaluation along the implementation of the Pilot Project – European Judicial Training Lot 1 "*Study on Best Practices in training of judges and prosecutors*"[1] , that can be found here. This study has led to adopt nine conclusions in the following areas : "best practices definition", "transferability of practices", "need for judicial training to engage with wider society", "interactivity", "judicial skills and judge craft", "new tools and methodologies"," training needs assessment and evaluation" (conclusion N.7), "training in European Union law", "value of cross border training".

Further, evaluation of training has also been a topic in the *EJTN Handbook on Judicial Training Methodology,* released in 2016, in its second edition, by EJTN[2]. The Handbook (that can be found here) aims to assist Europe's judicial training organisers and managers with a proper conceptual planning of comprehensive training programmes as well as the need for a thorough knowledge of modern training methodology. The five chapters of the Handbook address the role and competencies of the trainer, the planning of a training programme, modern training methods and design, organising training events and evaluations.

The European Commission, taking into account the uniqueness of this Handbook, has recognised its added value at the EU level and has translated it into all EU languages, also to favour its accessibility to the widest audience possible.

This guideline summarises and develops into recommendations the work performed by the EJTN in the field of judicial training evaluation, with reference to Kirkpatrick's[3] Four Levels of Evaluation model.

---

1   Tender JUST/2012/JUTR/PR/0064/A4.

2   The original Handbook was drafted in 2013 and revised and updated by EJTN's Judicial Training Methods (JTM) group in December 2015.

3   Donald Kirkpatrick (March 15, 1924 – May 9, 2014) was Professor Emeritus at the University of Wisconsin in the United States and a past president of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). He is best known for creating a highly influential 'four level' model for training course evaluation.

The Kirkpatrick evaluation model
– a short introduction

Most models for evaluation of training are based on Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation model. The levels can briefly be described as follows:

- Level 1 - how did the participants **react** to the training?
- Level 2 - to what degree did the participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills or attitudes from the training, i.e. the **learning?**
- Level 3 - what **change** has there been in the participants' behaviour in the workplace (after returning from the training activity)?
- Level 4 - what are the overall **results** or wider benefits (to the judiciary) of the training?

The four levels of Kirkpatrick's model represent a systematic way to evaluate training programs. As you move from one level to the next, the process becomes more difficult and time consuming. But it also provides more valuable information (See Appendix 5 for a summary explanation of the 4 levels).

The existing evaluation of the judicial training activities of the EJTN is also based on the Kirkpatrick model.

1. Level 1 – Reaction - Introduction

Level 1 focuses on participant-centered evaluation, i.e. on training customised to the needs and interests of participants, workplace-oriented and competency based.

You use level 1 evaluation to collect participants' reactions to the training process with the final aim to:

- Confirm that the learning outcomes/objectives were met.
- Consider the quality of the training (appropriateness, effectiveness, utility).
- Identify how to improve the training.

1.2. Tools

For level 1, plenty of effective evaluation tools can be identified. They are more or less complicated but they all measure the participants' reactions. Some of the most frequently used tools are listed below, followed by a short explanation:

- <u>Debriefing/feedback</u> – This is a way of collecting input from the participants (and from the trainers and/or experts as well) directly after a training session. A training can involve a single class, part of a day or a complete training activity. This tool can be used on site or at distance after some time has passed. The data can be collected on a sheet of paper, orally or via an electronic tool. Whether the training activity is evaluated immediately or after some time has passed, somewhat different questions are used. See sample questions below:
  - What were the strengths of the training; what about the weaknesses?
  - What knowledge or skills will you immediately apply at the workplace?
  - Did you find the different training methods useful? Which in particular and why?
  - How did you find the different experts/trainers skills in teaching?
  - What should, in your opinion, be changed in the training? Why?
  - Other comments?

- <u>Flip charts – post it notes</u> – Writing comments/answering questions on flip charts or post it notes, work in the same way as the tool above. The only difference is that this is done during the training activity/training session, and the flip charts or post it notes are collected by the trainer/activity coordinator before the end of the training. Similar questions as above can be used. Another alternative is to focus on a special theme, for instance the contents, the training methods or the trainers.

- <u>Activity coordinator report</u> – Giving the activity coordinator the task to write a report on the training activity is another way of collecting data on immediate reactions. The report can be freely written or written with the help of a template. Template used in EJTN training activities is found [here](#).

- Another way to collect data on the reactions of the participants is to gather a <u>focus group</u> by involving some of the participants after a training activity. One person, an interviewer is asking the questions and taking notes (a concrete example of focus group, the so called *rapporteur,* can be found in the Pilot Project – [European Judicial Training Lot 1](#)). Similar questions as above can be used.

- Evaluation questionnaire – An evaluation questionnaire can be both qualitative and quantitative, depending on the questions used. Qualitative questions are used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons, opinions and motivations, and provide insights into the participants´ thoughts to dive deeper into the experience of the training. Quantitative questions are used to quantify the participant´s views on the training or trainers, and the data can be transformed into usable statistics. They are used to quantify attitudes, opinions and generalise results.

- See Appendix 1 for an evaluation questionnaire sample.

- Happy sheets – An evaluation that is short, direct and very easy to use, however with limited usage, is a so called *happy sheet*. The happy sheet consists of a number of statement that the participant grades with the help of different smileys.

- See Appendix 2 for a happy sheet evaluation sample.

1.3. EJTN tools already in use

Almost every training institution already evaluates level 1, and therefore many of the tools listed above are already in use by EJTN. Giving feedback on flip charts or post it notes are commonly used and an activity coordinator report is written after every JTM training activity. Finally the happy sheets and the evaluations questionnaire are tools that are frequently used: the EJTN questionnaire in use is found here.

1.4. Recommendations

- If the intention is to get direct and fast feedback of a training activity, it is advised to use an evaluation tool that the participants work with during the end of a training activity, for instance feedback/debriefing, writing comments/answering questions on a flip chart or post it note. The happy sheets also provide instant feedback, but the design of the sheets does not allow participants to comment on their answers. Using fast feedback tools are advised when an institution is arranging the same training activity a number of times within a short period of time. The training institution still wants some kind of feedback of the event, even if there is not enough time between the occasions letting participants fill in a regular evaluation questionnaire.

- The result of the evaluation is used for developing the training, revising contents, exchanging trainers etc., which means that the data or results collected from the evaluation should be given to people at different levels at the training institution, for instance directors, training managers, activity coordinators, trainers and stakeholders.

- The activity report is a good tool for comparing the participants' views on the training, with the coordinator´s view, to get another perspective of the training.

- Focus groups can be used if, by some reason, it is important that the results of the training activity is thoroughly discussed.

Recommendations for evaluation questionnaires:

- When using an evaluation questionnaire, it is important to be flexible when developing it. The sample questionnaire provided in the appendix, consists of different parts that evaluate different aspects of the training. The sample questions might be used as a whole, or adapted as required.

- The evaluation questionnaire should contain both closed and open free text questions. Make sure there are plenty of space for the participants´ replies on the open questions. Electronic evaluation questionnaire is preferred since analysing data will be easier and the IT-system used normally contains many useful features.

- The number of grades in closed questions could be four or five. If four grades are used, three are positive and one negative (for instance: Excellent, very good, good and poor). In the case of five grades, there are two negative alternatives: Poor and very poor. There should also be an alternative saying: Did not attend or not applicable.

- The length of the evaluation questionnaire should not exceed three pages, 10-15 questions.

- Introduce the participants to the evaluation questionnaire in the beginning of the training activity, and remind them throughout the training.

- Leave at least 10-15 minutes in the end of the training session for the participants to fill in the feedback forms.

- If using electronic evaluation questionnaire, there is a choice to send it to the participants *before* or *after* the training activity. The advantages of sending it before are many: They can answer the questions during the training activity, which means you will get many respondents and they will have plenty of opinions about contents and trainers. The advantage of sending the evaluation questionnaire after the end of the activity is that the participants´ first reactions are gone and the chance of getting more useful information is higher, although the number of participants will be lower.

- It is recommended that as many participants as possible fill in the evaluation questionnaire, so they should be reminded after the training. Sending reminding e-mails and/or not giving them the certificate until after they have filled in the evaluation questionnaire are two ways of raising the number of responding participants.

- The participant should answer the evaluation questionnaire anonymously and the time frame for answering should be two weeks .

2. Level 2 – Learning - Introduction

Adult professionals are autonomous learners. Judges and prosecutors have personal ways to integrate what was learnt at the training activity in their everyday work .

You use evaluation Level 2 to evaluate to what degree the participants:

- Acquire knowledge;
- develop skills;
- develop professional attitude.

In principle, the methods of training do not interfere with the learning. Both face to face learning and distance learning can involve all three aspects of learning depending on how the training is planned and structured. As always, it is important to set the *learning objectives* when planning the training. This helps both trainers and participants to focus on results.

2.2. Tools

Learning is the main focus for every trainer and training organiser. At present though, most European judicial training providers do not devote special focus on the participants learning i.e. have developed in knowledge, skills or mindset and attitude.

The assessment of knowledge and/or skill acquisition has a limited number of tools. There are two major opportunities:

1. Straight forward assessment of specific knowledge, practical skills and attitude:

   - Test
   - Action Plan
   - Self-assessment
   - Team assessment

2. Use of modern technologies that can generate efficient ways of organising and analysing assessment results:

   - Clicker tool.

2.3. EJTN tools already in use

The clicker tool is a multi-purpose learning tool that increases engagement during learning and allows a more effective assessment of learning outcomes. The participants use hand held devices and interact with the teacher/expert and the learning content by answering questions or completing assessment assignments in the classroom. EJTN's use of the clicker typically involves drafting a number of questions, multiple choice or true/false questions, which are used to open and close each seminar. Participants are asked to vote on the correct answers to these questions during the opening of the seminar and again during the closing of the seminar to provide a measure of the learning having taken place.

2.4. Recommendations

The key question used when preparing the evaluation of learning is simple: did the participants learn what was intended to be taught/trained?

However, the answer to this question differs depending on whether the learning objectives have been set and the training has been planned according to the following pre-conditions: Management/executive board should show a clear interest in the training activity and/or evaluation. Management/executive board should prove a clear interest from serious investment in training. The training provider should establish a strong connection between training and organisational and strategic goals. Visibility of the training activity and/or the involvement of trainees and stakeholder is high. A long lifecycle of the training activity is planned (i.e. the training is not a single event but recurring on a yearly basis).

Recommendations in the use of training tools.

• If the intention is to get direct and fast feedback of a training activity, it is advised to use an evaluation tool that the participants work with during the end of a training activity, for instance feedback/debriefing, writing comments/answering questions on a flip chart or post it notes.

• The trainers should prepare a test (questionnaire) in accordance to what is going to be evaluated (the learning objectives).

• The evaluation questionnaire should contain both closed and open free text questions. It could be multiple choice tests; matching items; true/false answers; short descriptive answers

• scaling with a comment. Make sure there are plenty of space for the participants´ replies to the open questions in the forms. Electronic evaluation questionnaire is preferred since analysing data will be easier and the IT-system used normally contains many useful features.

• The number of grades in closed questions could be four or five. If four grades are used, three are positive and one negative (for instance Excellent, very good, good and poor). In the case of five grades, there are two negative alternatives: Poor and very poor. There should also be an alternative saying: Did not attend or not applicable.

• The length of the evaluation questionnaire should not exceed three pages, 10-15 questions.

- At the end of the training day/days the participants could be encouraged to make an action plan for how they will apply what they have learnt and what they want to accomplish. If there are several judges/prosecutors from the same jurisdiction, they can work on the action plan together.

- The training organisers might ask the participants to send the action plan back electronically in a certain time unit. Two weeks is the recommended time frame. The action plans can be shared in the network of participants.

- The action plan might be related to case studies with a key; the participant might do an exercise according to a behaviour checklist by filling in a template.

- Implementing self-assessment: At the beginning of a training session, participants should be encouraged to write down their personal learning needs/interests focusing on knowledge acquisition, skills development and professional attitude development. At the end of the session the participants might re-read their list of needs/interests as presented in the beginning of the seminar. See Appendix 3 as a sample of a self-assessment, and how to use it.

- Team assessment can be applied after any problem solving exercise/case study/experiential exercise etc. that is performed in small groups (3-5 participants). Questionnaires to be answered individually after the group work and/or a questionnaire to be answered by all the members of the group through a group discussion can be used. The questions refer to the individual and group learning processes. (See Appendix 4).

- The clicker tool can be used as icebreakers to open a seminar; as initial assessment tool to test participants' knowledge of topics before a training session starts and then again at the end of the session. It can also be used to increase interactivity and interest in seminars, by asking questions and soliciting immediate responses, as a tool for the post-seminar assessment, for polling or voting to find out what the participants would like.

3. Level 3 – Change of behaviour - Introduction

In Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model from reaction to results, level 3 can be described as to what degree participants apply what they learnt during the training when they are back at work.

You use evaluation Level 3 to:

- confirm that learning outcomes/objectives were met. Did the participants change their behaviour, based on the training they received?

- Identify how to improve or redesign the training if the outcomes/objectives were not met. It gives important feedback for revising training activities – before, during and after the learning event – based on what is and is not producing changes in job performance.

The level 3 evaluation is more complex partly because of the need to wait an amount of time to permit the participants to go back to the workplace and apply what they learnt during the training. Secondly, the evaluation is more complex because of the need to take into account external factors, i.e. the opportunity for the participants to implement the new skills at work and i.e. the level of implication/encouragement of managers/stakeholders.

When Level 1 evaluation is used by trainers and course organisers for almost all training activities, Level 3 evaluation is only used for 30 to 40 % of the training activities. This type of evaluation must be done in order to conduct meaningful and accurate Level 4 evaluations.

3.2. Tools

Evaluations are typically conducted three to six months after the training by direct observation, tests or questionnaires (paper-based or digital) or interviews (i.e. focus groups).

Two evaluation instruments are proposed for Level 3 evaluation: Questionnaire and Observation, and one learning method: Intervision.

- **Questionnaire** – The tool which was introduced at level 1 can also be used for the evaluation at level 2 and 3. The evaluation of the learning process works as follows: the training activity produces results that correspond to the development of new skills and those skills change the behavior of the participants and therefore have the desired impact in the work situation.

  The questionnaire for level 3 is used to measure the possible behaviour changes of the participants and focuses on the learning objectives . To evaluate correctly, it is essential to precisely formulate the objectives of the training activity. The list of objectives will serve as evaluation criteria. It seems logical but it is not always applied.

  In the example hereby, the questions are general and need to be specified according to the learning objectives of the training activity.

Example of general questions:

- In what ways did you prepare before the training?

- Did the training meet your expectations /learning requirement? If not, please comment.

- To what extent/how often are you using what you have learnt in your work? Monthly, weekly, daily.

- Why do you not use your new skills more often? (No relevance to your work? No opportunity at the workplace? No encouragement from the management? Other)

- Did the training activity lead to required changes in your work practice? If yes, within what areas? If no, please comment.

- Which parts of the training were most useful in your work? Other comments about using the theory acquired in practice.

- How can the training be improved?

- **<u>Observation</u>** – is a way of gathering data by watching a person´s behaviour (please see chapter 3.4 for more information).

- **<u>Intervision</u>** – (meeting with peers) is a structured method, where participants reflect on their behaviour together with peers. Participants gather in small groups with the purpose of discussing specific issues. After each issue is clarified, the participant receives advice and feedback from the group. This process gives the participants the opportunity to summarise and apply what they have learnt in a safe learning environment .

  Intervision is learning:

  - For the content provider: Awareness, analysis, space for solutions, finding alternatives, developing ideas.

  - For the group: Learn to pose good questions, advise, learn active listening, recognise, differentiate in main and side issues and emotions, develop flexibility to communicate at different levels.

  - For the organisation: When the professionals are learning, the organisation as a whole gets better.

Intervision is not primarily an evaluation tool. However it makes the learning cycle described by Kolb[4] possible. Effective learning is seen when a person progresses through a cycle of four stages: of (1) having a concrete experience followed by (2) observation of and reflection on that experience which leads to (3) the formation of abstract concepts (analysis) and generalisations (conclusions) which are then (4) used to test hypothesis in future situations, resulting in new experiences.

---

4   David A. Kolb (born 1939) is an <u>American</u> educational theorist whose interests and publications focus on <u>experiential learning</u>, the individual and social change, career development, and executive and professional education.

3.3. EJTN tools already in use

- Criminal project questionnaire. One example of long-term evaluation questionnaire (level 2 and 3) conducted by EJTN for the EJTN Criminal Justice Project can be found [here](#).

- An example of best practice on long term evaluation can be read in *LOT 1 Best Practices on Evaluation* ([here](#)). One of the best practices in Lot 1 is about combining several questionnaires. Before the training an initial needs assessment questionnaire is sent to the participants asking them about their professional background, their experience, their motivation to take part at the training in terms of expectations. After the training a questionnaire on level 1 can be sent to explore the immediate feedback. A mid-term evaluation can be sent several months after in order to measure the application of learning.

3.4. Recommendations

- The evaluation should take place three to six months after the training activity. The questions asked need to reflect the learning objectives of the training activity. The objectives should give the participant appropriate skills to make the required change in the work situation.

- The evaluation should include a question about the relevance of the training for their daily work. If the training is not relevant, the participants are not going to use the skills.

- The evaluation should include a question about preparation (How did the participants prepare for the training activity? If they were well prepared, it can imply that the participants consider the training activity as important/relevant for their work).

- The evaluation should include a question about frequency (How often do the participants use what they have learnt? Daily, weekly, monthly…). Regarding the data, the participants should also explain their answers in alternatives like: No relevance for their work? No opportunity at the workplace? No encouragement from the management etc.?

Recommendations about observation

- Observation can be used for example during a real hearing but can also be used as an exercise during the training activity. In that case it is important that the situation is similar to the work situation.

- Determine the focus: think about what to observe and select a few focus areas for data collection: for example while some are observing the verbal technique employed, others can focus on non-verbal communication during the hearings.

- Generalised questions invite generalised answers. The questions should be detailed and followed up. For example empathy in the non-verbal communication: Does the judge look at the defendant when s/he is talking to the defendant? Yes/ no? How? How long? How many times? Does the judge make eye contact when the defendant is talking? Yes/ No? How Long? How many times? Etc.

- Provide easy-to-use observations forms containing questions and checklist.

- At the first stage, when unfamiliar with the method, people give short feedback and focus on positive behaviour. On a later stage, the feedback can be more extensive and more critical.

Recommendations for intervision.

- Intervision is a component of a learning process: It is a training activity in a learning environment and permits exchange of experiences, reflection, feed-back from peers and (self)evaluation. This method can be used to improve both the personal and the group performance in the work context. The improvement of the professionalism of the intervision members has an impact on individual, group and organisation growth.

- Use intervision when there is a desire to stimulate and optimise work processes.

- In an intervision the participants define the agenda and the intensity of openness in sharing experiences. They must feel safe and comfortable in the group, and there must be no hierarchical differences nor judging. The discussions are confidential and guided by a specially trained coach.

4. Level 4 – Results - Introduction

A changing society has raised new expectations about the quality of justice. This is not only impartiality, integrity, expertise and professionalism of judges, but also accessibility, timeliness, effectiveness of justice and the consistency of jurisprudence. Judicial training has adapted to meet the needs of judges to cope with society expectations. Judicial training focuses more and more on ethics, judge craft, leadership and management.

What are the final results of the training? Level 4 determines the overall success of the training activities. Evaluation of judicial training results is the systematic assessment of training programs in terms of their impact on quality of Justice and judicial decisions.

It is the most costly and time-consuming evaluation and its effects are still uncertain, because it is rarely implemented.

You use evaluation level 4 to evaluate:

- effectiveness of training: The ability to produce desired output, whether the training objectives were achieved and if the results are the ones expected when planning;

- impact of training on improvement of performance of courts and prosecution offices;

- sustainability of training: To evaluate if an institution delivers appropriate training activities to develop appropriate competencies used in courts and prosecutors' offices.

4.2. Tools

- **Questionnaire** – (See Level 1 for an exhaustive description) aimed at measuring the hours spent by judges and prosecutors in professional education (though it measures quantity it does not ensure assessment of quality).

- **Peer review or intervision** – (See level 3 for an exhaustive description). It involves reflection and feedback about training outcomes. It could include dialogue between lower and higher courts or between judges and lawyers about common training outcomes.

- **Action plans** – for the implementation of training guidelines or best practices developed or debated in training activities.

- **Court wide position study or report** – done by the court's management to report on what impact training had on case law or the court's organisation.

- **Court's expert committees** (including academics and legal practitioners) **visitation** – to assess what impact training had on case law or the court's organisation.

- **Court users** (professional users and litigants) **satisfaction surveys** – this tool could be used to assess how training impact on access to justice, treatment of parties or judges' integrity.

- **Staff motivation and satisfaction survey** – to evaluate the impact of leadership training.

4.3. EJTN tools already in use

- In implementing the exchanges of Presidents of Courts and Chief Prosecutors, EJTN collects feedback from the participants about best practices in the exchange that they consider to implement in their own courts. After some months, EJTN collects information about best practices implementation.

- Best practices about implementation of action plans in the context of leadership training have been identified in the context of European Judicial Training Lot 1 "*Study on Best Practices in training of judges and prosecutors*"[5] ([here](#)).

4.4. Recommendations

- Intervision and peer review could be regularly implemented to assess change in Court's and prosecution offices after training. Concrete indicators of quality are the establishment of action plans or operational guidelines or protocols, that may involve the Bar or external stakeholders to implement best practices.
- Court wide position study or reports could be regularly produced by courts management to monitor changes in case law or to assess case law consistency. Concrete indicators are periodical internal court's consultation meetings that focus on reflection about training inputs and learning outcomes.
- Court users (professional users and litigants) satisfaction surveys could be periodically conducted to assess the improvement after training in courts' accessibility and effectiveness of judicial work: Integrity of judges, their capacity to communicate with parties and parties' treatment, timeliness management of proceedings, the use of language in judgments and proceedings etc. Concrete indicators of quality are: Courts' guidelines about the access to court and the protection of vulnerable parties; professional standards' development that embodies the vision of judges and prosecutors on quality of judicial performance.
- Periodical staff motivation and satisfaction surveys could be conducted to evaluate the impact of leadership and management training on the organisation. Indicators are new working processes or organisational changes, following the training.

---

5   Paragraph 8.3.2

Collection of appendixes

Appendix 1: Level 1 – Evaluation questionnaire

The example questions are divided into core questions and optional questions. If every question is used, the evaluation questionnaire will be very voluminous, so before designing an evaluation on Level 1, be careful when deciding what data needs to be collected and how to do so.

Type of question	Example questions	Example answers
Part 1: About Expectations and relevance (optional part, but recommended)		
Qualitative	What were your expectations of the training activity?	Open question
Quantitative	Were your expectations met?	Yes/no
Qualitative	If you answered no, why not?	Open question
Quantitative	How relevant was the training event to your role as judge/prosecutor/leader?	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Extremely relevant, relevant, partly relevant, hardly relevant, not at all relevant)
Part 2: About pre-training preparations (optional part, but recommended)		
Quantitative	In what way/s did you prepare before the training activity? (This can be either an open question or multiple-choice questions)	Multiple-choice question, for example: I read about the training event, the curricula etc. I discussed the course and my expectations with my colleagues and/or my manager I did some/all training preparations that were included I did not do anything because … Other (open question)
Quantitative	To what extent did the pre-course material assist your preparation and learning?	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Fully, substantially, in part, not very much, not at all)
Part 3: About Contents/Learning outcomes (core part)		
Use question A for every significant content/learning outcome of the training event, and use question B and C once for the whole content and every learning outcome, as a summary		
Quantitative	A) {describe content/learning outcome:} To what extent was the outcome reached?	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Fully, substantially, in part, not very much, not at all)
Qualitative	What content did you find particular useful for your professional life?	Open question
Qualitative	What improvements regarding contents can be done ?	Open question

Part 4: About the trainers/experts (core part)		
Use the question for every significant trainer/expert involved, but it should be optional for facilitators, conveyers etc.		
Quantitative	{trainers/expert´s name:} How did you find the trainer´s/expert´s ability to explain the contents/topic, make the contents interesting and involve the participants, that is, his/her pedagogical capabilities?	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Excellent, very good, good, poor, very poor)
Qualitative	Please comment on your grades	Open question
Part 5: About Methods (core part)		
Qualitative (Quantitative if multiple-choice alternative is used)	What training methods that were used did you mostly appreciate?	Open question or a scaling in points from 1 – 5 in the list of methods used, for example: Lecture ___ Seminar ___ Group discussion ___ Work shop ___ Laboratory ___ Etc ___
Qualitative	Why? Or when using the scaling: Comment on utility and effectiveness etc	Open question
Part 6: The training on the whole (core part)		
Quantitative	In view of the overall topic, the length of the training event was:	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Much too short, a bit too short, adequate, a bit too long, too long)
Qualitative	Please comment	Open question
Quantitative	What is your overall assessment of the content, the methodology and the usefulness of the training event	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Excellent, very good, good, poor, very good)
Qualitative	Please comment	Open question
Quantitative	Would you recommend the training to your colleagues?	Scaling, 4 or 5 point scale (for example: Absolutely, perhaps, in part, not at all, definitely not)
Qualitative	Please comment	Open question
Qualitative	Other comments on the training?	Open question

Appendix 2: Level 1 – Evaluation "Happy sheets"

An evaluation on Level 1 that is short, direct and very easy to use, however with limited usage, is a so called *happy sheet*. The happy sheet consists of a number of statements that the participant grade with the help of different smileys, for instance:

Example statement	*Example smileys*
My expectations were met.	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
The training event as a whole was relevant to my role as judge/ prosecutor/ leader.	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
The contents (X,Y, Z...) was relevant to my role as judge/ prosecutor/ leader. *(one statement per contents)*	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
The learning outcome (X,Y, Z...) was reached. *(one statement per learning outcome)*	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
I was satisfied with the expert/trainer (X, Y Z...)´s ability to explain the contents/topic, make the contents interesting and involve the participants. *(one statement per trainer/expert)*	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
I was satisfied with the training methods used.	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
I was satisfied with the length of the training event.	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃
I would recommend the training to my colleagues.	😦 😟 😐 🙂 😃

Appendix 3: Level 2 – Self assessment

You can use this in the beginning of a training session:

INSTRUCTION. Ask the participants to write down their personal learning needs/interests. Fill in the table/handout/post-it note. (Focus on knowledge acquisition, skills development and professional attitude development).

My learning needs/interests are

Use this in the end of the training session:

INSTRUCTION: Re-read your list of needs/interests from the beginning of the seminar. Fill in the table/handout/post-it note. (Focus on knowledge acquisition, skills development and professional attitude development)

I learnt	*I still need to clarify*	*I will apply*

A group discussion can follow. It depends on the responsible trainer/expert and the will of the participants.

Appendix 4: Level 2 – Evaluation tools matrix

The tools presented can be used in all forms of training, face to face and distance learning alike.

Evaluation Tools	Examples	Modes of delivery	When
Tests	Multiple choice tests Matching items True/false answers Short descriptive answers Scaling with a comment	Paper based Online Verbal Clicker tool	Pre training While training End of training
Action plan	Action plan	Paper Based Online	End of training
Self-assessment	Case Studies with a key Behaviour checklist Templates for perfor-mance based exercises	Paper based Online	Pre training While training End of training
Team assessment	Case Studies with a key Behaviour checklist Templates for perfor-mance based exercises. Peer observation with observation sheet	Paper based Online	While training End of training

Team Assessment Variant One. Individual Questionnaire after Group Work

Instruction: In 5- 10 minutes write your answers to the following questions:

Examples of questions:

- How effectively did your group work together in the problem solving/case study/experiential exercise activity?
- Scale from one to five or one to four.
- Give one specific example of something you learnt from the group members that you probably would not have learnt working alone?
- Give one specific example of something the other group members learnt from you?
- Give one suggestion for what can be done to improve learning in a group?

Team Assessment. Variant Two. Group Questionnaire

Instruction: In your teams take 10 minutes and discuss the learning process that you experienced through your work together.

Examples of questions:

- What three things did you learnt in your group?
- What can be done to improve the group learning?
- What problems did you encounter in the problem solving and group learning process? Why?

Appendix 5 – Levels 1-4
– explanations, tools and criteria – a summary

Level	Explanation of the level	Resource(s)/Tools	Objectives
1.Reaction *Kirkpatrick's guideline is to measure 100% of all learning activities at this level*	What did the participants think of the learning activity? I.e. an initial satisfaction measurement.	Debriefing/feedback Flip charts – post it notes Activity coordinator report Evaluation questionnaire Happy sheets	Every activity focuses on teaching the participants something
2.Learning result *Guideline 60/80%*	Have the participants learnt what was intended? Have the participants achieved the learning objectives set in advance and/or their own learning objectives?	Test/ questionnaire Action Plan Self-assessment Team assessment Clicker tool	The learning activity has learning objectives which form the basis for the programme (content and delivery methods)
3. Application and implementation in practice *Guideline 30%*	Do the participants apply what they have learnt in practice too?	Questionnaire Observation Intervision	The learning activity has learning objectives regarding the desired application in practice: what behavior do we want the participants to demonstrate after the training?
4. Impact on the organisation *Guideline 10-20%*	What is the impact on the organisation? What is the improvement of quality on judicial performance?	Questionnaire Peer review or intervision Action plans Court wide position study or report Court's expert committees visitation Court users satisfaction surveys Staff motivation and satisfaction survey.	The learning activity has learning objectives regarding the desired impact on the judicial organisation and on the quality of the judicial performance.