SURVEY OF JUDICIAL VIEWS OF THE SCOTTISH COURT SERVICE

2011

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

May 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SURVEY OF JUDICIAL VIEWS OF THE SCS: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Contents

SURVEY OF JUDICIAL VIEWS OF THE SCS: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

1 Introduction

1.1 The Scottish Court Service (SCS) is an independent body corporate established by the Judiciary and Courts (Scotland) Act 2008. Its function is to provide administrative support to Scotland's courts and to the judiciary of those courts, including the High Court of Justiciary, Court of Session, sheriff courts and justice of the peace courts.

1.2 In 2011, the SCS Board commissioned the first ever survey of the views of members of the judiciary about the services and support provided to them by the SCS. The SCS already undertakes and publishes regular surveys of the views of its staff and both professional and non-professional court users.

1.3 The development of the survey was overseen by the SCS's Judiciary and Court User Satisfaction Project Board, and was informed by a Judicial Reference Group including a senator, sheriff, part-time sheriff and justice of the peace. The inaugural *Survey of Judicial Views of the SCS* was launched on 7 November 2011 and was open for completion by all permanent, part-time and lay judicial office holders until the end of December 2011.

1.4 The survey consisted of a mixture of multiple choice 'rating' questions and open questions that enabled respondents to amplify their views about key elements of the services and support provided by the SCS, including:

- the technical competence of SCS staff;
- court property and facilities;
- health, safety and security;
- Information and Communications Technology (ICT) facilities;
- legal publications;
- communications with the SCS;
- efficient disposal of business; and
- overall satisfaction.

1.5 There were also a few demographic questions, including level of judicial office held and general location of court or courts in which respondents worked, e.g. sheriffdom or supreme courts. More detailed information was not collected in order to preserve the anonymity of respondents.

1.6 A variety of methods were offered for members of the judiciary to submit their survey returns. Respondents were able to print hard copies, fill them in and post them to SCS headquarters; complete a Word questionnaire electronically and e-mail it to a dedicated survey mailbox; or complete an online questionnaire.

2 Analytical Approach

2.1 Responses to the multiple choice rating questions have been collated, checked and analysed. The analysis includes breakdowns for most of the multiple

choice questions by level of judicial office and by sheriffdom. There were also many responses to the open questions. These were redacted to remove court names and other potential identifiers, then organised by question and theme. A summary of the issues raised is provided at the end of each section in the report to give context to the rating results. This report is ordered in sections that mostly correspond to the order of sections in the questionnaire.

Some Caveats

2.2 Response rates per question are shown in the tables throughout this report as some respondents did not answer all of the multiple choice questions. Judges' responses are included in the breakdowns by level of judicial office but they are not repeated in the breakdowns by sheriffdom. To protect their anonymity, responses by Sheriffs Principal and temporary judges have not been reported in the breakdowns by level of judicial office or sheriffdom though they are included in the higher level analysis. Some part-time sheriffs did not indicate a 'base' location and so their responses had to be excluded from the sheriffdom level analysis.

2.3 A few respondents gave double ratings ('very satisfied and fairly satisfied', 'very dissatisfied and fairly dissatisfied', 'very good and fairly good', 'very poor and fairly good' and 'very poor and very good') for some questions. These have been included in the analysis, as the answers to open questions indicated that some respondents in the larger courts or those who were commenting on more than one court felt staff had varying levels of technical competence. Similarly, there were a few double ratings given for questions about property, facilities and communications. It is possible that some of these double ratings were completion errors, as all were in the electronic questionnaires.

2.4 For the staffing questions, small numbers of responses were disregarded where there appeared to be a mismatch between judicial duties and staff technical competence (e.g. JPs who rated staff working on civil business). These exclusions contribute to the variable response rates for the staff rating questions.

2.5 Some respondents did not answer all of the open questions, which were analysed thematically, question by question, to ensure that specific comments and ideas were not missed. The main points that emerged are reported at the end of each section, organised by theme. As some respondents' comments covered several themes, references are made to the number of comments per theme rather than per question. Direct quotations have not been used in the report to avoid the risk of quotes being read out of context.

3   Response Rate

3.1 A total of 181 responses were received (95 online surveys, 47 hard copies and 30 Word questionnaires), representing around 27% of the total available population of judicial office holders.

Table 1: Responses by Level of Judicial Office

Judicial office holder	n	approximate population	% of population
Full-Time Sheriff	67	143	47
JP	67	412	16
Judge	25	34	74
Part-Time Sheriff	15	72	21
Sheriff Principal	3	6	50
Temporary Judge	2	12	17
Level not disclosed	2	-	-
Total	181	679	27

3.2   As Table 1 shows, nearly three quarters of judges and just under half of full-time sheriffs completed the survey. There were lower response rates from part-time sheriffs and justices of the peace.

Table 2: Responses by Location

Location	n	%
South Strathclyde, Dumfries & Galloway (SSD&G)	32	18
Tayside, Central & Fife (TC&F)	31	17
Supreme Courts	25	14
Lothian & Borders (L&B)	23	13
North Strathclyde (NS)	23	13
Glasgow & Strathkelvin (G&S)	18	10
Grampian, Highland and Islands (GH&I)	18	10
More than one location / did not answer	11	6
Total	181	

3.3   Respondents were asked to indicate in which location most of their judicial time was spent. Table 2 shows that the responses were spread quite evenly across sheriffdoms.

4   Overall Satisfaction

4.1   All but one respondent answered this question, which was placed towards the end of the questionnaire.

Table 3: Overall Satisfaction

Q30: "Thinking about all the questions you have answered up to now, how dissatisfied or satisfied are you overall with the staff, services, and facilities provided by the SCS?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	31	17
Fairly satisfied	111	62
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	18	10
Fairly dissatisfied	18	10
Very dissatisfied	2	1
No response	1	<1
Total	181	

4.2   Table 3 shows that over three-quarters (79%) of respondents were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' overall with the staff, services and facilities provided by the SCS.

Table 4: Overall Satisfaction by Level of Judicial Office

Q30 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP	Other
	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	4	8	3	13	3
Fairly satisfied	20	38	9	40	4
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	8	1	9	0
Fairly dissatisfied	1	11	2	4	0
Very dissatisfied	0	2	0	0	0
No response	0	0	0	1	0
Total	25	67	15	67	7

Note: 'Other' consists of 2 temporary judges, 3 sheriffs principal and 2 responses where the status question was left blank.

4.3   Amongst the larger judicial groupings, all but one judge was satisfied overall, as were over three-quarters of part-time sheriffs and JPs, and over two-thirds of full-time sheriffs, as shown in Table 4.

Table 5: Overall Satisfaction by Sheriffdom

Q30 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	2	1	3	1	4	12
Fairly satisfied	13	9	13	20	17	14
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	3	2	1	6	3
Fairly dissatisfied	0	5	5	0	4	2
Very dissatisfied	1	0	0	1	0	0
Total	18	18	23	23	31	31

4.4   Whilst the findings were not dissimilar when broken down by region, with more respondents satisfied than dissatisfied everywhere, there was a difference in emphasis, with twelve respondents from TC&F 'very satisfied' and two 'fairly dissatisfied'. By comparison, in GH&I one respondent was 'very satisfied' and five were 'fairly dissatisfied' (see Table 5).

4.5   The raw numbers are too low to ascribe particular significance to these differences. Further disaggregation, for example to see how many from each level of judicial office completed surveys in each sheriffdom, would risk compromising the anonymity of respondents.

5   SCS Staff - Technical Competence

5.1   All respondents gave an overall rating for the technical competence of SCS staff.

Table 6: Technical Competence of Staff Overall

Q7: "Overall, please rate the support provided to you by SCS staff."		
	n	%
Very good	95	52
Fairly good	68	38
Neither poor nor good	13	7
Fairly poor	5	3
Very poor	0	0
Total	181	

5.2   In total, 90% (n=163) rated the overall technical skills of SCS staff as either 'very good' or 'fairly good' and 3% rated them 'fairly poor' (see Table 6).

Table 7: Technical Competence of Staff Overall, by Level of Judicial Office

Q7 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very good	14	26	4	46
Fairly good	11	30	10	15
Neither poor nor good	0	6	1	6
Fairly poor	0	5	0	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total	25	67	15	67

5.3   All judges rated staff either 'very good' or 'fairly good' overall (see Table 7). Over two-thirds of JPs rated staff 'very good', and neither JPs nor part-time sheriffs gave any 'poor' ratings.

Table 8: Technical Competence of Staff Overall, by Sheriffdom

Q7 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	9	6	14	11	20	17
Fairly good	8	6	6	8	10	12
Neither poor nor good	1	4	3	3	1	1
Fairly poor	0	2	0	1	1	1
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	18	23	23	32	31

5.4   Within sheriffdoms, the highest overall staff ratings were found in G&S, SSD&G, and TC&F, each of which had 94% of respondents rating staff 'very' or 'fairly' good (Table 8). SSD&G had the highest 'very good' rating of 63%, with L&B next on 61%. There were no 'poor' staff ratings in G&S or L&B. Fewer high staff ratings were reported in GH&I, where one third of responses were 'very good' and another third were 'fairly good'.

5.5   A follow up question asked how the general support provided to respondents and their courts by SCS staff could be improved. The main themes that emerged were:

- training, staff numbers and resourcing;

- use of court officers/bar officers/macers;
- communication/collaboration with the judiciary;
- improving staff morale and conditions;
- SCS management; and
- earlier provision of information/papers to aid judicial preparation.

Training, Staff Numbers and Resourcing
5.6   Twelve responses made reference to the need to improve staff training, whilst six commented on the need for SCS staff numbers to be maintained or increased. Both of these issues are covered in more detail below.

Use of Court Officers, Bar Officers and Macers
5.7   Nine respondents emphasised the important role of court officers, bar officers and macers in supporting their work. Some suggested increasing the number of court officers or bar officers; others warned of the consequences if their numbers were cut back.

Communication/Collaboration with the Judiciary
5.8   Eight respondents referred to the potential to improve communications with the judiciary, for example pre-court preparation, etc. This is covered in more detail in the section on communication.

Improving Staff Morale and Conditions
5.9   Five respondents thought that greater efforts should be made to improve the morale of SCS staff, including improving the terms and conditions of staff; monitoring stress on senior members of staff; and ensuring the adequacy of staff numbers.

SCS Management
5.10   Five respondents referred to SCS management, including the need for SCS management to better understand the pressures on courts; placing less focus on sitting times as a measure of efficiency; reducing the number of non-court based managers overall; improving liaison between the SCS and Crown; and ensuring more effective local management information.

Earlier Provision of Information/Papers to Assist Judicial Preparation
5.11   Four respondents requested earlier provision of information and papers.

Miscellaneous
5.12   Miscellaneous comments from individual respondents included concerns that JP court work was not given sufficient priority by SCS staff; a lack of dedicated staff working solely to Appeal Court judges; and increased focus on tackling poor performance.

5.13   Respondents were invited to rate the performance of SCS staff in each of seven technical competences.

Summary Criminal

Table 9: Technical Competence Ratings for Summary Criminal

Q1a: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [summary criminal] business."		
	n	%
Very good	87	57
Fairly good	58	38
Very good and fairly good [double rating - see page 2]	1	1
Neither poor nor good	6	4
Fairly poor	1	1
Very poor	0	0
Total	153	

5.14   This competence received 'very good', 'fairly good' or 'very good and fairly good' ratings from 95% of the 153 responses (judges and sheriffs principal do not normally preside over summary criminal courts) and a 'fairly poor' rating from 1% of respondents (see Table 9).

Table 10: Ratings for Summary Criminal, by Level of Judicial Office

Q1a by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very good	4	27	6	48
Fairly good	1	33	8	15
Very good and fairly good [see page 2]	0	0	1	0
Neither poor nor good	0	6	0	0
Fairly poor	0	1	0	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total	5	67	15	67

5.15   Broken down by level of judicial office, 90% of full-time sheriffs and 94% of JPs rated the technical competence of staff as either 'very' or 'fairly' good in supporting the courts on summary criminal cases (Table 10).

Table 11: Ratings for Summary Criminal, by Sheriffdom

Q1a by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	13	6	12	10	18	20
Fairly good	4	8	10	11	9	11
Very good and fairly good [see page 2]	0	0	0	1	0	0
Neither poor nor good	0	4	0	1	1	0
Fairly poor	1	0	0	0	0	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	18	22	23	28	31

5.16   At sheriffdom level, G&S had the highest proportion of 'very good' ratings (72%), followed by TC&F (65%) and SSD&G (64%). GH&I had the lowest such proportion (33%) and the only 'fairly poor' response came from G&S (Table 11).

Solemn Criminal

Table 12: Technical Competence Ratings for Solemn Criminal

Q1b: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [solemn criminal] business."		
	n	%
Very good	53	51
Fairly good	44	43
Neither poor nor good	5	5
Fairly poor	1	1
Very poor	0	0
Total	103	

5.17   This competence received 'very' or 'fairly' good ratings from 94% (n=97) of the 103 responses (see Table 12). There was only one 'fairly poor' rating for solemn crime.

Table 13: Ratings for Solemn Criminal, by Level of Judicial Office

Q1b by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff
	n	n	n
Very good	18	28	6
Fairly good	4	32	6
Neither poor nor good	0	5	0
Fairly poor	0	1	0
Very poor	0	0	0
Total	22	66	12

5.18   Solemn criminal ratings were strongest from judges, 82% of whom rated their staff 'very good' (Table 13). Of full-time Sheriffs, 91% rated staff 'very good' or 'fairly good' and one rated staff 'fairly poor'.

Table 14: Ratings for Solemn Criminal, by Sheriffdom

Q1b by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	4	3	4	6	7	7
Fairly good	5	7	3	4	6	10
Neither poor nor good	1	1	0	1	2	0
Fairly poor	0	0	0	0	1	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	10	11	7	11	16	17

5.19   At sheriffdom level, the most positive ratings were in L&B and TC&F, where all shrieval ratings were 'very good' or 'fairly good', and the only 'fairly poor' response came from SSD&G (Table 14).

Criminal Appeals

5.20   This competence was eligible to be answered by all respondents, as it could have been interpreted to cover the hearing of appeals (including bail appeals) in the High Court and Court of Appeal as well as preparation for appeals from solemn and summary courts of first instance.

Table 15: Technical Competence Ratings for Criminal Appeals

Q1c: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [criminal appeals] business."		
	n	%
Very good	54	46
Fairly good	44	37
Neither poor nor good	14	12
Fairly poor	6	5
Very poor	0	0
Total	118	

5.21   Overall, criminal appeals received 'very good' or 'fairly good' ratings from 83% of the 118 responses and 'fairly poor' ratings from six respondents (see Table 15).

Table 16: Ratings for Criminal Appeals, by Level of Judicial Office

Q1c by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very good	13	18	2	21
Fairly good	4	23	9	6
Neither poor nor good	0	9	1	2
Fairly poor	0	4	1	1
Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total	17	54	13	30

5.22   All judges who answered this question rated competence in criminal appeal work as 'very good' or 'fairly good' (Table 16). Among the 30 JPs who responded, 90% rated staff 'very good' or 'fairly good'. Of the 54 full-time sheriffs who responded, 24% (n=13) rated competence in criminal appeal work as 'neither poor nor good' or 'fairly poor'.

Table 17: Ratings for Criminal Appeals, by Sheriffdom

Q1c by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	4	3	9	8	11	5
Fairly good	5	6	3	3	6	10
Neither poor nor good	2	5	0	2	2	1
Fairly poor	0	0	2	2	2	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	14	14	15	21	16

5.23   At sheriffdom level the six 'fairly poor' ratings were evenly split between L&B, NS and SSD&G (Table 17). However, these sheriffdoms were also the three where an absolute majority of those responding gave 'very good' ratings, notably L&B (64%).

Summary Cause/Small Claims

Table 18: Technical Competence Ratings for Summary Cause/Small Claims

Q1d: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [summary cause/small claims] business."		
	n	%
Very good	32	38
Fairly good	33	39
Neither poor nor good	12	14
Fairly poor	6	7
Very poor	1	1
Total	84	

5.24   Over three-quarters (77%) of the 84 valid responses had ratings of either 'very good' or 'fairly good' (see Table 18).

5.25   Equal numbers of full-time and part-time sheriffs gave 'very good' and 'fairly good' ratings (n=31 for each). Full-time sheriffs' responses included six 'fairly poor' ratings and one 'very poor' rating.

Table 19: Ratings for Summary Cause/Small Claims, by Sheriffdom

Q1d by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	2	2	4	8	5	9
Fairly good	6	4	3	0	6	8
Neither poor nor good	2	5	0	2	1	1
Fairly poor	0	0	0	2	4	0
Very poor	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total	10	11	8	12	16	18

5.26   At sheriffdom level, the 'fairly poor' and 'very poor' ratings were split between L&B, NS and SSD&G (see Table 19). In NS 66% of respondents gave 'very good' ratings, as did exactly half of respondents in L&B and TC&F.

Ordinary Civil

Table 20: Technical Competence Ratings for Ordinary Civil

Q1e: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [ordinary civil] business."		
	n	%
Very good	44	44
Fairly good	42	42
Neither poor nor good	7	7
Fairly poor	3	3
Very poor	3	3
Total	99	

5.27   A large majority of respondents (86%) gave staff 'very good' or 'fairly good' ratings for competence in ordinary civil (see Table 20). There were three 'fairly poor' ratings (all from full-time sheriffs) and three 'very poor' ratings (two from full-time sheriffs and one from a judge).

Table 21: Ratings for Ordinary Civil, by Sheriffdom

Q1e by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	3	1	4	6	6	10
Fairly good	4	4	3	5	7	6
Neither poor nor good	1	4	0	0	1	0
Fairly poor	0	1	0	0	1	1
Very poor	0	1	0	1	0	0
Total	8	11	7	12	15	17

5.28   At sheriffdom level, ordinary civil was rated either 'very good' or 'fairly good' by all L&B respondents (see Table 21). The other sheriffdom with a clear majority of 'very good' ratings was TC&F. The only sheriffdoms with no 'fairly poor' or 'very poor' ratings were G&S and L&B.

Civil Appeals

Table 22: Technical Competence Ratings for Civil Appeals

Q1f: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [civil appeals] business."		
	n	%
Very good	40	47
Fairly good	29	34
Neither poor nor good	15	18
Fairly poor	1	1
Very poor	0	0
Total	85	

5.29   Four-fifths (81%) of responses rated staff 'very good' or 'fairly good' (see Table 22). Two sheriffs principal rated civil appeals 'very good' and the third rated this 'fairly good'.

Table 23: Ratings for Civil Appeals, by Level of Judicial Office

Q1f by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff
	n	n	n
Very good	15	20	3
Fairly good	3	17	7
Neither poor nor good	0	14	1
Fairly poor	0	1	0
Very poor	0	0	0
Total	18	52	11

5.30   All judges gave civil appeals 'very good' or 'fairly good' ratings (see Table 23), as did all but one part-time sheriff and two-thirds of full-time sheriffs. A single full-time sheriff gave a 'fairly poor' rating for civil appeals.

Table 24: Ratings for Civil Appeals, by Sheriffdom

Q1f by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	4	1	3	5	4	5
Fairly good	2	5	1	4	4	6
Neither poor nor good	2	5	0	2	4	1
Fairly poor	0	0	0	0	1	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8	11	4	11	13	12

5.31   At sheriffdom level, civil appeals was rated either 'very good' or 'fairly good' by all L&B respondents (see Table 24). The 'fairly poor' rating was in SSD&G.

Commissary

Table 25: Technical Competence Ratings for Commissary

Q1g: "Please rate the technical competence of SCS staff, in terms of their specific responsibilities, for [commissary] business."		
	n	%
Very good	24	41
Fairly good	25	43
Neither poor nor good	9	16
Fairly poor	0	0
Very poor	0	0
Total	58	

5.32   There were no 'fairly poor' or 'very poor' ratings for commissary (see Table 25). Similar numbers considered staff to be 'very good' or 'fairly good'. Commissary staff were rated 'very good' or 'fairly good' by similar proportions of full-time (84%) and part-time (86%) sheriffs.

Table 26: Ratings for Commissary, by Sheriffdom

Q1g by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	1	1	2	3	7	7
Fairly good	1	6	3	2	5	5
Neither poor nor good	1	3	0	3	2	0
Fairly poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Very poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	3	10	5	8	14	12

5.33   At sheriffdom level, in TC&F there was a clear majority of 'very good' ratings (see Table 26). In SSD&G half of the responses were 'very good' ratings.

Other

5.34   Respondents could specify and rate other areas of technical competence. The results were mostly positive, similar to the preceding staff rating questions, and are shown in Table 27.

Table 27: Ratings for Other Competences Suggested by Respondents

Technical competence	Rating	Status
Administration/Admin support	Very good	Sheriff Principal
	Very poor	Full-Time Sheriff
Adults with incapacity	Very good	Full-Time Sheriff
	Fairly good	Part-Time Sheriff & Full-Time Sheriff
	Fairly poor	Full-Time Sheriff
Warrants	Very good	JP
Summary applications	Very good	Full-Time Sheriff
	Fairly poor	Full-Time Sheriff
Guardianships, adoptions	Very good	Full-Time Sheriff
	Fairly poor	Full-Time Sheriff
Cashiers	Fairly good	Full-Time Sheriff
Training of JPs	Very good	JP
Court of Session Civil	Very good	Judge
Family	Fairly good	Full-Time Sheriff
Typing	Very poor	Full-Time Sheriff

5.35   'Very good' ratings were also given for general helpfulness by two respondents, and a 'fairly good' rating was given for 'general approach to JP work'.

SCS Staff Technical Skills - Free Text Comments

5.36   After being asked to rate specific technical skills of SCS staff, respondents were then asked what improvements could be made to the technical knowledge and skills of staff. The main themes were:

- training;
- interlocutors, minutes and records;
- loss of experience;

- staff rotation;
- training by skilled senior staff;
- shrieval/judicial input to training; and
- management of performance.

Training

5.37   Over thirty respondents mentioned the importance of SCS staff training, though most did not specify the type(s) of training they thought was required. Specific comments included the need for timely training in new procedures; training of newer staff; and continuing professional development for existing staff. There were varying views on the relative merits of 'on the job' and classroom-based training. Four respondents (three sheriffs and one judge) thought that judicial office holders could be involved to some extent in staff training.

Interlocutors, Minutes and Records

5.38   Nine respondents referred to the potential to improve staff skills in drafting court documentation. This is covered in more detail in the next section.

Loss of Experience

5.39   Seven respondents perceived problems to have arisen due to the loss of experienced staff, for example through the voluntary redundancy scheme in 2011. Specific comments included concerns about the impact of changes on the grading and experience of staff in specific posts; the balance between experienced and inexperienced staff numbers; and the loss of staff with key skills and experience.

Staff Rotation

5.40   Six respondents felt that staff were moved too frequently, preventing them from acquiring specialist knowledge. One respondent suggested rewarding technical competence and encouraging clerks with expertise to remain in courts rather than being promoted into administrative and management posts.

Management of Performance

5.41   Two respondents referred specifically to a need for performance management and greater supervision of staff.

Miscellaneous

5.42   Miscellaneous comments from individual respondents included: concern that the knowledge of criminal appeals among legal advisors could be patchy; that the model of judge, clerk and macer could lead to a development of inter-personal relations and methods of team-working; and that mistakes could be made in civil appeals, even by competent staff, as the procedures are used infrequently.

Document Quality

5.43   Respondents were asked to rate the quality of documents prepared by SCS staff. Most respondents (n=171) answered this question.

Table 28: Ratings for Document Quality

Q3: "Please rate the quality of documents (e.g. undefended decrees, minutes, motions, interlocutors, etc.) checked or prepared for you by SCS staff."		
	n	%
Very good	53	31
Fairly good	80	47
Neither poor nor good	20	12
Fairly poor	14	8
Very poor	3	2
Very poor and fairly good [see page 2]	1	1
Total	171	

5.44   Over three quarters (78%) rated document quality either 'very good' or 'fairly good' (see Table 28). A minority (10%) rated document quality 'fairly poor' or 'very poor' and there was one 'very poor and fairly good' rating.

Table 29: Ratings for Document Quality, by Level of Judicial Office

Q3 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very good	14	7	3	27
Fairly good	10	37	10	20
Neither poor nor good	1	10	0	8
Fairly poor	0	11	1	2
Very poor	0	2	0	1
Very poor and fairly good [see page 2]	0	0	1	0
Total	25	67	15	58

5.45   Broken down by level of judicial office, judges gave a clear majority of 'very good' ratings and no 'poor' ratings (Table 29). All but two of the 15 part-time sheriffs rated document quality 'very good or 'fairly good'. Over 80% of the JPs who answered this question gave 'good' ratings for document quality but there were also two 'fairly poor' responses and one 'very poor' response. Although the majority of full-time sheriffs rated document quality 'fairly good', nearly a fifth rated this 'fairly poor' or 'very poor'.

Table 30: Ratings for Document Quality, by Sheriffdom

Q3 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	3	2	9	5	7	10
Fairly good	8	6	9	9	12	19
Neither poor nor good	5	3	1	3	4	2
Fairly poor	1	3	3	1	6	0
Very poor	0	1	0	1	1	0
Total	17	15	22	19	30	31

5.46   At sheriffdom level, TC&F staff were rated highest, with no 'poor' ratings and 93% of responses in one of the 'good' rating categories (Table 30). Whilst all other sheriffdoms had a clear majority of 'good' ratings for document quality, this was quite

variable: L&B had 82% 'good'; NS 73%; G&S 65%; SSD&G 63% and GH&I 53%. The 'poor' ratings in these five sheriffdoms also varied between a single 'fairly poor' rating in G&S to six in SSD&G plus one 'very poor' rating.

5.47   A follow-up question asked how the quality of documents prepared by staff could be improved. The main themes raised were:

- quality control;
- training and supervision;
- JP court lists;
- better/more flexible interlocutor templates; and
- discussion with judicial office holders.

Quality Control
5.48   Twenty-five respondents mentioned quality control, in particular the need to check the content and accuracy of documents more regularly, e.g. spell-checking; improving the quality of English, grammar and punctuation in interlocutors and minutes; and giving staff more time to do administrative tasks.

Training and Supervision
5.49   Twenty-five respondents mentioned training and supervision, specifically the need for staff to better understand what is happening during court hearings; practice in drafting of interlocutors, including understanding the principles and purpose underlying standard forms, and more intensive training through course work, class work, hands-on experience and support and mentoring from skilled colleagues.

Better/More Flexible Interlocutor Templates
5.50   Eleven respondents commented that standardisation of styles and interlocutor templates would be beneficial. Five respondents specifically referred to ICT, with one feeling the computer templates cause problems when staff encounter something unusual that the computer system cannot accommodate.

JP Court Lists
5.51   Nine JP respondents suggested that their court lists could be improved. Two respondents felt that the forms and reports produced for means courts were difficult to read and needed a lot of study to get the necessary information from them to use in court. One respondent suggested adding available disposals onto JP court sheets.

Discussion with Judicial Office Holders
5.52   Three respondents thought that more engagement between the judiciary and their clerks could lead to an improvement in standards. One considered that both judge and clerk could improve their skill levels together, while another felt that sheriffs could be more constructively critical of poor documents.

Miscellaneous
5.53   Miscellaneous comments included: concern about inexperienced clerks copying the text of an undefended motion into the interlocutor, leading to errors if the motion is written in substandard English; insufficient regard for the preferences of individual judges; JPs being asked to sign utility warrants from outwith their geographical area; and the lack of dedicated typing support. One respondent

suggested that sheriffs could be given access to the civil case management system to track changes on interlocutors.

Programming Support

5.54   Virtually all respondents (n=176) answered this question.

Table 31: Ratings for Programming Support

Q5: "Please rate the support provided by SCS staff in assisting the process of court programming."		
	n	%
Very good	75	43
Fairly good	63	36
Very good and fairly good [see page 2]	1	1
Neither poor nor good	25	14
Very poor and very good [see page 2]	1	1
Very poor and fairly good [see page 2]	1	1
Fairly poor	9	5
Very poor	1	1
Total	176	

5.55   Over three quarters (79%) of respondents rated programming support either 'very good' or 'fairly good' (see Table 31). A minority (6%) rated programming support 'fairly poor' (n=9) or 'very poor' (n=1). There were three mixed ratings.

Table 32: Ratings for Programming Support, by Level of Judicial Office

Q5 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very good	14	27	0	29
Fairly good	6	22	8	25
Very good and fairly good [see page 2]	0	0	0	1
Neither poor nor good	3	11	3	8
Fairly poor	0	5	3	1
Very poor	0	1	0	0
Very poor and very good [see page 2]	1	0	0	0
Very poor and fairly good [see page 2]	1	0	0	0
Total	25	66	14	64

5.56   Broken down by level of judicial office, a large proportion of JPs (86%) rated programming support highly, with nearly half rating this 'very good' and over a third rating this 'fairly good' (Table 32). Four-fifths of judges rated programming support either 'very good' or 'fairly good'. Nearly three-quarters of full-time sheriffs rated programming support 'very good' or 'fairly good, while a tenth rated it 'fairly poor' or 'very poor'. A majority of part-time sheriffs gave programming support a 'fairly good' rating.

Table 33: Ratings for Programming Support, by Sheriffdom

Q5 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very good	9	4	8	7	14	16
Fairly good	7	6	9	11	10	9
Very good and fairly good [see page 2]	0	0	1	0	0	0
Neither poor nor good	2	6	3	4	5	2
Fairly poor	0	1	1	0	2	3
Very poor	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	18	18	22	22	31	30

5.57   At sheriffdom level, programming support was rated most highly in G&S, with 89% of responses either 'very good' or 'fairly good', and there were no poor ratings, as in NS (Table 33). Just over half of GH&I respondents thought programming support was 'very good' or 'fairly good'.

5.58   A follow-up question asked how the effectiveness of the support provided by staff on court programming could be improved. The main themes to emerge from the responses were:

- consultation with and input from judicial office holders;
- better co-ordination and communication;
- courts being overloaded;
- more local flexibility and less headquarters control;
- programming being outwith SCS control;
- earlier notice given for court dates; and
- shrieval resources.

Consultation with and Input from Judicial Office Holders
5.59   Fifteen respondents suggested that there should be greater consultation about court programming between SCS staff and judicial office holders who, some felt, should have input into programming decisions.

Better Co-ordination and Pre-Planning
5.60   Ten respondents referred to a need for better co-ordination and pre-planning. Specific comments included the need for more thought to be given to the likely time some business will take; the need to allow time within programmes for members of the judiciary for writing, training and legitimate personal commitments; and the need for better co-ordination with the Crown and other parties.

Courts Being Overloaded
5.61   Seven respondents thought that problems were caused by courts being overloaded, for example, accused being unwilling to plead if their case is unlikely to proceed and civil proofs being overbooked.

More Local Flexibility and Less Headquarters Control
5.62   Concern was expressed that policies on programming were devised by staff with no direct court experience. Five respondents referred to perceived tensions between local needs and policies imposed by SCS headquarters. Specific points

included the need for more local flexibility for staff compiling programmes; less focus on bench-time; and more focus on the efficient conduct of business.

Programming Being Outwith SCS Control
5.63   Four respondents believed that problems with programming are generally due to factors outwith the control of SCS staff.
Earlier Notice Given for Court Dates
5.64   Four respondents (two part-time sheriffs and two JPs) requested earlier notice of court dates or changes thereto.

Shrieval Resources
5.65   Three respondents called for an increase in shrieval resources to get through the business. Specific reference was made to recent reductions in part-time shrieval cover and the impact this had on the delivery of summary justice.

Miscellaneous
5.66   Miscellaneous responses included: better ICT provision for staff; staff could manage JP court rotas where a JP is unable to attend a particular court day; and increasing court sittings to reduce the delay between pleading and trial diets.

Staff Questions: Conclusions

5.67   Judicial ratings of SCS staff competence were, on the whole, positive. In total, 90% of the judiciary that responded rated the overall technical skills of SCS staff positively as either 'very good' or 'fairly good'. Most of the responses for each of the individual technical competences were also positive, with 'very good' and 'fairly good' responses ranging from 95% (for summary crime) to 77% (for small claims and summary cause). 'Very poor' and 'fairly poor' responses ranged from 0% (for commissary) to 8% (for small claims and summary cause).

5.68   The open questions from the staff section of the questionnaire were designed to elicit areas for improvement, and the analysis has concentrated on these. Although many respondents were complimentary about the professionalism and helpfulness of SCS staff, either across the board or with a few exceptions, these have not been listed in the report because they are largely reflected in the results of the multiple choice question ratings. Consistent themes from the responses to open questions included:

- the variability of staff skills and the need for additional staff training;
- quality control to improve the accuracy of documents prepared by staff;
- the need to improve the drafting of interlocutors, and templates for these;
- greater consultation and communication with judicial office holders;
- the importance of having bar officers, courts officers and macers in court; and
- the impact of voluntary redundancy and the loss of experienced staff.

5.69   On court programming, consistent themes included the need for greater engagement with members of the judiciary; the setting of fewer trials overall; improved communication between parties before cases come to court and less focus on bench time as a measure of efficient programming.

6   Court Property and Facilities

6.1   This section sought respondents' satisfaction ratings for chambers, courtrooms and other court facilities.

Chambers

6.2   All respondents answered this question.

Table 34: Satisfaction Ratings for Chambers

Q9: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the comfort, cleanliness and suitability of judicial chambers or equivalent accommodation?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	55	30
Fairly satisfied	78	43
Very satisfied and fairly satisfied [see page 2]	1	1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	19	10
Fairly dissatisfied	25	14
Very dissatisfied	3	2
Total	181	

6.3   Nearly three-quarters (74%) were either 'very satisfied', 'fairly satisfied' or 'very satisfied and fairly satisfied' with their chambers (see Table 34). However, 15% of respondents were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with their chambers.

Table 35: Satisfaction Ratings for Chambers, by Level of Judicial Office

Q9 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	12	22	2	16
Fairly satisfied	10	24	7	33
Very satisfied and fairly satisfied [see page 2]	1	0	0	0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	6	4	9
Fairly dissatisfied	2	13	1	9
Very dissatisfied	0	2	1	0
Total	25	67	15	67

6.4   Broken down by level of judicial office, Table 35 shows that considerably more judges were satisfied with their chambers (92%) than were dissatisfied (8%). Nearly three-quarters of JPs were also satisfied with their chambers. Among full-time sheriffs, over two-thirds (69%) were satisfied with their chambers, although nearly a quarter were 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied'. A majority of part-time sheriffs were satisfied with their chambers; one was 'fairly dissatisfied' and another was 'very dissatisfied'.

Table 36: Satisfaction Ratings for Chambers, by Sheriffdom

Q9 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n

Very satisfied	9	3	5	9	3	10
Fairly satisfied	2	11	16	9	15	10
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	1	0	1	6	4
Fairly dissatisfied	2	2	2	3	8	6
Very dissatisfied	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total	18	18	23	23	32	31

6.5   At sheriffdom level, chambers were rated more highly in L&B than elsewhere with 92% of respondents satisfied (see Table 36). In both GH&I and NS, 78% of respondents were satisfied with chambers, whereas in SSD&G 56% of respondents were satisfied with their chambers.

Courtrooms

6.6   All respondents answered this question.

Table 37: Satisfaction Ratings for Courtrooms

Q10: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the comfort, cleanliness and suitability of courtrooms?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	35	19
Fairly satisfied	86	48
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26	14
Fairly dissatisfied	29	16
Very dissatisfied	5	3
Total	181	

6.7   Two-thirds were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with their courtrooms (Table 37). Nearly a fifth (19%) of respondents were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with their courtrooms.

Table 38: Satisfaction Ratings for Courtrooms, by Level of Judicial Office

Q10 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	8	9	2	15
Fairly satisfied	10	29	10	32
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	11	1	12
Fairly dissatisfied	5	15	2	7
Very dissatisfied	1	3	0	1
Total	25	67	15	67

6.8   The courtroom results are broken down by level of judicial office in Table 38. Part-time sheriffs (80%) were slightly more satisfied with courtrooms than judges (72%), JPs (70%) and full-time sheriffs (56%). Full-time sheriffs (26%) were more dissatisfied with courtrooms than judges (24%), part-time sheriffs (13%) and JPs (11%).

Table 39: Satisfaction Ratings for Courtrooms, by Sheriffdom

Q10 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F

	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	3	2	5	4	5	8
Fairly satisfied	8	9	13	14	10	13
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	2	3	3	11	0
Fairly dissatisfied	2	4	2	2	5	8
Very dissatisfied	0	1	0	0	1	2
Total	18	18	23	23	32	31

6.9   In the sheriffdoms respondents were most satisfied with courtrooms in L&B (79%) and NS (78%) and SSD&G had the lowest proportion of respondents (47%) satisfied with courtrooms (see Table 39). There were proportionately more respondents dissatisfied with courtrooms in TC&F (32%) and GH&I (28%) than in L&B and NS (both 9%).

Other Court Accommodation

6.10   All but three respondents answered this question.

Table 40: Satisfaction Ratings for Other Court Accommodation

Q11: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with other court facilities managed by the SCS, e.g. parking, catering and access?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	35	20
Fairly satisfied	64	36
Very satisfied and fairly satisfied [see page 2]	1	1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	20
Fairly dissatisfied	34	19
Very dissatisfied	8	4
Total	178	

6.11   While a majority (57%) were 'very satisfied', 'fairly satisfied' or 'very satisfied and fairly satisfied' with other court accommodation (see Table 40), this was lower than for chambers and courtrooms and the levels of dissatisfaction were higher (23%).

Table 41: Ratings for Other Court Accommodation, by Level of Judicial Office

Q11 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	5	15	0	10
Fairly satisfied	15	19	6	24
Very satisfied and fairly satisfied [see page 2]	0	0	0	1
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	12	3	14
Fairly dissatisfied	0	15	4	15
Very dissatisfied	0	5	0	3
Total	25	66	13	67

6.12   There was a clear difference between judges and other judicial office holders in the responses to this question (see Table 41). No judges were dissatisfied and 80% were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied'. A slight majority of full-time sheriffs (52%) were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied', but 31% were 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied'. The results for JPs were very similar, with 52% 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' and 26% dissatisfied. Among the 13 part-time sheriffs who answered this question under half were 'fairly satisfied' and nearly a third were 'fairly dissatisfied' with other court accommodation.

Table 42: Ratings for Other Court Accommodation, by Sheriffdom

Q11 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	6	3	5	4	3	4
Fairly satisfied	6	6	6	9	11	11
Very satisfied and fairly satisfied [see page 2]	0	0	1	0	0	0
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	5	5	2	8	6
Fairly dissatisfied	2	3	4	7	8	7
Very dissatisfied	1	1	1	0	2	3
Total	18	18	22	22	32	31

6.13   Disaggregated by sheriffdom (Table 42), the results showed the greatest proportion of respondents satisfied with other court accommodation in G&S (66%) and NS (59%). Around a third of respondents were dissatisfied with other court accommodation in TC&F (33%), NS (32%) and SSD&G (31%).

6.14   Respondents were asked what improvements could be made to court property and facilities. The main themes to emerge were:

- general modernisation/upgrading;
- accessibility/security;
- heating, acoustics and lighting issues;
- car parking;
- catering;
- overcrowding;
- cleanliness and toilets;
- ergonomics;
- electronics/ICT; and
- telephones.

General Modernisation/Upgrading

6.15 Forty-five respondents made some reference to modernisation and upgrading being required in their courts, though many recognised that this was unlikely in the current economic climate. Specific comments related mostly to the perceived inadequacy of areas for public and professional court users and visiting judicial office holders, while other issues included: poor internal layout; variable sightlines in courts; the impact of defacement by court users and a perceived lack of investment outwith Edinburgh. One respondent proposed the establishment of a permanent court users' reference group to work with design teams on such projects as are undertaken in future.

Accessibility/Security

6.16 Thirty-three respondents made suggestions relating to accessibility and security.[1] Specific comments included concern about judicial office holders having to walk through public areas to get to their court; insecure car parks for judicial office holders; general issues about disabled access; access passes for part-time sheriffs not being available; and issues with the transport of prisoners within the courthouse.

Heating, Acoustics and Lighting

6.17 Twenty-five respondents mentioned problems with heating and/or cooling systems in courts. Nine respondents commented on acoustics, including poor acoustics within courts and noise emanating from public areas or cells. Three respondents were of the view that the lighting in their courtroom and/or chambers was poor.

Car Parking

6.18 Twenty-one respondents believed that car parking facilities were inadequate or lacking in their courts. Three respondents complained that reserved judicial parking spaces were sometimes ignored. One respondent suggested the need for additional disabled access to parking facilities.

Catering

6.19 Nineteen respondents made reference to limited, poor or non-existent catering facilities. Specific comments included: the lack of a secure area for judicial office holders to eat; and the absence of hot water in chambers.

Overcrowding

6.20 Eighteen respondents alluded to overcrowding in courthouses. Five respondents commented that the courthouse was too small to accommodate the number of people attending. Five respondents felt it was undesirable that civil courts and civil appeals had to be heard in jury rooms. Other comments included: a lack of seats for unempanelled jurors at one court; one courtroom being too small for JP Court business; and a lack of private facilities for solicitors and social workers to interview their clients.

---

[1] Most of these related to situations experienced in specific courts and are not identified to protect the anonymity of respondents. However discussions will be held with the Judicial Reference Group to explore appropriate ways of communicating perceived defects to the SCS's Property Services Unit.

Cleanliness and Toilets

6.21   Ten respondents commented adversely on the cleanliness of court buildings, chambers or toilets. Two respondents thought it inappropriate that sheriffs of both sexes had to share the same toilet, and one respondent did not like having to share the same toilet as accused in criminal cases.

Ergonomics

6.22   Nine respondents commented in similar terms on the ergonomics of chairs in courtrooms and chambers supplied for sheriffs and judges, who often have to sit for lengthy periods whilst writing constantly. Specific comments included: the varying height of benches; no footrests in some courts; the variable quality and adjustability of chairs; and inadequate back support.

Electronics/ICT

6.23   Nine respondents commented on access to ICT and the provision of other electronic equipment in courts. Specific points made included: the unpredictability of remote TV links; the lack of laptop plugs and connection points on the bench; the lack of digital recording for civil courts; and the inability to view documents electronically in court.

Telephones

6.24   Five respondents referred to internal telephone systems. Two respondents advised that there was no phone in their chambers; two suggested that lists of contact numbers should be provided or updated; and one thought that the internal telephone system was awkward to use.

Number of Courts Used

6.25   Respondents were asked how many courts they normally worked in. Some answers were specific while others were more general, and the analysis does not detail the high outliers. From 167 responses over half (n=92) were based in a single court. Just under a fifth (n=30) regularly worked in two courts, and the remainder worked in more than two. Nearly all judges worked in multiple courts as did a large majority of part-time sheriffs. Two thirds of full-time sheriffs (n=43) and three-quarters of JPs (n=45) were based in a single court. A majority of respondents in G&S, L&B, NS and TC&F were based in a single court, but in GH&I and SSD&G a majority of respondents were based in two courts or more.

Health, Safety and Security

6.26   All but two respondents rated health, safety and security in the courts in which they worked.

Table 43: Satisfaction Ratings for Health, Safety and Security

Q14: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the way in which health, safety and security issues are managed and addressed by the SCS?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	43	24
Fairly satisfied	67	37
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	42	23
Fairly dissatisfied	20	11
Very dissatisfied	7	4
Total	179	

6.27   Overall, three-fifths (61%) were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' and 15% were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' (Table 43).

Table 44: Ratings for Health, Safety and Security, by Level of Judicial Office

Q14 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	6	10	3	20
Fairly satisfied	11	22	4	28
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	4	19	5	13
Fairly dissatisfied	3	12	1	4
Very dissatisfied	0	4	1	2
Total	24	67	14	67

6.28   Broken down by level of judicial office (Table 44), JPs and judges had the highest satisfaction ratings for health, safety and security (72% and 71% respectively), whereas sheriffs had generally lower ratings (50% part-time and 48% full-time). In each grouping fewer were 'very satisfied' than were 'fairly satisfied'. Levels of dissatisfaction were highest among full-time sheriffs (24%) and lowest among JPs (9%).

Table 45: Satisfaction Ratings for Health, Safety and Security, by Sheriffdom

Q14 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	4	3	5	7	7	9
Fairly satisfied	10	8	9	6	10	10
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	1	6	6	9	9
Fairly dissatisfied	0	4	2	3	5	3
Very dissatisfied	1	2	1	1	1	0
Total	18	18	23	23	32	31

6.29   At sheriffdom level (Table 45), G&S had the highest proportion of respondents who were satisfied with health, safety and security (78%), and SSD&G had the lowest (53%). GH&I had the highest proportion of respondents who were dissatisfied with health, safety and security (33%), and G&S had the lowest (6%).

6.30   Respondents were asked what improvements could be made to the ways health, safety & security issues are managed and addressed by the SCS. The main themes were:

- better security in courthouses;
- police or other security presence in courtrooms;
- ergonomics;
- too much security;
- health & safety tests and checks; and
- stress.

Better Security in Courthouses
6.31   Twenty-four respondents commented on security issues in courts. Thirteen respondents alluded to the risks to the personal safety of judicial office holders when having to walk through public areas to get to their courts or chambers. Eight respondents referred to security issues in court buildings, including one who requested security screening be installed and another who requested that security screening be used throughout the day, not only at peak times. Other comments included: a need to retain bar officers in court to increase security; inadequate security of chambers when the judicial office holder was in court; a need for better separation of different groups of court users when they are waiting in court; a need for more frequent checks of toilets; and that there were too few staff in courts to keep good public order.

Police or Other Security Presence in Courtrooms
6.32   Twelve respondents commented on the need for improved or more regular police or other security presence in courtrooms. Specific comments included the occasional absence of court officers and police from court; the diminutive stature of some security officers who are with the accused in the dock; the need for a regular police presence in JP courts; and the location in one JP court of the accused between the JP/other court staff and the only exit.

Ergonomics
6.33   Seven respondents commented on the ergonomics of bench and chambers seating in response to this question (see also paragraph 6.22). One also made points about inadequate lighting in courts, similar to those covered in paragraph 6.17. Other comments included: the length of sittings without morning and afternoon breaks for judicial office holders; a need for workstation health and safety assessments for judicial office holders; and a request for health screening.

Too Much Security
6.34   Six respondents, conversely, felt that there was too much security in courthouses, including two who were concerned about the invariable use of handcuffs on all persons appearing from custody in criminal and civil courts. Other specific comments included: suggestions that security was 'over the top' (two respondents); and a dislike of having to use pass cards to move freely about the building.

Health and Safety Tests and Checks

6.35   Six respondents commented on the need for more health and safety tests and checks, including electrical tests on computers and printers issued to part-time judicial office holders; follow-ups to workplace assessments carried out with judicial office holders; the need for a proper Heath and Safety Executive assessment of the court building; annual interviews with judicial office holders; and, in the same vein, regular surveys of and consultations with judicial office holders.

Stress

6.36   Five respondents referred to stress, in the context of increasing judicial workloads; the lack of writing time; less time for preparation; the strain of constantly writing when on the bench; and perceived increases in ill-health of judicial office holders and staff as a consequence.

Miscellaneous

6.37   Miscellaneous comments included excessive travelling for some part-time sheriffs; disability access issues in some buildings; a need for separate entrances for sheriffs; a need for separate toilets for sheriffs; updating fire plans; greater awareness needed of the hazardous nature of some court productions; the security of prisoner accommodation; better signage; more space; security issues caused by smoking-breaks for jurors; and better co-ordination of hours to enable more consistent bar officer cover in courts.

Court Property and Facilities: Conclusions

6.38   The majority of judicial respondents were satisfied overall with court properties and facilities and health, safety and security. However, up to a quarter of respondents were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with health, safety and security (15%), their chambers (16%), courtrooms (19%) and other court accommodation (23%).

6.39   The free text responses contained general views that the quality of court accommodation is variable and that many buildings are old fashioned, not suitable for modern purposes and in need of modernisation. A number of other consistent themes included:

- judicial office holders having to access courts through public areas;
- heating, acoustic and lighting problems;
- the lack of dedicated car parking for judicial office holders in secure areas;
- the lack of catering facilities in some locations;
- overcrowding of courthouses;
- cleanliness; and
- ergonomics of seating in courts and chambers.

6.40   On health, safety and security, the main themes included:

- the risk to judicial office holders moving through public areas;
- increasing the police, bar officer or other security presence in courtrooms;
- bench and chambers seating and ergonomics;

- too much security;
- health & safety tests and checks; and
- stress and ill-health from increased workloads and writing strain.

7   ICT Facilities and Helpdesk Support

7.1   Recognising that a survey of ICT facilities had been carried out earlier in 2011 by the ICT Sub-Committee of the Judicial Council, the ICT rating questions in this survey were restricted to satisfaction with ICT facilities and ICT helpdesk support.

ICT Facilities

7.2   All but one respondent answered this question.

Table 46: Satisfaction Ratings for ICT Facilities

Q16: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the effectiveness and suitability of the ICT facilities provided for your use by the SCS?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	17	9
Fairly satisfied	68	38
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	42	23
Fairly dissatisfied	41	23
Very dissatisfied	12	7
Total	180	

7.3   Overall, fewer than half of respondents (47%) were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' (see Table 46) and just under a third (30%) were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied'.

Table 47: Ratings for ICT Facilities, by Level of Judicial Office

Q16 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	1	4	2	7
Fairly satisfied	9	33	8	18
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	16	3	18
Fairly dissatisfied	8	12	2	19
Very dissatisfied	6	2	0	4
Total	25	67	15	66

7.4   Broken down by level of judicial office (Table 47) there was a clear difference between sheriffs and other judicial office holders. Two-thirds of part-time sheriffs (66%) were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with ICT facilities, as were 55% of full-time sheriffs. In contrast, 40% of judges were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied', as were 38% of JPs. A majority of judges (56%) were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied' with ICT facilities, as were around a third of JPs (35%), a fifth of full-time sheriffs (21%) and an eighth of part-time sheriffs (13%).

Table 48: Ratings for ICT Facilities by Sheriffdom

Q16 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	2	2	1	0	3	5
Fairly satisfied	7	4	11	9	12	12
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	6	6	5	9	6
Fairly dissatisfied	2	6	3	8	6	8
Very dissatisfied	2	0	2	0	2	0
Total	18	18	23	22	32	31

7.5   The sheriffdom breakdown (Table 48) shows that in two sheriffdoms there was a majority of respondents who were satisfied with ICT facilities – TC&F with 55% and L&B with 52%. The sheriffdom with the lowest proportion of satisfied respondents was GH&I (33%).
Proportionately more respondents were dissatisfied in NS (36%) and GH&I (33%) than elsewhere.

ICT Helpdesk Support

7.6   The question on ICT helpdesk support was answered by 175 respondents.

Table 49: Satisfaction Ratings for ICT Helpdesk Support

Q17: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the effectiveness and suitability of the SCS helpdesk support?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	46	26
Fairly satisfied	68	39
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	45	26
Fairly dissatisfied	12	7
Very dissatisfied	4	2
Total	175	

7.7   Overall, two-thirds of respondents (65%) were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' (see Table 49) and a tenth (9%) were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied'.

Table 50: Satisfaction Ratings for ICT Helpdesk Support, by Level of Judicial Office

Q17 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	3	21	6	13
Fairly satisfied	7	30	7	22
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7	12	1	23
Fairly dissatisfied	3	4	1	4
Very dissatisfied	4	0	0	0
Total	24	67	15	62

7.8   Again, there was a pronounced difference in ratings disaggregated by level of judicial office (see Table 50). The majority of part-time sheriffs (87%), full-time

sheriffs (76%) and JPs (56%) were satisfied, as were 42% of judges. However, 30% of judges were dissatisfied with ICT helpdesk support, compared with less than 10% of the other judicial groupings.

Table 51: Satisfaction Ratings for ICT Helpdesk Support, by Sheriffdom

Q17 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	5	4	5	4	9	11
Fairly satisfied	9	6	9	11	10	13
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	5	6	6	11	4
Fairly dissatisfied	1	1	3	0	2	1
Very dissatisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	16	23	21	32	29

7.9   There was less difference at sheriffdom level (see Table 51). The highest proportions of respondents who were satisfied with ICT helpdesk support were in TC&F (83%) and G&S (78%), whilst the equal lowest such proportions were in L&B and SSD&G (61%). The highest proportion of respondents who were dissatisfied with ICT helpdesk support was in L&B (13%). No respondents from NS were dissatisfied at all.

7.10   Respondents were asked what improvements could be made to SCS ICT facilities and technical support. The main themes were:

- ICT helpdesk responsiveness;
- ICT systems, hardware and software upgrades;
- remote access;
- speed of ICT systems and equipment;
- ICT system failure;
- E-documentation;
- judicial ICT training; and
- wireless ICT.

ICT Helpdesk Responsiveness
7.11   Whilst a number of responses were complimentary about the helpfulness and courtesy of SCS ICT helpdesk staff, forty-one respondents commented on issues relating to the responsiveness of the ICT helpdesk. Nineteen respondents referred to having had difficulty in getting through to speak to someone when telephoning the ICT helpdesk or to their preference for speaking to someone in person rather than leaving a message on a voicemail system. One respondent added that given bench and office hours it was likely that call-backs would occur when they were on the bench. Another requested that helpdesk staff explained what they were doing when they took remote control of a computer. Ten respondents mentioned having had long waits for a call back from the helpdesk; four respondents requested 'out of hours' helpdesk cover; two asked for a dedicated judicial ICT helpdesk; one wanted more helpdesk staff; one felt that repairs to a laptop had been ineffective; and one suggested that home visits by helpdesk staff would be of assistance.

ICT Systems, Hardware and Software Upgrades

7.12   Twenty-eight respondents commented on the perceived need for some or all aspects of ICT systems, hardware or software to be upgraded. Specific comments included: a request for better laptops; the need for judicial requirements to be given greater priority; a request for scanning, video conferencing or Skype facilities to deal with urgent out of office work like warrants and child protection orders; the provision of computers on the bench to enable sources and Westlaw to be consulted; greater e-mail capacity; improved video link facilities and cabling; a request to put the justice bench book online; and installation of a diary notification system.

Remote Access

7.13   Twenty-three respondents identified problems with remote access, including two respondents who had had difficulty completing the survey remotely. Two respondents suggested that data protection issues could arise in the course of their work, and one felt that provision of a service for I-Pad users had been denied due to security concerns .

Speed of ICT Systems and Equipment

7.14   Fifteen respondents commented on the slow start-up and download speeds of SCS ICT systems and equipment, including the login process, laptops and the judicial intranet. Two specific comments involved a difficulty accessing legal authorities (Linets) on a laptop and on the bench, and the suggestion was made that if this problem was resolved there could be savings from having to print out less paper. Another respondent requested more bandwidth capacity.

ICT System Failure

7.15   Eleven respondents referred to ICT system failures, including e-mail; servers; laptops; webmail; electronic diary; and remote TV links. It was acknowledged that most of the planned system down-times (for example, to install upgrades) occurred at weekends, but one respondent found that this prevented documents being sent to other judges or clerks for consideration or revisal at such times.

E-documentation

7.16   Nine respondents made comments that have been grouped under the heading of e-documentation, including: requests for greater use of ICT to enable productions, processes and precedents to be viewed electronically in court, saving paper; requests that warrants and other urgent applications could be signed electronically; and requests that fewer e-mails are sent to all judicial officeholders. The other specific comments were: a request that court papers are attached to e-mails and sent to judicial office holders to enable preparation for court to be undertaken at home; a problem with opening attachments to e-mails; and a difficulty in getting dictated material sent for typing.

Judicial ICT Training

7.17   Seven respondents requested training in various aspects of ICT. Two commented specifically that they did not know what training was available to them, and one of these requested clarity on whether ICT training should be provided under the auspices of the Judicial Studies Committee or by SCS ICT staff.

Wireless ICT

7.18   Five respondents requested wireless ICT connectivity and access. Two respondents asked for smart phones to be made available in courts and chambers.

Miscellaneous

7.19   Miscellaneous comments included: difficulties with telephone systems (five respondents); requests for greater use of videoconferencing for custodies, taking evidence, civil business and training to prevent unnecessary travel and expense (three respondents); requests for internet blocks to be lifted (three respondents); a request for consultation with the judiciary to be undertaken before implementing ICT changes; a request for unused computer equipment on the bench to be removed to clear sight-lines; a request for judicial access to the civil case management system; a dislike of receiving technical messages at login that are not easy to understand; a suggestion that the password protection system does not take into account occasional users like JPs; a request for the provision of digital audio recording in all courts; a request for judicial access to live Supreme Court broadcasts; and a suggestion that limitations on the use and alteration of laptops and computer systems was unnecessarily restrictive.

ICT Facilities and Helpdesk Support: Conclusions

7.20   Less than half of respondents were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with ICT facilities. In particular, over half of all judges were either 'very dissatisfied' or 'fairly dissatisfied' with ICT facilities. Levels of satisfaction with ICT helpdesk staff were higher, and less than a tenth of respondents were 'very dissatisfied' or 'fairly dissatisfied'. The Judicial ICT Committee of the Judges Council undertook a more detailed survey of judicial ICT needs and views during 2011, although the overall response rate was low. SCS will consider how to improve ICT facilities, using the results from both surveys.

7.21   The main themes from the free text question included:

- difficulties in discussing problems with ICT helpdesk staff and arranging call-backs;
- out-of-date systems, hardware and software;
- difficulty in accessing ICT from home;
- slow ICT systems and equipment;
- problems caused by system failures or downtime;
- more electronic access to documents used in courts;
- the development of judicial ICT training; and
- the provision of wireless ICT access in courthouses.

8   Access to Legal Books and Publications

8.1   In this short section respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with access to legal books and publications, and whether they currently used online publications.

Satisfaction with Legal Books and Publications

8.2   All but one respondent gave a satisfaction rating for legal books and publications.

Table 52: Satisfaction Ratings for Legal Books and Publications

Q19: "How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the accessibility and availability of legal books and journals provided for your use by the SCS?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	51	28
Fairly satisfied	65	36
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	20
Fairly dissatisfied	15	8
Very dissatisfied	13	7
Total	180	

8.3   Nearly two thirds of respondents overall (65%) indicated they were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with legal books and publications (see Table 52), whereas 15% were either 'fairly dissatisfied' or 'very dissatisfied'.

Table 53: Ratings for Legal Books and Publications, by Level of Judicial Office

Q19 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	15	21	2	11
Fairly satisfied	6	32	5	18
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	2	6	2	26
Fairly dissatisfied	2	5	2	6
Very dissatisfied	0	3	4	5
Total	25	67	15	66

8.4   Broken down by level of judicial office (Table 53), a sizeable majority of judges and full-time sheriffs were satisfied (84% and 79% respectively), while less than half of part-time sheriffs and JPs were satisfied (46% and 44% respectively). Proportionately more part-time sheriffs (40%) than JPs (17%), full-time sheriffs (11%) and judges (8%) were dissatisfied.

Table 54: Ratings for Legal Books and Publications, by Sheriffdom

Q19 by sheriffdom	G&S	GH&I	L&B	NS	SSD&G	TC&F
	n	n	n	n	n	n
Very satisfied	5	5	6	2	6	10
Fairly satisfied	5	6	8	10	15	9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	5	4	8	6	6	5
Fairly dissatisfied	1	2	0	3	3	4
Very dissatisfied	2	1	1	1	2	3
Total	18	18	23	22	32	31

8.5   At sheriffdom level (Table 54) there was less variation in satisfaction with legal books and publications, ranging from 66% in SSD&G to 54% in NS. Dissatisfaction was highest in TC&F (23%) and lowest in L&B (4%).

Use of Online Publications

8.6   All but one respondent answered this question.

Table 55: Use of Online Publications

Q20: "Do you make use of online publications (e.g. statutes, statutory instruments, case reports and legal journals) when in court or in your chambers?	n	%
Yes	112	62
No	34	19
Not currently, but would like to	34	19
Total	180	

8.7   Nearly two-thirds of respondents (62%) did make use of online publications and 19% did not currently, but would like to in future (see Table 55).

Table 56: Use of Online Publications, by Level of Judicial Office

Q20 by level of judicial office	Judge	F/T Sheriff	P/T Sheriff	JP
	n	n	n	n
Yes	20	61	14	11
No	3	2	0	29
Not currently, but would like to	2	4	1	26
Total	25	67	15	66

8.8   Within these results there was a marked difference between the professional and lay judiciary (see Table 56) with 93% of part-time sheriffs, 91% of full-time sheriffs and 80% of judges currently using online publications, compared with 17% of JPs. Over three-quarters of those who said they would like to use online publications in future were JPs.

8.9   Respondents were asked how the accessibility and availability of legal books and journals could be improved or delivered more efficiently. The main themes were:

- extension of electronic access;
- updating of hard copies of documents;
- provision of legal books and journals for part-time sheriffs;
- access to legal books and journals for JPs; and
- better publicity of what books and publications are available for judicial office holders.

Extension of Electronic Access

8.10   Twenty-eight respondents requested the extension of or improvements to electronic access to legal books and journals. Other specific comments included: the slowness of existing online access; the lack of remote online access; requests for the bench book to be put online; training in the use of online publications; and the cost of printing documents remotely.

Updating of Hard Copies of Documents

8.11   Twelve respondents commented on the provision of hard copies of legal books in courts. Four respondents found accessing legal publications in hard copy preferable and easier to use than by online access. Four respondents requested that loose-leaf volumes of commonly-used reference materials should be updated more regularly and more accurately. Other specific comments included: a request for improving provision of legal libraries in courts to prevent peripatetic judicial office holders from carrying large amounts of books around with them; a request for sheriffs to be included in the circulation lists for legal journals; a request for a bigger library budget; and the unavailability of certain standard textbooks in one court, despite repeated requests for their acquisition.

Provision of Legal Books and Journals for Part-time Sheriffs

8.12   Nine part-time sheriffs requested that they should be provided with or given access to a set of basic legal books and periodicals, with three commenting on the expense of purchasing these themselves. Specific comments included: a suggestion that clerks should take appropriate legal books to courts presided over by part-time sheriffs; and that some Government databases of statutes are not always up to date.

Access to Legal Books and Journals for JPs

8.13   Eight JPs requested access to legal books and journals. Three of these respondents commented that access to these in courts was not available or allowed, and one requested that their legal advisers be allowed to use the library.

Better Publicity of What Books and Publications are Available for Judicial Office Holders

8.14   Four respondents commented that there could be better publicity about what library facilities and publications are available in different courts.

Legal Books and Publications: Conclusions

8.15   Nearly two-thirds of respondents were satisfied with legal books and publications, notably judges and full-time sheriffs. The free text responses should assist in analysing respondents' views on improving access to legal books and publications.

8.16   The main free text themes included:

- the need to expand access to both online and paper publications;
- concerns about the lack of access to publications for JPs and part-time sheriffs; and
- better publicity about what publications are available, and where they are located.

9   Communications with the SCS

Communications with Local SCS Staff

9.1   Respondents were asked for comments about the communications they receive from local SCS staff about issues affecting the court or their judicial roles. The main themes were:

- a lack of communications with local staff;
- electronic communications;
- communications with part-time sheriffs;
- the tone of communications; and
- communications about court programming.

A Lack of Communication with Local Staff
9.2   Fifteen respondents commented that they generally received no, or very few, communications from local staff. Specific comments included: a suggestion that meetings be held between sheriff clerks and their sheriffs every two months; a request for confirmation of JP rota changes to be sent out to JPs; poor circulation of key documents (for example a feasibility study on moving JP court business into a sheriff court); and instances where vital information had not been communicated to judicial office holders because of an oversight.

Electronic Communications
9.3   Seven respondents commented on electronic communications, including three who felt that greater use of electronic communications would save money on hard copies. Other specific comments included: that webmail and Citrix remote access is slow; greater use of text messaging should be encouraged; and a problem regarding downloading attached files.

Communication with Part-time Sheriffs
9.4   Five part-time sheriffs referred to a lack of, or poor quality, communications affecting their interests. Specific points made included: not having a base court or sheriffdom meant that part-time sheriffs did not receive communications circulated to resident and floating sheriffs by Sheriffs Principal and sheriff clerks (for example, about the festive drink-driving campaign and forfeiture of vehicles); most communications are instigated by part-time sheriffs; few courts provide advance confirmation of the work part-time sheriffs are expected to cover; part-time sheriffs have to be alert to variations in practice around the country; and changes in personnel have caused difficulties with part-time shrieval bookings.

The Tone of Communications
9.5   Four respondents commented on the tone of communications, including: clerks being caught between loyalty to sheriffs and pressures to adopt and enforce centrally developed policies; a perception of being 'managed' and drip-fed information on a need-to-know basis; the SCS executive's policies on aspects of court programming, management and court craft interfere with judicial independence; the approach of senior staff to some aspects of programming and management (for example, policy on access to court minutes); and the tone of some communications being too inflexible.

Communications About Court Programming
9.6   Three respondents suggested that information about court programmes could usefully be communicated sooner.

Miscellaneous
9.7   Miscellaneous comments included: the level of local communications varies from court to court; too many all-user e-mails; communications being too late to be of use; decisions being made without the knowledge of or input from sheriffs; communications by phone from a court with a single number makes it difficult for missed calls to be returned; and concern about how judicial views on the consultation about future court structures will be taken into account by senior SCS staff.

SCS Corporate Communications

9.8   Respondents were asked for comments about the communications they receive from the SCS about its corporate work, such as SCS Board discussions and corporate decisions affecting the wider operation and staffing of the courts. The main themes were:

* the content and quality of corporate communications; and
* limited corporate communications.

The Content and Quality of Corporate Communications
9.9   Twenty-four respondents commented on the content or the quality of corporate communications. Five respondents felt these communications contained too much 'management-speak' or jargon. A number of respondents found corporate communications insufficiently informative. One respondent found the tone of corporate communications patronising.

9.10   Three respondents specifically referred to SCS Board communications and minutes, in particular expressing concern that the minutes lacked detail about how decisions are taken and whether the Board is receiving, and is able to challenge robustly, information about local staffing levels.

Limited Corporate Communications
9.11   Five respondents thought that corporate communications were limited or sparse. One thought that the inaccessibility of the judicial intranet compounded the problem.

Miscellaneous
9.12   Other comments about corporate communications included: that there was too much corporate communication; that insufficient account is taken of consultation with the judiciary; and that most communications received by JPs came directly from legal advisors or the Scottish Justices' Association.

Types of Communication

9.13   Respondents were then invited to assess the effectiveness of a range of different types of communication according to their preferences for methods of communication with all judicial office holders (generic messages for all to read) and individual judicial office holders (targeted for individuals or smaller groups to read or hear).

Effectiveness of Communications with All Judicial Office Holders

9.14   The effectiveness ratings are shown in Table 57 below. Response rates varied for each option, as shown in the 'Total n' column.

Table 57: Effectiveness of Communications with All Judicial Office Holders

Q24: "How ineffective or effective do you consider each of the following means of communicating with all judicial office holders to be?"	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Judicial intranet	14	48	19	11	7	175
SCS intranet	8	36	28	14	14	173
All users e-mails	27	49	13	8	3	177
Judicial associations	16	50	22	6	6	177
Hard copy by post	32	45	19	2	2	179

9.15   Overall, hard copy was considered 'very effective' by around a third of the sample and use of the SCS intranet was considered 'very effective' by less than a tenth. Similar proportions (between 45% and 50%) considered all options except for the SCS intranet 'fairly effective'. Proportionately more respondents considered the SCS intranet to be either 'fairly ineffective' or 'very ineffective' than for other options. Hard copy was rated ineffective by fewest respondents.

9.16   The effectiveness ratings for communicating with all judicial office holders are broken down by level of judicial office in Tables 58-61.

Table 58: Effectiveness of Communications with All Judges

Q24 by level of judicial office – judges	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Judicial intranet	20	48	20	4	8	25
SCS intranet	4	24	36	12	24	25
All users e-mails	32	40	16	12	0	25
Judicial associations	4	12	56	12	16	25
Hard copy by post	24	44	20	8	4	25

9.17   Table 58 shows that nearly three-quarters (72%) of judges considered all users e-mails most effective, followed by the judicial intranet and hard copy (both 68%), while the SCS intranet (36%) and judicial associations (28%) were rated most ineffective.

Table 59: Effectiveness of Communications with All Full-time Sheriffs

Q24 by level of judicial office – full-time sheriffs	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Judicial intranet	18	61	12	7	1	67
SCS intranet	9	38	24	17	12	66
All users e-mails	36	46	10	7	0	67
Judicial associations	18	59	12	5	6	66
Hard copy by post	28	52	16	0	3	67

9.18   Over three-quarters of full-time sheriffs considered all options except the SCS intranet effective (Table 59), with all users e-mails getting the highest rating (82%). Few full-time sheriffs considered any option ineffective, with the exception of the SCS intranet (29%).

Table 60: Effectiveness of Communications with All Part-time Sheriffs

Q24 by level of judicial office – part-time sheriffs	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Judicial intranet	21	50	14	7	7	14
SCS intranet	0	47	33	7	13	15
All users e-mails	40	53	7	0	0	15
Judicial associations	20	60	13	7	0	15
Hard copy by post	40	53	7	0	0	15

9.19   Part-time sheriffs expressed strong preferences for all users e-mails and hard copy, both of which were considered effective by 93% of the sample and ineffective by none (see Table 60. The judicial intranet and judicial associations were considered effective by 71% and 80% of part-time sheriffs respectively. Very low numbers considered any options ineffective (judicial associations: 1; judicial intranet: 2; and SCS intranet: 3).

Table 61: Effectiveness of Communications with All JPs

Q24 by level of judicial office - JPs	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Judicial intranet	5	24	36	21	15	62
SCS intranet	8	35	27	15	15	60
All users e-mails	13	52	16	10	10	63
Judicial associations	18	49	23	5	5	65
Hard copy by post	38	35	23	2	2	65

9.20   JPs, however, gave somewhat different ratings (see Table 61). Hard copies were considered effective by nearly three quarters (73%), followed by judicial associations (67%) and all users e-mails (65%), whilst fewer than half considered either of the intranets to be effective. Hard copies were rated least ineffective (4%) and the intranets most ineffective (judicial: 36%; SCS: 30%).

Effectiveness of Communications with Individual Judicial Office Holders

9.21   Response rates varied for each option, as shown in the 'Total n' column of Table 62, with between six and 38 non-responses per option. This was, in part, because a number of respondents indicated that they had not experienced visits by executive directors or the SCS Board, or used text messaging or Twitter.

Table 62: Ratings for Communications with Individual Judicial Office Holders

Q25: "How ineffective or effective do you consider each of the following means of communicating with individual judicial office holders to be?"	Very effective	Fairly effective	Neither effective nor ineffective	Fairly ineffective	Very ineffective	Total n
	%	%	%	%	%	
Meetings with staff	41	37	15	3	2	175
Visits by SCS directors	9	23	44	7	17	151
Visits by SCS Board	7	14	57	7	15	143
Telephone	22	38	31	4	6	167
Text messages	9	17	36	7	31	151
Twitter	1	1	32	4	62	143
Hard copy by post	28	49	16	5	2	167

9.22   Over three-quarters of respondents considered meetings with staff (78%) and hard copy communication (77%) to be effective (see Table 62), with proportionately more considering meetings with staff to be 'very effective' (41%) than 'fairly effective' (37%). Few respondents considered text messaging (26%), or visits by executive directors (32%) or by the SCS Board (21%) to be effective, while only two respondents considered using Twitter to be effective. Similarly, two-thirds of respondents considered Twitter to be ineffective as a means of communication, as did over a third in respect of text messaging and around a quarter in respect of visits by executive directors (24%) or by the SCS Board (22%).

9.23   There were some differences by level of judicial office, though the raw numbers involved were quite low for some of the sub-groups. Meetings with court staff were considered effective by a large majority of responding judges (91%), full-time sheriffs (80%) and JPs (78%). Few respondents from any level of judicial office considered such meetings ineffective. The responses did not suggest that visits by executive directors and the SCS Board were felt to be particularly effective or ineffective.

9.24   A majority of judges (71%), part-time sheriffs (71%) and JPs (63%) thought that contact by telephone was effective, as did around half of full-time sheriffs, and

relatively few respondents considered this an ineffective way to communicate. Around half of judges (55%) and part-time sheriffs (50%) thought text messaging was effective, but around a quarter of JPs (26%) and 10% of full-time sheriffs agreed. Conversely, around half of full-time sheriffs (49%) considered text messaging to be ineffective, as did over a third of judges (35%) and over a quarter of part-time sheriffs (28%) and JPs (29%).

9.25   Twitter was considered 'very effective' by a single part-time sheriff and 'fairly effective' by a single full-time sheriff. Over three-quarters of judges (79%) and around two-thirds of full-time sheriffs (68%), part-time sheriffs and JPs (both 62%) considered Twitter ineffective. By contrast, all groups considered sending hard copy communications by post to be effective, ranging from 93% of part-time sheriffs to 73% of full-time sheriffs.

9.26   There were few observable differences at sheriffdom level. Meetings with court staff were considered effective in all sheriffdoms. Visits by the SCS Board were considered most effective in GH&I (40%) and least effective in NS (7%), though this difference is magnified by very low raw numbers. The majority of those who rated telephone communication in NS (70%), SSD&G (65%), G&S (59%) and TC&F (53%) considered it effective, as did proportionately fewer in L&B (43%) and GH&I (34%). Hard copy communication was rated effective by over three-quarters of the samples in NS (85%), SSD&G (80%), G&S (77%) and L&B (76%) but by proportionately fewer in GH&I (56%).

Overall Satisfaction with SCS Communications

9.27   All but three respondents answered this question.

Table 63: Overall Satisfaction Ratings for Communications

Q26: "Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the ways in which the SCS communicates with you?"		
	n	%
Very satisfied	25	14
Fairly satisfied	93	52
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	20
Fairly dissatisfied	19	11
Very dissatisfied	4	2
Fairly dissatisfied and very dissatisfied [see page 2]	1	1
Total	178	

9.28   Overall, two-thirds were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with SCS communications with the judiciary (Table 63). Smaller numbers were 'fairly dissatisfied' (n=19), 'very dissatisfied' (n=4), or 'fairly dissatisfied and very dissatisfied' (n=1).

9.29   Broken down by level of judicial office, 80% of judges, 70% of JPs, 58% of full-time sheriffs and 54% of part-time sheriffs were either 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with SCS communications. Proportionately more part-time sheriffs (27%) than judges (8%) were dissatisfied.

9.30   At sheriffdom level, proportionately more respondents in NS (76%) and TC&F (71%) were satisfied with SCS communications than in GH&I (50%). Dissatisfaction with communications were highest in G&S and GH&I (both 22%), and lowest in NS, which had no respondents dissatisfied. The four 'very dissatisfied' respondents were in G&S (2), L&B and SSD&G.

9.31   Respondents were asked how the ways in which the SCS communicates with judicial office holders can be improved. The main themes were:

- improved electronic access;
- a preference for face-to-face communications and meetings;
- more consultation and dialogue with the judiciary before decisions are taken;
- a preference for e-mail communication;
- a lack of SCS Board visits to courts and meetings with executive directors;
- an inability to use or the inappropriateness of using text messages and Twitter;
- the content of communications; and
- a preference for hard copy communications.

Improved Electronic Access
9.32   Thirteen respondents requested improvements to be made to ICT that would enable better electronic access to SCS communications via, for example, the judicial intranet and webmail.

A Preference for Face to Face Communications and Meetings
9.33   Ten respondents expressed a preference for face to face meetings with SCS management and clerks.

More Consultation and Dialogue with the Judiciary Before Decisions are Taken
9.34   Nine respondents requested more direct contact with SCS management and consultation in order to give them more input and involvement in decisions affecting them and their courts.

A Preference for E-mail Communication
9.35   Seven respondents expressed a preference for receiving communications by e-mail.

A Lack of SCS Board Visits to Courts and Meetings with Executive Directors
9.36   Six respondents found it difficult to rate the prior multiple choice questions as the SCS Board had not visited their court or they had never or rarely had meetings with executive directors.

An Inability to Use or the Inappropriateness of Using Text Messages or Twitter
9.37   Six respondents felt that communication by text message or Twitter was inappropriate.

The Content of Communications
9.38   Six respondents thought the content of communications could be improved by, for example, making them more focused and user-friendly. One respondent

requested a concise summary of relevant issues and felt it was unrealistic to expect sheriffs to read minutes of SCS Board meetings.

A Preference for Hard-copy Communications
9.39   Five respondents expressed a preference for receiving hard copy communications.

Miscellaneous
9.40   Other comments included: a preference for communications by telephone (four respondents); requests for ICT training (four respondents); requests for more regular corporate communications (three respondents); requests for earlier communication (two respondents); requests for late cancellations to be avoided (two respondents); and a request for less communication overall.

Communications with the SCS: Conclusions

9.41   Satisfaction was dependent on the accessibility of modes of communication as well as convenience for respondents. Around two-thirds of respondents were satisfied overall. For all-user communications, all-user e-mails and hard copies attracted support from over three-quarters of the sample. For individual communications, meetings with local staff and hard copies were considered effective by more than three-quarters of respondents.

9.42   The free text comments indicated that local communications were variable or lacking, particularly for part-time sheriffs. There were mixed views on the levels of corporate communications and considerable disparity in preferences for and dislike of different channels of communication; and concerns about the tone of some communications, frequent use of 'management speak' and the lack of meaningful consultation on key decisions.

10   Support for the Efficient Disposal of Business

SCS Staff

10.1   Respondents were asked what actions by the SCS would improve the support provided to judicial office holders in ensuring the efficient disposal of business through the courts. The main themes were:

- programming issues;
- availability and utilisation of SCS staff;
- pre-court preparation;
- reducing 'churn';
- ICT problems;
- communication; and
- management information.

Programming Issues
10.2   Thirty-four respondents suggested various adjustments to court programming, including: increasing the number of JP court days; setting down fewer cases per sitting; ensuring sufficient judicial cover; better scheduling and allocation of cases;

starting courts earlier and finishing them later; avoiding cancellations of part-time sheriffs; allowing days for writing opinions; enabling civil business to be called when other cases go off at short notice; more effective court diary management; slowing down intermediate diets to allow more trials to be concluded at their first calling; introducing evening and weekend courts; giving JP court business precedence over utility warrant signing; better communication of cases that are not going ahead; placing more emphasis on solemn business; more flexibility in fixing diets and earlier availability of longer diets; reducing the period allocated for lunch; and balancing business more evenly throughout the week.

Availability and Utilisation of SCS Staff
10.3   Thirty respondents commented on the availability of SCS staff, including training; ensuring there are sufficient staff to run the business; allocating bar officers to courts; keeping judge, clerk and macer teams together; maintaining the typing pool for judges; employing judicial assistants; giving court work priority over other duties; stopping clerks handwriting minutes in detail as this causes delay to subsequent cases; fostering good working relationships between sheriffs and court staff; keeping loose-leaf volumes up to date; improving the drafting of interlocutors and minutes; avoiding lowering staff morale by frequent changes of policy and bureaucratic intervention; reducing the number of headquarters staff in senior positions and thus freeing resources for core functions; and staff failing to comply with judicial instructions about when the court should convene.

Pre-court Preparation
10.4   Seventeen respondents requested improvements in pre-court preparation, including: earlier receipt of case papers; more allocation of writing time; better forward planning; better reports from fines enforcement teams; access to an electronic diary for judges; advance warning of unusual cases; making known to judges the availability of all trial diets for cases; verifying when trial diets are set that the courtroom allocated is suitable for the number of accused, disabled access and use of CCTV; setting trial diets for letter pleas of 'not guilty' before the main court sitting; and allowing decisions to be made by judicial office holders without checking in advance whether a case can be continued or part-heard.

Reducing 'Churn'
10.5   Twelve respondents suggested tackling the causes of 'churn' by, for example, improving witness citation and service of complaints; granting fewer continuations; putting legal aid in place sooner; ensuring DVLA printouts are available to avoid deferrals; increasing judicial and staff resources; and more active case management in JP courts.

ICT Problems
10.6   Ten respondents suggested resolving ICT problems. Most of these were general comments about improvements, and were addressed in greater detail earlier in survey responses, but specific comments included: having a single electronic diary for all courts accessible by sheriffs and all clerks; more interaction with litigants at the inception of cases to explain to them what will happen; better access to information (for example, leaflets and websites) for the public; and wireless access in court buildings for litigants.

Communications

10.7   Seven respondents referred to communication issues, including: regular local formal meetings about business disposal, strategy and programming (three respondents); greater contact between senior SCS staff and judges to promote greater understanding and more effective and efficient resolution of business (two judges); input into decision-making; and communication about possible delays in courts starting and re-starting.

Management Information

10.8   Five respondents commented on issues relating to management information, including: suggesting counting output figures to show the number of cases cleared; providing better local management information; recognising that time spent on the bench is not the only measure of work carried out; understanding that efficiency is only one element in developing a proper understanding of how court business operates; stopping 'making sheriffs work harder' and stopping counting 'court time'; and providing meaningful and accurate statistical information about court business, waiting periods, etc.

Miscellaneous

10.9   Other comments included: a request for more resources; more secure courtrooms; providing available disposals for each complaint on JP court sheets; a suggestion that the main problems lie with other agencies; and, in terms of section 61 of the Judiciary and Courts (Scotland) Act, the importance of the SCS meeting its obligations to provide a properly resourced court system.

Efficient Disposal of Business – Other Individuals and Organisations

10.10 Respondents were asked what actions by other individuals and organisations within the justice system would assist judicial office holders in ensuring the efficient disposal of business through the courts. The main themes were:

- the Crown;
- the defence;
- programming issues;
- prisoners;
- better preparation for court; and
- the police;
- party litigants;
- children's reporters;
- witnesses; and
- Scottish Government.

The Crown

10.11 Fifty-one respondents commented on aspects of the work of the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS). There was widespread recognition that COPFS is also facing financial pressures.

10.12 Specific comments included concerns about the preparation time available to fiscals; court deputes' access to up-to-date information about witness status and

citations; administrative demands; disclosure; and a desire for custody cases to be given priority.

Defence Agents
10.13 Eleven respondents commented on the role of defence agents, including six who commented on the preparation of defence agents for trial. Other comments included: the funding of defence agents; greater focus on discussion of adjusted pleas of guilty at the outset; and agents ensuring that their clients are in court in time, having discussed matters with the Crown in advance of the court starting.

Programming Issues
10.14 Eleven respondents referred to programming issues, with suggestions including: better management of the case load; more meaningful intermediate diets and pre-proof hearings (two respondents); more courts scheduled per week; evening and weekend courts; staggered lunch-breaks instead of a universal shut-down at lunchtime; taking writing time into consideration within court programmes; holding more cases in civil weeks as so many go off; have back-up criminal trials scheduled in case others go off; and avoid convening a custody court that can sit for less than five minutes.

Prisoners
10.15 Ten respondents commented on issues relating to prisoners being brought to court in time. Other suggestions included: greater availability of custody officers to bring accused into court when required; and the possibility of using video links to avoid the need for prisoner transportation when dealing with routine matters.

Better Preparation for Court
10.16 Five respondents commented generally that there was a need for greater preparation in advance of court, specifically: greater punctuality by all parties; and provision of information and reports in advance of court hearings.

The Police
10.17 Four respondents commented on the police. Two believed that better communication and liaison was needed between the police and the prosecution, including for the citation of police witnesses; one felt that the police should provide adequate security cover in courtrooms and court buildings to prevent courts being interrupted by unruly members of the public.

Party Litigants
10.18 Three respondents commented on issues relating to party litigants, including one who suggested devising a system whereby parties could confidentially give the Keeper of the Rolls an indication of the prospects of the case settling in due course; and one who requested the deployment of dispute resolution procedures to assist party defenders similar to that operating in a summary cause court.

Children's Reporters
10.19 Two respondents commented on children's reporters. One felt that the reporters responsible for preparing and presenting cases should all be legally qualified; and the other thought that reporters should meet with agents for parties in

advance of court hearings to agree cases or parts of cases instead of leaving such discussions until the morning of the court hearing.

Witnesses

10.20 Two respondents commented on witnesses. One suggested sending reminders to witnesses by text messages in the days leading up to a trial in an attempt to improve witness attendance.

Scottish Government

10.21 Two respondents commented on the Scottish Government, including a requested reduction in procedural law changes and better consistency in policy.

Miscellaneous

10.22 Miscellaneous comments included: all documents should be digitised to prevent judges having to take verbatim notes in court; greater communication between agencies; good communication and follow through on processes and initiatives; early engagement of the judiciary in planning; more use of video links; introducing written submissions in debates and putting time constraints on those presenting arguments; giving JPs greater powers to deal with fines defaulters; supporting the legal profession to use electronic communications instead of letters; too much 'short-termism' without consideration of long-term impact on the court system; holding occasional seminars to facilitate sharing of knowledge and experience; better access to social work; and providing security at the main door of the courthouse.

Efficient Disposal of Business: Conclusions

10.23 Many of the comments about efficient disposal of business by the SCS related to issues with programming courts, the availability and utilisation of its staff, and a need for better pre-court preparation. Comments about efficient disposal of business by other agencies within the justice system also consistently addressed the need for better pre-court preparation.

11   Other Comments

11.1   Finally, respondents were invited to make other comments about the SCS, its staff and the services it provides that had not previously been covered. The main themes were:

- compliments about SCS staff;
- areas for improvement of SCS staff;
- the SCS's corporate activities;
- building maintenance; and
- surveys.

Compliments about SCS Staff

11.2   The analysis of open question reported comments and suggestions about how the work of the SCS could be improved, but many respondents made ancillary comments throughout the questionnaire that were complimentary about the helpfulness, dedication and professionalism of the SCS staff supporting them. While

compliments were not included in the analysis of open questions, partly to save space and partly because they largely repeated the results of the rating questions, they are mentioned in this final section. The 18 complimentary responses included: having many talented and committed employees, and the importance of maintaining their morale; working in a court where there are excellent relations between SCS staff and the judiciary; a request for some way of recognising the outstanding efforts of members of staff; being well supported by diligent, hard-working, decent people; and staff being described as obliging and helpful.

Areas for Improvement of SCS Staff
11.3   Eleven respondents referred to areas for improvement of SCS staff, largely mirroring comments made earlier in their responses about training and supervision.

The SCS's Corporate Activities
11.4   Eight respondents commented on aspects of the SCS's corporate work. Three respondents were concerned about the level and impact of budget reductions. Three respondents felt that there was a lack of understanding, at various levels, of the way in which judicial office holders work and what their needs are. Two respondents commented on the recent 'future court structures' paper: commenting that closure of parts of the court estate should be supported by more robust evidence. Other comments included concern that the SCS structure was too elaborate and that the SCS is underfunded for its role. One respondent did not think there was enough accountability of the judicial members of the SCS Board to their constituent judicial associations or sufficient knowledge of what their views are on matters of importance which affect judicial office holders.

Building Maintenance
11.5   Two respondents commented on the need for additional maintenance of the court estate.

Surveys
11.6   Two respondents referred to the judicial survey itself. One observed that JPs had recently taken part in a number of surveys but they did not seem to get any feedback of results. The other suggested that the scope of the survey questionnaire was limited, but did not indicate other issues that should have been covered.

May 2012

ANNEX A   SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The SCS Board is interested to know what judicial office holders, at all levels, think about the services, support and facilities provided to them by the SCS, and how these can be improved. The results from this survey will help to inform the decisions of the Board about how to fulfil its statutory duty to support the work of judicial office holders.

The survey seeks views on **the services provided by the SCS and its staff** to judicial office holders; not services provided by the Judicial Office for Scotland, which supports the Lord President in his role as head of the Scottish judiciary, or the Scottish Government. It does not, therefore, have questions on judicial salaries and pensions, allowances, expenses, travel and subsistence, training, conduct and welfare.

The survey has been set up in a way that ensures responses are submitted anonymously. The results of questions will be reported nationally, by sheriffdom or by jurisdiction level, and individual responses from judicial office holders will not be attributable or identifiable in the final report or any subsequent analysis.

This survey is not intended as a substitute for local dialogue. If you have specific concerns about particular issues that impact on your judicial role, you should raise these with SCS staff in the relevant court(s). Individual members of SCS staff should not be mentioned by name in survey responses.

Completing the Survey

One method for you to complete the survey is through the completion of an **electronic Word file** – typing your responses directly onto the questionnaire. The survey questions mostly comprise two types. Closed questions offer a range of options. Most of these are in the form of a rating scale, and boxes are provided to the right of each option, for example:

How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with issue X? (Check one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

To answer this type of question, all you need to do is type a capital 'X' in the box to the right of your preferred option. A variant of this question has a set of options, including 'other'. If you select 'other', you can add your own option in the space provided and you can type a capital 'X' in the relevant box underneath.

Open questions allow you to express yourself freely. You are given an empty box to type in your answer. The box initially looks like the example below and, if you need more space, the box will expand line by line as you type.

What are your views about issue X?

It doesn't matter if subsequent questions spill over onto another page when you answer open questions.

When you have finished answering all the questions, please save this document to your own computer, then close the document. Send an e-mail to judicialsurvey2011@scotcourts.gov.uk, attach your saved questionnaire and press 'Send'.

The survey can also be completed **on-line**. Please click on this link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Z2ZQ9B2 to access the survey. You will need internet access for the link to work. If you have difficulty in getting the link to work (or saving/attaching/e-mailing the file) please telephone Robert Gray on 0131 444 3381 during office hours or e-mail rgray2@scotcourts.gov.uk. Robert will try to fix any problems reported to him as soon as possible.

If you would prefer to submit a paper questionnaire, please type in your answers, print the Word questionnaire, and send your response to: Ian Clark, Head of Research, Scottish Court Service, Spur N1, Saughton House, Broomhouse Drive, Edinburgh, EH11 3XD. Please clearly mark the envelope "Private and Confidential".

Closing date

The closing date for all responses, whether by e-mail, on-line or by post, is 16 December 2011.

Follow-up research

It would be useful to know if you would be willing to take part in follow-up research in future, covering any of the areas addressed by this questionnaire, or other issues. If you are willing, please indicate in an e-mail with your name and e-mail address to the futurejudicialresearch@scotcourts.gov.uk mailbox:

- whether you would prefer focus groups or individual interviews,
- which subjects interest you the most, and
- the location(s) and approximate times that would suit you best.

Section A   SCS Staff
The following questions ask for your views about court and administrative staff and their managers. It is recognised that judicial office holders will interact with a number of different SCS staff. General views are sought in the questions that follow about the services and support provided by SCS staff and individual members of staff should not be mentioned by name.

Technical Competence

Q1   Please rate the **technical competence of SCS staff**, in terms of their **specific responsibilities**, for each type of court business. (Click one option per business type.)

Summary criminal	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Solemn criminal	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Criminal appeals	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Summary Cause / Small Claims	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Ordinary civil	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Civil appeals	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Commissary	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	
Not applicable	

Other (please specify)	
Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	

Q2   What improvements can be made in the **technical knowledge and skills of SCS staff** who provide support to you?

Q3   Please rate the **quality of documents** (e.g. undefended decrees, minutes, motions, interlocutors, etc.) checked or prepared for you by SCS staff. (Click one option only.)

Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	

Q4   How can the quality of documents prepared by SCS staff be improved?

Q5   Please rate the **support provided by SCS staff in assisting the process of court programming**. (Click one option only.)

Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	

Q6   In what ways can the effectiveness of the **support provided by SCS staff on court programming** be improved?

SCS staff – overall rating

Q7   Overall, please rate the **support provided to you by SCS staff**. (Click one option only.)

Very poor	
Fairly poor	
Neither poor nor good	
Fairly good	
Very good	

Q8   How can the **general support provided to you and the court by SCS staff** be improved?

Section B   Court Property and Facilities

The following questions ask for your views about courtrooms and chambers, public areas, access and facilities within court buildings. It is recognised that some judicial office holders work from more than one court, and may wish either to comment on the court with which they are most familiar or provide an overall assessment of SCS accommodation.

Q9   How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the comfort, cleanliness and suitability of **judicial chambers or equivalent accommodation**? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q10 How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the comfort, cleanliness and suitability of **courtrooms**? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q11 How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with **other court facilities managed by the SCS**, e.g. parking, catering and access? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q12 What improvements can be made to **court property and facilities**?

Q13 To how many court buildings do your answers to Q9-Q12 relate?_____

Section C   Health, Safety and Security

The following questions seek your views about any health, safety or security issues that affect your work within the court. This can include both general health and safety and occupational health and safety and/or security issues affecting either you directly or the wider operation of the court.

Q14   How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the way in which health, safety and security issues are managed and addressed by the SCS? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q15   What improvements can be made to the way in which health, safety and security issues are managed and addressed by the SCS?

Section D   Information and Communication Technology Facilities

The following questions seek your general views about the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) facilities provided by the SCS, including, for example, desktop and laptop computers, software, telephones, video links, digital recording, etc., and helpdesk support.

Q16   How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the effectiveness and suitability of the ICT facilities provided for your use by the SCS? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q17   How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the effectiveness and suitability of the SCS helpdesk support? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q18   What improvements can be made to SCS ICT facilities and helpdesk support?

Section E   Legal Publications

The following questions seek your views about access to legal books and other publications provided by the SCS that are relevant to your judicial role, including both hard copy and on-line publications.

Q19   How dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the **accessibility and availability of legal books and journals** provided for your use by the SCS? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q20   Do you make use of on-line publications (e.g. statutes, statutory instruments, case reports and legal journals) when in court or in your chambers? (Click one option only.)

Yes	
No	
Not currently, but would like to	

Q21   How can the accessibility and availability of legal books and journals be improved or be delivered more efficiently?

Section F   Communications with the SCS

The following questions ask for your views about the form and content of communications issued by the SCS on matters relevant to your judicial role.

Q22   What comments do you have about the communications that you receive from local SCS staff about issues affecting the court or your judicial role?

Q23   What comments do you have about the communications that you receive from the SCS about its corporate work, e.g. SCS Board discussions and corporate decisions affecting the wider operation and staffing of the courts?

Q24 How ineffective or effective do you consider each of the following means of communicating with **all judicial office holders** to be? (Click one option per type of communication.)

News items on the Judicial Intranet	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

News items on the SCS Intranet	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

'All judicial users' e-mails	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Via the Judicial associations	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Hard copy documents by post	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Other (please specify)	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Q25 How ineffective or effective do you consider each of the following means of communicating with **individual judicial office holders** to be? (Click one option per type of communication.)

Meetings with court-based SCS staff	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Visits by SCS Executive Directors	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Visits by SCS Board members	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Via telephone	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Via text messages to a mobile phone	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Via 'Twitter'	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Hard copy documents by post	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Other (please specify)	
Very ineffective	
Fairly ineffective	
Neither ineffective nor effective	
Fairly effective	
Very effective	

Q26   Overall, how dissatisfied or satisfied are you with the ways in which the SCS communicates with you? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Q27   How can the ways in which the SCS communicates with you be improved?

```



```

Section G   Efficient Disposal of Business

The following questions seek your views about factors, either within or outwith the control of the SCS, that impact on judicial responsibilities for the efficient disposal of business through the courts.

Q28   What actions by the SCS would improve the support provided to judicial office holders in ensuring the efficient disposal of business through the courts?

```



```

Q29 What actions by other individuals or organisations within the justice system would assist judicial office holders in ensuring the efficient disposal of business through the courts?

Section H   Overall Satisfaction

Q30 Thinking about all the questions you have answered up to now, how dissatisfied or satisfied are you overall with the staff, services, and facilities provided by the SCS? (Click one option only.)

Very dissatisfied	
Fairly dissatisfied	
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	
Fairly satisfied	
Very satisfied	

Section I   Other Issues

Q31   Please make any other comments, if you have any, about the SCS, its staff
and the services it provides, not already covered in your answers.

Section J   Judicial and Demographic Information

*It would be helpful if you could provide some general information to assist us
in assessing whether the responses are broadly representative of the different
judicial groups and demographics.*

Q32   Please indicate your status. (Click the option that best fits the majority of your
judicial work.)

Judge of the Court of Session	
Temporary Judge	
Re-employed retired Judge	
Sheriff Principal	
Sheriff	
Part-time Sheriff	
Re-employed retired Sheriff	
Stipendiary Magistrate	
Justice of the Peace	

TO KEEP RESPONSES CONFIDENTIAL, SHERIFFS PRINCIPAL NEED NOT ANSWER Q33.

Q33   In which of these jurisdictions is most of your judicial time spent? (Click one option only.)

The High Court of Justiciary **or** The Court of Session	
The Sheriffdom of Glasgow and Strathkelvin	
The Sheriffdom of Grampian, Highland and Islands	
The Sheriffdom of Lothian and Borders	
The Sheriffdom of North Strathclyde	
The Sheriffdom of South Strathclyde, Dumfries and Galloway	
The Sheriffdom of Tayside, Central and Fife	

Q34   For how long have you held judicial office? (Click one option only.)

Up to two years	
More than two years and up to five years	
More than five years and up to ten years	
More than ten years	

Q35   Please indicate your sex. (Click one option only.)

Male	
Female	
Prefer not to say	

Q36   Please indicate your age group. (Click one option only.)

Up to and including 29	
30-44	
45-59	
60 and over	
Prefer not to say	

Thank you for taking part in this survey. The results should be available in early 2012.