

**EJTN Working Group „Judicial Training Methods“**  
**Survey on Evaluation and Assessment of Training Events**  
**- presentation of results**

**I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

<b>Target group:</b>	Judiciary training institutions (schools, centres, academies) – EJTN members and observers
<b>Number of training institutions that completed survey:</b>	26 (attached is the list of training institutions that have been completed the survey)
<b>Tool for implementation of the survey:</b>	electronic survey in the LMS Loomen/Moodle platform: <a href="https://loomen.carnet.hr">https://loomen.carnet.hr</a>
<b>Time of implementation:</b>	4 <sup>th</sup> February to 17 <sup>th</sup> March 2015

**II. REVIEW OF RESULTS <sup>1</sup>**

**1. Which methods does your training institution employ to assess the immediate reactions to a particular training event (Level 1 Kirkpatrick’s Model)?**

Item	Percentage	Total answers
<b>Evaluation questionnaires to be filled-in by the participants</b>	49%	26
<b>Questionnaires to be filled-in by the trainer(s)</b>	6%	3 (Spain, Romania, The Netherlands)
<b>Questionnaires to be filled-in by the course directors</b>	2%	1 (Romania)
<b>(Written or oral) reports by trainers /course directors</b>	26%	14 (Germany, Sweden, Judicial Institute for Scotland, ERA, Bulgaria, Croatia, Finland, Judicial College England and Wales, Spain, Belgium, Norway, France, Estonia, Lithuania)
<b>Post-event interviews with chosen participants</b>	8%	4 (Bulgaria, Germany, Lithuania, The Netherlands)

<sup>1</sup> The order of the questions in the review does not match the order of the questions in the survey since in the survey was added a question on the very top „Name of the training institution“ under #1.

<b>Others</b>	9%	5 (Norway, Germany, Slovenia, Sweden, Belgium)
---------------	----	--

**2. If your answer is “Others”, please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country</b>
“We have also made <u>phone calls</u> after two-three months, to ask about the learning out-come”	Norway
“ <u>Personal talks</u> at the end of training course between the course director and either the Director or one of the two Administration Managers of GJA”	Germany
“ <u>Course organisers assess the event</u> with the expert, leading the educational event”	Slovenia
“System of “The Rapporteur”	Belgium
“The training planner/course director is always present at a new course or training event. The purpose of this system is to gain personal knowledge of the training event so that the personal responsible for the new training event does not only rely on the reactions of the participants expressed in the evaluation questionnaire. The same principle applies if there is a new trainer or the training event has undergone significant changes since the last time it was held.”	Sweden

**3. In your evaluation questionnaire to be filled-in by the participants, do you ask:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
If the training event has met the participant’s expectations, and especially, if the training objectives have been attained?	16%	24 (Germany, Slovakia, ERA, The Netherlands, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Finland, Macedonia, Judicial College England and Wales, Romania, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Norway, Hungary, Croatia)

		Slovenia, France, Judicial Studies for Northern Ireland, Portugal, Sweden, Estonia, Serbia, Lithuania)
If the length of the training event was adequate?	11%	16 (Germany, Judicial Institute for Scotland, Austria, The Netherlands, Bulgaria, Finland, Macedonia, Romania, Spain, Belgium, Slovenia, France, Portugal, Sweden, Estonia, Serbia)
For an assessment of the content-related and the methodological quality of each individual training session on a point (0, 1, 2, 3...) /letter /A, B, C...) /descriptive (excellent, very good, good, rather satisfactory...) scale?	14%	20 (Germany, Austria, ERA The Netherlands, Finland, Macedonia, Judicial College England and Wales, Romania, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Norway, Slovenia, France, Croatia, Portugal, Sweden, Estonia, Serbia, Lithuania)
For an assessment of the coherence of the methodological approach of the whole training event?	9%	13 (Judicial Institute for Scotland, The Netherlands, Finland, Romania, Spain, Belgium, Norway, Slovenia, Croatia, France, Sweden, Estonia, Portugal)
For an overall assessment of the quality of the training event on a point/letter/descriptive scale?	14%	21 (Slovakia, Judicial Institute for Scotland, Austria, ERA, The Netherlands, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Finland, Macedonia, Judicial College England and Wales, Romania, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Norway, Slovenia, France, Portugal, Sweden, Estonia, Lithuania)
For an assessment of the quality of the venue?	12%	17 (Judicial Institute for Scotland, The Netherlands, Finland, Romania, Spain, Belgium, Slovenia, Croatia, France, Portugal, Austria, ERA,

		Italy, Judicial College of England and Wales, Germany, Bulgaria, Slovakia)
For proposals for further suitable training topics?	15%	22 (Germany, Slovakia, Judicial Institute for Scotland, Austria, ERA, The Netherlands, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Finland, Macedonia, Romania, Spain, Belgium, Slovenia, France, Croatia, Judicial Studies for Northern Ireland, Portugal, Sweden, Estonia, Serbia, Lithuania)
For other information?	10%	14 (Portugal <sup>2</sup> , Macedonia, Montenegro, Sweden, Slovakia, Croatia, Germany, Austria, Romania, Norway, Slovenia, Estonia, Judicial Study Board for Northern Ireland, Judicial College England and Wales, Lithuania)

**4. If your answer is “For other information”, please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
“The participants may add future topics to be taken into account; participants may add suggestions, comments regarding the training event.”	Macedonia
“For an assessment of the quality of the teachers /descriptive (excellent, very good, good, rather satisfactory...) scale.”	Montenegro
“We also ask if the preparations (if there were any) required by the participants were adequate and if the participants had enough time to prepare.”	Sweden
“We ask separately, if they were satisfied with the concrete lecturer, we use the scale 1-5 to all questions. Separate question if the participants accessed the website of our Academy or website of the project to which the activity	Slovakia

<sup>2</sup> The Centre for Judicial Studies of Portugal didn’t provide other information on the question

---

belongs.”		
“Participants are asked to estimate usefulness of acquired knowledge and skills for their work on the 1-5 scale and to set off a key message of the training event. Diverse pedagogical and communication skills of the trainers are evaluated on the 1-5 scale with comment. We also ask about organisational aspect of the training event. ”	Croatia	
“German Judicial Academy also asks if within the given training course the time repartition of the sub-topics was adequate, if other sub-topics should have been added, and if sub-topics could have been deleted.”	Germany	
“We also ask if the topic was well-chosen, if the contents conveyed can be applied in practise, if the training was well organised and on the quality of the trainers.”	Austria	
“Aspects to be enhanced/amended; The quality of the participants’ selection; the communication with the course director (NIM representatives).”	Romania	
“We ask if they recommend this event to others. We also ask some open questions, example about improvement, where they in own words can write.”	Norway	
“Participants can write other suggestion about training, they assess the written material distributed at the educational venue...”	Slovenia	
“Possible topics of Case Law Analysis (Court Practice Analysis).”	Estonia	
<p>“We also ask participants the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please comment on any aspect of this training (including any suggested improvements or additional related content);</li> <li>• Please indicate by ticking the relevant box <b>【box options: very good/ good/satisfactory/unsatisfactory】</b> what you thought of the administrative arrangements (seating layout, location, etc.) and lastly</li> <li>• Please comment on any aspect of the administrative arrangements.”</li> </ul>	Judicial Study Board for Northern Ireland	
“To what extent did the training support you in your judicial role.”	Judicial England and Wales	College
“For assessment of the overall organisation of the training.”	Lithuania	

---

**5. Does your training institution give feedback on the participants' reactions to:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
The training planners?	28%	22 (Slovenia, Romania, Sweden, Norway, Macedonia, Montenegro, Judicial Studies Board for Northern Ireland, Austria, Judicial College England and Wales, Germany, Portugal, Hungary, Serbia, Judicial Institute for Scotland, Finland, Croatia, Spain, Belgium, France, ERA, Italy, Bulgaria)
The trainers (if different from the training planners)?	30%	24 (Slovenia, Romania, Estonia, Sweden, Norway, Macedonia, Montenegro, Judicial Studies for Northern Ireland, Lithuania, Slovakia, Austria, Judicial College England and Wales, Germany, Portugal, Hungary, Serbia, Judicial Institute for Scotland, The Netherlands, Finland, Spain, Croatia, Belgium, ERA, Bulgaria)
The course directors (if different from the first two categories)?	19%	15 (Romania, Sweden, Norway, Macedonia, Austria, Judicial College England and Wales, Germany, Portugal, Hungary, Judicial Institute for Scotland, The Netherlands, Finland, Spain, France, Bulgaria)
The organizers in the training venues?	19%	15 (Slovenia, Sweden, Norway, Macedonia, Montenegro, Lithuania,

		Austria, Germany, Portugal, The Netherlands, Finland, Spain, Belgium, ERA, Bulgaria)
Other stakeholders?	7%	6 (Belgium, Croatia, Estonia, Lithuania, Italy, Jud. College England and Wales)

**6. If your answer is “Other stakeholders”, please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
“Working group who is involved in the establishment of the program.”	Belgium
“Feedback is also provided to the members of the Programming Board since it is the official body that approves the content of the programme.”	Croatia
“Judicial Training Council”	Estonia
“Feedback of assessment is provided to the trainers upon their request.”	Lithuania
Global data of assessment of participants are made public on the website, affixed in the premises of the School and, upon request, sent to other bodies (so far CSM has requested them, albeit public).	Italy
“Included in Board level reports Judicial Training Council.”	Judicial College England and Wales

**7. Does your training institution carry out assessments as to long-term learning results and training effects (i.e. on what has been learned, on changes in behaviour due to learning and on improvements of working results in the institution = Levels 2 to 4 of Kirkpatrick’s Model)?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
No (then Questions 9 to 21 are not relevant for you; go on with Questions 22 to 25)	58%	15 (Slovakia, Judicial Institute)

		for Scotland, Austria, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Macedonia, Romania, Italy, Belgium, Norway, Hungary, Slovenia, Judicial Studies Board for Northern Ireland, Portugal, Croatia)
For each individual training event	4%	1 (Serbia)
In suitable cases. Please explain the selection strategy.	38%	10 (Judicial College England and Wales, France, Germany, Serbia, ERA, Sweden, The Netherlands, Finland, Spain, Estonia)

### 8. Please explain the selection strategy:<sup>3</sup>

Answer / Selection strategy	Country/ Training institut.
“We are at the start of a process of identifying which courses to select for further evaluation.”	Judicial College England and Wales
“Initial training and highly technical matters for in service training.”	France
“GJA annually carries out nearly 150 training courses. Due to the necessary investment in time and money, in only a handful of cases, a long-term assessment can be carried out. Especially modular course and courses with a particularly high personal impact of the participants are chosen. The Board (Programming Conference) of GJA is currently pondering ways to deepen and to professionalize this.”	Germany
“Having in mind that Serbia is a transitional country, which means that it often amends its legal framework; we are not available to monitor longitudinally all fields of law. For example, in criminal legislative, with introduced new Criminal Procedure Code, only after the conducted education is when we can determine the education impact to their work. Sometimes it happens that after the conducted education, judges or prosecutors, process no relevant cases.”	Serbia
“We are in the process creating a new evaluation framework which will aim to capture this information more effectively.”	Judicial Institute for Scotland

<sup>3</sup> Lithuania and Judicial Institute for Scotland didn't mark the answer on the question „In suitable cases“, but provide the answer on the question „Please explain the selection strategy“.

“There is work in progress in this field. We have recently started a trial period during which, for certain chosen training events, a second questionnaire is distributed to the participants a few months after the training event. The questions focus on what the participant learnt and how the participant has made use of this knowledge.”	Sweden
“Long-term assessments may be carried out with reference to former participants in given training projects, from selected target groups or who have made use of specific resources.”	ERA
“For the new initial training only. Not for the continuous training.”	The Netherlands
“We carry out assessments as long term learning results when the training programmes are long and when they include many trainings periods or we want to evaluate if training is changing peoples’ working processes. We also check national statistic all the time (e.g. about court work).”	Finland
“Effectiveness of the training is evaluated not by the training provider but by the other subjects such as Chairpersons of the Courts who provide personal evaluation report on judges working in their court, the Permanent Commission for the Assessment of Activities of Judges, the Selection Commission of Candidates to Judicial Office. Performing their functions they also consider the assessment of the personal qualification and skills improvements.”	Lithuania
“Some e-learning activities have examinations (answer to several questions) after each module. Trainers mark.”	Spain
“We use Case Law Analysis in suitable cases.”	Estonia

**9. Which methods do you use for the long-term assessment of learning results and training effects?**

Item	Percentage	Total answers
Specific questionnaires given out to the trainees several month after the training event	22%	4 (France, ERA, Sweden, Germany)
Other forms of self-assessment by the trainees	22%	4 (Estonia, Serbia, Finland, The Netherlands)

Involvement of the trainees' superiors in the courts and in the prosecution office	11%	2 (Finland, The Netherlands)
External assessment of an individual trainee's working results (statistical data as to monthly performance, as to appeal ratios, etc.)	11%	2 (Finland, The Netherlands)
Intranet fora for suitable participants' groups	11%	2 (ERA, Germany)
Other methods	22%	4 (Lithuania, Judicial College England and Wales, The Netherlands, Estonia)

**10. Please give a short description of your training institution's overall strategy in that field:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
Telephone interviews with participants 3 - 6 months following the event.	Judicial College England and Wales
1) We use Case Law Analysis in suitable cases 2) During the training needs assessment the training impact could be also measured (general level).	Estonia
There is no overall strategy yet, the Board is pondering ways to further improvement (see already Answer 8), especially concerning the potential use of GJA's website.	Germany
We have not had designed information system by now, and specific surveys were used to monitor only certain areas of work. Development of the information system is in the course, and we have foreseen to conduct various education analyses.	Serbia
Long-term assessments may be conducted in order to: - evaluate the impact of training projects (as opposed to participants' satisfaction) by asking how the training was used in practice, to what extent it was passed on etc.; - evaluate specific aspects of the training programme, e.g. effectiveness of e-learning or relevance for a particular target group.	ERA
Feedback/ intervision (meeting with peers); feedback tutors (practical trainer) and core trainer; Assessment commission separate from the core trainer and practical trainer.	The Netherlands
We check national statistics data and compare courts (case	Finland

management, processing time etc.). We also have our stakeholders who give feedback of exact themes.

The long-term assessment is not conducted in our institution. Lithuania

**11. Do you use your training institution’s website/other e-tools for the long-term assessment of learning results and training effects?<sup>4</sup>**

Item	Percentage	Total answers
No	42%	5 (Italia, Estonia, Serbia, Lithuania, Judicial College England and Wales)
Yes	58%	7 (Spain, France, Finland, The Netherlands, ERA, Sweden, Germany)

**12. If your answer is “Yes”, please explain:**

Answer	Country/ Training institut.
On line questionnaires	France
In suitable cases, GJA has used a Forum Space developed by the North-Rhine Westphalian Ministry of Justice to open fora for particularly suitable participants' groups.	Germany
The questionnaire is distributed through our LMS.	Sweden
Online surveys	ERA
Digital portfolio	The Netherlands
E-questionnaire called Webropol. Sometimes intranet.	Finland
We use the e-learning platform.	Spanish Judicial School

<sup>4</sup> It is a pity that this question was not a part of the questions that dealt with short-term evaluation issue. For example, Croatian Judicial Academy uses its website for regular on-line evaluation, Level I of Kirkpatrick’s Model. It could be the case with more training institutions that do not carry out the long-term assessment and therefore skipped certain set of questions.

**13. If you involve the court leaders /managers and /or the prosecution service leaders/managers in your long-term assessment of learning results and training effects: Do these or do the assessed complain about a potential infringement with their judicial independence?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
No	88%	7 (Spain, Serbia, Lithuania, Finland, The Netherlands, ERA, Estonia)
Yes	12%	1 (Germany)

**14. Please explain which measures are taken to avoid such kind of infringement:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
In Germany, it is the 16 State Judicial Administrations which organize the training needs' assessment, communicate these results to GJA via their Members in GJA's Board, and then assess the (long-term) effect of trainings. Nearly all the 16 States have introduced regular formal personal and carrier development talks between judges / prosecutors and their immediate superiors (presiding judges / chief judges / senior prosecutors / chief prosecutors). Experience shows that especially a non-negligible quantity of judges see these talks as an infringement with their personal judicial independence. The only way to get rid off this skepticism seems to be to gradually implement the system and to show "by the good example" that it works. An important factor here is the confidentiality of each carrier development talk.	Germany
During seminars is being established a mutual trust relation between lecturers and participants and education situation is being guarded, i.e. each exchange of information and knowledge remains in the training premises.	Serbia
Questionnaires are anonymous.	ERA
By keeping teaching and assessment as separate as possible and making assessment transparent and objective. This allows the trainer to focus fully on the role of coaching and developing the trainee judge. The practical trainer and the core trainer do provide input for assessment ( they are required to complete a number of feedback forms and	The Netherlands

---

evaluation forms every three months for the portfolio.)

There is no practice formed on the measures to avoid potential infringement of the judicial independence yet, as there were no cases evolved so far. Lithuania

We give previous information. Participants know that they have to pass these "online examinations" to finally get the certificate. Spain

---

**15. Who decides on what good learning results (from a trainee's perspective) and suitable training effects (from the training provider's /court's /prosecution service's perspective) are, and on which kind of learning results and training effects are measurable?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
A scientific (educational) council within your training institution	14%	3 (ERA, Serbia, Spain)
The Ministry of Justice	10%	2 (Finland Serbia)
An independent judicial/prosecutorial council elected by peers	10%	2 (Serbia, Estonia)
The organizers of each individual training event	38%	8 (Germany, Sweden, ERA, The Netherlands, Finland, Judicial College England and Wales, Lithuania, Estonia)
Other persons	29%	6 (Germany, Sweden, The Netherlands, Finland, Judicial College England and Wales, Italy)

**16. If your answer is “Other persons”, please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
Directors of Training, Education Advisers, Senior College leaders including the Board.	Judicial College England and Wales
The Members of GJA's Board play an important role here, because they detail-plan the bulk of GJA's training courses.	Germany
The training planner/course director to some extent, but ultimately the director of the Judicial Training Academy.	Sweden
Group of high professional and experienced judges and prosecutors working at SSR (lectoren) but it is not a council like mentioned up; SSR educationalists and jurists; several expert centers within the Judiciary.	The Netherlands
We have so called board of judges for trainings.	Finland
The Board of the School, upon proposal of training sector responsible members.	Italy

**17. What are learning results/outcomes which have been detected as measurable by your country/your training institution?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
Better legal knowledge of the trainee	24%	8 (Germany, Sweden, ERA, The Netherlands, Finland, Serbia, France, Spain)
Better knowledge of the trainee in other fields/disciplines necessary for a judge's /prosecutor's work	24%	8 (Germany, Sweden, ERA, The Netherlands, Finland, Estonia, France, Italy)
Improvement of the trainee's willingness and capacities to take over responsibilities within the organization /unit/team	12%	4 (Germany, Sweden, The Netherlands, Serbia)
Enhancement of the trainee's capacities to cope with changes /new challenges in the working environment	15%	5 (The Netherlands,

		Finland, Serbia, Estonia, Judicial College England and Wales)
Increased productivity (output) of the trainee	15%	5 (Germany, The Netherlands, Finland, Serbia, Italy)
Others	9%	3 (Lithuania, Judicial College England and Wales, ERA)

**18. If your answer is “Others”, please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
Increased judicial skills (judge craft), ability to manage change and to manage judicial case loads, management and leadership skills.	Judicial College England and Wales
Cross-border cooperation by making contacts with colleagues from other Member States.	ERA
Overall benefit/ value of trainings, quality of provided training services (trainers' evaluation), quality of services provided by the training organiser (institution).	Lithuania

**19. What are training effects (going beyond individual learning and behaviour changing) which have been detected as measurable by your country /your training institution?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
Enhancement of productive networking (via fora, etc.) within a given trainees' group	24%	4 (Germany, Spain, Finland, ERA)
Usability of a trainee as a “multiplier” (new trainer) inside the organization	35%	6 (Estonia, Spain, Italy, Finland, The Netherlands, ERA)

Improvement of the workflows in the whole organization	24%	4 (Germany, Serbia, Estonia, Finland)
Higher job satisfaction inside the organization	12%	2 (Italy, Finland)
Others.	6%	1 (Lithuania)

**20. If your answer is “Others” please explain:**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
No evaluation is conducted to measure the above mentioned training effects.	Lithuania

**21. Do you include evaluation and assessment elements in your country’s / your training institution’s training-of-trainers activities?**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Total answers</b>
<b>No</b>	38%	10 (Germany, Slovakia, Judicial Institute of Scotland, ERA, Belgium, Hungary, Judicial Studies Board for Northern Ireland, Portugal, Estonia, Lithuania)
<b>Yes</b>	62%	16 (Finland, Judicial College England and Wales, Slovenia, Romania, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Montenegro, Macedonia, Croatia, France, Bulgaria, Italy, Serbia, Spain, The Netherlands)

**20. If your answer is “Yes”, please explain:<sup>5</sup>**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Country/ Training institut.</b>
Evaluation and methods are part of the teaching of new trainers.	Judicial College England and Wales
The questionnaire to evaluate the event is given out to participants at every venue, organised by JTC.	Slovenia
The evaluation is the same as explained at the beginning of the questionnaire.	Austria
Two types of T-o-T exist in our work. The first one is in the sense of work methodology, education for trainers/lecturers; the second type of T-o-T is related to the specific legal area, where certain experts agree to transfer key amendments of the laws as future lecturers.	Serbia
When a new trainer is recruited the issue of evaluation an assessment is always addressed. The trainer needs to be aware of the fact that every training event/course is evaluated by the participants and by the course manager. It is also important that the trainer is aware of, and in agreement with, the Judicial Training Academy’s strive to offer high quality training in every aspect of training.	Sweden
Internal assessment (presentation) and feedback; we have also training for trainers;	The Netherlands
End of course evaluations Kirkpatrick's model (Level 1 only), feedback from trainers and participants.	Bulgaria
Each trainer has got elaborated results of evaluation of his/her workshop within ten days at the latest. When the training cycle on particular topic is done, the Evaluation department prepares comprehensive report on the quality and achievements of the subject that includes both quantitative and qualitative aspects of evaluation. Final reports on topic are sent to all trainers involved in teaching and designers of the teaching material. Material is also used as training tool for the T-of-T workshops to represent good and poor teaching practise.	Croatia
Evaluation and developing the willingness to be or to become a trainer, skills to use new trainings methods (e-learning, videos etc.), to develop social interaction skills in the training events.	Finland

<sup>5</sup> Montenegro and France didn’t provide the explanation of the answer

The same evaluation form is used as used on the regular events. Macedonia

One of the topics addressed to in the training of trainers' activities is evaluation and assessment of the trainees/of the training process. Romania

It gives us valuable information that we can use for improvement. Norway

Debates of the permanent training team. Spanish Judicial School

In ToT activities, evaluation and assessment are discussed as to methodologies and results; new visions and proposals are collected and put forward to deciders. Italy

**21. All in all, how important do you rank the evaluation and assessment of training processes in your training institution's global training strategy?**

Item	Percentage	Total answers
Key aspect (cornerstone)	15%	4 (Croatia, Portugal, France, Romania)
Very important	73%	19 (Lithuania, Estonia, Judicial Study Board for Northern Ireland, Germany, Slovenia, Hungary, Italy, Judicial College England and Wales, Macedonia, Finland, Montenegro, Bulgaria, ERA, Austria, Judicial Institute for Scotland, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, The Netherlands)
Important	12%	3 (Norway, Belgium,

		Spanish Judicial School)
<b>One aspect among others</b>	0	0
<b>Not important. Please explain</b>	0	0

**22. If your answer is “Not important”, please explain:**

No answers for this question.

**APPENDIX:****List of judiciary training institutions that have been completed the survey**

#	Judiciary Training Institutions
1.	Judicial College England and Wales
2.	Judicial Study Board for Northern Ireland
3.	Supreme Court of Estonia (Judicial Training Department)
4.	ENM
5.	Judicial Training Centre, Slovenia
6.	Austrian Federal Ministry of Justice
7.	Deutsche Richterakademie (German Judicial Academy)
8.	Judicial Academy of the Republic of Serbia
9.	Judicial Institute for Scotland
10.	Judicial Academy of the Slovak Republic
11.	Courts of Sweden Judicial Training Academy
12.	Academy of European Law (ERA)
13.	SSR The Netherlands
14.	National Institute of Justice, Bulgaria
15.	Judicial Academy, Croatia
16.	Judicial Training Centre of Montenegro
17.	Ministry of Justice Finland
18.	Academy for judges and public prosecutors "Pavel Shatev", Republic of Macedonia
19.	Judicial Training Institute of Belgium (IGO-IFJ)
20.	National Institute of Magistracy, Romania
21.	Norwegian Court Administration
22.	Office of the Prosecutor General of Hungary
23.	Centre for Judicial Studies Portugal
24.	National Courts Administration of the Republic of Lithuania
25.	Spanish Judicial School
26.	Italian School for the Judiciary