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1. Introduction

- **Framework of the survey**

This report falls within the project of providing legal training for legal and judicial institutions in Iraq, a project conducted by the Arab Center for the Development of the Rule of Law and Integrity (ACRLI) and is part of the broader frame of the “Rule of Law” project conducted by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Iraq.

Project activities include conducting a full mapping process for legal training modernization needs at the Judicial Training Institute JTI, assessing the training materials and methods, in addition to developing proposals to enable a more efficient and appropriate legal and judicial work environment. The Project will also review the legal library and the JTI’s IT equipments while assessing the institute’s needs and putting forward equipment proposals.

The survey’s main goal is to gather useful data to help the ACRLI in its evaluation process of the current JTI curriculum and comparative study with other Arab and international curriculums with the aim of:

1. **Modernizing the JTI’s teaching curriculum by adapting the best Arab and international practices, and suggesting the addition of new material**

2. **Determining the JTI’s needs as to Library and IT equipments**

3. **Suggesting recommendations for development and recovery**

In addition, the survey will provide an overall picture of the respondents’ different opinions and determine directives that could be of use for the party responsible of the project.

2. Methodology

- **The Work team**

  - ACRLI experts and ENM experts (Ecole Nationale de la Magistrature): Preparing the questionnaire form based on best international practices and experiences in this domain.

  - International Data Corporation (IDC): technical help for producing the final format of questionnaire
- A specialized field-work team from Iraq: conducting the survey under the supervision of the project management.
  
  - **Surveyed sample size and respondents characteristics**

The survey was conducted with 10 JTI professors in Iraq.

The survey for JTI professors was conducted in Iraq between April and May of 2010.
3. Respondents characteristics/Information on the respondent

- **Post/Title**

The survey included the Head of Integrity Committee (10%), 1 judge (10%), 2 judges – Vice presidents of Appeal Court in Baghdad (20%), 2 Retired Judges (20%), 1 Translator (10%), 1 programmer (10%) and 1 Professor at Law School- Baghdad University (10%).

- **Gender**

The survey included 80% male respondents and 20% female respondent.
- **City**

The survey revealed that all respondents were from Baghdad.

![City Graph](image)

- **Age**

The survey showed 30% of respondents were over 55 years old, 30% between 35 and 44 years and 30% between 45 and 54 years.

![Age Graph](image)
• **Level of Education**

Survey results revealed that the majority of respondents (70%) are University Degree holders (BA/BS).

![Level of Education Chart](chart1.png)

• **Profession**

Survey revealed that 60% of respondents are judges and 40% University professors.

![Profession Chart](chart2.png)
- **Years of Experience in teaching in general**

Survey revealed that half of respondents have between 3 to 10 years of experience.

![Bar Chart for Years of Experience](chart.png)

- **Foreign Languages**

4 respondents do not master any foreign language (40%), 6 master English only (60%).

![Pie Chart for Foreign Languages](chart2.png)
• Basis of professors’ selection at the institute

Survey revealed that the majority of respondents (90%) were selected on the basis of relative field of expertise.

![Pie chart showing basis of professors' selection at the institute.](image)

• Original field of expertise

Results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11-2 What is your field of expertise as a professor?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil law in general</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law of Civil Procedures</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Status Law</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Procedures Law</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computer Literacy | 10.0% | 90.0%
Foreign Languages | 10.0% | 90.0%
Art of investigation | 10.0% | 90.0%
Social Sciences | 0.0% | 100.0%
Human Rights | 10.0% | 90.0%
Judicial ethics | 0.0% | 100.0%

11-2 What is your field of expertise as a professor?

- Years of experience in original field of expertise

Survey revealed that 40% of respondents have 3 to 10 years of experience in their original field of expertise, 30% between 11 and 20 years and 30% between 21 and 40 years.

2-12 Years of experience related to the above mentioned legal field of expertise
• Full-time professors at the Institute, or part-time professors exercising a legal profession

Survey revealed that half of respondents are part-time professors.
4. Evaluation of JTI’s legal training

- **Part One: General Questions**

  - Assessing JTI’s training in terms of promoting the daily written professional practice of the trainee/judge

    The respondents were asked to evaluate the institute’s training for promoting the daily written professional practice of the trainee/judge; the majority of them (90%) considered the training “good”.

    3 - 1 How do you assess training in terms of promoting your daily written professional practice (drafting provisions, decisions, minutes...)?

    ![Pie chart showing 90% Good, 10% Average]

  - Assessing JTI’s training in terms of promoting the daily oral professional practice of the trainee/judge

    The respondents were asked to evaluate the institute’s training for promoting the daily oral professional practice of the trainee/judge; the majority of them (80%) considered the training “good”.

    3 - 2 How do you assess training in terms of your daily oral professional practice (interrogation, investigation, managing sessions...)?

    ![Bar chart showing 80% Good, 10% Average, 10% Don't know/No Answer]
• Evaluating the general level of response and understanding of the legal material studied at JTI

Respondents were asked to evaluate the general level of response and understanding of the legal material studied at the institute; half of respondents evaluated it as “good” and 40% as “excellent”.

![Bar Chart 3-3: What is the trainee’s general level of response and understanding of the legal material he studies at the institute?](chart1.png)

- Very high level: 40.0%
- High level: 50.0%
- Average: 10.0%

• Number of extracurricular legal activities attended during training period at the institute

60% of respondents did not specify an answer while the rest of respondents reported that the number of extracurricular legal activities attended do not exceed one conference.

![Bar Chart 3-4: What is the number of extracurricular legal activities (short-term legal conferences and workshops) that the trainee attends during his training period?](chart2.png)

- Only one conference: 20.0%
- None: 20.0%
- Not specified/No Answer: 60.0%
• Extent of benefit from attended extracurricular legal activities (short-term legal conferences and workshops)

Results were equally divided (50%) between “yes strongly” and “yes fairly”.

- Link between weakness in foreign language and failure to increase practical level of training in terms of scientific research in foreign references

Majority of respondents considered there is a connection (complete or slight) between not mastering a foreign language and increasing training's practical level.
On the necessity of reconsidering trainees selection method and to which extent

The majority of respondents reported a need to reconsider trainees’ selection method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-7 Do you think that the method of judge selection should be reconsidered?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the necessity of conducting preparatory training sessions for contestants before joining JTI

The majority of respondents (70%) reported a need for preparatory training sessions for contestants before joining the institute (completely).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-8 Do you think that preparatory training sessions for contestants before they join the institute is necessary?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Evaluating professors’ selection method

Results were as follows: 40% excellent, 40% good, 10% average and 10% poor.

---

- On the best way of dealing with trainees’ low grades in one of the training materials

The majority of respondents (80%) considered that the best way to deal with trainees’ low grade on of the materials is “retaking the legal material”.

---

3-9 How do you find the method of professors’ selection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-10 What is the best way to handle trainees who get low grades in a training material?

- Retake the legal material: 80%
- Delay the process of judicial ranking: 20%
• On the necessity in the institute to address issues relating to ranking and promotion in the judicial profession

The majority of respondents (80%) reported the necessity (between strongly and quite) of addressing issues relating to ranking and promotion in the judicial work.

3-11 Should the Institute address issues relating to judicial ranking and promotion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>No answer or don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• On the necessity and benefit of exchanging knowledge, expertise and visits with other foreign or Arab judicial institutes

Respondents agreed (100%) on the necessity of exchanging knowledge, expertise and visits with Arab and foreign institutes.

3-12 Do you think that exchanging knowledge, expertise and visits with other foreign or Arab judicial institutes is necessary?

Yes with both institutes

Yes with both
On the necessity of offering incentives to judges/trainees to increase their level of interaction in terms of training: specify type of incentives

Respondents agreed (100%) on the necessity of offering incentives for judges to increase their interaction with training. Results also revealed that most of the respondents (40%) consider that incentives should be financial, moral, scientific and professional.
• Evaluating book references available in JTI’s library

The majority of the respondents (70%) reported that book references available in JTI’s library are good.

3-15 How do you find the book references at the Institute’s library?

- Above average 30%
- Slightly below average 70%

• Legal branches that need to be enriched with more books at JTI’s library

The survey revealed a need to focus mainly on books related to “IT law”, “Computer Literacy”, “Law of Civil Procedures”, “Penal Code” and “Personal Status law”.

3-16 Which legal branch needs to be enriched with more books at the Institute's library?

- Yes
- No
• On the need for foreign language books in JTI’s library: which language

Majority of respondents (80%) considered there is a need for enriching the institute’s library with foreign language books. And half of the respondents specified that the need is for English books only while the other half asked for English and French books.

![Pie chart for 3-17: Do you think the library should be enriched with foreign language?](image)

Yes: 80%
No: 20%

![Pie chart for 3-18: If yes, please specify:](image)

Only English: 50%
English and French Only: 50%
• **Evaluating IT equipments at the institute**

The respondents were asked to evaluate JTI’s IT equipment on a scale of Excellent to Not acceptable, and the majority of them (90%) considered the IT equipment level as good.

![Pie chart showing IT equipment evaluation](image)

**Part Two: questions related to material taught at the institute**

• **Material you teach at the institute**

![Bar chart showing material taught](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-18 What kind of material you lecture at the Institute?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil law in general</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law of Civil Procedures</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Law</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Status Law</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Procedures Law</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Law</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art of investigation</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial ethics</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Law</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• On having practiced theoretical or practical legal work or taught in the field of the material you teach at the Institute: specify the material

Survey revealed that majority of respondents (80%) has having practiced theoretical or practical legal work or taught in the field of the material you teach at the Institute. Also, half of the respondents had years of experience varying between 11 and 20 years.

![Pie chart showing 80% Yes and 20% No for practicing theoretical or practical legal work or teaching in the field of the material taught at the Institute.]

![Bar chart showing number of years of experience: 12.5% Between 3 and 10 years, 50% Between 11 and 20 years, 37.5% Between 21 and 40 years.]

3-21 Have you practiced theoretical or practical law or taught in the field of the material you teach at the Institute?

Yes 80%
No 20%

3-21-B If yes, please specify:

- Between 3 and 10 years: 12.5%
- Between 11 and 20 years: 50.0%
- Between 21 and 40 years: 37.5%
On the necessity to collect additional theoretical and practical knowledge related to the material you lecture at the Institute

Survey revealed that all respondents considered there’s a necessity (entirely to fairly) to collect additional theoretical and practical knowledge related to the material you lecture at the Institute.

3-22 Do you think that you need to collect additional theoretical knowledge related to the material you lecture at the Institute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Entirely</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>No answer/don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3-23 Do you think that you need to collect additional practical knowledge related to the material you lecture at the Institute?

- Entirely: 50%
- Fairly: 50%
• On the extent of using professional acquired experience when training at the Institute

Survey revealed that majority of respondents answered “yes considerably”.

3-24 Do you use your professional acquired experience when training at the Institute?

- Considerably: 90%
- Quite: 10%
On preferring to teach another material at the institute: specify the subject and reason of this preference

Results for this question were contradictory; half of the professors do prefer to teach another material, while the other half does not.

As for specifying the material preferred, results came as follows:
40% “Civil law in general”, 20% “Judicial ethics”, 20% “Criminal procedures law” and 20% “Civil procedures law”.

50% of respondents who chose “Civil law in general” and “Criminal procedures law” explained that they are better specialized in these two subjects and can provide much benefit for trainees.

Respondents who chose “Judicial ethics” explained that they chose this subject as it develops the knowledge and personality of the judge.
3-26 If yes please specify the material

- Civil Law in general: 2
- Judicial Ethics: 1
- Criminal Procedures Law: 1
- Law of Civil Procedures: 1

If the Civil Law in general Specify the reason:

- More specialized in the material, can better benefit the students: 50%
- No answer/don’t know: 50%
If Judicial Ethics Specify the reason:

Develop the knowledge and personality of the judge 100%

If criminal Procedures Law Specify the reason:

More specialized in the material, and can better benefit the students 100%

If Law of Civil Procedures specify the reason:

No answer/don’t know
On the need to change the content of the current legal material to become more judge-friendly

50% of respondents consider that there’s no need to change materials’ content while 30% consider it’s fairly necessary to change the current material content.

On the method and approach of legal lecturing

30% of the respondents reported that there is no need to change the method and approach of legal lecturing or the organization of legal materials, while half of the respondents consider it fairly necessary to change the method and approach of legal lecturing or the organization of legal materials.
On the necessity of increasing JTI's material at the theoretical level

Results for this question were a bit contradictory; 40% of respondents did not see a need to increase the theoretical level of the institute’s materials while 30% saw a great necessity to do so.

![Bar chart showing responses to the necessity of increasing JTI's material at the theoretical level.]

On the necessity of increasing JTI’s material at the practical level

All of the respondents reported a necessity to increase the practical level of the institute’s materials (greatly or slightly).

![Pie chart showing responses to the necessity of increasing JTI's material at the practical level.]

3-30 Do you think that the Institute’s material should be increased at the Practical level?
• On teaching trainees how to apply theoretical legal information on facts

Survey revealed that majority of respondents (70%) reported they do “considerably” teach trainees how to apply theoretical legal information on facts.

3-31 Do you teach trainees how to apply the theoretical legal information on facts?

- Considerably: 70.0%
- Quite: 10.0%
- Fairly: 10.0%
- No answer/don’t know: 10.0%

• On allowing for discussions in class and answering trainees' questions

All respondents reported they do allow for questions and discussions during training.

3-32 Do you allow for discussions in class and answer trainee’s questions?

- Considerably: 70%
- Quite: 30%
On handing out written lectures at the Institute: type of lectures

Majority of respondents (70%) reported they hand out written lectures during classes. 57.1% of lectures are written lectures including basic principles.
On the extent of reinforcing and updating the material you lecture by personal efforts and new theories

Survey revealed that majority of respondents reinforce and update the material they give by personal efforts and new theories.

- **3-35 Do you reinforce the material you lecture by personal efforts and new theories?**

  - Strongly: 50.0%
  - Fairly: 40.0%
  - Slightly: 10.0%

- **Number of references relied on by the professor for teaching each legal material**

  Survey revealed that 60% of respondents reported that the number of references they rely on is “between 2 and 6” and 40% “between 2 and 20”.

- **3-36 What is the number of references you rely on when teaching your material?**

  - Between 2 and 5: 60%
  - Between 6 and 20: 40%
• On preferring theoretical or practical examinations

Survey revealed that the majority of respondents (80%) prefer balancing between both practical and theoretical aspects of examination.

3-37 Do you prefer giving theoretical or practical examinations?

- Practical 20%
- I prefer balancing between both 80%

• On preferring written or oral examinations

Survey revealed that the majority of respondents (90%) prefer balancing between both written and oral aspects of examination.

3-38 Do you prefer giving oral or written examinations?

- Oral 10%
- I prefer balancing between both
On the method used by the professor for grade dividing

Survey revealed that 40% of respondents “One final and one semester” while 30% prefer “One final and one semester examination plus an assessment on class participation”.

Trainee assessment methods relied on by the professor

Survey revealed that all professors are not in favor of “Choose from pre-prepared answer” method and they all consider that “practical cases” method.
• **Number of researches assigned for each student**

40% of professors do not assign any research for trainees while 20% assign more than 1 research and 20% assign only one research.

![3-41 What is the number of researches you assign for each student?](chart)

• **Conducting a continuous assessment for each trainee**

The majority of respondents (60%) reported they conduct continuous assessment for each trainee.

![3-42 Do you conduct a continuous assessment for each trainee?](chart)
- Modernizing current JTI’s curriculum

The majority of respondents (70%) reported a need to fairly modernize the current curriculum at JTI.

![3-43 Do you think that the Institute’s curriculum needs development?](chart)

- On the ability of the current curriculum to fill legal knowledge gaps in law schools’ curriculums

70% of respondents considered that the current curriculum greatly fills legal knowledge gaps found in the curriculums of law schools.

![3-44 Do you think that the current curriculum fills legal knowledge gaps found in the curriculums of law schools?](chart)
• Identify deficiencies in legal and scientific sections in training curriculum requiring an addition of another training material

Survey revealed an important deficiency in “Criminal procedures law” and “Computer literacy”.

3-45 Out of the following legal and scientific sections, where do you identify a training curriculum deficiency requiring an addition of another training material?

- Civil law in general
- Law of Civil Procedures
- Criminal Law
- Real Estate Law
- Commercial Law
- Personal Status Law
- Civil Law in general
- Financial Law
- IT Law
- Criminal Procedures Law
- Constitutional Law
- Administrative Law
- Psychology
- Forensics
- Accounting
- Criminal law
- Foreign Languages
- Art of investigation
- Social Sciences
- Human Rights
- Judicial ethics
- No deficiencies
• Main three subjects to be removed from Institute’s curriculum

Results revealed that most of the respondents (70%) do not see any necessity for removing any subject from JTI’s curriculum. Results also revealed that main subjects to be removed from curriculum if need be are: Social sciences and real estate law.

![Chart showing top 3 subjects to be removed from the Institute’s curriculum]
On the preference to instruct more specialized legal materials related to new and modern laws and subjects

Majority of respondents (80%) strongly prefer instructing more specialized legal materials related to new and modern laws and subjects.

3-47 Do you prefer instructing more specialized legal materials or new and modern laws and subjects? (Such as IP, E-signatures, IT crimes...)

- Strongly 80%
- Don’t know / No Answer 20%

On assessing the current Institute’s method in terms of preparing trainees to exercise their judicial profession

60% of respondents assess the preparation as good and 40% as acceptable.

3-48 How do you assess the current Institute’s method in terms of preparing trainees to exercise their judicial profession?

- Good 60%
- Acceptable 40%
- Don’t know / No Answer 20%
• **Benefit of adopting e-learning at JTI**

Half of the respondents (50%) found no benefit in adopting e-learning.

3-49 **Do you think that e-learning is useful for certain materials? (By correspondence, online...)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Learning methods ratings according to suitability**

Respondents were asked to give ratings to learning methods according to their suitability and the results were pretty close between the following: “Lectures” (30%) and “Judgment analysis” (30%). Also the least favored way was “Class Discussions”.

3-50 **On a scale from 1 (Least favorable) to 5 (Most favorable), please give ratings to the following learning methods?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures More complex</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing Judgment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing real case</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing a legal text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Assessing practical training in courts**

Respondents were asked to assess practical training in courts; 40% of them considered the training good and 20% said it is average. It should be noted here that 30% of respondents described the training as poor.

![Bar chart showing how respondents assess practical training in courts](chart)

- **On the benefit of providing practical training via joining non judicial governmental institutions such as state administrations**

About half of the respondents (50%) consider there is no benefit in sending trainees to non judicial governmental institutions such as state administrations.

![Bar chart showing respondents' views on the benefit of practical training](chart)
• On the benefit of providing practical training via joining law firms and private companies

40% of respondents consider there is no benefit in sending trainees to law firms and private companies, while 30% find there’s quite a benefit in providing this practical training.

![Bar chart showing the benefit of providing practical training via joining law firms and private companies.](chart)

• On the benefit of providing practical training via joining private legal or academic institutes

The majority of respondents consider there is no benefit (strongly to quite) in sending trainees to private legal or academic institutes.

![Bar chart showing the benefit of providing practical training via joining private legal or academic institutes.](chart)
• On the level of the Institute’s annual examinations in terms of questions and content

The majority of respondents (70%) reported that the annual examinations at the institute, in terms of questions, are good.

3-55 How do you find the level of the Institute’s annual examinations in terms of questions and content?

- Excellent: 2 (20.0%)
- Good: 7 (70.0%)
- Average: 1 (10.0%)