

# VALUATION BY COURT CLIENTS – THE ROAD TO IMPROVING FUNCTIONING OF COURTS

2010 Research on court functioning evaluation

Overview of conducting research  
and survey results



Research financed by  
**Sorosa fonds – Latvija**

Riga, 2011

## INTRODUCTION

Functioning of a court in Latvia today is evaluated on the basis of statistical data on progress of cases in courts. It is no doubt a substantial quantitative indicator to evaluate court's functioning, however it may not be considered as the only indicator, since it does not provide a complete insight on various aspects of court functioning.

Commonly, results of court functioning are looked at through the prism of quantity of judgments (in various dimensions) without paying attention to human and organizational factors within court proceedings. Those factors are nevertheless a substantial and inalienable part of court procedure. Litigation is a process with judgment as the final result. But before this 'award' parties and their representatives get to 'enjoy' all the other aspects, e.g., visiting the courthouse as an institution, interacting with court staff (chancellery, archives, security etc.), familiarizing with received court documents, awaiting court session in waiting area, etc. Often enough parties to a case, especially individuals from general public who are involved in the court proceedings and interact with judge in a court room gain a far more subjective insight on justice than from the final judgment. Whether or not a person will go to court to settle a dispute depends on the information available on litigation. The moment when a decision "yes" or "no" to court proceedings is taken is the moment when the litigation actually starts.

It is important to widen the list of criteria for determining quality of court functions in Latvia. Court proceedings should be perceived as service to public. And finally, methods should be introduced for regular evaluation of court functioning to measure all aspects of court functioning.

Valuation of different aspects of court functioning can lead to important information needed for improvement of the court functioning, and raise the prestige of judiciary in Latvia. The following criteria are used as quality criteria in European countries, e.g., in Sweden: quality of court judgement, speed of proceedings, quality of service to court clients as well as competency and training of court staff<sup>1</sup>. The Netherlands have identified the following areas of quality: 1) objectivity and integrity of judge, 2) competency of judge, 3) justice in court proceedings/procedure including judge's attitude towards each of the parties, and service to court clients, 4) functioning of objective/just court and equal attitude towards all parties involved, as well as 5) speed of proceedings and whether or not judge keeps to schedule identified early in the beginning of proceedings<sup>2</sup>.

Continuous education is one of many criteria to measure quality of proceedings. It must be used to support both – improvement of the system as a whole and improvement of knowledge and skills of each individual judge and court employee. If continuous education is aimed at facilitating professional growth, it contributes to development of uniform case law and quality of the legal system. In order for continuous education to achieve the goals set a thorough research and evaluation of court functioning is needed.

Latvian Judicial Training Centre<sup>3</sup> (LJTC) has accumulated 15 years of valuable experience on various aspects of court functioning. In 2009 it therefore initiated a widespread discussion on quality of litigation in Latvia. The goal is to facilitate introduction of new criteria and methods to

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluation of the Quality of adjudication in courts of law. Principles and proposed Quality Benchmarks. Quality Project of the Courts in the Jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal of Rovaniemi, Finland. March 2006. 22. – 23. lpp. <http://www.oikeus.fi/uploads/4begub0nj.pdf> Last viewed on 18.03.2011.

<sup>2</sup> Quality of the judicial system in the Netherlands. de Rechtspraak, March 2008. 8. lpp. [http://www.rechtspraak.nl/NR/rdonlyres/1DE71111-240C-4A53-A799-F4477C99FDAC/0/BrochKwaliteit\\_GBFR.pdf](http://www.rechtspraak.nl/NR/rdonlyres/1DE71111-240C-4A53-A799-F4477C99FDAC/0/BrochKwaliteit_GBFR.pdf) Last viewed on 18.03.2011.

<sup>3</sup> Latvian Judicial Training Centre is a foundation that singlehandedly provides continuous education for judges and court staff and does this with the aim to strengthen a lawful state and uniform interpretation of law within the unified legal space of the European Union.

evaluate daily court functioning/operation in Latvia. The aim of the valuation research conducted by LJTC is 1) to compile data needed for valuation and analysis of quality of court functioning from the perspective of their clients and 2) approbate a new quality valuation method of court functioning.

The basis for this research is experience gained by the Council of Judiciary of the Netherlands in the process of evaluating quality of court functioning in the Netherlands. LJTC adjusted the questionnaires for court clients on quality of court functioning to suit Latvian situation. For the purposes of this research 'clients' are people who have had a real contact with court during the time the research was conducted in the end of 2010. Two different types of questionnaires were developed to suit two client target groups: 1) lawyers or sworn advocates (and their assistants), prosecutors and authorized persons, and 2) representatives of general public or anyone who has been involved in a court case and has participated in a court session – a party to case, victim, witness, etc.

Eight Latvian courts participated on voluntary basis: District Courts of Bauska, Saldus, Aizkraukle and Cēsis, Riga City Zemgale District Court, Regional Courts of Riga and Kurzeme, as well as Liepaja Court House of Administrative District Court.

Surveys were one of the activities in project "Quality of Court Proceedings in Latvia" implemented with financial support from Sorosa Fonds - Latvija. Various other activities have been implemented within framework of this project: 1) compilation of experience from other countries on aspects for quality evaluation of judicial proceedings; processes of evaluation, development and implementation; 2) a week-long study visit for four Latvian judges to the Council of Judiciary of the Netherlands on matters of court functioning quality valuation; as well as 3) a state-level conference for persons employed and involved in the judiciary system on aspects of court functioning quality evaluation in Latvia.

The aim of this summary is to provide information on implementation of 2010 Research on court functioning valuation to enable further discussions on implementing valuation methods by application of LTJC's experience.

# MAIN CONCLUSIONS

## 1. Court functioning is valued higher by court clients than the general public

- Factual information on quality of court functioning is compiled through court clients' surveys. The view of general public (which is equally important) is obtained through analysis of common opinion on court functioning.
- Mass media, friends and relatives are the main source of information that forms a person's view. A survey conducted by SKDS<sup>4</sup> shows that approx. 33% of general public trust courts (survey of general public), while the survey by LTJC shows that 79% do trust courts (survey of court clients).
- Both, notions as well as facts about court functioning should be analyzed. Primary attention however should be paid to valuation by court clients, since it gives the biggest contribution to improve court functioning.
- The prestige of court can be elevated, and support can be provided to those working in the judiciary through publishing the data received from client surveys.

## 2. New criteria should be set to evaluate court functioning

- Court functioning is a public service
- Statistical data on speed of proceedings alone cannot be considered a result of court functioning. The following aspects also form the quality of court functioning: courthouse and premises, court documentation, interaction between court staff and clients, activities of judge in courtroom, information available on litigation, etc.
- In order to fully evaluate quality of functioning of courts it is important to find out the opinion and valuation of courts' "users" – the court clients.
- The more regular (approx. once every 3 to 4 years) surveys are conducted in each court, the more useful results of valuation become.
- Data from clients' surveys are important not only from the perspective of overall improvement of court functioning; they are equally important for motivation and support of court staff.

---

<sup>4</sup> Marketing and public opinion research centre

# SURVEYS OF COURT CLIENTS – METHOD OF VALUATION OF COURT FUNCTIONING

## THE AIM OF CONDUCTING SURVEYS

### **1. Determining court clients' opinion on court functioning – a substantial criterion for measuring the quality of litigation**

Statistical data on speed of court proceedings currently used do not provide full picture on the quality of court functioning. It is productivity of court system rather than quality that the statistical data testify about.

If the main focus is set only on analysis of statistical data, the court clients are left without due attention. Statistical data do not show trust in judiciary, satisfaction with court functioning in general, nor do they say anything about quality of court documentation, communication skills of court staff, activities of judge in courtroom or any other aspects of court functioning. Interaction with court continues throughout the process until the result of court proceedings – a judgment is delivered. However quality of this interaction is not evaluated and measured.

Measuring quality of court functioning is a very difficult process, but setting quality criteria is by no means easier task. Even though determining valuation by court clients is an actual practice in European (and the rest of the world's) countries, it cannot be considered as commonly and systematically used method. There are countries that only ask the opinion of general public and/or parties to a case (Finland, Belgium); there are those who consider only the opinion of legal professions – lawyers, prosecutors (Lithuania, Estonia, Portugal). And finally there those who analyze both of the aforementioned groups as well as determine the valuation by clients (Sweden, Austria and the Netherlands, etc.)<sup>5</sup>.

In autumn 2010 European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) published a report on quality management in courts of eight countries of Council of Europe where it was concluded that the standards for quality of court functioning everywhere is the speed of court proceedings as well as client satisfaction<sup>6</sup>. CEPEJ also acknowledged that client satisfaction surveys are the key element for implementing changes in internal quality culture. In beginning of 2010 CEPEJ published a handbook for courts providing guidelines<sup>7</sup> on conducting surveys in order to find out clients' opinion on court functioning. Publication of this handbook indicates that client satisfaction surveys to evaluate quality of litigation are to be further promoted among countries of the Council of Europe.

There are different methods of evaluating court functioning in Europe and the rest of the world, but the opinion of court clients gains weight in improvement court functioning.

---

<sup>5</sup> European judicial systems. Edition 2010 (data 2008): Efficiency and quality of justice European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ). Chapter 4. Users of the courts: rights and public confidence.

<sup>6</sup> Quality management in courts and in the judicial organizations in 8 Council of Europe member states. CEPEJ. September 2010. 4. lpp.

<https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=1716655&SecMode=1&DocId=1666264&Usage=2> Pēdējo reizi skatīts 18.03.2011.

<sup>7</sup> Conducting satisfaction surveys of court users in Council of Europe member countries. CEPEJ. February 2010.

[https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CEPEJ\(2010\)1&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&BackColorInternet=DBDCF2&BackColorIntranet=FDC864&BackColorLogged=FDC864](https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CEPEJ(2010)1&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=original&BackColorInternet=DBDCF2&BackColorIntranet=FDC864&BackColorLogged=FDC864) Pēdējo reizi skatīts 18.03.2011

## **2. Appropriate court client's surveys as a method and share experience with developers of court policy.**

LJTC provides continuous education to judges and court staff for already 15 years, yet still maintaining a status of a non-governmental organization (NGO). During the last year LTJC has facilitated discussions on quality of litigation in Latvia: elements involved and measuring possibilities. By attracting additional financing LJTC is willing to create a practical contribution in development of quality measurement methods. Raising the discussion on importance of court client's opinion in valuation of court functioning, LJTC decided to appropriate court clients' surveys as a method.

While analyzing experience of other countries in measuring quality of litigation, LJTC found a possibility to organize a study visit for four Latvian judges to the Judicial Council of the Netherlands. The main aim of this visit was to get an insight into experience of the Judicial Council, as well as to get some recommendations on how to continue discussions on quality of litigation in Latvia more successfully.

When conducting the court clients' survey LJTC used experience of the Judicial Council of the Netherlands both with respect to content and methodology of questionnaires.

LJTC gives an opportunity for developers of the policy of judiciary to discuss the surveys' positive aspects and necessary improvements, as well as its future within the framework of valuation of court functioning. Thus LJTC gives its contribution as an NGO to the development of the judiciary.

## **3. Obtain facts on court functioning**

Latvia has good examples of receiving the opinion of court clients. For instance, in 2002 there was a survey of court visitors conducted by "Latvijas fakti"<sup>8</sup>. In it 200 court visitors who had had a contact with eight Latvian courts in September 2002 were surveyed. The survey provided data that were attributed to all courts in Latvia.

In years 2007 to 2008 once every three months the Court Administration with the assistance from Marketing and public opinion research centre SKDS researched questions on confidence of general public in the judiciary as well as about main sources of information that provide insight on court functioning to general public. In these surveys the trust in judiciary is extremely low. On average 33% of the respondents indicated that they are more likely to trust or completely trust courts. The largest part or 55.3% indicated that they get their information from mass media or 17.2% from their relatives or friends who have been in contact with a court. Only 7.8% have had a real contact with court<sup>9</sup>!

When reading this kind of data the judiciary can get an idea of the existing view in general public, but not about what the court clients who have actually had a contact with a court think.

Without clarifying the view of court clients on court functioning, an opinion that it is impossible to trust a court and that it does a bad job is cultivated. However, conclusions like that are based on prejudices rather than facts.

---

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.tm.gov.lv/lv/documents/petijumi/430\\_Tiesu\\_apmekletaju\\_aptauja.doc](http://www.tm.gov.lv/lv/documents/petijumi/430_Tiesu_apmekletaju_aptauja.doc) Last viewed on 18.03.2011

<sup>9</sup> „Society's attitude towards courts”. Survey of Latvian inhabitants. June, 2008 by SKDS. <http://www.ta.gov.lv/index.php/lv/29/390/index.html> Last time viewed on 18.03.2011

For example in LJTC's 2010 Research on Evaluation of Court Functioning 79% of representatives of general public as well as 74% of lawyers have expressed their trust judiciary. Since the survey was held in courts it involved only those who have had a real contact with court functioning.

#### **4. Prove the usefulness of surveys in cases of individual courts**

Experience from the Netherlands and other countries (Sweden, Finland) shows that data received as a result of a survey become more useful if they are about individual courts. Therefore it is important to conduct surveys in each individual court. By using the data each court can introduce improvements in functioning of their court. For instance, data on quality of work of court staff, timely commencement of court session, etc., are important to each individual court. Results from surveys are substantial for both getting information on necessary improvements as well as for getting proof that there are other aspects functioning well, and providing full satisfaction to clients. The data can be used to support and motivate court staff.

In the LJTC research eight courts gained valuation and reports on functioning of their individual court.

LJTC provides general data on courts for discussion, but individual results are known to respective chairpersons of the eight relevant courts.

#### **5. Obtain information for developing skill workshops in LJTC**

Surveys contain questions on aspects of court functioning and work done by court staff which can be improved through continuous education workshops provided by LJTC. For instance interaction between court staff and court clients, judge's activities in the court room, the role of judge, etc.

LJTC's 2011 Curriculum includes workshops such as "Skills of chairing court proceedings", "Public speaking", "Role and ethics of a judge", "Interacting with difficult clients". Data from surveys have been used to prove tendencies and areas in the field of competency of a judge and court staff that should be improved in the aforementioned workshops.

## CONDUCTING THE SURVEYS

Using the experience of the Judicial Council of the Netherlands and adjusting questionnaires that the Council kindly allowed to use to suit the needs of Latvia, the following research methodology was developed. Research was conducted by LJTC with the assistance of marketing and social research agency “Fieldex” for development of a research methodology and questionnaires, organization and management of field activities, data processing and analysis, as well as to prepare the final report.

### *Selection of courts*

Courts signed up for surveys voluntarily. An invitation to participate in client surveys was sent out to all chairpersons of regional and district courts. Eight Latvian courts answered this invitation: District Courts of Bauska, Saldus, Aizkraukle and Cēsis, Riga City Zemgale District Court, Regional Courts of Riga and Kurzeme, as well as Liepaja Court House of Administrative District Court.

### *Categorization of court clients*

Court clients were divided into two groups: representatives of general public and lawyers.

Representatives of general public: anyone who is involved in a case and has participated in court proceedings as any of the parties, a victim, witness or the likes.

Lawyers: sworn advocates (and assistants), prosecutors and authorised persons.

This categorization allows to divide those who have a thorough knowledge on court proceedings from those who most likely have once in a lifetime contact with a court.

LJTC is still working on analysis of the third category - inner clients who are the judges themselves and court staff.

### *Types of surveys and distribution thereof*

Representatives from the general public had access to printed questionnaires in Latvian and Russian languages. Posters were put up to attract attention to the opportunity of expressing one's view. In order to guarantee total anonymity of survey, the filled questionnaires were to be put in “survey boxes”.

A form to be filled in electronically was developed for lawyers and it was distributed through General Prosecutor's office, Sworn Advocates bar association as well as publication in professional magazine “Jurista vārds”.

### *Content of the survey*

After analyzing experience of the Netherlands and other countries, the survey included questions on the following areas:

- evaluation of courthouses and premises,
- evaluation of court documentation,
- work done by court staff,
- work done by judge in court room,
- valuation of the judgment (only to lawyers).

The survey had some additional general questions on trust in the judiciary and satisfaction with the court functioning in general.

A substantial aspect of quality of court proceedings is the information available on litigation and courts in general. Even though the Judicial Council of the Netherlands does consider this aspect as a quality criterion, LJTC did not include questions on this topic to avoid the questionnaire being too



long. The question on availability of general information should be raised when (if) this kind of survey is to be repeated.

### ***Amount of questionnaires***

Since there are no data on how many court clients have repeated contact with a court, for instance, within a year, it was hard to determine the amount of printed forms that each court would need to “collect” to get a result that can be trusted.

SIA “Fieldex” who was in charge of practical implementation of the survey determined that each court would need to collect 100 forms. During the process of conducting the survey a decision was taken to analyze data on courts that have collected only 30 forms. There was one court that did not collect the minimum amount necessary to qualify for a separate analysis, but they were included in the general analysis.

### ***Costs of the survey***

The total costs of survey amounted to EUR 3920.00. This included the following: production of posters and survey boxes (design and printing expenses), development and multiplication of questionnaires, courier services for distribution of questionnaire forms in courts. Expenses do not include wages of LJTC employees.

# RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

## METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY

Goal of the research:	To obtain data that allows evaluation and analysis of quality of court functioning from the point of view of its clients
Tasks of the research:	Obtaining data on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) trust in Latvian judiciary in general,</li> <li>2) satisfaction with functioning of courts in general,</li> <li>3) detailed evaluation of court functioning,</li> <li>4) detailed evaluation of courthouse and premises,</li> <li>5) detailed evaluation of court documents,</li> <li>6) detailed evaluation of work done by court staff,</li> <li>7) detailed evaluation of work done by judges,</li> <li>8) evaluation of court judgements (only to lawyers),</li> <li>9) and recommendations of court clients on improvement of court functioning.</li> </ol>

	Survey for general public	Survey for lawyers
Time for conducting the survey:	November – December 2010	January 2011
General target audience of the survey:	Court clients	Prosecutors, sworn advocates and lawyers
Respondents:	Court clients who were attending court sessions at courts where the survey was conducted.	Prosecutors, sworn advocates and lawyers
Total amount of selection:	520 respondents	159 respondents
Principle of selection:	Selection made randomly	Self-selection
Method of survey:	Forms to be filled in by oneself	Forms to be filled in by oneself

Research task group:	<p>Inese Avota, LJTC – development of methodology and questionnaire</p> <p>Gints Klāsons, „Fieldex” – development of research methodology, questionnaire, processing and analysis of survey data, preparation of final report</p> <p>Guna Spurava, „Fieldex” – organization and management of field tasks</p>
----------------------	---

## SUMMARY<sup>10</sup>

### *General public*

- ✓ The majority of survey participants state that they trust the judiciary of Latvia in general- 53% say that they are more likely to trust and 26% say that they trust completely. Meanwhile a considerable amount of negative valuation was also received – 13% say they are less likely to trust the judiciary and 6% say they don't trust at all.
- ✓ Also the indicators on satisfaction with functioning of courts are rather positive – 49% have said that they are more likely to be satisfied and 32% more are completely satisfied. But also in this respect there was a considerable amount of negative valuations– almost 1/5 of the survey participants valued that they are less likely or absolutely unsatisfied.
- ✓ When analyzing functioning of a court in more detail clients who took part in the survey gave rather positive valuations. The most positive reviews were awarded to attitude of court staff towards court clients (87% said it was very good or good), job done by court staff in general (83%) and court documents (82%). Positive responses with regard to all other aspects of evaluations were also substantially high – over 70%.
- ✓ Valuations of courthouses and premises were ambiguous – some aspects were evaluated extremely high, while others – extremely low. The most positive responses were with regards to possibility to find a court house (95% agreed it was easy), adequateness of working hours of the court chancellery (86%), possibility to find court chancellery in the courthouse (85%) and possibility to find the needed court room (85%). The lowest results were however with regard to following aspects: having privacy in waiting area (only 38% agreed with that) and satisfactory parking possibilities nearby courthouse (45%).
- ✓ A very positive responses in regard to all three aspects gained evaluation of court documents – 88% agreed, that documents received from courts were easy to understand, 86% agreed that documents were received in due time, but 79% agreed that the text of a decision made sense.
- ✓ When valuating job done by the court staff the highest marks were awarded to kindness of the court staff (89% agreed) and responsiveness (87% agreed). The majority also agreed that they have received all the answers to their questions (81%) and that the court staff was interested in helping (76%).
- ✓ When analyzing the work done by judge in various aspects, most of the answers were positive. The highest marks were awarded to the following aspects: judge explains the agenda of proceedings (88% agreed), judge reports on circumstances of the case (87%), directions given by judge are clear and make sense to parties of the case (84%); judge comes prepared to session (84%). Considerably less positive answers were provided with regards to aspects such as empathy of a judge (65% agreed) and that judge explains what happens to the case after court session (68%).

---

<sup>10</sup> Information copied from SIA „Fieldex” report on final results of research „2010 Research on Court Functioning Valuation: Survey of court clients” and „2010 Research on Court Functioning Valuation: Survey of Prosecutors, Sworn advocates and lawyers”.

## *Lawyers*

- ✓ Majority of survey participants indicated that they trust Latvian judiciary in general. 66% mentioned that they are more likely to trust, while 8% said they trusted completely. Meanwhile there is a substantial part of those who said that they are less likely to trust or don't trust Latvian judiciary at all (23% and 3% respectively).
- ✓ Satisfaction with functioning of courts in general is on average less positively evaluated than trust in the judiciary in general. The majority – 59% have indicated that they are not satisfied with the functioning of courts while a large portion of survey participants – 42% said they were less satisfied or absolutely unsatisfied.
- ✓ Those who indicated that they are unsatisfied with the functioning of courts were asked to give detailed reasons. 46% said that due dates are not followed and court proceedings are lengthy and slow. 40% mentioned that they have encountered incompetency, bad quality of work and lack of discipline in courts.
- ✓ When analyzing court functioning in more detail the highest marks were awarded to court documents (81% valued them as good and very good), availability of information on court proceedings (67%) and the job court staff does in general (63%). Marks below satisfactory were usually given with regard to two aspects of court functioning – 51% of survey participants showed mediocre, low or extremely low satisfaction with administration of cases in courts, while 52% gave negative feedback on job that the judges do.
- ✓ In all categories of valuation court staff received only positive valuation – the positive share of opinion was usually more than 50%. Kindness of court staff was the area that was evaluated with the highest marks (82% agreed), followed by availability on information about case materials in court (80% agreed) and possibility to contact court staff over phone (78%). However a rather low valuation was usually expressed in regard to following areas: 35% don't agree that court session starts at the planned time, 40% don't agree that court staff is interested to help and 30% don't agree that it is easy to agree on use of procedural rights outside of court session.
- ✓ The absolute majority of survey participants agreed that it was easy to find court chancellery in the courthouse (84%), that security checks in courthouses are adequate (81%) and that information on practical solutions is available at court premises (80%). Meanwhile negative evaluation was given mostly on possibility to park a car nearby a courthouse (63% are unsatisfied with the current possibilities) and on whether privacy is ensured in waiting areas (65% think that it is not ensured).
- ✓ Positive feedback is given to court documents. The highest marks were awarded to how easy the documents are to understand (91% agreed that documents received from court make sense), while the most negative evaluation in comparison was about clarity and sense of court argumentation (36% of negative evaluations).
- ✓ The job that judges do was valued extremely positively. Respondents usually agreed that judge reports on situation in case (94%), explains the agenda of court session (85%), as well as indicates that the attitude of a judge towards respondent is correct and kind (80%). The worst evaluations were usually with regard to two aspects: 46% are of the opinion that when chairing the session, judge disregards feelings and emotions of the parties and participants, while 53% think that judge has no empathy.
- ✓ Results on quality of court decisions were ambiguous – positive in some aspects while extremely negative in others. The best evaluation was given the possibility to receive minutes from a court session (85% agree), as well as comprehensibility and “readability” of court decisions (71% agrees). More than 30% of respondents indicated a negative valuation on other aspects in the questionnaire. The highest amount of negative votes was received with regard to two aspects: 61% thought that a uniform case law is not observed, while 66% think that the speed of proceedings is unsatisfactory.

- ✓ At the end of the questionnaire respondents were asked to list their recommendations for improvement of functioning of courts. Majority of respondents – 57% did not indicate any recommendation (which however does not mean that they are fully satisfied). Meanwhile from recommendations that were actually listed none particular can be indicated as used frequently. 8% thought it was important to improve the quality of job the judges do, communication among parties involved in a case as well as court management matters in general.

## **NECESSARY IMPROVEMENTS**

### ***General public***

#### ***The following areas received mediocre, low and extremely low valuations:***

1. I am satisfied with possibilities for parking nearby a courthouse (41% disagree)
2. Privacy is ensured in waiting areas (36% disagree)
3. Courthouse is accessible to people of age and with special needs (34% disagree)
4. Availability of information on litigation as such (24% are not satisfied)
5. Availability of information of court proceedings (22% are not satisfied)
6. There is sufficient amount of signs and indications in court house to find everything (22% disagree)
7. Court sessions start on the time set beforehand (18% disagree)
8. Judge is sympathetic (17% disagree)
9. In general I feel that the court is just (16% disagree)
10. Judge explained what will happen to the case after session (14% disagree)

### ***Lawyers***

#### ***The following areas received mediocre, low and extremely low valuations:***

1. I am satisfied with the total time of case proceedings (66% disagree)
2. Privacy is ensured in waiting area (65% disagree)
3. I am satisfied with possibilities to park a car nearby a courthouse (63% disagree)
4. Uniform case law is observed (61% disagree)
5. Judge is sympathetic (53% disagree)
6. When chairing a court session, the judge has due regard to feelings and emotions of all parties to the case (46% disagree)
7. Minutes of a court session are accurate (46% disagree)
8. Court staff is interested in helping me (40% disagree)
9. Argumentation of a court judgment is good enough for me to explain it to my client (39% disagree)
10. Judge has equal attitude towards both parties (36% disagree)
11. Court session starts at the time set beforehand (35% disagree)
12. Judge comes to court session prepared (35% disagree)
13. Judge is impartial towards both parties (34% disagree)

14. Judge's attitude towards court clients is correct and kind (31% disagree)
15. I have received all the answers to my questions from the court staff (31% disagree)
16. It is easy to agree on use of procedural rights outside of court session (30% disagree)
17. Time allocated for a court session is enough to review the case fully (29% disagree)
18. Court decision makes sense and written in a reader-friendly manner ("readable") (29% disagree)
19. Information is available on court session that has been postponed (28% disagree)
20. Judge is competent (27% disagree)
21. Court staff are happy to help (27% disagree)

**Questionnaire for general public****2010 QUESTIONNAIRE ON VALUATION OF COURT FUNCTIONING****Dear Court Client!**

We, the Latvian Judicial Training Centre, would like to ask for your opinion on quality of functioning of courts. Your valuation and recommendations are necessary to improve the service provided by courts to general public. We are interested in your opinion about court chancellery staff, judges' activities during court session, as well as on quality of information available in courts, and comfort when using court house. Please, take 10 minutes of your time to answer to questions in this form. Drop the filled-in questionnaire in a survey box that is situated in the court chancellery.

We guarantee confidentiality of your answers, and that the information you will provide will be used only together with other opinions!

**Thank you for your help/responsiveness and participation!**

Q1	<b>How often do you visit this court on average?</b>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> First time today	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a week or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a month or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once in 6 months or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a year	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than once a year
Q2	<b>In what kind of case did you participate today?</b>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Civil law case	<input type="checkbox"/> Criminal law case	<input type="checkbox"/> Case on administrative breach		<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative law case	
Q3	<b>In what status did you participate?</b>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> A party to a case	<input type="checkbox"/> Victim	<input type="checkbox"/> Witness		<input type="checkbox"/> Other (write): .....	
Q4	<b>How much do you trust in Latvian judiciary in general?</b>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Absolutely	<input type="checkbox"/> More likely to trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Less likely to trust		<input type="checkbox"/> Don't trust at all	
Q5	<b>How satisfied are you with functioning of the court in general?</b>					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Absolutely satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/> More satisfied than not	<input type="checkbox"/> More unsatisfied than satisfied		<input type="checkbox"/> Completely unsatisfied	
Q6	<b>If you said you were unsatisfied with functioning of the court, please give your reasons?</b>					
	..... .....					
Q7	<b>How would you value court's functioning with regard to the following aspects?</b>					
	<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Very good	Good	Mediocre	Bad	Very bad
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Courthouse in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Session rooms in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Court documents (summons, letters)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Availability of information on litigation in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Judges' activities in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Court staff functioning in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	Availability of information on court proceedings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	Attitude of court staff towards court clients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q8	<b>How much do you agree with these expressions on courthouse and premises?</b>					
	<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Completely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don't know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Courthouse is easy to find	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Courthouse is accessible to people of age and with special needs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	I am satisfied with possibilities to park a car nearby the courthouse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Security checks at the court house are kind and correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Chancellery is easy to find	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Working hours of chancellery are adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	It was easy to find my session room	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	There are enough signs to find everything	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09	Waiting areas ensure privacy (for example, the victim does not have to meet the offender)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>11</sup> Information copied from SIA „Fieldex” report on final results of research „2010 Research on Court Functioning Valuation: Survey of court clients” and „2010 Research on Court Functioning Valuation: Survey of Prosecutors, Sworn advocates and lawyers”.

<b>Q9 How much do you agree with these expressions on court documents?</b>						
	<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Complet ely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don' t know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	I received documents sent by court (summons, letters, etc.) in due time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Documents sent by court were easy to understand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Decision (judgment) was easy to understand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q10 How much do you agree with these expressions on functioning of court staff?</b>						
	<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Complet ely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don' t know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Court staff is easy to contact over the phone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Court staff is kind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Court staff is helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	I received answers to all my questions from court staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Court staff is interested in helping me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Court session started at the time it was supposed to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q11 How much do you agree with these expressions on judge's activities?</b>						
	<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>	Complet ely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don' t know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Judge explains agenda of the session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Judge comes prepared for the session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Judge reports on the situation of the case	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Judge is impartial towards both parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Judge's attitude towards both parties is equal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Judge is competent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	Judge understands circumstances of the case	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	Judge talks in plain language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09	Judge is sympathetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Judge listens to different opinions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Directions given by judge to parties of case are clear and make sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Basis of court judgement is clear and makes sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Judge explains the court decision and consequences thereof	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Judge explained how the case is going to be treated after session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	In general I believe the court is just	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q12 If you have any recommendations on improving functioning of courts (including courthouse, session rooms, court staff and judge's activities), please write them here:</b>	
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>	

**In conclusion, please provide some details about yourself.**

<b>D1</b>	<b>What is your age?</b>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; padding: 2px 10px;">  __   __  </div> full years
<b>D2</b>	<b>What is your educational level?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Primary school or unfinished primary education <input type="checkbox"/> Elementary education <input type="checkbox"/> Unfinished high-school <input type="checkbox"/> High-school or vocational school <input type="checkbox"/> Unfinished university degree <input type="checkbox"/> University degree

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!**  
Please, put the form in survey box situated in the court chancellery or main hall.



# Questionnaire for lawyers

## 2010 QUESTIONNAIRE ON EVALUATION OF COURT FUNCTIONING (for prosecutors, sworn advocates and lawyers)

### Dear Respondent!

We, Latvian Judicial Training Centre, would like to ask for your opinion on quality of functioning of courts. Your valuation and recommendations are necessary to improve the service provided by courts to you and general public. We are interested in your opinion about court chancellery staff, judge's activities during court session, quality of information and documents provided by courts, and comfort when using court house. Please, take 10 minutes of your time to answer to questions in this form.

We guarantee confidentiality of your answers, and that the information you will provide will be used only together with other opinions!

### Thank you for your responsiveness and participation!

**WE URGE YOU TO ANSWER TO QUESTIONS IN THIS FORM WHILE RECALLING THE COURT YOU ATTENDED THE LAST COURT SESSION AT.**

Q1	Please, provide the title of the court _____					
Q2	How often do you attend this court?					
	<input type="checkbox"/> First time today	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a week or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a month or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once in 6 months or more	<input type="checkbox"/> Once a year	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than once a year					
Q3	In what kind of case did you participate today?					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Civil law case	<input type="checkbox"/> Criminal law case	<input type="checkbox"/> Case on administrative breach		<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative law case	
Q4	In what status did you participate?					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Advocate (sworn advocate, assistant advocate)	<input type="checkbox"/> Prosecutor	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorized person			
Q5	How much do you trust in Latvian judiciary in general?					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Absolutely	<input type="checkbox"/> More likely to trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Less likely to trust	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't trust at all		
Q6	How satisfied are you with functioning of the court in general?					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Absolutely satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/> More satisfied than not	<input type="checkbox"/> More unsatisfied than satisfied	<input type="checkbox"/> Completely unsatisfied		
Q7	If you said you were unsatisfied with functioning of the court, please give your reasons? .....					
Q8	How would you value court functioning in respect of the following?					
	Choose only one answer in each line!	Very good	Good	Mediocr e	Bad	Very bad
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Procedural documents prepared by court (summons, letters)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Activities of judges'	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Functioning of court staff in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Overall satisfaction with management of the case proceedings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Availability of information on court proceedings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Attitude of court staff towards visitors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q9	How much do you agree with these expressions on functioning of court staff?					
	Choose only one answer in each line!	Completel y agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don' t know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Court staff is easy to be contacted over the phone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Court staff is kind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Court staff is helpful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	I got answers to all my questions from court staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Court staff is interested in helping me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Court session started when it was set beforehand	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	It is easy to agree on court session dates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	It is easy to agree on use of procedural rights outside of court session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09	Procedures are unified within one court (for instance, receiving a case materials from archive)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Court staff answers my requests in timely manner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Information is available on materials in case	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Information is available on a court session that is postponed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q10	How much do you agree with these expressions on court house and premises?					
	Choose only one answer in each line!	Comple tely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don' t know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Information on practical matters is available in court (receiving copies, payment methods etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	I am satisfied with parking possibilities nearby courthouse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

03	Security checks in court house are adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	It is easy to find chancellery in court house	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	There are enough signs to find everything	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Privacy is ensured in waiting area (for example, the victim does not have to meet the offender)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q11 How much do you agree with these expressions on court documents?</b>						
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>		Completely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don't know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	I received documents sent by court (summons, letters etc.) in due time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Documents sent by court made sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Decisions (judgments) made sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Documents were prepared in accordance with grammar laws	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Argumentation of the judgment is clear and makes sense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q12 How much do you agree with these expressions on judge's activities?</b>						
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!!</i>		Completely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don't know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	Judge explains the agenda of session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Judge reports on circumstances of case	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Judge observes time limits allocated to session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Judge is a skilful chair of the session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Judge comes prepared to session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	Judge listens to different opinions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	Judge is sympathetic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	Judge is competent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
09	Judge's attitude towards court clients are correct and kind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Judge's attitude towards yourself was correct and kind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Judge is impartial in respect to both parties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Judge's attitude towards both parties are equal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	When chairing the session, judge duly considers feelings and emotions of participants to a case (including those of victims)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Time allocated for a session is enough for a review in full	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Q13 How much do you agree with these expressions on court judgement?</b>						
<i>Choose only one answer in each line!</i>		Completely agree	Likely to agree	Not likely to agree	Don't agree	Hard to say/don't know
		1	2	3	4	5
01	I am satisfied with speed of court proceedings in general	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
02	Court decision makes sense and is reader-friendly ("readable").	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Minutes of court session are available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Minutes of court session are accurate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Basis of a court decision makes sense and I am able to explain it to my client	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
06	A uniform case law is observed – similar decisions in similar cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	In general I believe that the court is just	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q14	<b>If you have any recommendations on improving functioning of courts (including courthouse, session rooms, court staff and judge's activities), please write them here:</b>					
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>					

**In conclusion, please provide some details about yourself.**

D1	What is your age?	_ _  full years			
D2	What is your record of service?	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: flex-end; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: right; padding-right: 10px;"> Up to 1 year 1-3 years 3 – 6 years 7-10 years More than 10 years </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> 1 2 3 4 5 </div> </div>			

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!**