



USAID
NGA POPULLI AMERIKAN
OD AMERIČKOG NARODA

Assessment of the Procedural Justice Application Tools Across Seven Basic Courts in Kosovo

January 2022



ASSESSMENT OF THE PROCEDURAL JUSTICE APPLICATION TOOLS ACROSS SEVEN BASIC COURTS IN KOSOVO

AUTHOR:

Dr. Albana Rexha



Visit our website
www.dplus.org

Learn more about our latest publications, news, and infographics online.



Find us on Facebook
[@democracyplus](https://www.facebook.com/democracyplus)



Find us on Facebook
[@democracy-plus](https://www.facebook.com/democracy-plus)



Find us on Twitter
[@democracy_plus](https://twitter.com/democracy_plus)



Find us on Youtube
[@Democracy Plus](https://www.youtube.com/DemocracyPlus)

Our Offices:

Rruga Tirana, Blloku C/4/1, Hyrja C,
Kati VIII, No. 83/84 Pristina, 10000
Kosovo

+383 (0) 38 749 288
info@dplus-ks.org

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without prior permission of D+.

DISCLAIMER: This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Democracy Plus and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.



Table of Contents

Key Findings.....	6
Introduction	8
Methodology.....	10
Court user survey:.....	10
Variables:	11
Access to information	11
Transparency.....	11
Efficiency	11
Fairness	11
Prevalence of corruption.....	11
Additional questions assessed	11
Observation courtroom experience survey	12
Demographic data	13
Court user survey results.....	19
Access to information and transparency	20
Overall ranking of courts on access to information and transparency.....	28
Efficiency and fairness	29
Overall ranking of courts on and efficiency and fairness.....	46
Prevalence to corruption	47
Overall ranking of courts on prevalence to corruption	51
Additional questions assessed	52
Overall ranking of courts on additional questions assessed	69
Comparison of rankings across all basic courts (2018- 2021)	71
Ranking comparison of all courts on access to information and transparency for 2018-2021....	73
Ranking comparison of all courts on efficiency and fairness for 2018-2021.....	74
Ranking comparison of all courts on prevalence of corruption for 2018-2021	75
Observation courtroom experience survey results	77
Ranking comparison of all courts based on observational questions' results	99
Policy recommendations	101
ANNEX I	102
ANNEX II	110

Key Findings

Court User Survey Findings

Access to Information and Transparency

Around **90%** of court users find it somewhat easy or very easy to find the courtroom or office needed.

Around **71%** of court users find it somewhat easy or very easy to get information about their case.

Around **79%** of court users do not use the court's website to obtain information.

Around **53%** of court users do not know about the existence of complaint boxes in the courthouse, while **3%** have claimed that there is no complaint box.

Efficiency and Fairness:

Around **77%** of court users claimed that they have been treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff. Data segregation by gender reveals the same sentiment for both women and men.

Around **94%** of court users were able to talk to court staff in their native language and around **89%** of court users have received documents in their native language.

Around **98%** of court users have declared they feel (physically) safe on the court premises.

Around **69%** of court users have declared that they do not know that they can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge.

Around **45%** of court users think that they are either not treated or only to some degree treated fairly by the judge. Data segregation by gender reveals the same sentiment for both women and men.

Prevalence to Corruption:

97.04% of respondents have never been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former.

98.5% of court users claimed that they have not offered a bribe to a judge or a court employee.

Observation Survey Findings

In **97.49%** of monitored court sessions where it was needed, translation was provided.

In **93%** of cases, people entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff.

In **96.9%** of court sessions monitored, the judge or other court staff presented the court etiquette and rules at the beginning of the court hearing.

In **95%** of cases monitored, the judge provided an overview of the hearing process both specifically related to the current hearing and as part of the overall case adjudication process.

In **95.6%** of cases observed, the judge made eye contact with the parties during the hearing.

In **99.2%** of court sessions monitored, the judge presented in a professional demeanor, speaking in a clear and calm manner.

In **98.8%** of sessions monitored, the judge made sure that the parties understood their rights.

In **94%** of courts sessions monitored, all speakers- judges, attorneys and parties - were easy to hear.

In **99%** of court sessions observed, the judges clearly described what the parties must do to comply with court expectations, interim orders, and/or judgements.

In **97.3%** of court sessions observed, the parties were permitted to ask questions or make a comment.

In **99%** of court sessions monitored, the judge used simple and clear language terms and acronyms.

In **69.39%** of court sessions monitored, the judge's name was not visibly posted on the bench, whereas in other cases (around 30%), when the name was visible, it was in instances when the hearings were held mainly in the judges' offices.

In **34.46%** of cases observed, the hearing did not start on time.

Introduction

This assessment study presents the findings of two surveys conducted by **Democracy Plus (D+)** with the support of **USAID Justice Activity**. The surveys were conducted in order to assess implementation of Procedural Justice throughout seven Basic Courts¹ in Kosovo as a basis for providing evidence-based recommendations on how to improve implementation of procedural justice. The first survey, the Court User Survey, is conducted with court parties at the entrance of the court building. The second survey, the Observation Courtroom Experience Survey, is conducted within the courtrooms through direct observation of the hearing or trial. The first survey builds upon the Citizen's Scores on Basic Court Services study conducted by D+ in two previous years (in 2018 and 2020), with support from USAID. The second survey gathers data on the way parties are dealt with, specifically in the context of a hearing or trial.

The two survey structures provide data on the status of access to information and transparency, efficiency and fairness, and prevalence of corruption for all seven Basic Courts and form the basis of this assessment study. As the Court User Survey builds upon previous Citizen's Scores studies, we are also able to assess and compare results across the years 2018-2021, while offering data on progress/regress made in regard to the dimensions assessed. Finally, with the aim of improving the Procedural Justice across the seven Basic Courts, this assessment study offers a list of evidence-based recommendations at the end.

¹ Pristina Basic Court, Ferizaj Basic Court, Gjilan Basic Court, Prizren Basic Court, Gjakova Basic Court, Peja Basic Court and Mitrovica Basic Court (both south and north).

The USAID Justice Activity is a five-year program that aims to strengthen Kosovo's justice system by applying a people-centered justice approach to improve institutional capacity to provide people access to quality services and multiple means to solve their justice needs and everyday legal problems, and to generate greater public trust in the justice system and the rule of law. The activity will achieve this through three distinct but interrelated objectives:

- **Quality and Accessibility of Justice Services Improved.** Support improved citizen access to justice by increasing procedural justice, expanding legal aid services, and continuing to improve administration and management policies and practices in courts. Through these efforts, the activity will support Kosovo institutions and key stakeholders to properly understand the priority needs of citizens to improve existing mechanisms or identify new measures, ensure all citizens receive fair and unbiased services, and citizen users better understand their legal rights and court procedures.
- **Citizen Understanding, Engagement, and Trust of the Justice System Improved.** Engage communities and practitioners in defining problems and proposing improvements to the delivery of legal services and information to disparate justice seekers where they live and on the issues they often confront. Working through responsible Kosovo institutions, the activity facilitates practitioner fora, including the community of practice for public information officers, to institutionalize critical and practical resources to engage with court users in soliciting their feedback and outreach and information sharing on justice services provision.
- **Effective Innovations in the Justice Sector Developed.** Create the Justice Innovation Incubator to help channel the capacity to innovate based on the challenges that justice institutions and their users face. In the people-centered justice paradigm, these innovations are likely to enhance the user-friendliness of policies and procedures, increase the affordability and accessibility of justice services, or improve justice seekers' feelings of fairness and trust in the justice system.

D+ is an independent, nonprofit, and non-partisan organization founded by a group of activists who believe in further strengthening democratic values in Kosovo. The main objective of D+ is to foster democratic values and practices that will further strengthen the voice of the Kosovar society. D+ aims to contribute in establishing good governance practices, strengthening the rule of law, assisting free and fair elections, and fostering respect for human rights and social issues. D+ has implemented different projects that aim to bring decision-makers closer to citizens through policy research, facilitation of dialogue and interaction, and public education.















Methodology

In order to assess Procedural Justice application level across the seven basic courts, D+ conducted two types of surveys: the (exit) Court Survey and the Observation Courtroom Experience Survey.

Court User Survey

D+ completed 1,357 valid surveys across the seven basic courts including Pristina Basic Court, Ferizaj Basic Court, Gjilan Basic Court, Prizren Basic Court, Gjakova Basic Court, Peja Basic Court and Mitrovica Basic Court (both south and north). The total number of valid surveys conducted in each basic court, and the percentage of the over-all total for each court is presented below:

■ **TABLE 1.** The total number of surveys conducted and percent of total

Courts ²	Total	%
 Ferizaj	158	 11.6%
 Gjakova	144	 10.6%
 Gjilan	146	 10.7%
 Mitrovica	164	 12%
 Peja	171	 12.6%
 Pristina	409	 30%
 Prizren	165	 12.1%

2 Courts are listed by alphabetical order throughout the text.

Court User Surveys were conducted by D+ enumerators during September and October 2021, at the entrance of the Basic Court buildings, with respondents who had active cases. Out of seven Courts, two courts, the Basic Court of Mitrovica and the Basic Court of Ferizaj were pilot courts, and the surveys at these courts were conducted during September, while surveys for the other five courts were conducted during October.

Those surveyed were selected at random: every fifth person leaving the court building was asked to answer the survey. D+ enumerators standing in front of the court buildings conducted surveys for a month, although in some courts they reached the predetermined number of completed surveys earlier. It is also important to note that, due to data confidentiality the survey does not include information on the name or surname of the individuals surveyed.

This survey (Annex A) is composed of 57 questions covering dimensions of access to information, transparency, efficiency, fairness, prevalence of corruption, and a set of additional questions related to user experiences in a courtroom during a hearing. None of these dimensions are intended to measure these concepts as defined by institutions or development agencies, but rather, they target the perspective and first-hand experience of court service recipients.

Variables

ACCESS TO INFORMATION is measured through data related to (1) ease of getting information about the case, (2) the helpfulness of the information provided by the court, (3) the experience in finding the courtroom or office needed, (4) the availability of complaint boxes, (5) the availability of an information desk in the courthouse.

TRANSPARENCY is measured through data related to (1) usage of court's website information. This question is followed up with three sub-questions including (1.1) the language used in the website content, (1.2) satisfaction with the quality of translation, (1.3) the kind of information checked in the court's website.

EFFICIENCY is measured through data related to (1) the reasonableness of the time needed to get the court business done on the day the respondents were asked, (2) how old their case is, (3) the respondent's level of satisfaction with the period of time in which their case was being reviewed.

FAIRNESS is measured through data related to (1) treatment with courtesy and respect of the respondents by the court staff, (2) respondent's views on if they were fairly treated by the judge, (3) the opportunity to talk to court staff in respondent's own native language, (4) the provision of translation during hearings, (5) receiving court documents in respondent's own language, (6) safety on the court premises, (7) respondent's knowledge of their right to submit a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge.

PREVALENCE OF CORRUPTION is measured through data related to (1) whether respondents have been asked for a bribe and (2) whether they have offered a bribe.




































ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ASSESSED cover data related to user experiences in a courtroom during a hearing, including: (1) where they went in the court building, (2) did they feel comfortable writing down complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box, (3) did they speak with anyone at the information desk, (4) signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building and the helpfulness and respect shown by the security personnel, (5) the cleanliness and maintenance of the building, (6) if signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand, (7) did they miss any personal events since their case began, (8) if they needed to come back to the court, were they asked what date would work best for them, (9) if they felt they were treated differently than other court users, and if so, why did they think that they treated in such ways, and (10) did they feel they were able to ask questions that they needed to today.

OBSERVATION COURTROOM EXPERIENCE SURVEY is designed to allow for an unbiased observer to collect data on the way parties are dealt with, specifically in the context of a hearing or trial, throughout the seven Basic Courts. D+ enumerators conducted observations primarily in courtrooms, but also in Judges Chambers throughout the months of September and October, 2021. The surveys of two pilot courts (Mitrovica Basic Court and Ferizaj Basic Court) were monitored during September, while the other five courts were monitored during October, 2021.

In the two pilot courts, D+ has conducted observations at a rate of 100% of the judges working in the civil and criminal chambers, inclusive of serious crimes, and captured a minimum of 1-2 hours of observation time per judge. Observations excluded the Minor Offenses and Juvenile case types.

In the other five basic courts (Pristina, Prizren, Gjiilan, Gjakova, Peja), D+ has conducted a minimum of 1-2 hours of observation per judge working on civil and criminal cases. In contrast to the other four courts, observation in Pristina Basic Court also included the Administrative Department, while Juvenile proceedings were not included in any of the courts. In total, as shown in the below table, D+ enumerators in the field have observed 384.02 hours of court cases across all seven basic courts.

TABLE 2. Number of hours in which court cases were observed per court

Court	Hours	
Ferizaj	41.25	   
Gjakova	48.98	   
Gjiilan	56.97	    
Mitrovica	41.97	   
Peja	46.70	   
Pristina	95.25	        
Prizren	52.90	    
Total	384.02	

The Courtroom Observation Survey is comprised of 46 questions related to (a) whether the start of the hearing was on time, (b) in case of delay, did the judge apologize, (c) did the judge make eye contact with the parties, (d) did the judge refer to parties by name, amongst others questions (See Annex B for the full list of questions).










Demographic Data

Demographic data for both surveys are presented below. The demographic data for the Court User Survey includes disaggregation of data by gender, ethnicity, and age. The demographic data for the Observation Courtroom Experience Survey includes judge's gender disaggregated data and judge's ethnicity disaggregated data.

(A) Court User Survey








Gender disaggregated data show that out of 1,357 respondents, 241 were women and 1,116 were men. The table below shows the number of women and men respondents per basic court:

■ **TABLE 3. Respondents' Gender**

	 Man	 Women	Total
 Ferizaj	126	32	158
 Gjakova	103	41	144
 Gjilan	110	36	146
 Mitrovica	143	21	164
 Peja	160	11	171
 Pristina	343	66	409
 Prizren	131	34	165








Age disaggregated data is shown in the below table:

■ **TABLE 4. Respondents' Age**

		15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Total
	Ferizaj	1	25	50	36	26	10	10	158
	Gjakova	2	21	33	22	24	21	21	144
	Gjilan	2	15	49	47	18	12	3	146
	Mitrovica	0	13	57	46	30	16	2	164
	Peja	3	19	43	44	45	16	1	171
	Pristina	0	8	84	130	140	35	12	409
	Prizren	1	19	56	54	23	10	2	165

Ethnicity disaggregated data is shown in the below table:










■ **TABLE 5. Respondents' Ethnicity**

		Albanian	Serbian	Turkish	Bosnian	Roma	Ashkali	Egyptian	Gorani	Other	Total
	Ferizaj	141	0	2	1	10	4	0	0	0	158
	Gjakova	127	0	0	0	5	8	4	0	0	144
	Gjilan	145	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	146
	Mitrovica	78	50	0	19	12	5	0	0	0	164
	Peja	145	3	0	13	0	7	1	0	2	171
	Pristina	406	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	409
	Prizren	155	0	1	5	0	3	1	0	0	165

(B) Courtroom Observation Experience Survey








Judge's gender disaggregated data show that in 63% of court cases observed, the presiding trial judge was man and in 35% of cases the presiding trial judge was woman.

■ TABLE 6. Judges' Gender

	 Men	 Women	Total
 Ferizaj	73	30	103
 Gjakova	42	34	76
 Gjilan	48	15	63
 Mitrovica	66	36	102
 Peja	32	31	63
 Pristina	58	23	81
 Prizren	33	29	62

Judge's ethnicity disaggregated data shows the ethnicity of the presiding trial judge.

■ **TABLE 7. Judges' Ethnicity**

		Albanian	Serbian	Bosnian	Turkish	Roma	Ashkali	Goran	Other	Total
	Ferizaj	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
	Gjakova	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
	Gjilan	62	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
	Mitrovica	41	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
	Peja	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
	Pristina	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
	Prizren	48	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	62



COURT USER SURVEY RESULTS








Court user survey results

Access to information and transparency

I. Access to information was assessed through a set of five questions and one sub-question including (1) ease of getting information, (2) the helpfulness of such information, (3) the experience in finding the courtroom or office, followed by a sub-question on what would make it easier, (4) the availability of the complaint box and (5) the availability of an information desk.








The first question posed to court users was to assess the level of ease of getting information about their cases and respondents could select among four categories a) very hard, b) somewhat hard, c) somewhat easy, and d) very easy. According to the survey results, in five out of seven basic courts, more than 50% of court users find it *somewhat easy* to get information. The highest percentage of court users who find it *very easy* to get information about their case is in Gjakova (44.44%), followed by Prizren (24.85%) and Mitrovica (24.39%). In contrast, Peja has the largest share of respondents who find it *very hard* to get information about their case (34.94%). Overall, findings indicate that getting information about your case is not a significant challenge across basic courts, apart from the Peja Basic Court.

■ **TABLE 8. In your experience, how easy is to get information about your case?**

		Very hard	Somewhat hard	Somewhat easy	Very easy
	Ferizaj	3.16%	24.05%	56.33%	16.46%
	Gjakova	4.86%	13.20%	37.50%	44.44%
	Gjilan	15.07%	23.97%	38.36%	22.60%
	Mitrovica	7.93%	17.68%	50.00%	24.39%
	Peja	34.94%	1.81%	52.41%	10.84%
	Pristina	8.31%	25.67%	58.68%	7.34%
	Prizren	9.09%	9.70%	56.36%	24.85%








In terms of the helpfulness of information provided by the court, the data indicate that the information provided to court users across all basic courts is *very helpful* or *somewhat helpful*. Around 53% of respondents find the information as *somewhat helpful* and around 33% find it as *very helpful*. In contrast, 5.7% of respondents find the information as *very unhelpful* and the court where the largest share of respondents stated that they found information “very unhelpful” is in Peja (18.67%), which is the only basic court with a two-digit number of respondents in this category.

■ **TABLE 9. How helpful was the information given to you by the court?**

		Very unhelpful	Somewhat unhelpful	Somewhat helpful	Very helpful
	Ferizaj	0.00%	10.76%	65.82%	23.42%
	Gjakova	3.47%	9.03%	54.17%	33.33%
	Gjilan	2.05%	2.74%	26.03%	69.18%
	Mitrovica	4.27%	7.93%	29.27%	58.53%
	Peja	18.67%	3.01%	66.27%	12.05%
	Pristina	2.45%	14.67%	60.88%	22.00%
	Prizren	9.09%	6.67%	70.91%	13.33%





Further, respondents were asked what their experience was in finding the courtroom or office they needed and they could select among four categories: a) very hard, b) somewhat hard, c) somewhat easy, and d) very easy. Survey results demonstrate that 90% of court users across the seven basic courts find it *somewhat easy* or *very easy* to find the courtroom or office needed. At the other end of the spectrum, the percentage of those who found it *very hard* to find the courtroom or office they needed is low and ranges from 0 (Gjilan and Ferizaj) to 3.61% (Peja) (14 out of 1,357 respondents claimed to have a very difficult time in finding the needed location).

■ **TABLE 10.** What was your experience in finding the courtroom or office you needed?

		Very hard	Somewhat hard	Somewhat easy	Very easy
	Ferizaj	0.00%	4.43%	67.72%	27.85%
	Gjakova	1.39%	0.00%	31.94%	66.67%
	Gjilan	0.00%	4.80%	11.64%	83.56%
	Mitrovica	1.22%	7.32%	60.97%	30.49%
	Peja	3.61%	2.41%	50.00%	43.98%
	Pristina	0.73%	1.47%	55.75%	42.05%
	Prizren	0.60%	0.61%	16.97%	81.82%

This question was followed by an open-ended question asking those respondents who found it *very hard* or *some-what hard* to find the courtroom or office, what could make it easier for them to find the required location. Some of the answers, as shown in the table below, include the need to have someone from the information desk accompany them to the courtroom or office they needed, better signage, and new measures, among others.

What would be helpful in this respect?








Number of Comments	Comments
 25	Better and clearer signage
 7	More information at the information corner
 2	Functioning system needs to be changed
 1	It would be more welcoming if they would speak Albanian language

■ TABLE 11. Answers from all seven basic courts grouped into four categories








Further, court users were also asked whether their basic court has a complaint box and an information desk available. The data show that a large share of respondents do not know that there is a complaint box available. In six out of seven courts, the percentage of those who are not aware of the existence of a complaint box ranges from 40.61% – 77.08% (in total 53.38% out of all respondents do not know that the complaint box exists). In contrast, the largest share of respondents that answered positively about complaint boxes is in Mitrovica (68.29%).

In contrast to the survey findings on complaint boxes, most court users answered positively about the existence of an information desk in their courthouse. As shown in table 13, the percentage of positive answers ranges from 55% to 91% in six courts, while the Ferizaj Basic Court remains an outlier with only 37% of court users answering positively and with the highest number of respondents who do know that their courthouse has an information desk (around 60%).

■ TABLE 12. Are complaint boxes available in the courthouse?

	Yes	No	I do not know
 Ferizaj	31.64%	1.90%	66.46%
 Gjakova	20.83%	2.08%	77.09%
 Gjilan	43.15%	4.11%	52.74%
 Mitrovica	68.29%	9.76%	21.95%
 Peja	34.34%	0.00%	65.66%
 Pristina	50.12%	0.73%	49.15%
 Prizren	56.97%	2.42%	40.61%








■ TABLE 13. Is there an information desk in the courthouse?

	Yes	No	I do not know
 Ferizaj	36.71%	2.53%	60.76%
 Gjakova	86.11%	0.00%	13.89%
 Gjilan	91.78%	2.06%	6.16%
 Mitrovica	55.49%	44.51%	0.00%
 Peja	83.74%	0.60%	15.66%
 Pristina	73.59%	0.25%	26.16%
 Prizren	89.70%	1.21%	9.09%

II. Transparency is assessed through one key question related to the usage of the court's website and three additional sub-questions related to: a) the information that court users look at, b) whether translation is provided, and c) the quality of translation provided.

Each Basic Court in Kosovo has an accessible website, however, like in previous years³, the majority of court users do not visit the court's website to obtain information. In all seven basic courts, the percentage of court users who have answered negatively ranges from 46.99 % - 97.22%, averaging 79% out of 100%. At the other end of the spectrum, the largest share of respondents who use the court's website to obtain information is in the Basic Court of Peja (51.01%). The other six courts have a significantly lower percentage of court users who answered positively, ranging from 2.78% in Gjakova to 27.14 % in Pristina. Overall, the data indicate that the use of court websites remains a systemic problem (1,048 out of 1,357 respondents answered negatively).








■ **TABLE 14.** Do you use the court's website to obtain information?

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	22.78%	77.22%
 Gjakova	2.78%	97.22%
 Gjilan	6.85%	93.15%
 Mitrovica	19.51%	80.49%
 Peja	53.01%	46.99%
 Pristina	27.14%	72.86%
 Prizren	13.94%	86.06%

3 Democracy Plus, "Citizen's Score on Basic Court Services" April 2020. Available at <https://gjujeta.dplus.org/en/reports/> (accessed December 07, 2021).








Respondents who answered positively about using the court's website (around 22% across all basic courts) were asked a set of three sub questions to gather data on the kind of information that they usually search for, whether the information is translated in their native language and the quality of translation. The survey findings show that court users visit the court's website primarily to view hearing schedules, followed by news, published decisions, information about judges, and contact information.

■ **TABLE 15.** What kind of information do you usually search for on the court's website? (multiple-choice question)

		Schedule of hearings	Contact information	News	Published decisions	Information about judges	Other
	Ferizaj	35.80%	12.35%	6.17%	24.69%	19.75%	1.24%
	Gjakova	25.00%	0.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Gjilan	30.00%	10.00%	30.00%	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	51.02%	6.12%	20.41%	14.29%	8.16%	0.00%
	Peja	26.31%	9.94%	50.88%	10.53%	2.34%	0.00%
	Pristina	21.96%	16.40%	20.11%	22.75%	18.78%	0.00%
	Prizren	42.43%	3.03%	24.24%	21.21%	6.06%	3.03%








Additionally, they were asked if the court's website content was translated in their native language; only five court users across all seven basic courts answered negatively (one in Pristina and four in Peja). This significantly low number indicates that translation is not a significant problem. Further, respondents were asked if they were happy with the translation provided, and all but one respondent (in Pristina) claimed not to be satisfied with the quality translation.

■ **TABLE 16.** Is the court website content that you need translated to your native language?⁴

	Yes	No	Total
 Ferizaj	1	0	1
 Gjakova	0	0	0
 Gjilan	0	0	0
 Mitrovica	32	0	32
 Peja	5	4	9
 Pristina	0	1	1
 Prizren	0	0	0

⁴ NOTE: The number of respondents who answered positively to question 14 is small, consequently the number of respondents who have answered the two sub-questions (15 and 16) is also small, thus the data are shown in numbers to provide a clearer picture.

■ **TABLE 17.** Are you satisfied with the quality of translation of the website content?⁵

	Yes	No	Total
 Ferizaj	1	0	1
 Gjakova	0	0	0
 Gjilan	0	0	0
 Mitrovica	32	0	32
 Peja	9	0	9
 Pristina	0	1	1
 Prizren	0	0	0















Overall ranking of courts on access to information and transparency

Based on the findings presented above, all seven basic courts have been ranked from one to seven for access to information and transparency, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave.

Access to Information and Transparency was assessed using these questions:

1. In your experience, how easy is to get information about your case?
2. How helpful was the information given to you by the court?
3. What was your experience in finding the courtroom or office you needed?
4. Are complaint boxes available in the courthouse?
5. Is there an information desk in the courthouse?
6. Do you use the court's website to obtain information?
7. What kind of information do you usually search for on the court's website?
8. Is the court website content that you need translated to your native language?
9. Are you satisfied with the quality of translation of the website content?

⁵ Ibid.

Ranking	Basic Courts
 First place	 Mitrovica
 Second place	 Gjilan
 Third place	 Pristina
 Fourth place	 Prizren
 Fifth place	 Gjakova
 Sixth place	 Peja
 Seventh place	 Ferizaj








Efficiency and fairness

I. Efficiency is assessed through data related to: (1) the reasonableness of the time needed to get the court business done on the day the respondents were asked, (2) how old the case is, (3) respondent's level of satisfaction with the length of time in which their case was being reviewed.

Survey findings, similar to the previous year findings⁶, show that the majority of court users were able to get work done in a reasonable period of time on the day they visited the court. The reasonableness of the length of time was left to be defined at the discretion of each individual respondent. The data show that 67.58% of respondents were able to get court business done in a reasonable period of time on the day they visited the court. The lead court is Mitrovica with 84.76%, followed by Ferizaj (82.28 %), Peja (71.08 %), Gjakova (69.44 %), Prizren (67.27%), Pristina (59.90 %) and Gjilan (38.36 %). In contrast, around 32% of respondents report that they have not been able to do so.








⁶ Democracy Plus, "Citizen's Score on Basic Court Services" April 2020. Available at <https://gjkata.dplus.org/en/reports/> (accessed December 10, 2021).

■ **TABLE 18.** Were you able to get your court business done in a reasonable period of time today?

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	82.28%	17.72%
 Gjakova	69.44%	30.56%
 Gjilan	38.36%	61.64%
 Mitrovica	84.76%	15.24%
 Peja	71.08%	28.92%
 Pristina	59.90%	40.10%
 Prizren	67.27%	32.73%

In terms of measuring efficiency, respondents were also asked how long their case has been pending and they could choose from seven categories including: a) less than six months, b) up to one year, c) up to two years, d) up to three years, e) up to four years, f) more than five years, and g) more than 10 years.

■ **TABLE 19. How long has your case been pending?**








		Less than 6 months	Up to 1 year	Up to 2 years	Up to 3 years	Up to 4 years	More than 5 years	More than 10 years
	Ferizaj	32.91%	24.68%	17.72%	15.19%	6.33%	3.17%	0.00%
	Gjakova	70.83%	19.45%	6.25%	2.78%	0.00%	0.69%	0.00%
	Gjilan	41.10%	29.45%	15.07%	5.48%	4.11%	2.74%	2.05%
	Mitrovica	7.92%	32.32%	31.71%	12.80%	6.71%	7.93%	0.61%
	Peja	24.09%	22.29%	22.29%	15.06%	7.23%	6.63%	2.41%
	Pristina	5.62%	19.56%	28.85%	27.87%	11.98%	3.67%	2.45%
	Prizren	21.82%	38.18%	16.97%	12.73%	3.03%	4.85%	2.42%

The largest share of responses falls in the first (less than six months), second (up to one year) and third (up to two years) categories. In the first category, the percentage of court users who stated that their cases are pending for less than six months ranges from 7.93% in Mitrovica to 70.83% in Gjakova (totaling 326 out of 1,357). In the second category, the percentage of court users who stated that their cases are pending for up to one-year ranges from 22.29% in Peja to 38.18% in Prizren (totaling 342 out of 1,357). In the third category, the percentage of court users who stated that their cases are pending for up to two years ranges from 6.25% to 31.71% (295 out of 1,357). Overall, 963 out of 1,357 (or 70%) of respondents have cases pending for less than six months, one year, and two years across all seven basic courts. In contrast, 4.2% (59 out of 1,357) of court users have cases pending for more than five years and 1.6% (22 out of 1,357) have cases pending for more than 10 years.

Further, the third dimension of transparency that respondents were asked about was whether they were satisfied with the length of time in which their case was being reviewed. The survey findings portray that in five basic courts (Mitrovica, Peja, Gjiilan, Ferizaj, and Prizren) more than 40% of respondents (570 out of 1,357 respondents) stated they are *somewhat satisfied* with the time in which their case is being reviewed. A considerable percentage of respondents in Gjakova (27.78 %) and Gjiilan (31.51 %) stated that they are *very satisfied* (182 out of 1,357 respondents).

In contrast, the largest share of respondents that are *very unsatisfied* is in the Pristina Basic Court (36.43%), followed by Mitrovica (32.93%), Peja (29.51%), Prizren (29.09%), Gjiilan (11.64%) and Ferizaj (6.96%). Overall, 61% of respondents stated that they are either *somewhat satisfied* or *very satisfied* with the length of time in which their case is being reviewed, while 39% claimed the opposite - that they are *very unsatisfied* or *somewhat unsatisfied*.








■ **TABLE 20. Are you satisfied with the time it is taking for your case to be reviewed?**

		Very unsatisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
	Ferizaj	6.96%	17.09%	63.92%	12.03%
	Gjakova	18.75%	16.67%	36.80%	27.78%
	Gjiilan	11.64%	6.16%	50.69%	31.51%
	Mitrovica	32.93%	4.88%	40.24%	21.95%
	Peja	29.52%	1.81%	54.82%	13.85%
	Pristina	36.43%	32.52%	28.85%	2.20%
	Prizren	29.09%	24.85%	40.61%	5.45%

II. Fairness assessed through a set of seven questions including: (1) respondent's assessment regarding being treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff, (2) respondent's view if the judge treated them fairly, (3) the ability to talk to court staff in respondents native language, (4) the provision of translation during hearings, (5) receiving court documents in respondent's own language, (6) safety on the court premises, (7) respondent's level of knowledge about their right to file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge.

Treatment with respect and courtesy is a key dimension of procedural justice. The survey findings indicate a good overall state of play in terms of treatment with courtesy and respect of court users by the court staff. The majority of respondents have answered with – yes- (76%) and – to some degree- (26%) to the question whether they were treated with courtesy and respect, totaling 77% of court users. A significantly small number of court users answered negatively (3%). Ferizaj stands out with 95.57 % of court users who answered positively, followed by Gjilan (82.88%) and Prizren (80.61%).








TABLE 21. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff?

	Yes	No	To some degree
 Ferizaj	95.57%	0.00%	4.43%
 Gjakova	56.94%	4.17%	38.89%
 Gjilan	82.88%	2.74%	14.38%
 Mitrovica	76.83%	4.27%	18.90%
 Peja	75.90%	1.21%	22.89%
 Pristina	74.08%	0.74%	25.18%
 Prizren	80.60%	6.67%	12.73%

Further, the data was disaggregated by gender to determine whether there were differences in treatment by the court staff towards women versus men. The findings reveal the same sentiment, as shown in the two below tables.








■ TABLE 22. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff? (Men only)



	Yes	No	To some degree	Total
 Ferizaj	122	0	4	126
 Gjakova	58	5	40	103
 Gjilan	90	4	16	110
 Mitrovica	108	7	28	143
 Peja	116	2	37	155
 Pristina	252	3	88	343
 Prizren	106	10	15	131








■ TABLE 23. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff? (Women only)



	Yes	No	To some degree	Total
 Ferizaj	29	0	3	32
 Gjakova	24	1	16	41
 Gjilan	31	0	5	36
 Mitrovica	18	0	3	21
 Peja	10	0	1	11
 Pristina	51	0	15	66
 Prizren	27	1	6	34








Further, court users were asked if they felt they were treated fairly by the judge and the survey data indicates that Ferizaj basic court leads in this regard, with 87.97% of court users stating that they were treated fairly by the judge in this courthouse, while respondents in Prizren present the smallest share of those who answered positively. Overall, 92% of court users across all seven basic courts answered positively (yes and to some degree) to the question about fair treatment by the judge while the remaining 8% have answered negatively. Regarding the latter, Mitrovica leads with 16.46%, followed by Prizren (15.76%) and Gjilan (10.27%).

■ **TABLE 24.** Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge?








	Yes	No	To some degree
 Ferizaj	87.97%	1.90%	10.13%
 Gjakova	53.47%	6.25%	40.28%
 Gjilan	41.78%	10.27%	47.95%
 Mitrovica	48.17%	16.46%	35.37%
 Peja	67.47%	2.41%	30.12%
 Pristina	52.08%	3.42%	44.50%
 Prizren	33.94%	15.76%	50.30%

The data was disaggregated by gender to find out whether there were differences in treatment by the judge towards women versus men. The findings reveal the same sentiment, as shown in the two below tables.

■ **TABLE 25.** Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge? (Men only) 








	Yes	No	To some degree	Total
 Ferizaj	110	3	13	126
 Gjakova	52	6	45	103
 Gjilan	37	11	62	110
 Mitrovica	67	24	52	143
 Peja	102	4	49	155
 Pristina	175	13	155	343
 Prizren	41	21	69	131

■ **TABLE 26.** Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge? (Women only) 

	Yes	No	To some degree	Total
 Ferizaj	29	0	3	32
 Gjakova	25	3	13	41
 Gjilan	24	4	8	36
 Mitrovica	12	3	6	21
 Peja	10	0	1	11
 Pristina	38	1	27	66
 Prizren	15	5	14	34








Another important element of fairness is the use of language, thus in this section of the survey, respondents were asked four questions related to it. For the first question- whether they were able to talk to court staff in their own native language - court users evaluated the court staff positively in all seven basic courts. In particular, 100% of court users in four basic courts (Pristina, Gjilan, Ferizaj, and Prizren) answered positively, followed by Peja (99.4%), Mitrovica (80.49%) and Gjakova (78.47%).

■ **TABLE 27. Were you able to talk to court staff in your native language?**








	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	78.47%	21.53%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	80.49%	19.51%
 Peja	99.40%	0.60%
 Pristina	100.00%	0.00%
 Prizren	100.00%	0.00%

For the second question - whether the court provided translation during court hearings - the largest share of respondents claimed that there was no need to offer it, as shown in the table below. Yet, in cases where there was a need for translation, as shown in table 28.A, the overwhelming majority of court users assessed the provision of translation during hearings positively. A smaller share of respondents ranging from 7.5% to 26.56% across all basic courts have answered negatively (around 6% of court users in total).

■ **TABLE 28. Did the court provide translation during hearings?**








	Yes	No	Not applicable
 Ferizaj	15.19%	0.00%	84.81%
 Gjakova	32.64%	11.81%	55.56%
 Gjilan	25.34%	2.05%	72.60%
 Mitrovica	81.10%	18.90%	0.00%
 Peja	11.45%	11.45%	77.11%
 Pristina	1.96%	0.49%	97.56%
 Prizren	12.73%	0.00%	87.27%

■ **TABLE 28a.** Did the court provide translation during hearings?
(figures provided only for cases when translation was needed)

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	73.44%	26.56%
 Gjilan	92.50%	7.50%
 Mitrovica	81.10%	18.90%
 Peja	50.00%	50.00%
 Pristina	80.00%	20.00%
 Prizren	100.00%	0.00%

Moreover, according to the survey findings, 94% of respondents across all basic courts who stated that the court provided translation were *somewhat satisfied* or *very satisfied* with its quality, as shown below. On the other hand, a significantly lower number of respondents (17 out of 289) were *very unsatisfied* or *somewhat unsatisfied* with the translation quality.








■ **TABLE 29.** Were you satisfied with the translation quality during hearings?⁷

		Very unsatisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Total
	Ferizaj	0	1	15	8	24
	Gjakova	10	1	10	26	47
	Gjilan	3	0	5	29	37
	Mitrovica	0	0	12	121	133
	Peja	0	0	5	14	19
	Pristina	2	0	4	2	8
	Prizren	0	0	5	16	21

7 NOTE: data is presented in numbers due to the small number of respondents who claimed that translation was needed.








Additionally, respondents were asked whether they received court documents in their native language. With the exception of Gjakova, survey data demonstrates that the majority of court users across all basic courts receive documents in their native language.

■ **TABLE 30.** Did you receive court documents in your native language?

		Yes	No	Sometimes
	Ferizaj	99.37%	0.00%	0.63%
	Gjakova	43.75%	11.11%	45.14%
	Gjilan	94.52%	0.69%	4.79%
	Mitrovica	96.34%	0.00%	3.66%
	Peja	95.18%	3.01%	1.81%
	Pristina	98.78%	0.00%	1.22%
	Prizren	95.15%	0.00%	4.85%

The final two questions used to assess fairness cover physical security and court users' knowledge about their right to file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge. The survey data portray that physical safety on the court building is neither a problem nor a challenge. At least 96% of respondents in each basic court answered positively on the question whether they feel physically safe on the court premises (1,337 out of 1,357 respondents have answered positively).

■ **TABLE 31. Do you feel (physically) safe on the court premises?**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	96.53%	3.47%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	98.78%	1.22%
 Peja	99.40%	0.60%
 Pristina	99.51%	0.49%
 Prizren	96.97%	3.03%

Those that answered negatively were asked a follow-up question on why did they not feel physically safe within the court premises. As shown in the table below, the reasons given vary from ethnicity to personal reasons.








If no, why do you not feel safe on the court premises?

Number of Comments	Comments
 3	Personal reasons
 1	Ethnicity
 1	I feel threatened because I have been convicted while I am innocent
 1	I have been threatened
 1	I have been attacked
 1	Sharing the same physical space with the defendants
 1	I am a disabled person and the court building does not offer the necessary infrastructure.









■ TABLE 32. Answers from all seven basic courts grouped into seven categories

Similar to previous years' survey results, the majority of court users (69% out of 100%) in five basic courts answered negatively on the question: do you know that you can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge? The highest percentage of negative responses came from respondents at the Gjakova court (95.14%), followed by Gjiilan (90.41%), Ferizaj (89.24%), Pristina (69.19%), and Prizren (32.12%). On the other hand, the largest share of court users that answered positively is in Peja (65.06%) and Mitrovica (62.20%).

■ **TABLE 33.** Do you know that you can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge?

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	10.76%	89.24%
 Gjakova	4.86%	95.14%
 Gjiilan	9.59%	90.41%
 Mitrovica	62.20%	37.80%
 Peja	65.06%	34.94%
 Pristina	30.81%	69.19%
 Prizren	32.12%	67.88%

Respondents who replied that they know that they can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge were asked an open question on whether they know where to file it. As shown in the below table, the answers include Judicial Council, Court President, the Court, the Police, General Department.

Number of Comments	Comments
 68	Police
 52	Judicial Council
 50	Court President
 22	Court
 13	Office/ Commission for complain filing
 6	General Department
 1	Central Office
 1	Information Corner

■ **TABLE 34.** Answers from all seven basic court users are categorized by the author⁸















⁸ Please note that these answers present the views of the respondents, but not necessarily they are correct.

Overall ranking of courts on efficiency and fairness

Based on the findings above, all seven basic courts have been ranked from one to seven on *fairness and efficiency*, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave.

Fairness and efficiency were assessed using these questions:

1. Were you able to get your court business done in a reasonable period of time today?
2. How long has your case been pending?
3. Are you satisfied with the length of time with in which your case is being reviewed?
4. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff?
5. Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge?
6. Were you able to talk to court staff in your native language?
7. Did the court provide translation during hearings?
8. Were you satisfied with the translation quality during hearings?
9. Did you receive court documents in your native language?
10. Do you feel (physically) safe on the court premises?
11. Do you know that you can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge?








Ranking	Basic Courts
 First place	 Mitrovica
 Second place	 Ferizaj
 Third place	 Gjilan
 Fourth place	 Gjakova
 Fifth place	 Peja
 Sixth place	 Prizren
 Seventh place	 Pristina

Prevalence to corruption

Prevalence to corruption is assessed through data on whether court users have been asked for a bribe and whether they have themselves offered a bribe. The first question is followed-up by a sub-question: for what reason. The second question is followed up by two sub-questions: a) for what reason and b) what position did the person hold.








Exit survey results demonstrate that 97.04% of respondents have never been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former (1,316 out of 1,357). In contrast, less than 3% declared the opposite. The highest percentage of those who claimed to have been asked for a bribe come from Pristina Basic Court (11.74%), followed by Mitrovica Basic Court (3.66%), and Gjiilan Basic Court (2.74%).

■ **TABLE 35. Have you ever been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former?**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	0.63%	99.37%
 Gjakova	0.69%	99.31%
 Gjilan	2.74%	97.26%
 Mitrovica	3.66%	96.34%
 Peja	0.00%	100.00%
 Pristina	11.74%	88.26%
 Prizren	1.21%	98.79%

As shown in table 36, those who answered positively were asked a follow-up multiple choice question and could select among the following reasons: a) to fast-track processes, b) to obtain the needed documentation, c) to have the case ruled in my favor, and d) other. The data demonstrate that the majority of those that have been asked for a bribe have done so to obtain the needed documentation (10 cases) and to fast-track processes (13 cases). The largest number of cases falls in the Basic Court of Pristina (21), followed by Mitrovica (2).








■ **TABLE 36.** If yes, for what reason? (multiple-choice question)⁹

		To fast-track processes	To obtain the needed documentation	To have the case ruled in my favor	Other	Total
	Ferizaj	0	0	0	0	0
	Gjakova	0	0	0	0	0
	Gjilan	0	0	0	0	0
	Mitrovica	0	2	0	0	2
	Peja	0	0	0	0	0
	Pristina	10	11	0	0	21
	Prizren	0	0	0	0	0

⁹ NOTE: The data is presented in numbers due to the small number of answers.

Further, survey findings show that 98.5% of court users have not offered a bribe to a judge or a court employee (1,326 out of 1,357 court users). The remaining 3% of respondents who answered positively to the question – have you ever offered a bribe to a judge or a court employee are in Prizren (4.24%), followed by Pristina (3.91%), Gjilan (1.37%), and Peja (0.6%)


■ **TABLE 37.** Have you ever offered a bribe to a judge or court employee?

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	0.00%	100.00%
 Gjakova	0.00%	100.00%
 Gjilan	1.37%	98.63%
 Mitrovica	0.00%	100.00%
 Peja	0.60%	99.40%
 Pristina	3.91%	96.09%
 Prizren	4.24%	95.76%

Those who answered positively were asked a follow-up multiple choice question and could select among the following reasons: a) to fast-track processes, b) to obtain the needed documentation, c) to have the case ruled in my favor, and d) other. According to the survey data, 40% of those who answered positively have given a bribe in order to have their case ruled in their favor, followed by 35% who claimed that they wanted to fast-track processes. Two respondents selected the remaining option – *to obtain the needed documentation*. As shown in table 39, only one respondent selected “other” and in the follow-up question, the respondent declared that the reason for paying a bribe was to find justice as soon as possible.

Data show that in instances where court users have given a bribe, the primary reason was to have their case ruled in their favor, but that they have never been asked to pay a bribe for the same reason by a court judge or a court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former. The two key reasons why they have been asked to pay a bribe include the need to obtain the needed documentation and to fast track processes.








■ **TABLE 38.** If yes, for what reason? (multiple-choice question)¹⁰

	To fast-track processes	To obtain the needed documentation	To have the case ruled in my favor	Other	Total
 Ferizaj	0	0	0	0	0
 Gjakova	0	0	0	0	0
 Gjilan	0	1	1	0	2
 Mitrovica	0	0	0	0	0
 Peja	0	0	1	0	1
 Pristina	11	7	13	0	31
 Prizren	4	1	2	1	8

10 NOTE: A small number of respondents had to answer this follow-up question; thus, the data is presented in numbers.

Further, court users who gave a bribe were asked a follow-up question: to whom they offered a bribe, and they could select among: a) judge, b) court employee, and c) other. The largest share of respondents selected court employee (17 out of 26 respondents), followed by judge (8 out of 26 respondents) and only one respondent answered “other”.

■ **TABLE 39.** If yes, what position do you hold?















	Judge	Court Employee	Other	Total
 Ferizaj	0	0	0	0
 Gjakova	0	0	0	0
 Gjilan	1	1	0	2
 Mitrovica	0	0	0	0
 Peja	0	0	1	1
 Pristina	6	10	0	16
 Prizren	1	6	0	7

Overall ranking of courts on prevalence to corruption

Based on the findings above, all seven basic courts have been ranked from one to seven for *prevalence to corruption*, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave.

Prevalence of Corruption was assessed using these questions:

1. Have you ever been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former?
2. If yes, for what reason?
3. Have you ever offered a bribe to a judge or court employee?
4. If yes, for what reason?








Ranking	Basic Courts
 First place	 Peja
 Second place	 Ferizaj
 Third place	 Gjakova
 Fourth place	 Gjilan
 Fifth place	 Mitrovica
 Sixth place	 Prizren
 Seventh place	 Pristina

Additional questions assessed

Additional questions comprise the last section of the Court User Survey and they include a list of ten key questions that assess user experiences in a courtroom during a hearing. The results of each question are discussed below.








First, court users were asked a multiple-choice question – where they went in the court building- and they could select among six categories, including: a) courtroom, b) judge’s chambers, c) court administrators office, d) case management office, e) cashier/finance office, or f) other. The answers vary from court to court, yet the majority of respondents across all seven basic courts stated that most of the time they went to the courtroom, followed by judge’ chambers, and then case management office. In contrast, a few respondents in Gjilan (3.33 %) and Ferizaj (0.84%) have selected “other” and they further explained that they have asked security for an office, asked for documents that proved they were not under investigation, or went to the personnel office.

■ **TABLE 40. Where did you go in the court building? (multiple-choice question)**

		Courtroom	Judge's chambers	Court Administrators Office	Case Management Office	Cashier/ Finance office	Other
	Ferizaj	35.02%	40.09%	2.95%	11.39%	9.71%	0.84%
	Gjakova	42.22%	35.00%	8.33%	11.67%	2.78%	0.00%
	Gjilan	35.33%	49.33%	0.67%	10.67%	0.67%	3.33%
	Mitrovica	28.80%	27.19%	17.15%	21.68%	5.18%	0.00%
	Peja	24.02%	74.30%	0.56%	1.12%	0.00%	0.00%
	Pristina	48.99%	37.42%	5.20%	6.04%	2.35%	0.00%
	Prizren	28.51%	67.87%	1.36%	1.81%	0.45%	0.00%

Another important indicator of Procedural Justice is whether court users feel comfortable writing down complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box. Survey data demonstrates that around 80% of respondents feel comfortable writing down complaints and putting them in the complaint box. In particular, apart from Gjakova, the survey data show that from 76% to 95% of respondents in each of the basic courts have answered positively. The largest share of respondents that do not feel comfortable writing down complaints and putting them into the complaint box are in Gjakova (63.89%).

■ **TABLE 41.** Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box?

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	94.30%	5.70%
 Gjakova	36.11%	63.89%
 Gjilan	95.21%	4.79%
 Mitrovica	76.83%	23.17%
 Peja	89.76%	10.24%
 Pristina	79.95%	20.05%
 Prizren	92.12%	7.88%

Further, we have disaggregated the data to analyze whether one gender feels less or more comfortable writing down complaints and putting them into the complaint boxes. The data shows that a higher percentage of women, though not significant, answered negatively. As shown in the two tables below, 81% (907 out of 1,111) of men versus 77% (187 versus 241) of women answered positively, while 18% (204 out of 1,111) of men versus 22% (54 out of 241) of women answered negatively.



TABLE 42. Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box? (Men only)















	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	95.24%	4.76%
 Gjakova	36.89%	63.11%
 Gjilan	93.64%	6.36%
 Mitrovica	78.32%	21.68%
 Peja	89.03%	10.97%
 Pristina	80.47%	19.53%
 Prizren	91.60%	8.40%










TABLE 43. Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box? (Women only)

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	90.62%	9.38%
 Gjakova	34.15%	65.85%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	66.67%	33.33%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	77.27%	22.73%
 Prizren	94.12%	5.88%








Further, respondents were asked whether they have spoken with anyone at the information desk. The largest share of respondents answered positively, starting with Gjiilan (97.26%), followed by Ferizaj (93.04%), Prizren (89.7%), Peja (85.54%), Gjakova (76.39%), Pristina (61.37%), Mitrovica (54.88%). In contrast, around 20% have answered negatively and among those Mitrovica Basic Court is the lead (45.12%), followed by Pristina (38.61%), and Gjakova (23.61%).

■ **TABLE 44. Did you speak with anyone at the information desk?**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	93.04%	6.96%
 Gjakova	76.39%	23.61%
 Gjiilan	97.26%	2.74%
 Mitrovica	54.88%	45.12%
 Peja	85.54%	14.46%
 Pristina	61.37%	38.63%
 Prizren	89.70%	10.30%








The data show that not all court users who spoke with someone at the information desk have found that person helpful. As shown in the table below, the largest share of respondents who found it *very helpful* is in Prizren (92.57%) and Peja (90.14%). In contrast, the largest share of respondents who found the person at the information desk *very unhelpful* is in Mitrovica (43.9%).

■ **TABLE 45.** How helpful was the person at the information desk?

		Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Somewhat unhelpful	Very unhelpful
	Ferizaj	73.47%	25.85%	0.68%	0.00%
	Gjakova	70.00%	24.54%	3.64%	1.82%
	Gjilan	85.21%	14.79%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	53.05%	1.22%	1.83%	43.90%
	Peja	90.14%	4.23%	2.11%	3.52%
	Pristina	60.16%	31.47%	8.37%	0.00%
	Prizren	92.57%	4.05%	2.70%	0.68%








Further, respondents could choose among four levels: a) strongly agree, b) agree, c) disagree, and d) strongly disagree on whether there was good signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building and whether the security personnel were helpful and respectful. For the first question, the survey findings show that the highest percentage of court users who have answered strongly agree and agree are in Peja (79.52% and 13.85% respectively), followed by Ferizaj (26.58% and 70.89%). In contrast, the largest share of those who strongly disagree and disagree are in Mitrovica (15.24% and 4.27 % respectively).

■ **TABLE 46.** There was good signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building and the security personnel were helpful and respectful

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Ferizaj	26.58%	70.89%	1.90%	0.63%
	Gjakova	61.81%	34.72%	3.47%	0.00%
	Gjilan	54.11%	43.15%	2.74%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	5.49%	75.00%	15.24%	4.27%
	Peja	79.52%	13.85%	4.82%	1.81%
	Pristina	35.21%	63.81%	0.73%	0.25%
	Prizren	29.09%	65.45%	4.85%	0.61%

Court users who *strongly agreed* with the statement – security personnel were helpful and respectful- make up the largest share of the responses. On the other hand, those who *strongly disagree* and *disagree* constitute a very small percentage which is insignificant when compared to those who state that security personnel were helpful and respectful.








■ **TABLE 47. Security personnel were helpful and respectful**

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
 Ferizaj	16.46%	83.54%	0.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	70.83%	25.70%	2.08%	1.39%
 Gjilan	54.79%	45.21%	0.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	64.02%	35.37%	0.61%	0.00%
 Peja	83.73%	12.05%	2.41%	1.81%
 Pristina	56.97%	42.79%	0.24%	0.00%
 Prizren	88.48%	11.52%	0.00%	0.00%

As shown in the two tables below, the gender disaggregated data demonstrate that the majority of both women and men *strongly agree* and *agree* that the security personnel were helpful and respectful.








■ TABLE 48. Security personnel were helpful and respectful (Men only)



		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Ferizaj	16.67%	83.33%	0.00%	0.00%
	Gjakova	71.85%	24.27%	2.91%	0.97%
	Gjilan	53.64%	46.36%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	64.34%	34.96%	0.70%	0.00%
	Peja	83.23%	12.90%	2.58%	1.29%
	Pristina	56.56%	43.15%	0.29%	0.00%
	Prizren	88.55%	11.45%	0.00%	0.00%








■ TABLE 49. Security personnel were helpful and respectful (Women only)



		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Ferizaj	15.62%	84.38%	0.00%	0.00%
	Gjakova	68.29%	29.27%	0.00%	2.44%
	Gjilan	58.33%	41.67%	0.00%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	61.90%	38.10%	0.00%	0.00%
	Peja	90.91%	0.00%	0.00%	9.09%
	Pristina	59.09%	40.91%	0.00%	0.00%
	Prizren	88.24%	11.76%	0.00%	0.00%








The overwhelming majority of respondent have *agreed* (53%) or *strongly agreed* (40%) that the building was clean and well maintained. In contrast, the percentage of those who *strongly disagree* (1.11%) is insignificant and is mainly spread among court users in Mitrovica and Peja.

■ **TABLE 50. The building was clean and well maintained**

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Ferizaj	13.93%	85.44%	0.63%	0.00%
	Gjakova	64.58%	34.03%	1.39%	0.00%
	Gjilan	47.26%	50.69%	2.05%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	12.81%	70.12%	13.41%	3.66%
	Peja	79.52%	13.25%	4.22%	3.01%
	Pristina	31.78%	55.50%	12.23%	0.49%
	Prizren	30.30%	64.85%	4.24%	0.61%








Further, the majority of court users across all seven basic courts *strongly agree* (40%) or *agree* (51%) that signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand.

■ **TABLE 51.** Sign posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand

		Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	Ferizaj	9.49%	80.38%	10.13%	0.00%
	Gjakova	68.06%	27.08%	3.47%	1.39%
	Gjilan	49.31%	46.58%	4.11%	0.00%
	Mitrovica	18.29%	62.81%	13.41%	5.49%
	Peja	77.71%	10.24%	7.23%	4.82%
	Pristina	38.14%	60.88%	0.73%	0.25%
	Prizren	24.24%	72.73%	2.42%	0.61%

Additionally, as shown in the below table below, 96% of respondents answered positively on whether signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were in their native language.








■ **TABLE 52. Signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were in my native language**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	92.41%	7.59%
 Gjakova	95.83%	4.17%
 Gjilan	95.21%	4.79%
 Mitrovica	99.39%	0.61%
 Peja	97.59%	2.41%
 Pristina	99.76%	0.24%
 Prizren	94.55%	5.45%

Further, respondents were asked a multiple-choice question and could select among a set of categories on whether, since their case began, they: a) missed work to attend a hearing or conduct business with the court, b) came to court and felt like nothing happened to advance their case, c) affected their ability to get a job/license/certification, d) could not get documentation needed for a visa application, f) had to switch attorneys/representation, e) did not have an attorney and had to represent themselves. It is important to note that respondents could select none, few or all the mentioned categories.








The survey findings show that the majority of court users who responded positively to one or more options a) – e) have :a) missed work to attend a hearing or conduct business with the court (49%), followed by b) I came to court and felt like nothing happened to advance my case (24%), and c) I did not have an attorney and had to represent myself (16%).

■ **TABLE 53.** Since your case began, have any of the following occurred (multiple-choice question)

		I missed work to attend a hearing or conduct business with the court	I came to court and felt like nothing happened to advance my case	It affected my ability to get a job/license/certification	I could not get a visa application	I've had to switch attorneys/representation	I did not have an attorney and had to represent myself
	Ferizaj	57.52%	3.98%	2.66%	7.52%	11.95%	16.37%
	Gjakova	32.83%	18.41%	2.49%	10.45%	5.47%	30.35%
	Gjilan	54.66%	28.67%	2.00%	4.00%	2.00%	8.67%
	Mitrovica	23.55%	25.21%	2.89%	2.07%	0.83%	45.45%
	Peja	76.99%	13.14%	2.82%	2.35%	3.29%	1.41%
	Pristina	39.36%	57.26%	0.60%	0.40%	1.59%	0.79%
	Prizren	58.87%	21.77%	1.21%	3.23%	1.21%	13.71%

Additionally, the question – if you need to come back for another hearing, did anyone ask you what date would work best for you? – was posed to respondents and out of 80% who had to come back to the court, 37% answered that that they were asked about the date suitability. In contrast, the largest percentage of respondents answered negatively (62%).








■ **TABLE 54.** If you need to come back for another hearing, did anyone ask you what date would work best for you?

	Yes	No	Total
 Ferizaj	29	40	69
 Gjakova	60	33	93
 Gjilan	103	30	133
 Mitrovica	64	50	114
 Peja	4	120	124
 Pristina	132	264	396
 Prizren	19	143	162








Fair treatment is another important element of procedural justice; thus, court users were also asked if they felt they were treated differently, and if yes, why they feel they were treated differently and they could select among seven categories: 1) race/ethnicity, 2) the language I speak, 3) gender, 4) economic status, 5) appearance, 6) age, 7) something else.

Survey data shows that the largest share of respondents who felt they were treated differently selected “something else” (49%), followed by the economic status (25%), and the language spoken (15.47). It is important to note that gender as a reason for differential treatment was selected by less than 2%.

■ **TABLE 55.** If you feel you were treated differently than other court users, why do you feel you were treated differently? (multiple-choice question)

		Race/ethnicity	The language I speak	My gender	My economic status	My appearance (clothing, hair, etc)	My age	Something else
	Ferizaj	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	15.39%	76.92%
	Gjakova	7.69%	0.00%	3.85%	11.54%	26.92%	34.62%	15.38%
	Gjilan	0.00%	0.00%	4.08%	14.29%	4.76%	4.08%	72.79%
	Mitrovica	3.21%	14.22%	2.75%	20.18%	10.55%	5.51%	43.58%
	Peja	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Pristina	0.62%	0.42%	3.11%	27.18%	15.35%	4.56%	48.76%
	Prizren	1.65%	0.83%	0.00%	4.13%	0.83%	0.83%	91.73%








Those who answered something else, were asked to identify the reason for differential treatment. The table below shows that the most frequent answer was the lack of family/friend/political connections with someone working in the court.

Number of Comments	Comments
 5	I lack family/ friend/ political connections with the court staff
 1	I gave money and that is why I was treated differently
 1	I am a disabled person
 1	I did not give money to anyone in the court
 1	I have been treated differently because of my case
 1	I have been treated differently because I am innocent
 1	Political affiliation

■ **TABLE 56.** Answers from all seven basic court users are categorized by the author

Further, court users were asked whether they felt that they were able to ask the questions that they needed on the day they visited the court. Survey results show that 52.59% answered positively, while 28% of them did not feel they were able to ask questions, and around 19% did not feel that they needed to ask questions. Though more than half felt that they were able to ask questions, that the remaining 1/3 of respondents do not feel that they were able to ask questions is a challenge to the procedural justice. The highest percentage of court users that answered negatively is in Peja (36.14 %), followed by Prizren (34.55%) and Pristina (26.89%).

■ **TABLE 57.** Overall, did you feel that you were able to ask questions that you needed to today?















	Yes	No	Not applicable
 Ferizaj	22.15%	0.63%	77.22%
 Gjakova	52.78%	20.14%	27.08%
 Gjilan	17.81%	6.16%	76.03%
 Mitrovica	90.24%	9.76%	0.00%
 Peja	62.65%	36.14%	1.21%
 Pristina	65.53%	26.89%	7.58%
 Prizren	56.97%	34.55%	8.48%

Overall ranking of courts on additional questions assessed









Based on the findings above, all seven basic courts have been ranked from one to seven for *additional questions*, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave to the questions.

Additional assessed questions included:

1. Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box?
2. Did you speak with anyone at the information desk?
3. How helpful was the person at the information desk?
4. There was good signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building and were the security personnel were helpful and respectful
5. Security personnel were helpful and respectful
6. The building was clean and well maintained
7. Sign posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand
8. Signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were in my native language
9. Since your case began, have any of the following occurred
- 9.1 If you need to come back for another hearing, did anyone ask you what date would work best for you?
- 9.2 If you were treated differently than other court users, why do you feel you were treated differently?

Ranking	Basic Courts
 First place	 Gjakova
 Second place	 Peja
 Third place	 Prizren
 Fourth place	 Ferizaj
 Fifth place	 Gjilan
 Sixth place	 Pristina
 Seventh place	 Mitrovica

At the end of the additional questions, respondents were asked if they had anything else to add related to their court experience, either positive or negative. Survey data show answers in a high number, and they all relate to a better court performance. The table below shows the comments grouped in eight categories:

Number of Comments	Comments
 26	Court is not working well enough; low efficiency of court work; work needs to be improved
 23	Extremely unhappy, unhappy, and disappointed with the court work, with the delay of cases, and with the delay of judges. Irresponsible and uneducated people working in the court.
 5	I cannot communicate in my native language (Albanian); I had to speak in English with court staff as they did not speak Albanian, I had to speak in Serbian with court staff as they did not speak in Albanian.
 4	I am late for travelling due to some documents I had to receive in the court, thus I hope that nothing will bring me back to the court again; I am late for travelling to Germany and applying for visa; I cannot apply for a job without the documents I need to receive here.
 1	Court should strive to have more convenient space (access) for disabled persons.
 1	I am jobless thus an attorney has been assigned to represent me at the court, but the attorney did not want to, thus they changed the attorney again and this is a poor system.
 1	I hope that my case is solved as soon as possible as it was difficult for me to take a day off.
 20	I am happy that my work was finished quickly; staff, including security, were very helpful; judges were helpful and respectful;

■ **TABLE 58.** The answers from all court users were grouped in eight categories by the author.

Similar comments related to court efficiency and other aspects (as shown in the table above) were made across all seven basic courts, except the language problem which was noted only in Mitrovica Basic Court (building in the South). The data for Mitrovica shows that court users find it difficult to talk to court staff in their native language (Albanian). Though the number of respondents that claimed difficulties speaking in their native language (Albanian) with the court staff is not high, it still represents a challenge that needs to be considered, as language remains a key element in the perception of trust towards the courts.

Comparison of Rankings across all Basic Courts (2018 - 2021)

The section below presents a ranking of the seven basic courts in 2018, 2020 and 2021. All seven basic courts are ranked from one to seven on: a) access to information and transparency, b) fairness and efficiency, and c) prevalence of corruption, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave .

Access to Information and Transparency was assessed using these questions:

1. In your experience, how easy is to get information about your case?
2. How helpful was the information given to you by the court?
3. What was your experience in finding the courtroom or office you needed?
4. Are complaint boxes available in the courthouse?
5. Is there an information desk in the courthouse?
6. Do you use the court's website to obtain information?
7. What kind of information do you usually search for on the court's website?
8. Is the court website content that you need translated into your native language?
9. Are you satisfied with the quality of translation of the website content?

Efficiency and Fairness was assessed using these questions:

12. Were you able to get your court business done in a reasonable period of time today?
13. How long has your case been pending?
14. Are you satisfied with the length of time in which your case is being reviewed?
15. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff?
16. Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge?
17. Were you able to talk to court staff in your native language?
18. Did the court provide translation during hearings?
19. Were you satisfied with the translation quality during hearings?
20. Did you receive court documents in your native language?
21. Do you feel (physically) safe on the court premises?
22. Do you know that you can file a disciplinary claim for violations of the judge?

Prevalence of Corruption was assessed using these questions:

23. Have you ever been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former?
24. If yes, for what reason?
25. Have you ever offered a bribe to a judge or court employee?
26. If yes, for what reason?

Additional Questions were assessed using these questions:

27. Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box?
28. Did you speak with anyone at the information desk?
29. How helpful was the person at the information desk?
30. There was good signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building and were the security personnel were helpful and respectful?
31. Security personnel were helpful and respectful.
32. The building was clean and well maintained.
33. Sign posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand.

34. Signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were in my native language.
35. Since your case began, have any of the following occurred.
36. If you need to come back for another hearing, did anyone ask you what date would work best for you?
37. If you feel you were treated differently than other court users, why do you feel you were treated differently?



Note:








There were some questions for which the order of the answers needed to be reversed because as they were originally formulated, higher scores indicated lower performance in the ranked domains.

There were some questions for which some answers needed to be deleted altogether, in cases when those answers did not contribute to the prevalence or a lack of any of the ranked domains.








There were some questions for which participants could indicate multiple answers at once. In those cases, the positive score of the ranked domains was higher when participants selected more answers and lower when participants only selected a few answers.

For the domain “Prevalence of Corruption”, the first places are occupied by regional basic courts with the lowest number of reported occurrences of corruption, whereas the lower places have courts in which more participants reported occurrences of corruption.








■ Ranking comparison of all courts on access to information and transparency for 2018-2021

Ranking of all courts on Access to Information and Transparency		2018	↑↓	2020	↑↓	2021
	Ferizaj	1	—	1	↓	7
	Gjakova	4	↑	2	↓	5
	Gjilan	2	↓	3	↑	2
	Mitrovica	6	↑	5	↑	1
	Peja	3	↓	4	↓	6
	Pristina	7	↑	6	↑	3
	Prizren	5	↓	7	↑	4

■ Ranking comparison of all courts on efficiency and fairness for 2018-2021

Ranking of all courts on Efficiency and Fairness		2018	↑↓	2020	↑↓	2021
	Ferizaj	1	↓	3	↑	2
	Gjakova	6	↑	5	↑	4
	Gjilan	3	↓	4	↑	3
	Mitrovica	7	↑	2	↑	1
	Peja	2	↑	1	↓	5
	Pristina	5	↓	7	—	7
	Prizren	4	↓	6	—	6

■ Ranking comparison of all courts on prevalence of corruption for 2018-2021

Ranking of all courts on prevalence of corruption	2018	↑↓	2020	↑↓	2021
 Ferizaj	2	↑	1	↓	2
 Gjakova ¹¹	1	—	1	↓	3
 Gjilan	4	↓	5	↑	4
 Mitrovica	5	↑	4	↓	5
 Peja	1	↓	2	↑	1
 Pristina	3	—	3	↓	7
 Prizren	6	—	6	—	6

11 In the 2018 report Citizen's Scores on Basic Court Services, two basic courts were ranked first on the prevalence of corruption variable, hence the ranking is continued with third place and therefore there is no second place. For comparison purposes the numbers in the table for 2018 have been changed to reflect the logic behind the ranking in 2020. Nonetheless, this does not change the ranking order of basic courts in 2018.










OBSERVATION COURTROOM EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESULTS

Observation courtroom experience survey results

The observation courtroom experience survey is composed of 18 observational questions and seven follow-up textual responses to provide further information where necessary. In the section below, each observational question result is interpreted in the same order as listed in the survey.








The first dimension observed was whether translation was provided during court hearings. Courtroom observation results show that in 97.49% of court sessions monitored, there was translation provided during the session, when translation was needed. In only 2.57% of court sessions monitored was there a lack of translation when this service was needed. The leading court (where translation was not provided when needed) is Peja Basic Court with 1.59%, followed by Mitrovica Basic Court with 0.98% of sessions when translation was not provided, while Mitrovica Basic Court had the highest percentage of sessions where translation was needed and provided.

■ TABLE 59. Is translation secured during the session?

	Yes	No	N/A
 Ferizaj	0.97%	0.00%	99.03%
 Gjakova	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
 Gjilan	7.94%	0.00%	92.06%
 Mitrovica	69.61%	0.98%	29.41%
 Peja	6.35%	1.59%	92.06%
 Pristina	6.17%	0.00%	93.83%
 Prizren	6.45%	0.00%	93.55%

Further, as shown in the table below, the sessions that required translation were for Albanian (74 cases), followed by Serbian (72 cases), Bosnian (6 cases), and Turkish language (1 case). Mitrovica Basic Court leads in terms of the number of sessions that required translation (127), followed by Gjiilan (10 cases), and Prizren (7 cases).








■ **TABLE 60. Translation secured**¹²

		Albanian	Serbian	Bosnian	Turkish	Rom	Gorane	Other	Total
	Ferizaj	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Gjakova	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Gjiilan	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	10
	Mitrovica	63	63	1	0	0	0	0	127
	Peja	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	4
	Pristina	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	6
	Prizren	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	7

12 NOTE: The data is presented in numbers due to the small number of respondents who claimed that translation was needed.








The second dimension observed was whether people entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff. The data indicate that acknowledgment by the court staff is not a major challenge as people entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff in 93% of cases, while they were not greeted only in a small percentage (7%) of instances. Two courts scored 100% (Peja and Ferizaj), meaning that there was no instance when people entering the courtroom were not greeted by court staff.

■ **TABLE 61. People entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	98.68%	1.32%
 Gjilan	96.83%	3.17%
 Mitrovica	80.39%	19.61%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	83.95%	16.05%
 Prizren	95.16%	4.84%








While there is no written rule or practice that requires judges to display their names on the bench during hearings on the courtrooms, it is essential that each judge introduce himself or herself prior to each hearing. However, we conducted observations to check whether they do so on voluntarily basis. The monitoring results show that in 69.39% of cases monitored judge's name was not visibly posted on the bench. On the other hand, in around 30% of court sessions observed, the judge's name was visibly posted on the bench, mainly in cases where hearing sessions took place at the judge's offices/chambers.

■ **TABLE 62. The judge's name was visibly posted on the bench**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	4.85%	95.15%
 Gjakova	98.68%	1.32%
 Gjilan	0.00%	100.00%
 Mitrovica	7.84%	92.16%
 Peja	96.83%	3.17%
 Pristina	1.23%	98.77%
 Prizren	4.84%	95.16%








Court sessions were also monitored to check whether the hearing started on time. The monitoring results show that in 65.54% of cases, the hearings started on time, while in 34.46% of cases it did not. Pristina Basic Court has the highest percentage of cases (61.73%) observed where hearings did not start on time, followed by Gjilan (52.38%), and Mitrovica (42.16%), whereas Prizren has the lowest percentage of such cases (19.35%).

■ **TABLE 63.** The hearing(s) started on time

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	59.22%	40.78%
 Gjakova	89.47%	10.53%
 Gjilan	47.62%	52.38%
 Mitrovica	57.84%	42.16%
 Peja	85.71%	14.29%
 Pristina	38.27%	61.73%
 Prizren	80.65%	19.35%








In case of delay, as shown in the below table, the judge apologized at the start of the hearing in 74% of monitored cases. In three basic courts (Peja, Gjakova and Ferizaj) there was no case observed where the judge did not apologize at the beginning of the session if delayed. On the other hand, the observation results depict a different situation in the case of Mitrovica, Pristina, Prizren, and Gjilan. In Mitrovica, in the majority of court cases observed (65.12%) the judge did not apologize for any delay, followed by Pristina (52%), Prizren (33.33%) and Gjilan (33.3%).

■ **TABLE 64.** In case of delay, the judge apologized for any delay in the starting of the hearing (s)

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	69.70%	30.30%
 Mitrovica	34.88%	65.12%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	48.00%	52.00%
 Prizren	66.67%	33.33%

Further, the monitoring results show that the judge presented himself/herself by name in around 80% of cases and did not do so in around 20% of observed cases. Gjakova leads in this regard, as in 100% of monitored sessions the judge presented himself/herself, followed by Ferizaj (99.03%), Gjilan (69.78%), Prizren (77.42%), Mitrovica (76.47%), Peja (73.02%), and Pristina (60.49%). In contrast, Pristina has the highest percentage of negative answers observed / cases where the judge did not present himself/herself by name (39.51%).

■ **TABLE 65.** The judge presented himself/herself by name

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	99.03%	0.97%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	77.78%	22.22%
 Mitrovica	76.47%	23.53%
 Peja	73.02%	26.98%
 Pristina	60.49%	39.51%
 Prizren	77.42%	22.58%








This question was followed by a textual response type of question, which required D+ enumerators to further explain what happened once the judge did not present himself/herself. As shown in the below table the most frequent explanation is that the session started directly, without judges presenting themselves by name.

Number of Comments	Comments
53	The session started directly.
16	It was not the first session.
10	It was the same trial judge so the session started by stating that fact.

■ **TABLE 66.** Comments from all basic courts in regard to when the session started








Further, as shown in the table below, the explanation of court etiquette and rules at the beginning of the court hearing is not a challenge to Procedural Justice across any of the basic courts, as in 96.9% of cases, this was clearly explained by the judge or other court staff at the beginning of the court hearing.

■ **TABLE 67.** The judge or other court staff clearly explained court etiquette and rules at the beginning of the court hearing

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	100.00%	0.00%
 Peja	98.41%	1.59%
 Pristina	86.42%	13.58%
 Prizren	93.55%	6.45%

The monitoring results demonstrate that in 95% of cases, the judge provided an overview of the hearing process both specifically related to the current hearing and as part of the overall case adjudication process.

■ **TABLE 68.** The judge provided an overview of the hearing process, both specifically related to the current hearing and as part of the overall case adjudication process

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	87.38%	12.62%
 Gjakova	98.68%	1.32%
 Gjilan	98.41%	1.59%
 Mitrovica	100.00%	0.00%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	91.36%	8.64%
 Prizren	90.32%	9.68%








In the 5% of the cases when judges did not provide such an overview, D+ enumerators further observed the session to see how the session proceeded; however, as the table below shows, there is no clear trend as to why this happened.

Number of Comments	Comments
7	The party did not want the judge to make an overview as they claimed to know where the court case is and the reason they are in the hearing session.
1	Continued with lawyer's statement
1	Continued with the testimony of the witness
1	Read the judgment
1	Started with questions for the parties
1	Started with charges for the accused

■ **TABLE 69.** Comments from all D+ enumerators across all basic courts








The monitoring results show that in 95.6% of cases, the judge made eye contact with the parties during the hearing and only in 5% of cases did not. The latter is significantly small and falls within the margin of error.

■ **TABLE 70.** The judge made eye contact with the parties during the hearing

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	97.09%	2.91%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	84.31%	15.69%
 Peja	98.41%	1.59%
 Pristina	92.59%	7.41%
 Prizren	96.77%	3.23%








Furthermore, judges were observed as to whether they were speaking in a clear and calm manner. The monitoring results depict that speaking in a professional and calm manner is not a problem across any of the seven basic courts. As shown in the below table, in 99.2% of cases the judge presented in a professional manner while speaking clearly and in a calm manner. Only in the case of Mitrovica and Prizren there were three sessions in total when the judge was observed to have not been clearly speaking.

■ **TABLE 71. The judge presented a professional demeanor, speaking in a clear and calm manner**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	98.04%	1.96%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	100.00%	0.00%
 Prizren	96.77%	3.23%








Another important aspect monitored is whether the judge referred to the parties by name. As shown in the table below, in 85.6% of cases, the judge referred to parties by name, while in around 14% of instances, the judge did not refer to the parties by name. Ferizaj Basic Court is an outlier in this case since in 79.61% of monitored sessions, the judge did not refer to the parties by name. In those cases where the judge did not refer to parties by name, they referred to them as party, defendant and accused (97 observed cases) or as sir/madam (2 observed cases).

■ **TABLE 72. The judge referred to the parties by name**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	20.39%	79.61%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	95.10%	4.90%
 Peja	98.41%	1.59%
 Pristina	93.83%	6.17%
 Prizren	91.94%	8.06%








The data show that in 98.8% of monitored sessions the judge made sure that the parties understood their rights, while in less than 2% of monitored sessions this did not happen, making it insignificant as it falls within the margin of error.

■ **TABLE 73.** The judge made sure that the parties understood their rights

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	99.02%	0.98%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	97.53%	2.47%
 Prizren	95.16%	4.84%








Additionally, all speakers-judges, attorneys and parties were easy to hear in 94% of observed sessions. The leading basic courts in this respect are Gjakova (100% of speakers were easy to hear) and Prizren (100%), followed by Peja (98.41%), Pristina (97.53%), Gjilan (96.83%), and Mitrovica (92.16%). In contrast, the basic court where the highest percentage of all speakers that were not easy to hear is observed in Ferizaj (23.3%).

■ **TABLE 74. All speakers- judges, attorneys and parties were easy to hear**

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	76.70%	23.30%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	96.83%	3.17%
 Mitrovica	92.16%	7.84%
 Peja	98.41%	1.59%
 Pristina	97.53%	2.47%
 Prizren	100.00%	0.00%








Moreover, in 99% of observed sessions the judges clearly described what the parties must do to comply with the court expectations, interim orders, and /or judgments. This aspect has received one of the two highest percentages of positive observations among all observational questions.

■ **TABLE 75.** The judge clearly described what the parties must do to comply with the court’s expectations, interim orders, and/or judgments

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	100.00%	0.00%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	98.77%	1.23%
 Prizren	95.16%	4.84%

We have also looked at whether the parties were permitted to ask questions or make comments. Results show that in 97.3% of sessions, the parties were allowed to ask questions or to make a comment, while in around 18% of cases they were not allowed to do so. There are three basic courts including Peja, Gjakova and Gjilan that scored 100%, meaning that there was no case observed when parties were not allowed to ask questions or make a comment.








■ **TABLE 76.** The parties were permitted to ask questions or make a comment

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	91.26%	8.74%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	99.02%	0.98%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	92.59%	7.41%
 Prizren	98.39%	1.61%

Further, in 91.28% of monitored sessions the judge asked the parties to repeat their understanding of their role, actions required/ next steps, including any fees they had to pay, documents they needed to submitted, etc. The largest share of sessions observed where the judge did not ask parties to repeat their role is in Ferizaj (55.34%), followed by Prizren (3.23%) and Pristina (2.47%), while in all other basic courts, such instances were not observed.








The reasons observed for cases when the judge did not ask the parties to repeat their understanding of the role includes: a) this is not the end of the case, b) the case continues, and c) it's the beginning of the case (totaling 57 cases observed).

TABLE 77. The judge asked the parties to repeat back their understanding of their role, actions required/next steps, including any fees they had to pay, documents they needed to submit, etc.

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	44.66%	55.34%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	100.00%	0.00%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	97.53%	2.47%
 Prizren	96.77%	3.23%








Further, the data depicts that in 99% of court monitored sessions, the judge used simple and clear language to explain legal terms and acronyms.

■ **TABLE 78.** The judge used simple and clear language to explain legal terms and acronyms

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	98.04%	1.96%
 Peja	100.00%	0.00%
 Pristina	96.30%	3.70%
 Prizren	100.00%	0.00%







Results show that in 76% of observed sessions the parties were consulted regarding when the next court date would be set, whereas in 24% of cases they were not consulted. The lead basic court for negative observations is Mitrovica (53.92%), followed by Prizren (48.39%), and Ferizaj (47.57%).

■ **TABLE 79.** The parties were consulted regarding when the next court date would be set

	Yes	No
 Ferizaj	52.43%	47.57%
 Gjakova	100.00%	0.00%
 Gjilan	100.00%	0.00%
 Mitrovica	46.08%	53.92%
 Peja	98.41%	1.59%
 Pristina	83.95%	16.05%
 Prizren	51.61%	48.39%

Regarding provision of an interpreter, as shown in the table below, there was no need for interpretation in the majority of observed cases (85% out of 100%). In instances where interpretation was needed, the court was aware of the need in advance of the hearing and provided it in a timely manner in 97% of cases (93 out of 95 cases required).















TABLE 80. The court was aware of the need for interpretation in advance of the hearing and provided it in a timely manner

	Yes	No	N/A
 Ferizaj	0.97%	0.00%	99.03%
 Gjakova	1.32%	0.00%	98.68%
 Gjilan	7.94%	1.59%	90.47%
 Mitrovica	69.61%	0.00%	30.39%
 Peja	9.52%	1.59%	88.89%
 Pristina	6.17%	0.00%	93.83%
 Prizren	6.45%	0.00%	93.55%

Ranking comparison of all courts based on observational questions' results

All basic courts are ranked from one to seven, where one is comparatively better than other courts, and seven is comparatively weaker than others. Scores for each court have been calculated by using average percentages derived by the number of positive or negative answers respondents gave to 18 questions including:

- 1) People entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff;
- 2) The judge's name was visibly posted on the bench;
- 3) The hearing(s) started on time;
- 4) The judge introduced him/herself by name;
- 5) In case of delay, the judge apologized for any delay at the start of the hearing(s);
- 6) The judge or other court staff clearly explained court etiquette and rules at the beginning of the court hearing;
- 7) The judge provided an overview of the hearing process both specifically related to the current hearing and as part of the overall case adjudication process;
- 8) The judge made eye contact with the parties during the hearing;
- 9) The judge presented a professional demeanor, speaking in a clear and calm manner;
- 10) The judge referred to the parties by name;
- 11) The judge made sure that the parties understood their rights;
- 12) All speakers - judges, attorneys and parties were easy to hear;
- 13) The judge clearly described what the parties must do to comply with the court's expectations, interim orders, and/or judgments;
- 14) The parties were permitted to ask questions or make a comment;
- 15) The judge asked the parties to repeat back their understanding of their role, actions required/next steps, including any fees they had to pay, documents they needed to submit, etc.;
- 16) The judge used plain language to explain legal terms or acronyms;
- 17) The parties were consulted regarding when the next court date would be set;
- 18) The court was aware of the need for interpretation in advance of the hearing and provided it in a timely manner.

Ranking of basic courts based on observational question result		Basic Courts	
	First place		Gjakova
	Second place		Peja
	Third place		Gjilan
	Fourth place		Mitrovica
	Fifth place		Prizren
	Sixth place		Pristina
	Seventh place		Ferizaj

Policy Recommendations

Based on the two survey findings and with the aim of improving the application of procedural justice across the seven basic courts in Kosovo, D+ has compiled the following list of policy-based recommendations:

-
- Basic courts should promote the use of the court's website via various channels, including social media, QR codes, and/or brochures. The latter could be made available at the entrance of the court premises or the information desk while QR codes can be placed at the entrance and/or in the building and would allow court users to scan via mobile devices and directly connect citizens to the court's webpage.
-
- Basic courts should systematically inform citizens about the existence of complaint boxes and the option to write complaints, while assuring them that their complaints will be taken into consideration. Informational signs could be posted at the entrance and in the halls of the court premises.
-
- Basic courts should better mark and/or better situate the information desk within the court premises, particularly in the case of Gjilan Basic Court, where 60.97% of court users stated that they are not aware of its existence.
-
- All court staff should be systematically trained to treat each court user with courtesy and respect.
-
- All judges should be systematically trained about fair treatment of each court user.
-
- Ensuring the opportunity for court users to speak in their native language should be prioritized in the Basic Courts of Mitrovica and Gjakova.
-
- All court users should be informed about their right to file disciplinary claims for violations of the judge and how to do so. This information should be made available at the information desk in the court and through brochures available at the entrance of the court and inside the court premises. Additionally, each basic court's website should include information about this possibility.
-
- Placement of the judges' names should be addressed by an internal regulation which obliges all judges to visibly place name tents.
-
- All judges should be trained about the importance of being on time for the hearings.
-

ANNEX I

1. Region

- ☐ Pristina
- ☐ Mitrovica
- ☐ Peja
- ☐ Gjakova
- ☐ Gjilan
- ☐ Ferizaj
- ☐ Prizren

2. What is your gender?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

3. What is your age group?

- ☐ 15-17
- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45-54
- ☐ 55-64
- ☐ 65+

4. Which of the below represents the ethnicity with which you most closely identify?

- ☐ Albanian
- ☐ Serbian
- ☐ Turkish
- ☐ Bosniak
- ☐ Roma
- ☐ Ashkali
- ☐ Egyptian
- ☐ Gorani
- ☐ Other

5. If you have selected other, please specify.

6. Why did you come to the court today?

- ☐ Physical person
- ☐ Lawyer or authorized representative
- ☐ Obtain ONLY administrative services: documents, information, make a payment, make a statement, etc.
- ☐ Witness
- ☐ Journalist
- ☐ Observer/Support a friend or relative
- ☐ Judge, Professional Associate of Judge
- ☐ Prosecutor, Professional Associate of Prosecutor
- ☐ Administrative staff
- ☐ I work in the court, but not on a professional duty
- ☐ Other

7. If you have selected other, please specify.

8. A party in a proceeding - natural person

- ☐ Plaintiff
- ☐ Defendant
- ☐ Respondent
- ☐ Victim

9. What type of case brought you to the court?

- ☐ Criminal
- ☐ Civil
- ☐ Commercial
- ☐ Administrative
- ☐ Minor Offence
- ☐ Juvenile

10. In your experience, how easy is it to get information about your case?

- ☐ Very hard
- ☐ Somewhat hard
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Very easy

11. How helpful was the information given to you by the court?

- ☐ Very unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat helpful
- ☐ Very helpful

12. What was your experience in finding the courtroom or office you needed?

- ☐ Very unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat unhelpful
- ☐ Somewhat helpful
- ☐ Very helpful

13. What would be helpful in this respect?

14. Are complaint boxes available in the courthouse?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I do not know

15. Is there an information desk in the courthouse?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I do not know

16. Do you use the court's website to obtain information?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

17. What kind of information do you usually search for in the court's website?

- ☐ Schedule of hearings
- ☐ Contact information
- ☐ News
- ☐ Published decisions
- ☐ Information about judges

18. If you have selected other, please specify.

19. Is the court website content that you need translated into your native language?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I do not know

20. Are you satisfied with the quality of translation of the court's website content?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

21. Were you able to get your court business done in a reasonable period of time today?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

22. How long has your case been pending?

- ☐ Less than 6 months
- ☐ Up to 1 year
- ☐ Up to 2 years
- ☐ Up to 3 years
- ☐ Up to 5 years
- ☐ More than 5 years
- ☐ More than 10 years

23. Are you satisfied with the length of time in which your case is being reviewed?

- ☐ Very unsatisfied
- ☐ Somewhat unsatisfied
- ☐ Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ Very satisfied

24. Were you treated with courtesy and respect by the court staff?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ To some degree

25. Do you think you were treated fairly by the judge?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ To some degree

26. Were you able to talk to court staff in your native language?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

27. Did the court provide translation during hearings?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

28. Were you satisfied with the translation quality during hearings?

- ☐ Very unsatisfied
- ☐ Somewhat unsatisfied
- ☐ Somewhat satisfied
- ☐ Very satisfied

29. Did you receive court documents in your native language?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Sometimes

30. Do you feel (physically) safe on the court premises?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

31. If no, why do you not feel safe?

32. Do you know that you can file a disciplinary complaint about for violations of the judge?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

33. If yes, do you know where to file the complaint?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

34. Have you ever been asked for a bribe by a court judge or court employee or an intermediary acting on behalf of the former?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

35. If yes, for what reason?

- ☐ To fast-track processes
- ☐ To obtain the needed documentation
- ☐ To have the case ruled in my favor
- ☐ Other

36. If you have selected other, please specify.

37. Have you ever offered a bribe to a judge or court employee?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

38. If yes, for what reason?

- ☐ To fast-track processes
- ☐ To obtain the needed documentation
- ☐ To have the case ruled in my favor
- ☐ Other

39. If you have selected other, please specify.

40. If yes, what position did the person hold?

- ☐ Judge
- ☐ Court employee
- ☐ Other

41. If you have selected other, please specify.

42. Where did you go in the court building?

- ☐ Courtroom
- ☐ Judge's chambers
- ☐ Court Administrators Office
- ☐ Case Management Office
- ☐ Cashier / Finance Office
- ☐ Other

43. If you have selected other, please specify.

44. Would you feel comfortable writing down your complaints about the court and putting them into the complaint box?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

45. Did you speak with anyone at the information desk?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

46. How helpful was the person at the information desk?

- ☐ Very helpful
- ☐ Somewhat helpful
- ☐ Somewhat unhelpful
- ☐ Very unhelpful

47. There was good signage and information to understand the security procedures for entering the building

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

48. Security personnel were helpful and respectful.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

49. The building was clean and well maintained.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

50. Signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were visible and easy to understand.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

51. Signs posted around the building and inside the courtroom were in my native language.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

52. Since your case began, have any of the following occurred

- ☐ I missed work to attend a hearing or conduct business with the court
- ☐ I came to court and felt like nothing happened to advance my case
- ☐ It affected my ability to get a job/license/certification
- ☐ I could not get documentation needed for a visa application
- ☐ I had to switch attorneys/representation
- ☐ I did not have an attorney and had to represent myself

53. If you need to come back for another hearing, did anyone ask you what date would work best for you?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't need to come back to court

54. If you were treated differently than other court users, why do you feel you were treated differently?

- ☐ My race/ethnicity
- ☐ The language I speak
- ☐ My gender
- ☐ My economic status
- ☐ My appearance (clothing, hair, etc.)
- ☐ My age
- ☐ Something else

55. If you have selected something else, please specify.

56. Overall, did you feel that you were able to ask the questions that you needed to today?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ N/A

57. Do you have anything to add?

ANNEX II

Courtroom User Experience Observation Form

Court:

Date:

Observer:

Docket#:	
Room#:	Begin time of observation: End time of observation:
Judge	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Plaintiff1	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Plaintiff2	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Plaintiff3	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Defendant/Respondent1	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Defendant/Respondent 2	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Defendant/Respondent 3	<input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F <input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other
Interpretation provided (check all that apply):	<input type="checkbox"/> Alb <input type="checkbox"/> Srb <input type="checkbox"/> Bos <input type="checkbox"/> Tur <input type="checkbox"/> Rom <input type="checkbox"/> Ash <input type="checkbox"/> Egy <input type="checkbox"/> Gor/other

Observational Questions

<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	1. People entering the courtroom were greeted by court staff.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	2. The judge's name was visibly posted on the bench.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	3. The hearing(s) started on time.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	4. The judge introduced him/herself by name.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	5. In case of delay, the judge apologized for any delay in the starting of the hearing(s).
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	6. The judge or other court staff clearly explained court etiquette and rules at the beginning of the court hearing.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	7. The judge provided an overview of the hearing process both specifically related to the current hearing and as part of the overall case adjudication process.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	8. The judge made eye contact with the parties during the hearing.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	9. The judge presented in a professional demeanor, speaking in a clear and calm manner.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	10. The judge referred to the parties by name.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	11. The judge made sure that the parties understood their rights. If no, explain why:
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	12. All speakers - judges, attorneys and parties - were easy to hear.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	13. The judge clearly described what the parties must do to comply with the court's expectations, interim orders, and/or judgments.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	14. The parties were permitted to ask questions or make a comment.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	15. The judge asked the parties to repeat back their understanding of their role, actions required/next steps, including any fees they had to pay, documents they had to submit, etc.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	16. The judge used plain language to explain legal terms or acronyms.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	17. The parties were consulted regarding when the next court date would be set.
<input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N	18. The court was aware of the need for interpretation in advance of the hearing and provided it in a timely manner. (circle here if translation was not required)

