



European Judicial Training Network

JTM 1st Seminar

“Measuring Learning Results and Training Effects – The Challenge of Proper Evaluation and Assessment at the Reactionary Level”

Zagreb (Croatia), May 5th - 6th, 2015

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Presentation of Judicial Training Institute of Belgium (IGO-IFJ)
3. Judicial training in Belgium
4. Content of the judicial trainings at IGO-IFJ
5. Evaluation of trainings by the IGO-IFJ
6. Principles of evaluation of trainings by IGO-IFJ
7. The Rapporteur
8. Conclusion

1. Introduction

- **4 levels of the Kirkpatrick Model:**
 - **level 1** (reaction level): satisfaction level of participants
 - **level 2** (learning level): evaluation of what was learned
 - **level 3** (behaviour level): evaluation of the use of newly acquired skills in the execution of their jobs.
 - **level 4** (results level): evaluation of the contribution of learning activity to performance improvements of the organization

1. Introduction

- **Opinion N° 4/2003 of the Consultative Council of European Judges:**
 - emphasises, e.g. a clear distinction between the participants' evaluation
 - in the context of initial training
 - and in the context of continuous training.

- **Situation in Belgium:**
 - judicial training is not used as a means to evaluate its participants.
 - The Judicial Code provides a specific procedure for the evaluation of magistrates and judicial trainees.

2. Judicial Training Institute of Belgium (IGO-IFJ)

- **IGO- IFJ:**

- founded by legal act of 31 January 2007
- operational since 2009
- is an independent federal institution
- charged with the professional training of magistrates, judicial trainees and judicial staff

2. Judicial Training Institute of Belgium (IGO-IFJ)

- **Corporate and decision-making bodies of IGO-IFJ:**
 - The governing board (14 members)
 - Management team (2 members)
 - Scientific council (20 members)
 - Judicial Traineeship evaluation committees (9 members)

2. Judicial Training Institute of Belgium (IGO-IFJ)

- **IGO- IFJ:** team of 24 staff members
- Annual budget (2015) of 5.320.000 Euro
- Target audience counts 15.500 persons
 - Nearly 50/50 split between magistrates and personnel
- IGO-IFJ is only operational since 2009:
 - Growing pains

3. Judicial Training in Belgium

- **Initial training curriculum:**
 - Content and duration established by IGO-IFJ
 - obligatory both for judicial trainees and for the magistrates appointed based on the exam with regard to the professional competence or the oral assessment exam.

3. Judicial Training in Belgium

- **Continuous training:**
 - not obligatory for magistrates
 - however, whether magistrates keep their competencies up to date is naturally taken into account in the context of magistrate evaluation procedures.
 - mandatory specialised training courses for magistrates which must be followed before they can take up specific positions.
e.g. investigating judge, attachment judge...

4. Content of the Judicial Trainings at IGO-IFJ

- Duration: most of the courses take several days.
- **Content:** multidisciplinary
- Chairperson-moderator:
 - An experienced specialised magistrate act as chairperson-moderator,
 - His tasks are:
 - to safeguard the main theme of the course in question
 - clearly demarcate the various interventions.
 - explain the objectives of the various topics,
 - give short introductions to the actual lessons,
 - set the framework, anticipate on possible issues, etc.,
 - make the training course an interactive one, to involve all the participants.

5. Evaluation of trainings by IGO-IFJ

- Evaluating a training programme and methodology for IGO-IFJ a legal obligation.
- For IGO-IFJ :
 - Evaluation of its courses at Kirkpatrick's levels 2 through 4 **not possible**;
 - Kirkpatrick's Level 1 (reaction level) is **possible**
 - By using a satisfaction survey (*'happy sheets'*).
 - ✓ Disadvantages of processing the individual evaluation forms: time and labour-intensive;

5. Evaluation of trainings by IGO-IFJ

- In initial years of IGO-IFJ online evaluation not possible because of the lack of necessary technology to carry out an electronic evaluation of its courses.
 - Necessity to devise **a specific methodology** for course evaluation
- The IGO attempted to reconcile a number of different principles in this regard:

6. Principles of evaluation of trainings by IGO-IFJ

- Participants want to know that evaluation is taken seriously and their opinions are taken into account.
- To draw useful conclusions about course efficiency, important to receive feedback from the greatest possible number of, preferably even all, participants.
- Comments should be constructive, focus on key issues, and be clearly reasoned.
- Since implementation of online evaluation: anonymous.
- Course evaluation is best done in standardised fashion, in accordance with a specific schedule.
 - Allows qualitative comparison of various courses.

7. Rapporteur by IGO-IFJ

In practice:

- IGO-IFJ appoints in consultation with the chairperson-moderator appoints a “rapporteur”,
- **Tasks of the rapporteur:**
 - in charge of convening all the participants at the end of every course day,
 - evaluate the past day **based on a template** drawn up by the IGO where , both numerical and qualitative data are requested

7. Rapporteur by IGO-IFJ

Tasks of the rapporteur:

- Each course / presentation / speech / activity / lecturer is assessed as to:
 - its/his/her relevance for the participants,
 - practical focus,
 - structure,
 - documentation and didactic materials used,
 - command of subject and didactic quality.
- Where several lecturers are involved, they are evaluated separately.

7. Rapporteur by IGO-IFJ

- The rapporteur notes the participants observations and drafts a report.
- At the end of the course,
 - the draft evaluation report is sent to all the participants.
 - Once any additional comments have been incorporated, the final report is submitted to the IGO.

7. Rapporteur by IGO-IFJ

Advantages of the Rapporteur:

- Substantive workload is decreased considerably
- Participants know that their views are taken into account and adjustments are made where possible.
- All participants are involved in the evaluation process, resulting in a balanced view.
- Because the rapporteur functions as the participant group's contact possible to obtain additional elucidation of specific comments where necessary.
- Since a template is used, structural adjustments can be made, where necessary in regard to several courses at the same time.

8. Conclusion

- Evaluation of reports drawn up on the various courses by the rapporteurs is not the only instrument the IGO uses.
- Increasingly, **several evaluation techniques are combined**.
- The chairperson-moderators and the members of the expert workgroup play an important part,
 - for example, they are informed of the participants' evaluation reports whenever the next edition of a course is taken into preparation. In a number of cases, also some lecturers' views are requested so that the fullest possible picture of course quality may be obtained.
- The IGO has started online course evaluation by participants since 1st October 2014;
- The rapporteur methodology will not be (completely) abandoned.

Contact:

IGO-IFJ Belgium

Avenue Louise 54

1050 Bruxelles

info@igo-ifj.be

www.igo-ifj.be