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Introduction

“Developing indicators for a judicial institution is not an easy task as it requires assessing and understanding complex factors.” – Judge Silvia Fernández de Gurmendi, the President of the International Criminal Court.

Measuring judicial performance is a daunting challenge for court managers. They need clear, responsive indicators that can adapt to changing goals and environments in their respective institutions. The last two decades have been marked by national and international attempts to address this issue through systems of judicial performance evaluation (JPE).

This is a complex task. While efforts to improve such systems are still underway in the Global North, the models recommended for improving judicial performance in the Global South pose further challenges given constraints in capacity and range of government action. Studying locally-developed systems of JPE may have a lot to offer as justice leaders and development practitioners look for new approaches and methods to measure performance of courts.

One such innovation recently took place in Ethiopia. The Federal Supreme Court of Ethiopia together with the Inspection Directorate has designed and implemented a new JPE program that shifted the emphasis away from a single-dimensional, productivity-focused approach towards a multidimensional, mixed-method approach. This paper will document the promise of multi-methodological approaches that supplement administrative data with survey-based evaluations and courtroom observations to assess the quality of judicial services. It also suggests ways in which existing JPE systems in the Global South could be improved drawing on the example of the new JPE program in Ethiopia.

Misaligned Measures of Judicial Performance

Judicial performance evaluation is usually defined as the process of monitoring, analyzing and using performance data on a regular and continuous basis for the purposes of transparency and accountability,
and for improvements in efficiency, effectiveness, and the quality of justice.¹ There is no universal definition for judicial performance evaluation though. The design of JPE programs is, ideally, anchored on a clear sense of their local purpose, and the strong will of court leaders to map out management priorities and systems of information to determine what to measure and how to measure it. However, as the concept of “good” judicial performance evolves to embrace more complex organizations and multi-layered standards, the path to meaningful performance measurement systems becomes intricate. Leadership transitions are frequent in many judicial systems, and institutional goals, and priorities are hard to define, and they change regularly. In the absence of regular review and refinement of systems of JPE, purposes, conventional measures and methods may quickly become misaligned in practice.

One example of such misalignment relates to what common JPE programs measure. There is a growing consensus among justice leaders around the world on the need to improve court experiences by specific users as well as more general perceptions of trust in judiciary. It is reasoned that increased legitimacy of courts can weaken incentives to seek private vengeance, strengthen the enforceability of judgments, and cooperation with courts, enhancing their effectiveness in return. Numerous studies found that people’s trust in law and judiciary is more sensitive to the perceived fairness of the procedures and treatment – “procedural justice”- than the outcomes or decisions derived from the proceedings.² Yet the JPE programs that are common in the Global North still incorporate procedural justice criteria only to a modest extent. Most JPE systems continue to single dimensionally emphasize productivity and efficiency over quality, and outcomes over processes.³

An initial explanation for this misalignment is historical, and arguably relates to the autonomy and independence of justice agencies. Courts often view themselves as public service organizations, but have not historically acknowledged their participants as “clients,” establishing procedures and processes that primarily address the needs of the court administration with less attention to the needs of court users.⁴ Standards of good performance in courts have, thus, been customarily shaped by uniform, static parameters that tend to operate in isolation of one another, with little sense of direction, or progress towards stated institutional goals, and focus more on internal short-term management needs, such as distribution of cases among different branches and judges, or promotion and appointment of judges and court personnel. Traditional judicial performance measures consequently rely heavily on the machinery of court organization, typically measuring a blend of inputs, such as the number of court staff employed, and outputs, such as the number of cases processed by court staff.

¹ While the most common objective of JPE programs is to demonstrate courts’ accountability, and improve the quality and efficiency of justice delivery, they respond to varying needs across the globe. For example, in the United States, JPE programs are also used to provide information for voters in judicial-retention elections in some states, and in others with appointed judiciaries, to assist judicial administrators in making decisions on retention and assignments.

² See, e.g., Tyler, T. and Sevier, J., How do the courts create popular legitimacy? The role of establishing the truth, punishing justly, and/or acting through just procedures, 77 (3) Albany Law Review 1095, 1102. Available at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2396945 .

³ E.g., Only one out of ten measures in the model court performance measures designed by the National Center for State Courts of the United States (CourTools) reveal some procedural justice aspects of courts’ functioning, while the other nine measures are mainly productivity and case-management focused. The ten CourTools measures respectively are (1) Access and Fairness; (2) Clearance Rates, (3) Time to Disposition, (4) Age of Active Pending Caseload, (5) Trial Date Certainty, (6) Reliability and Integrity of Case Files, (7) Collection of Monetary Penalties, (8) Effective Use of Jurors, (9) Court Employee Satisfaction, and (10) Cost Per Case.


The Quest for Multi-Method Approaches to JPE in the Global North

Procedural justice and quality measures, to the extent they are incorporated in JPE, are not only limited by narrowly-defined, or confusing goals or objectives. They are further restrained by the relatively few approaches used to inform them.

In the United States, for example, procedural justice criteria in judicial performance have traditionally been limited to surveys completed by attorneys and in some instances by courtroom personnel. With few exceptions, court users are typically excluded from, or minimally engaged in this process. Many of these contemporary JPE programs are primarily based on a model first established in 1985 by the American Bar Association (ABA). ABA Guidelines incorporated a few procedural justice indicators under “Integrity and Impartiality” and “Professionalism and Temperament,” such as treating people with dignity and respect, acting fairly by giving people individual consideration, and consideration of both sides of an argument before rendering decision.

CourTools, the model trial court performance measures designed by the National Center for State Courts in the United States, is another example of the heavy reliance on surveys as a single-method approach to measuring procedural justice in courts. CourTools’ Access and Fairness measure, which is notably the only measure devoted to procedural justice out of ten model measures, recommends administration of court user surveys to measure court’s accessibility and its treatment of customers in terms of fairness, equality, and respect.

Measures of procedural justice and methodologies recommended by the ABA, and the CourTools have inspired several other national and international JPE, which in return also relied heavily on surveys. For example, the International Framework for Court Excellence recommends survey of court users about their experiences to measure key aspects of procedural justice, including accessibility, fairness, accuracy, timeliness, knowledge of judges and treatment by court staff. The approach in this procedural justice measure is a close-adaptation of CourTools’ Access and Fairness measure, and the model survey questionnaire is based on a USAID-sponsored Court Modernization Project for the Macedonia Judiciary.

While the ABA and CourTools models continue to influence design of JPE systems both nationally and internationally, their overreliance on survey-based measures lacks empirical validation. One issue with overreliance on surveys in measuring procedural justice is that such surveys often cannot capture contextual information that shapes the behavior of court actors, and their interactions. Instead, they track structured, quantitative information from respondents about clearly defined descriptions of behavior (e.g. whether the judge properly applies the law or not). Since the context is very important to evaluating procedural justice, the systems that employ surveys as the only method may not accurately reflect procedural fairness of judicial performance. Second, gender and racial biases are common in surveys, and single dimensional, survey-based JPEs could, thus, misinform justice leaders.

The use of surveys has many other problems as well, including cost, ability to track measures over time, sampling, and over-reliance on “subjective” measures (perceptions, expectations, etc.).

These inherent problems with surveys are amplified because the weaknesses of surveys are often not compensated for by the strengths of alternative measurement methodologies. Over-reliance on surveys that result in a single-metric of performance may impede judges’ acceptance of JPE programs, their self-improvement, and strengthening of public trust and satisfaction.

In response to these concerns, some judicial

---

branches have begun to expand the scope of the methodologies used in their evaluation programs beyond surveys. One of these innovations has been to incorporate courtroom observations in JPE programs. While still seldom used, courtroom observations have a great potential in revealing information about how processes affect outcomes, and how judicial behavior affects people’s perceptions and trust in judiciary. Observation instruments can be designed to collect less structured, qualitative information about behavior of court actors in its natural context. In this way, courtroom observations and surveys can complement one another to generate a more complete picture of the functioning of judiciary, including for example, argumentation, on-record/off-record behavior and interventions by actors, courtroom climate, use of technology, among other variables.7

Like in surveys, there are inherent challenges to using courtroom observations for JPE. First, like surveys, courtroom observations can produce biased results if they are not designed carefully, or if used without proper training and guidance. The affect of bias may be reduced by focusing observer’s attention on the direct professional working experience in the courtroom, instead of judge’s personality traits. Second, designing good courtroom observation instruments, selecting, and training observers could be a complex task. One suggestion to address this capacity issue, is to start small, and employ an incremental approach while developing mixed-method systems of JPE.8

Developing and implementing multi-dimensional, multi-methodological systems of JPE takes time. But with persistence, and continuous refinements justice leaders can develop performance measurement tools that are tailored to the varying local contexts and challenges. The experience in Ethiopia’s courts proves so.

The New Multidimensional Judicial Performance Evaluation System in Ethiopia

The Federal Supreme Court of Ethiopia (FSE) has been one of the most engaged Ethiopian government institutions in the process of reform to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their services, as well as the responsiveness of the services to the needs of the public.


Court reform in Ethiopia was initially mainly focused on improving the efficiency of courts. The former federal JPE system replicated traditional European and U.S. models. It was one-dimensional and measured administrative outcomes only using predominantly intake and output measures, such as number of cases received and disposed, and speed of processing. The Judicial Administration Council, supported by a small complaints department within the Supreme Court, used to manage JPE in Ethiopia. While this former system was in place, efficiency of courts as measured by clearance rates achieved a remarkably high level. According to the five-year Court Performance Summary report of the FSE (2011-2016), the clearance rate in Ethiopian courts,

7 E.g., The state of Utah in the United States has been a pioneer in effectively using courtroom observations in its judicial performance evaluation program since 2008. See, Nicholas H. Woolf & Jennifer MJ Yim, The Courtroom-Observation Program of the Utah Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission, Court Review, Volume 47, Issue 4, p.84.

8 E.g., The Judicial Performance Evaluation Commission in charge of designing and conducting courtroom observations in Utah had several attempts over the years to gradually improve the observation instrument, training and selection of observers. See Woolf & Yim, supra at p.85.
on average was 100% in 2012, and despite a slight decrease since then, remained at 95% in 2016. However, justice leaders in Ethiopia quickly realized that speedy delivery of judicial services did not necessarily translate into increased public satisfaction and trust in courts.

The FSE together with other leading justice agencies concluded that they needed a new tool to improve the performance and capacity of the judges, and decided in 2010 to develop a new, multidimensional JPE system. While developing this new system, the Federal Supreme Court used a participatory method inspired by the “Indicator Methods Camp,” co-hosted by Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice and the Justice and Legal Systems Research Institute in Addis Ababa in 2014, and engaged in discussions with a group of experts and varying stakeholders.9

After a pilot program that lasted five years at the federal level, the new system was officially implemented in 2015. The enthusiasm for the new JPE program at the federal level matched a comparable momentum at the state level across the country. By December 2016, Amhara, Tigray, Oromia, and Southern Nations, Nationalities and People’s Regional States had in place innovative JPE programs in their local courts.

The new federal JPE program in Ethiopia is comprised of three dimensions, and employs a combination of multiple methodologies for periodic data collection:

1. **Balanced scorecard**: This component consists of indicators drawn from the case management system based on the strategic plan of the FSE, and uses administrative data.

2. **Customer satisfaction**: This component consists of surveys of lay people and legal professionals participated in legal proceedings, as well as courtroom observations by designated officials.

3. **Individual judicial plans**: This component allows individual judges to set their own benchmarks for their performance goals each year.

These three components of the new JPE program are used on a regular basis to evaluate both the overall performance of courts to improve justice delivery in the country, and individual performance of judges. A Judicial Evaluation Directive was enacted to guide the process of evaluation. Judicial Inspection Directorate, Strategic Management Directorate and the Secretariat of the Judicial Administration Council were mandated to jointly oversee the program.

**The New ‘Customer’ Satisfaction Dimension of JPE in Ethiopia**

One of the most innovative aspects of the new JPE program in Ethiopia is its new ‘customer’ or user satisfaction dimension. This new component assesses individual judicial performance together with the overall performance of courts to meet the strategic goals of the justice sector as a whole. It also aims to assess public perception and trust towards the judiciary based on their experiences. Nine indicators under three main measures are developed to evaluate the satisfaction of users of judicial services: (1) **Independence and professionalism**, measured by five indicators; (2) **Rendering [quality of] judgment**, measured by two indicators; and (3) **Public perception**, measured by two indicators as seen in Figure 1.

---


In addition to the increased sophistication of indicators of quality and procedural justice as seen in Figure 1, this new, multi-layered dimension of JPE in Ethiopia is especially remarkable for the richness of the methodologies chosen to inform these indicators. The customer satisfaction component employs multiple methodologies simultaneously: survey of stakeholders and court users including legal professionals and laypeople, as well as observations of courtroom proceedings. The Inspection Directorate collects broader opinion of the institutional stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Justice (now the Office of the Attorney General), the Police, the Prison Administration, the Office of the Ombudsman and Human Rights Commission, to assess their satisfaction of courts’ overall performance via surveys consisting of closed-ended and open-ended questions. Additionally, legal professionals (attorneys) and laypeople participating in courtroom proceedings (“public”) are asked to fill in a survey instrument (“questionnaire”) prepared by the secretariat of
Judicial Administration Commission to assess the judge’s performance based on their experience. The questionnaires for both groups contain several evaluation criteria, designed as structured definitions of judge’s behavior and attitude, where the respondent ranks the performance of the judge from 1 (very low performance) to 5 (excellent performance) for each criterion (See Survey Form for Public and Survey Form for Legal Professionals in the Appendix). The survey instrument for legal professionals contains nine criteria focusing on legal and technical knowledge and capacity of the judge, while the instrument for laypeople contain fifteen criteria with a more targeted focus on judge’s communication skills and attitude. At present, surveys of legal professionals and laypeople are conducted twice a year, and the findings constitute 15% of the individual performance evaluation of judges, remaining of which is comprised of judge’s self-evaluation, and evaluation by peer judges, and the president of the court.

The new JPE system in Ethiopia also involves courtroom observations. The observations are conducted by a team of legal professionals from the Inspection Directorate according to the procedures set in the Directorate’s Inspection Manual, in randomly selected courts in all three divisions (civil, criminal, and labor) of three levels of federal courts (First Instance, High Court and Supreme Court), using structured checklists (See Courtroom Observation Form in the Appendix). The observation checklist includes ten structured questions relating to the behavior of the judge observed, each of which are scored out of ten, and constitutes 10% of the total performance score of the judge. The instrument ends with an open-ended question where the observer can note the strengths and weaknesses of the judge observed in terms of building public trust and satisfaction. The structured questions channel observations towards the following aspects of judicial performance, and procedural justice:

- Having due regard to constitutional rights and principles;
- Making necessary preparation on the case;
- Efficiency and capacity portrayed in leading the case and allocating time;
- Giving enough time and opportunity for litigants to explain their case;
- Judge’s attitude and respect towards court users;
- Discriminatory treatment based on race, ethnicity, gender, economic status or any other condition;
- Effort to facilitate the assignment of interpreters, so that court users understand proceedings;
- Ensuring order and respect for the court;
- Effort to describe the proceedings to court users; and
- Explaining any delay or inconvenience in a polite manner.

The Directorate oversees the inspection process, which includes case file reviews in addition to observations, on a quarterly basis according to its annual plan. Findings of courtroom observations are not taken into consideration in individual performance evaluation of judges, but primarily used to complement and cross check the findings of the inspectors’ examination of active and disposed court files. The findings of observations are also referred to in the Inspection Directorate and the Strategic Management Directorate’s assessment of the overall performance of courts. These observations also inform the Judicial Administration Commission on the existing needs for improvement in knowledge and attitude of judges in general.

**Challenges and Strategies in Implementation of JPE**

Like elsewhere, the transition to the new multidimensional JPE program in Ethiopia has not been smooth. The main challenge while implementing the new program was overcoming...
the resistance of judges, and the need to balance performance evaluation with judicial independence and autonomy.

As an early strategy, the officials at the Federal Supreme Court and the Inspection Directorate considered modifying the methods, and the people involved in the evaluation. For instance, they tried to emphasize peer evaluation and appellate review instead of external measurement, such as surveys of legal professionals, to help manage the tension on more sensitive measures, such as the rendering [quality] of judgment measure. However, several months of piloting revealed that understanding the level of knowledge, and specifically the attitude of judges during the proceedings through peer and appellate review was very difficult, if not impossible. Therefore, as they implemented the new JPE program, the officials reinstated the role of external legal professionals in ‘customer’ satisfaction component, and developed other strategies to promote judge’s acceptance of the new system. For example, they invested in improving their communication methods both internally with all stakeholders in the judiciary, and externally with the public, creating an expectation among the public, and hoping to create an obligation among judiciary to meet it. They also planned to integrate the evaluation criteria into the benefit package of the judiciary to reward progress and celebrate success. The strategies seem to have been effective. Since its implementation in 2015, judges have increasingly been supportive of the new system, and now view it less as an encroachment on their independence.

While the transition to the new multidimensional and multi-methodological system is a significant progress for JPE in Ethiopia, limited technical, infrastructural and human resource capacity is still challenging the implementing agencies. Over the past five years of the piloting phase, the Federal Supreme Court and the Judicial Administration Council worked to increase human resources for data collection and analysis, and automated some of the data collection. However, the capacity deficit has not completely been resolved yet. It is most significant in the recruitment of legal professionals by the Inspection Directorate to conduct the courtroom observations. The Directorate acknowledges that observers must be adequately selected, trained and overseen to ensure accurate and unbiased evaluation of a judge’s knowledge and attitude. Due to its current institutional and departmental structure, however, the Inspection Directorate can recruit only junior legal professionals as observers. Some allege that observers lack adequate experience and training for the task. Further research is needed to understand whether and how this has impacted the observation process. The question of whether the judges adjust their behavior while the observer is present in the courtroom, and how this affects the evaluation also remain unaddressed. Finally, there is room for further refinement of survey and observation instruments used in the new JPE program. The observation instrument is very similar to the survey instruments. The results in observations would, thus, likely closely mimic the survey results, generating only a limited amount of new information. The observation instrument could be enhanced to include more qualitative information. This, in return, would require a carefully designed training program for the observers, emphasizing the need for continuous improvements in technical, and human resources capacity.

Given their limited resources, how can officials in Ethiopia continue to refine their performance evaluation indicators, and methods? One practical and less-costly way the existing systems of JPE can be improved is to build on methodological developments in academic research. A recent research collaboration between the Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice, Oromia Supreme Court, and Justice for All Prison Fellowship Ethiopia on “Linkages Between Formal Justice Systems and Customary Dispute Resolution Mechanisms” is just one example. The study explored the functioning of customary dispute resolution mechanisms in six communities of the Oromia region, and sought ways in which such

systems can work together with the formal justice system to improve procedural justice, and maximize justice delivery in Ethiopia. The researchers conducted systematic observations of judicial proceedings using a structured checklist to record the interactions between the community members, the parties to the disputes, and the actors in the traditional and formal criminal justice systems. The observation instrument included both quantitative and qualitative information, such as selection criteria of elders (who serve as ad hoc ‘judges’ in disputes), interactions between the elder and the parties (e.g. defendant, witnesses), and other contextual information. Officials may find it useful to review such studies, especially the innovative methodologies employed, and engage scholars in discussion to learn about the challenges encountered in study implementation, as they strive to improve their JPE instruments and methods.

Conclusion

Justice leaders and development practitioners around the world are increasingly seeking ways to design and implement better JPE systems with a view to increase accountability of courts, and public trust and confidence to formal justice systems. While productivity-focused, one-dimensional systems are still prominent, promising examples of multi-layered systems that favor mixed-method approaches to JPE have been flourishing in the last decade. The Federal Supreme Court of Ethiopia developed one such system that could be a source of inspiration for the Global South. The new system employs a multidimensional set of indicators of quality of judicial services, and procedural justice in addition to the more traditional measures of productivity and efficiency. The sophistication of the indicators used is accompanied by the richness of methodologies supplementing administrative data with survey and observational data collected from a variety of stakeholders, from legal professionals to laypeople.

The transition to the new multidimensional, multi-method system of JPE has been neither swift nor smooth in Ethiopia. The implementation of the new system was preceded by a pilot phase that lasted over five years, was followed by regular adjustment and refining, and only gradually came to be accepted by judges, and other main stakeholders. The challenge is not over. Even after all these refinements, justice officials in Ethiopia wisely acknowledge various issues that persist in the new system and need continuous adjustment. Their successors, and peers may also benefit from such an iterative and incremental approach as they develop new or refine existing judicial performance evaluation systems.

Acknowledgements

This paper draws heavily on observations, and research assistance of Maereg Gebregziabher, who served as a Research Affiliate for the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management in Ethiopia. Andres Rengifo provided helpful comments and insights. The Author is grateful to both for their help, and to officials in the Federal Supreme Court of Ethiopia, in particular, for sharing the information contained in this paper.

Selen Siringil Perker is a Research Fellow at the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
APPENDIX: Judicial Performance Evaluation Forms in Ethiopia

Judicial Evaluation Survey Form to be Filled Out by Public [Court Users]

Name (optional)_____________________________
Reason for appearing in Court__________________
Court_____________________________________
Bench_____________________________________  
Date_______Month_______year  Morning☐  Afternoon☐  
Name Of the Judge__________________________
Type of Case______________________________

Evaluate the specified judge in light of the following evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In terms of conducting proceedings in open court</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity and time given to explain one's case</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of understanding about the case</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort made to resolve the case in due time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of the judge in conducting the proceeding free from using strong language</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention and care in analyzing evidence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution taken to ensure their work is not in any way contrary to or belittles the culture, religion or sentiments of others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of order/decision given by the judge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of finishing the necessary work and appearing ready in appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving service to customers on the scheduled time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort made to clarify/explain issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of using appropriate language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect they show to customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of treating both genders equally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting a proceeding free from bias/discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description
For the purpose of this questionnaire evaluation standards ranging from 1-5 are put
5 point indicates Excellent performance
4 point indicates Very Good performance
3 point indicates Good performance
2 point indicates Low performance
1 point indicates Very Low performance

If you could not/it is difficult for you to evaluate the performance of the judge in light of these standards put a mark in the “X” column

Do you have additional comments about the judge or is there any idea you would like to add?
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

Thank You
Confirmation to be filled out by the person who supervised the questionnaire
Name ______________________________ Date __________________ Signature ___________________
Judicial Evaluation Survey Form To Be Filled Out By Legal Professionals

Name (optional) __________________________
Profession ______________
Court ______________

Bench ______________
Date______Month______Year Morning ☐ Afternoon ☐

Name of the Evaluated Judge __________________
Type of Case __________________

➢ Evaluate the specified judge in light of the following evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of the judge in conducting the proceeding</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the judge in the area of law relevant to the case</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct of the proceeding according to relevant procedural laws</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence in court having undertook the necessary preparation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the evidence in light of the appropriate law when rendering judgment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of the judge in identifying the issue of the case</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner of clearly explaining the order, judgment or outcome of the case</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presiding litigations, rendering judgment and decision in a manner free from bias</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity and attitude of the judge in accepting and implementing the principles of the Constitution</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description

For the purpose of this questionnaire evaluation standards ranging from 1-5 are put

5 point indicates Excellent performance
4 point indicates Very Good performance
3 point indicates Good performance
2 point indicates Low performance
1 point indicates Very Low performance

If you could not / it is difficult for you to evaluate the performance of the judge in light of these standards put a mark in the “X” column

Do you have additional comments about the judge or is there any idea you would like to add?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank You
Confirmation to be filled out by the person who supervised the questionnaire

Name__________________________ Date__________________ Signature__________________
Courtroom Observation Form

Name of the judge __________________________
The bench where the judge presides __________________
Number of files the judge has on the day [of observation] _________________
Number of cases heard ______________________
Number of cases resolved on the day [of observation] _________________
Date of observation ___________/___________/year
Start of observation (hour and minute) __________________________
End of observation (hour and minute) __________________________
Time the bench convened (hour and minute) __________________________
Time the bench adjourned (hour and minute) __________________________

Type of proceeding  □ Open  □ In Office

Name of the person who conducted the assessment  _________________ Responsibility __________

Mode of Assessment  □ In Person
Reason for Assessment __________________________

Proceeding Observation Summary

Each of the following ten questions should be scored, and constitute 10% of the total score.
Care should be given, since explanation may be required from the person who fills out the form.

1. Does the judge carry out his/her task having due regard to constitutional rights and principles?

□ Yes  □ No  □ Other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given ________________/10
2. Does the judge appear ready and prepared for the case?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given______________/10

3. Does the way the judge presides over the case and allocates time show efficiency and capacity?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given______________/10

4. Does the judge give enough time and opportunity for litigants to explain their case?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given______________/10

5. What do you think about the judge's attitude while giving service to customers? Does s/he use strong language that demeans customers and attorneys?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given______________/10

6. Does the judge treat individuals without discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, economic status or any other condition?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark

Point that needs to be given______________/10

7. Does the judge make an effort to assign interpreters so that customers get service in the language they understand?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ other/additional remark
Point that needs to be given_____________________/10

8. Does the judge take necessary measures to ensure respect for and the order of the court?

   ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ other/additional remark
   Point that needs to be given_____________________/10

9. Does the judge make an effort to describe the procedure to customers and others in the court?

   ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ other/additional remark
   Point that needs to be given_____________________/10

10. Does the judge provide appropriate reason and explanation for any delay or inconvenience in a polite manner?

    ☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ other/additional remark
    Point that needs to be given_____________________/10

    Total point out of 100_________100%

In general, Judge_________________________ has the following strengths in building the trust of the public __________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

The following weaknesses in building public trust are also observed _____________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

The person who prepared the summary
Name____________________________________
Signature_______________________________

The person who verified the summary
Name _______________________
Date _______________________
Signature ______________________