

Medium- to long-term evaluation of judicial training

December 2023



With financial support from the Justice
Programme of the European Union



EDITOR: Marco Fabri

EDITORIAL BOARD: Petros Alikakos, Gianluca Grasso, Eva Krejčová, Anastasia Patta,
Pedro Raposo de Figueiredo, and Arno Vinković

AUTHORS: Marco Fabri, Ivanka Kirilova, Katarzyna Krysiak, Otilia Pacurari, Pedro Raposo de
Figueiredo, and Arno Vinković

ISBN NUMBER - 9789464944471

All the texts and materials included in this *Handbook on Medium- to long-term evaluation of judicial training*, except where otherwise stated, are the exclusive Property of the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN).

Absolutely no reproduction of the contents of *Handbook on Medium- to long-term evaluation of judicial training*, in whole or in part, may be made without the express written permission of EJTN.

This excludes sale or any other use in conjunction with a commercial purpose. Any public legal use or reference to the *Handbook on Medium- to long-term evaluation of judicial training* should be accompanied by an acknowledgment of EJTN as the source and by a mention of the author of the text referred to.

EJTN is grateful to the individuals who have contributed to this publication.

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the European Judicial Training Network and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.




With financial support from the Justice
Programme of the European Union

Table of Contents

Foreward of the Secretary General	4
Introduction	6
The evaluation of training activities	8
Kirkpatrick Level 1 evaluation: reaction	12
Kirkpatrick Level 2 evaluation: learning	15
Kirkpatrick Level 3 evaluation: behaviour change	20
The Italian School for the Judiciary – Case Study	22
Concluding remarks	26
Appendix 1	
Research report. The medium- to long-term evaluation of the initial and continuous training courses organised by the Italian School for the Judiciary	29
Appendix 2	
Examples of questions that may be used in a questionnaire, in interviews, in a focus group to evaluate training activities ‘over time’	43
Appendix 3	
Example of a Level 3 form from the Kirkpatrick PILOT EJTN 6-month Cybercrime and E-Evidence II (advanced) Training	45
References	48

Foreward of the Secretary General

Dear readers,



**Judge Ingrid
DERVEAUX**

Secretary General
European Judicial
Training Network
(EJTN)

It is with great pleasure and pride that I present to you the EJTN Handbook *Medium to long-term evaluation of judicial training*, a significant contribution to our ongoing efforts in enhancing the judicial training programs across Europe. As Secretary General of the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), I am honoured to introduce this comprehensive guide, which embodies our commitment to promoting excellence within the judicial profession.

EJTN's mission is to foster a culture of continuous improvement and excellence in judicial training. One of the pillars of this mission is the establishment of a robust framework for evaluating the effectiveness of our training programs. Evaluation, in its many dimensions, is crucial for ensuring the relevance and quality of the initial and continuous judicial training. This handbook represents a significant milestone in that endeavour. It reflects the dedication, expertise and collaborative spirit of the members of the Judicial Training Methods Working Group, who have worked on this project. I extend my gratitude to the chief editor, Mr Marco Fabri, the authors and the editorial board, who have contributed with their knowledge, insight and experience to make this publication a reality.

In the pages that follow, you will find practical tools and best practices to support mid- to long-term evaluation in judicial training. Whether you are a confirmed professional or just starting your career in judicial training, this handbook will be useful and supplements other Handbooks on judicial training methodology published by EJTN.

I encourage EJTN members, Activity Coordinators, trainers and colleagues in the judicial community to read this publication with an open mind, apply its principles in their judicial activities and share their experiences with their peers. The power of evaluation lies not just in the knowledge it imparts, but in its ability to inspire meaningful change and innovation in our profession.

In conclusion, let us remember that evaluation is not just a process; it is a catalyst for progress. As we navigate through the complex landscape of judicial training, we need adequate tools to evaluate it so as to be able to learn and grow. I therefore hope that this handbook will serve as an enduring resource for years to come.

Sincerely,

Judge Ingrid Derveaux

Secretary General European Judicial Training Network (EJTN)

A stylized, handwritten signature in white ink, consisting of a large, loopy 'D' followed by a horizontal line and a small flourish.

Introduction

The objective of this document is to provide some guidance when evaluating training activity with particular reference to Level 2 and 3 of the so-called Kirkpatrick model or method. This work is not meant to be an ‘essay’ on training evaluation methods, but is supposed to be useful for the judicial training institutions that are approaching the evaluation of their training activities, thanks to suggestions and practicalities to be used in the judicial context.

A training activity is any organized activity supported by a set of resources to achieve specific and intended results after the training. Evaluation enables the systematic collection of information on these activities to analyse and to ‘measure’ the extent to which the training has reached the intended training objectives, and to improve future activities based on the data collected and informed decisions. Evaluation is a fundamental step in ensuring quality training and is an important component of the training activities; using the words of the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), ‘Evaluation is an essential part of a systematic approach to training’.¹

As stated on page 67 of the 2016 EJTN *Handbook on Judicial Training Methodology in Europe*, ‘The concept of evaluation has a wide range of definitions. However, in everyday practice, the theory of assessment and evaluation is meaningful only if something is being done with the results obtained by the participants,² and the training institution. If there is no follow-up and no improvement, evaluation is sterile and useless.’

¹ EJTN, *Guidelines for Evaluation of judicial Training Practices*, 2017.

² Please note that ‘participant’ means a learner of a training event.

The evaluation is a time-consuming and difficult exercise where ‘the central driver is not the concept of evaluation, but the professionals who design, apply and use evaluation results [...] a needs-oriented approach allows our training institutions to be closer to practice and practitioners in the judiciary’.³

Training activities are not valuable per se – ‘even the most well-designed and well-received training programs are of little use unless what is learned in training gets implemented on the job. This is often called the transfer of learning to behaviour. If what was learned translates into improved job performance, then it is possible for better organizational results to be achieved. If training evaluation shows that on-the-job performance increased and results improved, then training effectiveness has occurred.’⁴

The EJTN Working Group Judicial Training Methods (WG-JTM) published the *Guidelines for Evaluation of Judicial Training practices* in 2017. The document explores the applicability of the Kirkpatrick model and contains some useful tools and recommendations for its application in the judicial context.

This document is a development of the 2017 Guidelines. It is organized into four main sections, the concluding remarks, and appendices. The first section briefly deals with the Kirkpatrick model and the factors that may be considered when the Kirkpatrick levels of evaluation are adopted. Section two briefly introduces the first level of evaluation, the so-called ‘reaction’, to give a comprehensive approach to evaluation. The third section focuses on Kirkpatrick Level 2: evaluation of learning. Section four addresses level three of the Kirkpatrick proposal: the change of behaviour at work. These last two sections will also benefit from the findings of a study conducted by the Italian School for the Judiciary and the Italian National Research Council (the Bologna branch of the Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems CNR-IGSG-BO) which is supposed to be the first empirical study that attempted to test the Kirkpatrick method in the judiciary training context. The fourth section summarizes this study.

The concluding remarks address the pros and cons of the theoretical framework proposed by Kirkpatrick, also using the test conducted by the Italian case study. The appendices are meant to be useful tools. The first is the questionnaire used in the Italian experience. The second is a list of questions that may be used in the evaluation exercise and the third is a practical example used by EJTN in the evaluation of a course.

³ EJTN, *Handbook*, 2016, p. 67.

⁴ Kirkpatrick J. and W.K. Kirkpatrick, *An introduction to the new Kirkpatrick Model*, Kirkpatrick Partners, 2021, p.2.

The evaluation of training activities

The EJTN decided to use and propose to the European training institutions the adoption of the so-called Kirkpatrick training evaluation model, which entails four levels of evaluation.

Level 1 is about the immediate evaluation of the course and the lecturers (the so-called ‘reaction’). Level 2 of the evaluation aims to measure whether the course enabled new competences, skills, and attitudes to be acquired (so-called ‘learning’). Level 3 aims to assess if and to what extent training participants apply what they learned during the training when they are back in their courts or prosecutors’ office (so-called ‘behaviour’). The objective of Level 4 is to measure the overall results after the training activity (‘results’). ‘By analysing each of these four levels, a thorough understanding can be gained of how effective the training was, i.e. if it met the objectives and goals set, and how it can be improved in the future’.⁵

Please note that Level 4 of the Kirkpatrick evaluation (‘results’) is outside the scope of this document.

It is also important to emphasize that ‘Kirkpatrick’s model is great for trying to evaluate training in a “scientific” way. This is why it is useful only if it is considered as a model to devise an evaluation methodology with specific objectives and results built in.’⁶

⁵ [EJTN, Handbook, 2016, p. 68.](#)

⁶ [EJTN, Handbook, 2016, p. 72.](#)

Therefore, the Kirkpatrick method is a basic proposal to be tested and then adapted to the different contexts.⁷

The tools used to collect data for the evaluation are: questionnaires/surveys, self or group evaluation, flip charts, debriefing, focus groups, individual interviews, activity reports, peer review, intervision, action plans, observations, evaluation by external or internal experts, supervision assessment, superior assessment and observation of activities before and after the course.

Each level of evaluation has its own preferred tools. The choice depends on the resources available, the number of participants at the courses to be evaluated and, equally important, the scope of the evaluation.

The table below has been slightly amended from the 2016 *EJTN Handbook on Judicial Training Methods* (p. 72) and gives an overview of the four levels of the Kirkpatrick model and the related proposed tools that could better fit that level of evaluation.

Table 1
The basic Kirkpatrick model at a glance

LEVEL	WHAT is being measured?	WHY?	HOW?
1	Reaction Evaluation of the reaction is about the perception of the participants after the training.	The degree of satisfaction of the participants straight after the training provides information about the immediate appreciation of the content and the methods used during the training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaires. • Feedback forms. • Verbal reactions.
2	Learning Evaluation of learning is a central process in initial training. It should be well structured to obtain a proper measurement of what happened from input to output context-wise.	Adult learning is about individual development and change. Learning should be checked and tested to prove that training has been useful and addressed the needs of the participants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tests before and after the training. • Interviews. • Self-assessment handouts. • Observation sheets.
3	Behaviour Evaluation of behaviour looks into the transfer of skills from the learning environment to the workplace environment.	As mentioned above, adult learning is about individual development and change. The information obtained could also be used to redesign the initial training programme and adjust the courses offered for continuous training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation and interviews over time are required to assess change, relevance of change, and sustainability of change.
4	Results Evaluation of the results measures the participant's impact on the job or environment.	Individual development and change are supposed to improve results, which have to be measured. The work and activity of the participants back at the court or prosecutor's office should positively affect the functioning of the organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management reports • Evaluation of the results 1/2/3 years after the training.

⁷ There are also other methods of evaluating training activities. Just to mention a few: the Kaufman five levels of evaluation, the CIRO (Context, Input, Reaction and Output) model, the Phillips ROI model and the Anderson model of learning evaluation.

As already stated in the 2016 EJTN *Handbook* (p. 16) as far as the training programmes are concerned, the design and implementation of the training evaluation should also be 'tailored-made'. Some of the issues that should be considered to address the kind of evaluation to design and implement are the following.

- The **training objectives** must be very clearly and analytically stated. If the training objectives are not clearly and analytically stated, it will not be possible to conduct an evaluation at Level 2 or 3 unless the training objectives can be defined ex-post.
- The **content** of the course should be appropriate to the level of evaluation that the training institution wants to measure. While Level 1 (reaction) is applicable to all kinds of courses, Level 2 (learning) and Level 3 (behaviour) are not. These last two levels can be used if the content of the course allows for the collection of reliable data using various tools to measure the 'learning' and/or the 'behaviour'.
- The **evaluation methodology** to be adopted must be specified **at the beginning of the design of the training** course. Evaluation is part of the design of the training course, while the type of evaluation to be used should be specified when the course is designed.
- The principle of '**participatory learning**', which is promoted for judicial training by EJTN (see 2016 EJTN, *Handbook*, p. 23)⁸ should also be applied to the evaluation of the courses and should be considered a fundamental part of the training process, which needs the active participation of the student.
- The decision on the level of evaluation to be measured, but also the various training activities, can highly benefit if the participants at the training course have a **similar basic knowledge** of the issues to be addressed during the training. If the initial basic knowledge of the participants is not similar, it will be very difficult to design a course that could improve the learning and change of behaviour of the participants.
- The **tools** to be used should be **consistent** with the level of the evaluation to be measured, the number of participants at the courses who are to be evaluated, and the resources that are available. For example, it is clear that the questionnaire is one of the recommended tools if there is a large number of participants, but the resources (competences and financial) must also be considered to determine which level of evaluation can be realistically measured and with which tool. For example, a less expensive tool could be one or more online focus groups.
- **Resources** (i.e. human capital, the required competences, time, information and communication technologies, financial support etc.) must be planned in advance to be able to implement the chosen level of evaluation.
- Features of the judiciary (**context-related approach**) must be considered while planning the evaluation. For example, on the one hand, questionnaire may have a very low response rate in some judiciaries and therefore may not be recommended, while on the other, peer reviews or interviews may be highly appreciated.

⁸ 'A participatory training architecture facilitates growth and individual discovery. It is aimed not just at "knowing more" but at putting judicial knowledge to work. A participatory training architecture builds upon: one's critical thinking, examining one's values, attitudes and professional orientations, "unfreezing" set notions and set patterns of behaviour. Using training methods entailing active participation is an adult education strategy in which participants in the judiciary get involved on the basis of their needs and questions, their reflection and analysis, and their interest in carrying their own professional development process forward.' *EJTN Handbook 2016*, p. 23.

Therefore, the features of the members of the judiciary must be taken into consideration when determining which level of evaluation can be measured and with which tools this can be done to try to make the evaluation successful.

- The principle of **judicial independence** must also be constantly protected through the ability to ensure **anonymity** in the evaluation process.
- **The results of the evaluation** should be made known to the trainers involved in the course and the participants who participated in the course.

The trainers will benefit from their assessment, which will also be compared with, for example, the average assessment of the other trainers. The participants will have the opportunity to see how the course was assessed by their colleagues, and then to compare their perceptions of the 'quality' of the course with the assessments of the other participants. The results of the evaluation of the various courses may be also summed up, for example, in an annual report to be made public.

1

Kirkpatrick Level 1 evaluation: **Reaction**

Level 1 evaluation in the Kirkpatrick model aims to capture the initial reactions of the participants immediately after a training session. Its primary purpose is to gauge the immediate satisfaction of the participants with the training experience.

This evaluation should ideally take place immediately after the training initiative ends or, at most, within a few days of its completion. Depending on the duration and content of the training, reactions can also be collected after each individual training activity in the case of a more extensive training programme. This approach provides specific and valuable feedback for each section, facilitating a more comprehensive assessment.

Design and Management Recommendations

The 2017 EJTN Guidelines offer comprehensive recommendations (pages 8–9) for designing and managing post-course evaluations, especially focusing on the preparation of questionnaires, which is commonly used as the primary assessment tool.

It should be noted that, based on the experiences shared by the EJTN members, online questionnaires have become the standard. Additionally, the questionnaire should be concise, covering all aspects of the training and the data collected should be shared with both trainers and participants.

It is important to collect this data for the purpose of planning future training activities. Emphasizing the importance of the completion of the questionnaire/survey by the participants during the training helps achieve the highest response rate and ensures valuable insights for continuous improvement.⁹

To achieve this, the Kirkpatrick Level 1 survey (KP1) should be conducted at the end of the training session to ensure a high response rate. In many cases, the training surveys are not obligatory, so the training providers have problems collecting the data after the event.

Training providers should take advantage of various e-tools to collect the KP1 data as early as possible. Experts can also use various tools throughout the training as part of their sessions to involve participants and provide a better learning experience – the evaluation process should also be approached in the same way. Almost all participants have a QR code reader and can access the surveys online. It is important that the training provider states whether the survey is anonymous or not.

⁹ Some small incentives may also help to increase the response rate. For example, the receipt of a certificate of attendance or a small gift, making the completion of the questionnaire a prerequisite for receiving travel reimbursement.

Here is a list of various free online tools that can be used in post-training evaluation:¹⁰

Tool	Pros	Cons
Google Forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wide range of question types, including multiple-choice, short answer and rating scales. • responses are automatically collected in Google sheets for easy analysis. • can be customized with themes and branding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires a Google account to create and manage the forms. • limited design customization options compared to some paid tools. • may not support very advanced survey logic.
SurveyMonkey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • user-friendly interface for creating surveys. • allows for advanced survey logic and branching. • offers robust reporting and analysis features. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited features in the free version, with restrictions on the number of questions and responses.
Microsoft Forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • part of the Microsoft 365 suite, so it integrates well with other Microsoft applications. • easy to create surveys and quizzes with various question types. • responses are collected in Excel for analysis. • collaboration features for co-authoring forms. • free plan suitable for most basic evaluation requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires a Microsoft account to create forms. • limited design customization options. • advanced features may require a Microsoft 365 subscription.
LimeSurvey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • open-source and self-hosted, offering complete control over data and customization. • supports a wide range of question types and survey logic. • no limitations on the number of questions or responses. • robust reporting and data export options. • suitable for organizations with more advanced evaluation needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires technical expertise to set up and manage the software. • the user or organization are responsible for hosting and maintenance. • steeper learning curve compared to user-friendly platforms like Google forms.
Mentimeter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • real-time feedback and surveys enhance participant engagement and maintain their interest during the evaluations. • visually appealing charts and graphs to present the evaluation results, making data interpretation and sharing easier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advanced features may require a paid subscription. • participants need a stable internet connection. • free version may have limitations in data export options.
Slido	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • active engagement with trainers and content through live polls, Q&A sessions and quizzes enhancing overall interactivity. • trainers can gather real-time feedback and insights from the participants, making it easier to adapt training sessions. • customization options for branding, themes and question types. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trainers and participants may require some time to familiarize themselves with the platform, especially if they are not accustomed to using interactive tools for training evaluations.

¹⁰ These applications offer various features and levels of customization, so the choice depends on your specific needs, technical proficiency, privacy policy and budget constraints.

2 Kirkpatrick Level 2 evaluation: Learning

The Kirkpatrick Level 2 evaluation assesses the extent to which the participants acquire knowledge, develop skills and cultivate a professional attitude as a result of training.¹¹ This assessment plays a pivotal role in helping trainers and training providers establish the extent to which the learning objectives have been achieved. The identification of what the participants have learned and what they have not learned is essential for making necessary programme adjustments and improvements.

Adult learning is a dynamic process which begins with concrete experiences, followed by observation and reflection.¹² These steps enable the generation of abstract concepts that can be tested in various contexts. In emphasizing this process, it is important to recognize that adults need to understand the 'why' behind learning. They predominantly learn from their experiences, approach learning as problem-solving and are in their element when the topics have immediate perceived value and involve active reflection and discussion among the participants.

¹¹ EJTN, Guidelines, 2017, p. 10.

¹² 2016 EJTN Handbook p. 25.

When evaluating the results, it is important to note that the assessment of Level 1 could be very positive, but this does not mean that learning has taken place. The immediate satisfaction of the participants ('reaction') could be a result of a positive course experience, but this is not evidence of learning. That is why it is important to try measure Level 2 whenever possible to determine whether the participants have achieved the intended learning objectives.

Objectives of the Learning Process

The learning process is geared towards enhancing knowledge, skills and professional attitudes:

- Knowledge: This represents the accumulation of information and bridges the gap between what the participants know and what they do not know.
- Skills: Skills constitute the practical application of knowledge. They represent the ability to effectively use the acquired knowledge in practice.
- Professional Attitude: This encompasses how individuals behave in a professional setting, combining knowledge and skills to shape workplace conduct.

These considerations prove valuable when planning the evaluation of training activities. It becomes clear that the measurement of these elements of the learning process is a complex task.

The data collected for Kirkpatrick Level 2 evaluation should enable:

- the determination of the level of learning achieved.
- the assurance of quality control of the training content and delivery.

- judgments and recommendations to be made about the training programme's relevance and quality.
- the provision of insights into future training needs and the adjustment of programmes accordingly.

The Importance of Clear Learning Objectives

To ensure the relevance and validity of the evaluation results, it is imperative that assessments at this level align with the original learning objectives. If the objectives are not clearly defined, gauging what content to assess and how to measure the achievement of the course objectives becomes challenging.

Learning objectives are the foundation stones of effective judicial training programmes. They serve as clear, specific statements which outline what participants should learn and achieve by the end of the training. In judicial training, these objectives are critical for shaping the curriculum, guiding instruction and evaluating the impact of the training on the participants.

Learning objectives must be clear, concise and specific. Vague objectives can lead to confusion and make it challenging to measure outcomes effectively. Learning objectives should be aligned with the competencies and skills that the participants need to develop within their judicial roles. Consider what knowledge, skills and attitudes are important for success in their positions.

Use Action Verbs: learning objectives are action oriented. Use action verbs such as 'analyse,' 'apply,' 'evaluate,' or 'demonstrate' to describe what participants should do to meet the objective.

Ensure that objectives are measurable, allowing for the clear assessment of the participants' progress and achievements. Specify how you will assess the achievement of each objective. By clearly defining learning objectives in judicial training and aligning them with the appropriate Kirkpatrick levels, you create a structured path for both effective training and comprehensive evaluation. This approach not only ensures that the participants acquire the necessary skills and knowledge but also enables you to measure the broader impact on their performance and the judiciary's overall effectiveness.

Timing and Methods of Assessment

Level 2 evaluation is more complex than Level 1. When resources allow, the use of multiple assessment tools enhances data collection to achieve improved validity and reliability. Learning can be assessed immediately after the training or several weeks or months later, but it is generally recommended that six months are not exceeded. Assessment methods include post-training tests, action plans, self-evaluations (including questionnaires) and team assessments or focus groups. The choice of assessment tools should align with the subject of the training, its objectives, the available resources and the objectives of the assessment. For instance, tests are suitable for assessing knowledge in specific areas, such as criminal law but may be less effective for broader topics like judicial independence.

Measuring Skills and Professional Attitude

Measuring the acquired skills and professional attitude is challenging and time-consuming. It often involves designing training activities offering opportunities to put knowledge into practice. However, this is contingent on the pre-training status of the participants. Assessing the knowledge

and skills of the participants before training can reveal their learning needs, enabling adjustments to be made for greater impact. However, measuring initial knowledge, skills and professional attitude is resource-intensive and difficult. Without pre-training assessments, evaluation of post-training learning typically relies on self-assessment, focus groups discussions and similar tools provide some insights, despite their limitations.

Self-Evaluation

Participant self-evaluation is a universal evaluation approach that could be used in most training activities. The training providers would be responsible for this process. Some of the benefits of self-evaluation include:

- developing motivation and generating interest in the task and training activity;
- ensuring that the participants are actively involved in the training and evaluation process (which promotes self-directed learning);
- providing the trainers with better insights into the participants' perception of performance.

Self-evaluation can be used before and after the training, or only as a post-evaluation. When used before the training, it provides information about the experience of the participants in the topic and their training needs.

The procedure for designing and administering the self-evaluation could include the following steps:

1. The activity coordinator, together with the trainers and a methodology specialist, identifies the learning objectives and the criteria to be assessed in the self-evaluation form. The expectations and criteria for self-evaluation before and/or after the training activity should be clearly articulated.

2. It is recommended that the pre-self-evaluation form is used at least one month before the training activity. The results could then be summarized and the trainers will have time to reflect upon the results and adjust the content according to the needs of the participants.
3. The post-self-evaluation form could be sent to the participants at least two weeks after the course to determine whether the intended knowledge and skills during the training activity were acquired. The Ebbinghaus forgetting curve should be considered in this process. The apex of the curve appears during the training activity; after one hour, retention is supposed to be 44% and, after 6 days, retention is just 25%. That is why it is important to provide opportunities for retention and application of the knowledge and skills at the workplace, as well as to conduct an evaluation after the training.¹³ This could be a questionnaire, self-assessment, tests, or another tool.
4. The pre- and post-self-evaluation forms could be distributed to the participants online, and the results could be collected and summarized online.
5. The results of the self-evaluation could be used to improve the training activity in terms of objectives, agenda, delivery and evaluation strategy.

Tests

Another useful tool for evaluating the effectiveness of the training at Level 2 is the 'Test'. It is an instrument or tool for measuring the change in knowledge, skills or attitude. A standard test is applied before the training begins (pre-test or baseline) and is re-applied after a set period, or at the end of the programme (post-test or end line). Pre- and post-tests provide information on whether or not the participants have gained new knowledge and, certainly with greater difficulty, skills and attitude after the training. Pre-tests and post-tests are used to compare the results and to identify areas, where the participants may need additional practice and information. Trainers and training providers must use pre-and post-test methodology if they want to understand exactly what knowledge can be credited to the training itself. A pre-test is not necessary if the objective is to know whether the participants can demonstrate knowledge of the content and skills at the end of the training. If the training is highly interactive with ample opportunities to assess knowledge of the participants or if the training course is short, there may not be any point in conducting pre-and post-tests.

Pre-tests and post-tests are designed with the use of the learning objectives for the training. The pre-test is given to participants to measure how much they know about the topic. At the end of the training, the participants take the post-test to measure their ability to apply the knowledge or to perform a specific task.

¹³ The curve was developed by Ebbinghaus, a German psychologist, in 1885. However, it should be understood that several factors are supposed to affect the ability to retain information and this general curve should be adapted to different contexts. For example, individual differences in remembering, prior knowledge of the issues or similar subjects dealt with during the training, the importance of what has been presented to the individual participants in their daily work, the repetition of the messages, the need of each participant to retrieve the information collected during the training, the training material supplied during and after the training. <https://intellelearning.wordpress.com/2018/07/19/learning-myth-1-ebbinghaus-forgetting-curve/>.

The basic test questions are multiple-choice, matching items, true/false answers, short descriptive answers and scaling with comments. Both tests should consist of the same or similar test items and content. To make the results more meaningful, it is recommended that variations are created so that the participants are tested on their understanding of the content rather than on their ability to remember their answers from the pre-test. Having a variety of questions can make the test more rigorous and interesting. Tests could be given in writing, orally, online, or as a clicker tool. Some tips for using pre-tests and post-tests are presented below.

Questions should focus on the learning objectives of the course. There should be at least one question for each objective and more if the objectives are complex and require thorough knowledge of a particular topic. Some effort is needed to identify the specific points that all participants must know so as to be able to test them.

1. Choose the best test item format for the learning objective you are measuring. The items may take different forms (multiple-choice, matching items, true/false answers, short descriptive answers and scaling with comments). Whenever possible, avoid true/false statements, because they are the least reliable and the participants have a 50% chance of answering correctly if they guess.

2. Avoid asking too many questions. The shorter the better, especially if there are open-ended questions. Eliminate redundant questions. It is recommended that the tests require no more than 30 minutes to complete. To ensure this, the trainers could pilot the test with their peers.

3. Prepare specific questions so that the participants clearly understand the scope of the question.

4. Design questions that are worded simply and unambiguously. Steer clear of conjunctions such as 'and', 'but', 'except' and 'or'. Also, avoid the use of unintentional clues such as 'always', 'all' and 'never'.

5. Avoid leading or biased questions.

6. Prepare responses that are substantively distinct from one another. Similar answers in a multiple-choice item do not give the respondents a clear choice.

7. Prepare incorrect answers (distractors) which are potentially plausible but wrong. Even the most knowledgeable learners should not find the correct answers extremely obvious. The text of the multiple-choice question should not be longer than the text of the answers. The majority of the information should be given in the question, not in the answers.¹⁴

¹⁴ For more on the design of the questionnaires, please also refer to page 73 *et seq.*, of the 2016 [EJTN Handbook on Judicial Training Methods](#), and to page 8 *et seq.*, and page 19 *et seq.*, of the 2017 [EJTN Guidelines for Evaluation of Judicial Training Practices](#).

3 Kirkpatrick Level 3 evaluation: **Behaviour change**

The Level 3 evaluation ('behaviour change') would like to measure the degree to which 'participants apply what they learnt during the training when they are back at work' (EJTN, *Guidelines*, 2017, p. 13)

The data obtained from Level 3 provides insight into the effectiveness of the training activities and how to further adapt, modify and improve their quality. The Kirkpatrick Level 3 evaluation is intended to measure:

- the extent to which the participants have applied the acquired knowledge and skills in their work;
- the effect of the training on their work;
- visible changes in the behaviour of the participants and whether change is sustained over time.

The complexity of this level of evaluation of the training means the evaluations should be used for about 30–40% of the training activities (EJTN, *Guidelines*, 2017, p.13).

The evaluation usually takes place after several weeks. Generally speaking, it should take place no more than 6 months after the training activities, but it may depend on the content of the training, and it could then take place even a little later.

Behavioural changes take time, most probably cannot only be induced by the training, and need certain workplace conditions. The lack of behaviour changes does not always mean that the training activity was unsuccessful. The training might have positive evaluations at Level 1 and Level 2, but the behavioural changes need certain conditions. The three main factors for the implementation of knowledge and skills are:

- the individual factor – the willingness and the ability of individuals to change their behaviour as a result of the training;
- the applicability of the training course – participants are aware of what should be done and how;
- the working environment – this factor refers to the ability of the participants to make choices at their workplace to put the content they learned into practice.

The tools used in the Kirkpatrick Level 3 evaluation include questionnaires, observation, interviews, focus groups and intervision.

The questionnaire can again be an effective tool for collecting information. It should follow the same rules of questionnaires already mentioned in previous EJTN documents for trying to collect the information needed for the evaluation of the degree of behavioural changes and, possibly, for improvement.

Since it is very difficult and tricky to evaluate behavioural changes, the questions should be carefully designed to connect the training activities with the possible change of behaviour. As was the case for the evaluation of the learning, it is very difficult to directly relate a change of behaviour and the training activities, so the questions should be carefully designed to try to collect as much information as possible on the perceived role of the training in the behavioural change. Once again, the initial definition of clear and measurable training objectives may help identify the questions that should be addressed with the questionnaire.

The topics addressed with the training activities are also of paramount importance for the collection of information to evaluate the change in behaviour (Level 3). The measurement of a change in behaviour cannot be used for all courses, but only those that have such a change as their training goals, and this change can somehow be measured. Unfortunately, if it cannot be measured, it cannot be evaluated.

Observation 'is a way of gathering data by watching a person's behaviour'.¹⁵ The use of this technique at this evaluation level entails some observation before the training, after which the post-training observation can be meaningful. This is a powerful technique, which is time-consuming and needs extreme sensitivity and care to be beneficially used in the judiciary.

Intervision is also referred to as peer supervision.¹⁶ It is a form of supervision without a supervisor, where the supervisees supervise each other. The participants reflect on their behaviour together with their peers to discuss what has been learned and the changes in their behaviour after the training. Intervision is strictly limited to peers and is a voluntary counselling.¹⁷ The participants give and receive feedback and advice in an open and 'safe' environment.

¹⁵ EJTN, *Guidelines*, 2017, p. 14.

¹⁶ EJTN, *Handbook*, 2016, p. 44.

¹⁷ EJTN, *Handbook*, 2016, p. 44.

When discussing the results of the evaluation with the participants, trainers and managers could also be an effective means of identifying potential barriers related to changing behaviour at the workplace, such as management style, or lack of resources.

The Italian School for the Judiciary – Case Study

The following paragraphs are extracted from the Foreword by the Steering Committee of the Italian School and the Executive Summary of a study conducted by the Italian School for the Judiciary (SSM) in collaboration with the Bologna Branch of the Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems of the National Research Council of Italy.¹⁸

The study was conducted to collect information about selected training activities some time after the training, and to try to apply the Kirkpatrick Level 2 and 3 evaluations in a real context. Since it was not possible to assess learning through a pre-test and a post-test, a decision was made to use a 'retrospective' pre/post assessment. Indeed, the survey of the new judges and prosecutors was very detailed and included all the different training activities in which the participants had been involved, in order to recall memories and facilitate a retrospective self-assessment.

The findings enabled the collection of a great deal of valuable information on the offering of training to be used for the future development of training courses. The study also put the Kirkpatrick model on the evaluation of the acquired learning (Level 2) and change of behaviour (Level 3) into practice. The empirical findings give hints on the feasibility of using and utility of such a model in the judicial training context.

The foreword states that the Italian School for the Judiciary (Scuola Superiore della Magistratura, SSM) is committed to the elaboration and development of new and effective methodologies in the field of judicial training in order to improve the quality of initiatives in all areas of its work.

Besides face-to-face training, the last three years have witnessed the testing of distance learning in its various forms as never before. In addition to e-learning modules, already known in the past, there have been implemented fully online or hybrid format courses, mixed forms of didactics with synchronous and asynchronous modules, virtual classrooms for lifelong learning, as in the case of corporate crisis, in order to propose a continuous and capillary training offer, with new complementary tools for training and updating, both documentary and video.

This offer has been developed in the context of a European and international dimension of continuous comparison with other judicial training institutions belonging, primarily, to the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) and international organisations dealing with the training of magistrates, such as the European Union and the Council of Europe.¹⁹

The research started from an analysis of the data obtained through the administration of a questionnaire for the mid- and long-term evaluation of courses for ordinary magistrates (judges and prosecutors) in training (magistrati ordinari in tirocinio, MOT) and the realisation of three focus groups for the mid-term evaluation of some permanent training courses, carried out with the participation of a selected number of participants and the expert trainers.

¹⁸ https://www.scuolamagistratura.it/documents/20126/564830/SSM+Quaderno+28_ing.pdf

¹⁹ 'Research report The medium-to long-term evaluation of the initial and continuous training courses organised by the Italian School for the Judiciary' p. 9 https://www.scuolamagistratura.it/documents/20126/564830/SSM+Quaderno+28_ing.pdf.

The aim was to verify whether the methods used allow an effective ex-post evaluation of the training activity according to the Kirkpatrick methodology (levels 2 and 3) and to enable the collection of useful information to improve the SSM's training offer after the training activities have been carried out.²⁰

The 'level 1' evaluation has always been the subject of data collection by the School at the end of each training course. The data were revised in the 10-year study of the SSM, and in the last year, the Steering Committee revised the evaluation forms. In relation to each lecturer, not only an overall assessment is requested, but also, separately, an assessment of the content, the methodology used and any teaching material provided. This allows a more precise analysis with reference to level 1, relying on the attention paid by the participants in filling out the relevant evaluation forms for the individual training contributions.

In the European panorama, the study carried out by the School in cooperation with the Institute of the National Research Council of Italy represents one of the most comprehensive studies in the literature in the field of judicial training evaluation, in terms of the breadth of the data considered and the methodological rigour. The results of the research show positive feedback on the quality of training activities in the short and medium to long term, both in the field of initial and continuous training.²¹

The questionnaire has undoubtedly proved effective in assessing initial training and has revealed an interest among new magistrates in contributing to improve the quality of training proposals.²²

The Executive Summary of the study refers to the questionnaire on the ex-post evaluation of initial training of participant ordinary magistrates and states that four hundred twenty-nine (429) magistrates out of nine hundred thirty-seven (937) who participated in three training courses from 2018 to 2020 answered the questionnaire prepared by the CNR in cooperation with the School for the ex-post evaluation of participant ordinary magistrates. This is a significant number, with balanced values also in terms of magistrates' districts, gender, functions performed, and age. The sample of respondents is therefore solid and representative.²³

The data analysis shows that overall the ex-post evaluation of the initial training is positive... The teaching materials made available by the School are also considered a useful aid.²⁴

The analysis of the questionnaire data also brings out clearly some useful aspects for the design of future courses, which can be briefly summarised in this short list:

- *The initial training appears to be characterised by content that is too theoretical in relation to expectations and training needs.*
- *Training activities should be characterised by markedly practical and operational content.*
- *The topics to be explored during the training should take into account the need to acquire specific competences related to the daily work to be performed.*

²⁰ Ibid. p. 11. Usually, the Italian School for the Judiciary conducts questionnaire surveys to assess the satisfaction of the participants straight after the training sessions (Kirkpatrick Level 1: 'reaction'). The study conducted with the Italian National Research Council had the objective of assessing the training session after some time, to also try to evaluate the learning and behavioural changes (Kirkpatrick Levels 2 and 3) with different tools.

²¹ Ibid. p. 11–12.

²² https://www.scuolamagistratura.it/documents/20126/564830/SSM+Quaderno+28_ing.pdf

²³ Ibid. p. 17.

²⁴ Ibid. p. 17.

- *The topics that would need to be explored in greater depth with an operational slant are many, among them are certainly: case management, organisation of hearings, time management, management of adjournments, backlog management, drafting of documents, judicial statistics, and disciplinary aspects.*
- *Consistent with the call for more focus on 'practical' training, the preferred training methodologies are case analyses, simulations of real situations, writing workshops, exchange of information on organizational practices, small group discussions, practical exercises, participation in hearings, and on-the-job training with the foster magistrate.*

These indications emerge clearly and consistently both from the analysis of the data in the questionnaire and from the comments of no less than 99 magistrates in the last open question ... which are very interesting and useful to read, as well as from the subsequent focus group that further confirmed the data that emerged with the questionnaire.

In particular, the focus group further highlighted the importance of foster magistrates in the initial training course. This is a fundamental aspect in the training of new magistrates on which the School should start reflecting precisely because of the decisive role that the assigned magistrate plays in the training course and which should be profitably integrated with the training activities proposed by the School.

It was also pointed out that it would be useful to have at least one meeting about a year after the end of the training course at the School in order to compare experiences and deepen certain issues such as those outlined above. On that occasion, it could also be proposed to fill in a similar, but shorter questionnaire to the one prepared on this occasion, for the ex-post evaluation of the training course attended.²⁵

Focus groups for the ex-post evaluation of continuous learning courses

The three focus groups to test the ex-post evaluation of continuous learning chosen by the School concerned the following courses: 1) 'The trial office and the collaboration office of the public prosecutor' (P21076) held from 4 to 6 October 2021, 2) 'Wiretappings' (P22021) held from 14 to 16 March 2022, 3) 'Open Issues in family and personal Law' (P22018) held from 7 to 9 March 2022.

The focus sessions lasted two hours. A limited number of magistrates, never more than eight of those who had attended the course, attended it. The sessions focused mainly on four aspects: 1) the evaluation of the course content, 2) the evaluation of the training methods used, 3) possible changes to be made in the design of a future course, 4) some methodological aspects relating to the evaluation of the course.

All the participants in the three focus groups evaluated the courses followed positively. Different nuances were represented on the quality of the individual courses, which can be gathered from a careful reading of the three summary reports, but overall, the evaluation was always positive, also taking into account the different training contents.

The practical and operational slant of the programmes offered by the School was also particularly appreciated in the case of continuing education courses, and especially for courses with a more technical-legal connotation such as those on wiretapping and family law.

Consistent with what has just been written, training through working groups, with the analysis of concrete cases, is the one most appreciated, precisely because it allows a greater in-depth study

²⁵ Ibid. p. 17–18.

of the topics covered, a more active involvement of the participants, and an effective exchange of knowledge and application practices.

The participants in the three focus groups testified to a positive impact of the respective courses on their work, both in terms of the increase in specific knowledge and competences, and in terms of the concrete adoption of certain 'operational practices' learnt during the course, albeit with different nuances taking into account the necessarily different programmes and contents for each course.

The teaching materials made available by the School were appreciated, although the abundance of heterogeneous materials and the absence of effective indexing makes their retrieval somewhat complex and, therefore, the teaching materials are, in fact, used rather infrequently.

In the course of the focus groups, some specific suggestions for improving the content of the individual courses were given, which are indicated in the summary reports of the various focus groups in the third part of the report.²⁶

The feasibility of Level 2 and Level 3 ex-post evaluation according to the Kirkpatrick method

One of the objectives of the collaborative work between the SSM and the CNR was to field-test the feasibility of the ex-post evaluation of levels 2 and 3 of the Kirkpatrick method proposed by the EJTN.

Ex-post evaluations would presuppose an initial design of the course, in which the training objectives, knowledge and competences that the course is expected to provide are clearly spelled out analytically. Currently, the School's courses do not

provide for such an analytical design, thus making ex-post evaluation more difficult.

For this work, an attempt was therefore made to carry out a subsequent reconstruction of the training objectives and expected results from the available documents, and then experimented with two different methods for collecting data for evaluation: the self-administered online questionnaire for initial training courses and focus groups for continuing education courses.

The work carried out, and documented here, shows how the ex-post evaluation obtained on levels 2 (learning) and 3 (behaviour change) on the scale proposed by Kirkpatrick is all in all feasible, even if it does not provide detailed data on the 'real learning' let alone on the 'real change processes' put in place. The questionnaire on initial training, with its very analytical content on the training activities carried out, having had a very good percentage of respondents and focusing on rather similar courses certainly provided some useful information on the perceived level of 'learning', while the indications on the level of 'change' achieved are very nuanced.


It seems deterministic and ineffective to think that one can measure a very complex and multifaceted phenomenon such as 'change', or perhaps it would be better to say the 'process of change', by basing it on the study of the training stimulus alone.

However, beyond the Kirkpatrick levels, this study has unequivocally shown how useful it is for the School to carry out an ex-post evaluation, using the techniques it deems most appropriate, to collect data on the training proposals. As this work makes clear, the information gathered ex-post on the training programmes was particularly rich and therefore potentially very useful for those who actually want to improve the training offer.²⁷

²⁶ Ibid. p. 18–19.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 20.

Concluding remarks



Training evaluation is a fundamental part of the training activities. The evaluation process is difficult and time-consuming, but it should not be avoided by any training provider.

The Kirkpatrick model has been selected by the EJTN for use in judicial training as the current evaluation framework, however, evaluation is an evolving discipline and new trends should also be considered from time to time, different methodologies may be effectively applied. What should be emphasized is that training activities should be evaluated not only immediately after the training, but also after some time ('medium-to long-term evaluation'). The 'medium-to long-term' evaluation enables the collection of valuable data after some time from the end of the course, and it supports the training providers with information that can enrich the future training programmes.

Evaluation allows training institutions to gain an understanding of the effectiveness of the training activities and provides fundamental insights into how to improve them.

As a general rule, for the Kirkpatrick model, Level 1 ('reaction') evaluation should be conducted for all training activities; Level 2 ('learning') evaluation may be implemented for such training content which fits better with the evaluation of 'learning' (for example, law searching, law drafting, effective use of sentencing templates, case management, etc.); Level 3 ('change of behaviour') evaluation can only be conducted for those courses in which evaluation of a change of behaviour is feasible and reliable (for example, hearing scheduling, hearing management, interaction with parties and lawyers, adoption of alternative dispute resolutions, etc.).²⁸

However, literature and the empirical case study have shown that evaluation immediately after the training and then some time afterwards may not be so useful for assessing the change in learning, behaviour and results, but it is extremely useful for assessing and changing the training content and methods of a specific course.

The factors that can limit the process of training include (a) the lack of knowledge about evaluation methods, (b) the time constraints for conducting the evaluation process, (c) the lack of resources, (d) the lack of knowledge about the techniques to measure the different evaluation levels, (e) the lack of management support for Levels 3 and 4 evaluations and (f) the difficulty of accessing data for Levels 3 and 4 evaluations.²⁹

It should also be noted that the main well-founded criticism about the Kirkpatrick Levels 2 and 3 evaluation is probably that it is extremely problematic to demonstrate that the learning (increase of knowledge, skills and professional attitude) and the change in behaviour are a direct result of the training

activities attended. It is very difficult to associate any 'measurable' change in learning or behaviour exclusively with the training.³⁰

However, when implementing the Kirkpatrick evaluation model, the following is a summary of the main steps that may be followed.

- The evaluation methodology, levels and tools are part of the training activity design and should be decided right after the setting of the training programme and related objectives.³¹
- The evaluation plan should include the resources needed, a schedule of when it will take place, the people involved, and the tool or tools to be used.
- The evaluation to be conducted must be consistent with the content of the training, and the tools to be used must be consistent with the evaluation methodology, the number of participants and the judicial context, and careful attention should be paid to judicial independence.
- Trainers should highlight the importance of assessing the courses to the participants. The evaluation conducted after the training and in the medium- to long-term should have the highest involvement of the participants in order to collect reliable data to be used for future courses.
- The data collected in the evaluation process should be analysed and communicated to all the stakeholders, including the participants of the training activities.

²⁸ It should also be pointed out that a 2012 Report by the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) showed that 94% of organizations evaluate Level 1, 34% measure Level 2, 13% evaluate Level 3, and only 3% measure Level 4.

²⁹ ASTD, 2009; Moller & Mallin, 1996.

³⁰ Twitchell et al., 2000, McLean and Moss 2003, Noe, 2017.

³¹ EJTN, *Handbook*, 2016, p. 12.

- The evaluation process will provide valuable information for the design future of activities which should be shared with the training coordinators and the management of the training institution.
- Monitoring is required of whether and which changes have then been really implemented in future courses, which can be related to the evaluation results in a constant learning process to improve the training offering.
- The 'medium- to long-term' evaluation is an important step in trying to assess whether the training improved the learning process and whether it helped change behaviour. However, the medium- to long-term evaluation primarily enables the fundamental collection of valuable data for designing new training, improving current courses and changing the training methods. All in all, the medium- to long-term evaluation might not really assess whether the participants have learned what they were supposed to learn, or whether they changed their behaviour as a consequence of the training, but it will certainly contribute to improving the learning offering and the behaviour of the training providers. This is why it is highly recommended, at least for a selected number of courses.

The analysis of the Kirkpatrick literature and the case study of the Italian School for the judiciary show that, on the one hand, the attempt to specifically evaluate the 'learning' and the 'changes in behaviour' after the training (Kirkpatrick Levels 2 and 3) is useful, but it is also, *de facto*, a very difficult and resource-consuming exercise.

On the other hand, an evaluation some time after the training ('medium- to long-term evaluation')³² is certainly extremely useful and valuable and does not drain too many resources. This evaluation will enrich knowledge about the training activities and will give the opportunity to collect information which can be very useful for designing and implementing future training activities.

The comparison between the data collected immediately after the training to assess the 'reaction' to the training and the data from the training assessment conducted later will also offer further information to be used for future training.

Therefore, the 'medium- to long-term' assessment of the training activities, with tools such as questionnaires or focus groups, is highly recommended for training providers to have a better evaluation of the training courses and to significantly improve the future training offering.

³² As mentioned above, it is recommended that this is done within six months but, again, it depends on the training content and the assessment objectives. For example, in the Italian case study, it was interesting and useful to compare three initial training courses for new judges and prosecutors in three consecutive years. In this way, it was possible to see if and how the assessment was different with respect to the different working experience of the judges and prosecutors.

1

Appendix 1

Research report

The medium- to long-term evaluation of the initial and continuous training courses organised by the Italian School for the Judiciary

Italian School for the Judiciary (SSM) – Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems, Bologna Branch, National Research Council of Italy (CNR), Rome 2022.

Questionnaire: The evaluation of initial training for magistrates.

S0. Introduction

This questionnaire aims to collect data on the initial training courses of trainee ordinary magistrates, with particular reference to their **actual usefulness in judicial work**, in order to promote possible changes to training programmes and methodologies.

Therefore, we ask you to answer the questionnaire always thinking about what you actually used of what you learnt during the initial training.

The decision to collect data from those who have attended the MOT course from 2018 onwards is based on the need to verify any variations in responses over time, and to compare years in which courses were held in presence and years in which the online mode had to be used.

The questionnaire is anonymous, the data will only be analysed in aggregate, and the results will be used by the School to plan future activities.

The estimated duration for filling in the questionnaire is about 8 minutes.

In the event that you are unable or unwilling to answer the questionnaire, we ask you, again anonymously, to at least let us know the reasons by answering a single question. Thank you.

We thank you for your cooperation and invite you to address any questions of clarification to the following e-mail address infosurvey@bo.igsg.cnr.it

S01. Answer yes/no

Q1. Will I answer the questionnaire? [The answer to this question is compulsory in order to continue filling in the questionnaire].

- ☐ Yes (if yes, you go to S03)
- ☐ No (if no, you go to S02 and then the questionnaire ends)

S02. Why are you not going to answer the questionnaire?

Q2. Why are you not going to answer the questionnaire?

- ☐ I have no time.
- ☐ I find it useless
- ☐ I do not believe the data will be processed anonymously
- ☐ I think it is a wrong way to collect my training evaluation
- ☐ I don't feel like answering
- ☐ Other (please specify in a few lines)

S03. Context data for subsequent aggregated and anonymous data analysis

Q3. What is your Ministerial Decree of appointment?

- ☐ Ministerial Decree 7 February 2018
- ☐ Ministerial Decree 12 February 2019
- ☐ Ministerial Decree 18 July 2019 and 03 January 2020

Q4. After initial training, what function did you mainly perform in the judicial office where you took up your position?

- ☐ Labour Judge
- ☐ Judge in bankruptcy matters
- ☐ Execution Judge
- ☐ Business Judge
- ☐ Immigration Judge
- ☐ Guardianship or family judge
- ☐ Civil court judge (in none of the above functions)
- ☐ Juvenile judge
- ☐ Judge of the review court
- ☐ Preliminary Investigation Judge (GIP)
- ☐ Criminal Judge
- ☐ Inmates Surveillance Magistrate

- ☐ Prosecutor
- ☐ Juvenile prosecutor
- ☐ So-called 'mixed' functions
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Q5. Which district do you serve or did you serve in immediately after your initial training?

- ☐ [drop-down list of all districts in alphabetical order].

Q6. Year of birth: _____

Q7. Gender:

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ I prefer not to declare it

Q8. Did you have any work experience in the legal field before becoming a magistrate?

- ☐ Yes (if yes Q9)
- ☐ No (if no, S3-Q10)

Q9. If yes, could you please indicate which ones? (you can indicate several answers)

- ☐ Honorary magistrate
- ☐ Lawyer
- ☐ Researcher
- ☐ Trainee under art. 37 Decree Law 98/2011
- ☐ Trainee under art. 73 Decree Law 69/2013
- ☐ Civil servant
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Q10. Did you attend any other courses organised by the School after your initial training?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes (One)
- ☐ Yes (Two)
- ☐ Yes (Three or more)

S3. Overall assessment of the usefulness of initial training for judicial work

Q11. What is your overall assessment of the usefulness for judicial work of the various training activities in which you participated as a MOT? (1 being the most negative, 10 the most positive)

- | | |
|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Courses attended at the school as part of the generic traineeship | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Courses attended at the school as part of the targeted traineeship | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training activities carried out in judicial offices as part of the generic traineeship | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Training activities carried out in judicial offices as part of the targeted traineeship | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internships with other organisations | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing activities with foster magistrates | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Activities carried out with foster magistrates excluding court hearings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Overall assessment of initial training received through courses at the school | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Overall assessment of initial training received through work in offices | 1 _____ 10 |

S3.1. The training course

Q12. We kindly ask you to express your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements concerning the training course you followed.

	totally agree	partially agree	partially disagree	totally disagree	don't know / I cannot answer
The objectives of the initial training course were clear.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The training activities carried out at the School during the generic internship were on the whole not very useful.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The legal knowledge acquired during my initial training was very useful for my work.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
My initial expectations of initial training were disappointed.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The training gave me an in-depth insight into the practical aspects of working as a magistrate.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The targeted internship was useful for the work I then actually did in the office.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
During the training at the school, I did not learn anything new.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]

The relationship that was created with colleagues was also useful to me after the course.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
I maintained contact with the foster magistrates.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
More training on managing the hearings scheduling would be necessary.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
I had a very good training on case processing times.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
It would be important to increase training on judicial statistics.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
I lacked specific training on the day-to-day management of proceedings.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]

S3.2. Methodological aspects of teaching

Q13. We kindly ask you to express your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements concerning the methodological aspects of the training course you followed.

	totally agree	partially agree	partially disagree	totally disagree	don't know / I cannot answer
The training materials provided by the School were useful to me.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The lectures were mostly boring.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The work in small groups was very useful.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The activities carried out with the foster magistrate were crucial.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
It would have been necessary to have more space for confrontation with more experienced magistrates.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
All courses for MOTs should be conducted in presence only.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The study of concrete cases and their discussion was a key learning moment.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The lectures during the general placement were too theoretical.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]

The lectures during the targeted internship were too theoretical.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The training activities simulating a real situation were very useful.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The presence of the tutors was unnecessary.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The drafting of the measures in working groups was very formative.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The forms distributed for the drafting of deeds did not help me at work.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The plenary discussion of the group work was superfluous.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The measure writing workshops have been very useful for me in my daily work.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
I would have preferred to have had more training opportunities in real hearings.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The training time at the offices was too short compared to the lessons at the school.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]

S4. Usefulness of the generic internship introductory part [section for all ENGs].

Q14. What is your assessment of the usefulness for your daily work of the following training contents offered to you during the general apprenticeship?

In case your training did not cover some of the listed competences, or you have never used the competences acquired in the training course in your work practice, please do not answer the specific question, *thank you*).

- ☐ Acquired competences on guarantees of impartiality and independence 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on the office organisational schema 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on extrajudicial activities 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on incompatibilities 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on Art. 37 Law Decree 98/2011 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on the organisational structure of the public prosecutor's office 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on deontological and ethical principles 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences in the use of social networks 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences in online regulatory and case-law research 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on the civil liability of the magistrate 1 _____ 10
- ☐ Acquired competences on the disciplinary system 1 _____ 10

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the management of referrals	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on management of hearings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on backlog management	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Expertise on reference for a preliminary ruling to the Court of Justice	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competence on incidental questions of constitutionality	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the psychology of judging	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on work contexts and organisational well-being	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the language of court orders	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the role of the judge with Courts, Constitution and European Charters	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on legal reasoning in judgments, orders, and decrees	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on clarity and conciseness of deeds	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on media relations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Expertise on the Pinto Law and the reasonable duration of proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on professional evaluations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on Registry Office Services	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in dealing with the head of the office	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with middle managers	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in relations with colleagues	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in dealing with the registry offices	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in dealing with lawyers	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in dealing with the parties to the proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in relations with the Judicial Council	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on judicial statistics	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired hearing management competences through Teams	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall acquired competence on civil law	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall acquired competences on criminal law	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the various international bodies dealing with justice	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on EUROJUST	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired knowledge on the association of the judiciary	1_____10

Q15. Which targeted apprenticeship did you mainly do?

- ☐ Targeted for civil and labour judge (continues at S5 and then S9)
- ☐ Targeted for criminal court (continued at S6 and then S9)
- ☐ Targeted for public prosecution (continued at S7 and then S9)
- ☐ Targeted for inmates surveillance magistrate (continued at S8 and then S9)

S5. Usefulness of the targeted civil judge traineeship
[section only for MOTs having attended the targeted civil/
labour judge traineeship]

Q16. What is your assessment of the usefulness for your daily work of the following training contents offered to you during the targeted civil judge traineeship?

In case your training did not cover some of the listed competences or you have never used the competences acquired in the training course in your work practice, please do not answer the specific question, *thank you*)

- | | |
|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on different procedures and jurisdictions | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the introductory phase of ordinary civil proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the discovery phase of ordinary civil proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on mediation and conciliation | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the pre-trial phase of ordinary civil proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the decisional phase of ordinary civil proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the online civil trial | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired jurisdiction on opposition to the injunction decree | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the European injunction | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Expertise in precautionary proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the warning procedure | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on civil precautionary proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on chamber procedures | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in verbalisation methods | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on notifications | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on e-filings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the drafting of documents in civil proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences a on the nullity of acts | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in family litigation and voluntary jurisdiction | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences ain the field of labour litigation | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in the field of enforcement | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in the bankruptcy and corporate sector | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on legal reasoning techniques | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competence on costs of litigation, reckless litigation and legal aid | 1 _____ 10 |

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on abuse of process	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on techniques for assessing pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired expertise on the reasonable duration of trials	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the scheduling of hearings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the management of the judge's agenda	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the management of proceedings with parties, lawyers, registry offices	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in the judge's assistant office ('trial office' <i>ufficio per il processo</i>)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in the use of the digital application for civil judges	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competence on the incidental question of constitutionality	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the priorities of proceedings	1_____10

S6. Usefulness of the targeted internship for criminal judge [section only for MOTs who attended the targeted internship for criminal judge]

Q17. What is your assessment of the usefulness for your daily work of the following training contents offered to you during the targeted criminal justice traineeship?

In case your training did not cover any of the listed competences or, you have never used the competences acquired in the training course in your work practice, please do not answer the specific question, *thank you*)

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on pathologies of acts in criminal proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Expertise in criminal investigation	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on witness examination and cross examination	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the examination of defendants	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the drafting of pre-trial orders	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the management of precautionary measures	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on backlog management	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on jurisdiction over exceptions raised before the trial judge	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on appeal against judgments of justices of the peace	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on criminal seizures and confiscations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on preliminary hearing	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on wiretapping	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on jurisdiction over protective orders	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the pre-trial hearing	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on criminal law	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on trial deflation systems	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on restorative justice	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on probation	1_____10

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on organised crime processes and the so-called 'double track'.	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on special proceedings (plea bargaining, abbreviated, immediate)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on preventive and patrimonial measures and related proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on sentence drafting techniques	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the formulas defining the judgement (acquittal, prescription, etc.)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the exercise of civil action in criminal proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in dealing with the public prosecutor	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the question of constitutionality	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on evidential reasoning	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the admission and evaluation of scientific evidence	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on proceedings in chambers	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on digital criminal proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on indictment	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on criminal proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the indictment and arguments	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the drafting of the decision	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on special procedures	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on legal costs	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the statute of limitations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the priorities of proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on distance hearings	1_____10

S7. Usefulness of the targeted traineeship for public prosecutors [section only for MOTs who attended the targeted traineeship for public prosecutors]

Q18 What is your assessment of the usefulness for your daily work of the following training contents offered to you during the targeted public prosecution traineeship?

In case your training did not cover some of the listed competences or you have never used the competences acquired in the training course in your work practice, please do not answer the specific question, *thank you*)

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the schedule of precautionary measures	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on delegation of investigations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the coordination of investigations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on meetings with the judicial police	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on meetings with colleagues	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on meetings with heads of offices	1_____10

<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on drafting documents (e.g., precautionary measures, requisitions, etc.)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on wiretapping management	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on so-called 'serial work'	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on handling crime reports	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in the field of personal and real protection	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on techniques for drafting public prosecutor's requests in pre-trial matters	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on unrepeatable technical assessments	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on technical advice	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on investigation techniques	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on hearing management	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on criminal trial	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences in 'external' work (e.g., inspections, searches, etc.)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on interrogation	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on backlog management	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on dealing with the suspect	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on dealing with advocates	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on criminal seizures and confiscations	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the search for evidence outside national borders	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the request for nolle prosequi	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on cross-examination before the preliminary investigation judge	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on jurisdiction over the order for compulsory indictment	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on time management of investigations (e.g., deadlines, extensions)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on prosecution (e.g., committal for trial, criminal decree, etc.)	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on participation in the preliminary hearing	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the drafting of charges	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on preventive measures and related proceedings	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on participation in the hearing at a distance	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the discovery of documents at the investigation stage	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on appeal and the prosecutor's cassation appeal	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on drafting techniques for appeals	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the search for evidence	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the functions of the juvenile prosecutor	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on penal enforcement	1_____10
<input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on written and oral closing arguments	1_____10

- | | |
|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the priority of proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on statute of limitations | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on dealing with judges | 1 _____ 10 |

S8. Usefulness of the targeted traineeship for supervisory magistrate [section only for MOTs who attended the targeted traineeship for supervisory magistrate].

Q19. What is your assessment of the usefulness for your daily work of the following training contents offered to you during the targeted traineeship for probation magistrate?

In case your training did not cover some of the listed competences or you have never used the competences acquired in the training course in your work practice, please do not answer the specific question, *thank you*)

- | | |
|--|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with prison management | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with other institutions (DAP, UEPE, etc.) | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on surveillance proceedings | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the management of files of alternative or security measures | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on work organisation | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the organisation of the collegial hearing | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the certificate of execution and criminal record | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the execution order | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on alternative measures | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on health in prison in particular mental health | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the criminal execution of foreigners | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the organisation of the collegial hearing | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the Criminal Execution Information System (SIES) | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the Surveillance Office Information System (SIUS) | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on exit permits | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on early release | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the dissolution of cumulation | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the conversion of fines | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on the specificity of the relationship between minors and prison | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on prison circuits and differentiated regimes | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on probation to social services | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on home detention | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on work outside and semi-freedom | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on restorative statute barred and restorative justice | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with the public prosecutor | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with the detainee | 1 _____ 10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Acquired competences on relations with lawyers | 1 _____ 10 |

S9. Assessment of one's role and function [Section for all respondents]

Q20. We would like to have your opinion on the contribution that initial training has had on your role and performance. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

	totally agree	partially Agreed	partially in disagreement	totally disagree	don't know / I cannot answer
Initial training significantly affected my perception of the work as a magistrate.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The initial training did not really influence my behaviour at work.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
Daily practice was very different from what I learnt during the initial training course	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The awareness of my role as a magistrate only emerged after some time.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
Only the relationship with colleagues at work actually consolidated my perception of the role of a magistrate.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The awareness of my impartiality increased after the initial training course.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]
The competences acquired during initial training have strengthened my ability to resist internal and external pressures that could threaten my independence.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[9]

S10. Comments [Section for all respondents]

The questionnaire is finished. We would be grateful if you would like to leave comments and/or suggestions. Please use this space [max 1000 characters].

We thank you for your cooperation.

2

Appendix 2

Examples of questions that may be used in a questionnaire, in interviews, in a focus group to evaluate training activities 'over time'

Course design

1. Was the order of the various training sessions within the logic of the course?
2. Was the length of the whole course consistent with the training objectives?
3. Were the training objectives clear?
4. Was the number of participants consistent with the training methodology?
5. Were you satisfied with the training methodology?
6. Which training methodology, if any, would be more used?
7.
8. Please leave a comment on the course design.

Content

1. Was the content of the training consistent with your expectation?
2. Was the content of the training consistent with the course programme?
3. With what percentage of the content were you not familiar?
4. Did you apply something at work that you learned during the course?
5. Did you notice that you increased your skills as a result of the training?
6. Did you notice a change in your professional attitude after the training?
7. Did you notice a change in some behaviour at work as a result of the training?
8.
9. Please leave a comment on the content of the course.

Presentation and course materials

1. Were the presentations clear?
2. Would you please single out the one that you liked the most and explain why?
3. Would you please single out the one that you did not like and explain why?
4. Do you believe the presentations were well coordinated?
5. Do you think they used the correct audio-visual aids?
6. Do you think the materials supplied were consistent with the presentations?
7. Did you consult the materials after the course?
8. Did you find it was easy to obtain access to the materials?
9. Do you think the course materials were useful for improving your knowledge?
10.
11. Please leave a comment on the presentation and the course materials.

Future course

1. Would you recommend the course as it is to your colleagues?
2. Would you propose any changes in the course?
3. Would you propose any changes in the course design?
4. Would you propose any changes in the content of the course?
5. Would you propose any changes in the course methodology?
6. Would you propose any changes in the course trainers?
7. Would you evaluate the course differently and if so, how?
8.
9. Please leave a comment on the improvement of future courses.

3

Appendix 3 **Example of a Level 3 form from the Kirkpatrick PILOT EJTN 6-month Cybercrime and E-Evidence II (advanced) Training**

INSTRUCTION - The following questions are about the **Cybercrime and E-Evidence II (advanced)** training which took place in **Lisbon, Portugal on October 28-29, 2021**. The goal is to evaluate the impact of the training you attended. Your answers are important in ensuring the effectiveness of the training and helping support improvement.

CONFIDENTIALITY - To protect confidentiality, the names of the participants in the training program will not be used in any of the reports produced. The data will be compiled together and analyzed as a group with the objective of understanding the impact of training.

1. Overall, how effective do you think the training activity **Cybercrime and E-Evidence II (advanced)** has been to improve your job performance?

Not at all effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very effective	Extremely effective
1	2	3	4	5

Additional notes/comments (optional)

2. Thinking back, indicate whether the **Cybercrime and E-Evidence II (advanced)** training were effective in improving your job performance in the following areas: (If you have not performed this task since taking the training, select Not Applicable (NA)) *

Why? Please provide comments to clarify your selection (if any)

	1 Not at all effective	2 Somewhat effective	3 Effective	4 Very effective	5 Extremely effective	NA
Search for specific online computer data						
Seize specific online computer data						
Seize cryptocurrencies						
Confiscate cryptocurrencies						
Contact Eurojust/ Europol/ Single Point of Contact for help in transborder access to data						

Additional notes/comments (optional)

3. If you were not able to apply what you learned or if you encountered barriers, what has prevented you from effectively using the knowledge and skills in your workplace?

(Select all that apply)

- ☐ I was able to apply what I learned and I did not encounter barriers
- ☐ I did not have the resources I needed
- ☐ I did not have opportunities to use what I learned
- ☐ The training content was not relevant to my current role
- ☐ I lacked procedural knowledge
- ☐ I did not have the time to apply what I learned
- ☐ I did not have support within the working environment

Additional notes/comments (optional)

4. Are there other ways you plan to use the knowledge and skills learned in the training in the future?

5. Finally, please note any suggestions or improvements to the training activity that could help you be effective in the workplace.

References

American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) (2009), *New study shows training evaluation efforts need help*, available at: <https://www.td.org/insights/astd-new-study-shows-training-evaluation-efforts-need-help>.

American Society for Training & Development (ASTD) (2012), *2012 State of the Industry*, ASTD Research Department

Arabi E. (2020), *Training Design Enhancement through Training Evaluation: Effects on Training Transfer*, 2020, NLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones. 3983, available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/2208573>

EJTN, (2016), *Handbook on Judicial Training Methods*.

EJTN (2017), *Guidelines for Evaluation of judicial Training Practices*.

Kirkpatrick J. and W.K. Kirkpatrick (2021), *An introduction to the new Kirkpatrick Model*, Kirkpatrick Partners.

Intela, Learning 'Myth' #1: Ebbinghaus Forgetting Curve, available at: <https://intelalearning.wordpress.com/2018/07/19/learning-myth-1-ebbinghaus-forgetting-curve/>

McLean, S., & Moss, G. (2003), 'The are happy, but did they make a difference? Applying Kirkpatrick's framework to the evaluation of a national leadership program', *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 18(1), 1-23.

Moller, L. & Mallin, P. (1996), 'Evaluation practices of instructional designers and organizational supports and barriers', *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 9(4), 82-92.

Noe, R. A. (2017), *Employee training and development*, McGraw-Hill Education.

Scuola Superiore della Magistratura (SSM) (2022), *Ten years of the Italian School for the Judiciary (2011-2021)*, Notebook No. 12, in https://www.scuolamagistratura.it/web/portalesm/nuovi-quaderni-ssm-frontend?p_p_id=en_intersistemi_ssm_portlets_quadernissm_P_QUADERNI_SSMPMPortlet_INSTANCE_3sVGZNRy1oLF&p_p_lifecycle=2&p_state=normal&p_p_mode=view&p_cacheability=cacheLevelPage&en_intersistemi_ssm_portlets_quadernissm_P_QUADERNI_SSMPortlet_INSTANCE_3sVGZNRy1oLF_filedownloadid=3498423

Twitchell, S., Holton, E., & Trott, J. (2000), 'Technical training evaluation practices in the United States', *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 13(3), 84-110.



European Judicial Training Network

European Judicial Training Network (EJTN)

123, rue du Commerce
B-1000 Brussels
Phone: +32 2 280 22 42
Fax: +32 2 280 22 36
www.ejtn.eu

