NATIONAL JUDICIAL ACADEMY

National Conference of the Presiding Officers of Family Courts July 25- 27, 2014

Programme Coordinator: Ms. Shruti Jane No of Participants- 26 No of Evaluation Forms: 24

	I. OVERALL				
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a.	The objective of the Program was clear to me	91.67	8.33	0.00	
b.	The subject matter of the program is useful and relevant to my work	87.50	12.50	0.00	
c.	Overall, I got benefited from attending this program	79.17	20.83	0.00	
d.	I will use the new learning, skills, ideas and knowledge in my work	75.00	25.00	0.00	
e.	Adequate time and opportunity was provided to participants to share experiences	79.17	20.83	0.00	
		II. I	KNOWLED	GE	
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
Th	e program provided knowledge (or provided lin	iks / reference	es to knowle	dge) which is:
a.	useful to my work	87.50	12.50	0.00	
b.	comprehensive (relevant case laws, national laws, leading text / articles / comments by jurists)	66.67	33.33	0.00	
c.	up to date	68.18	31.82	0.00	
d.	related to Constitutional vision of justice	39.13	60.87	0.00	
e.	related to international legal norms	13.04	78.26	8.70	20. Only few participants are taking active part in discussion.
	III STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM				
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all	Remarks
a.	The structure and sequence of the program was logical	69.57	30.43	0.00	
b.	The program was an adequate combination of the following	60.00	40.00	0.00	

	.1 1 1				
	methodologies viz.				
	Group discussions	54.43	45.00		
	Case studies	54.17	45.83	0.00	
	Interactive sessions	66.67	33.33	0.00	
	Simulation Exercises	39.13	60.87	0.00	
	Audio Visual Aids	29.17	66.67	4.17	
		IV INDI	VIDUAL SH	SSIONS	
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great	To some	Not at all	Remarks
		extent	extent	Not at an	Kemai K5
a.	Discussions in individual	66.67	29.17	4.17	
u.	sessions were effectively				
	organized				
b.	The session theme was	87.50	12.50	0.00	
0.	adequately addressed by the				
	Resource Persons				
		V. PROG	RAM MAT	ERIALS	<u> </u>
	PROPOSITIONS	To a great	To some	Not at	Remarks
		extent	extent	all	
a.	The Program material is	70.83	29.17	0.00	
	useful and relevant				
b.	The content was updated. It	54.17	45.83	0.00	
	reflected recent case				
	laws/current thinking/				
	research/ policy in the				
	discussed area	77.77	22.73	0.00	
c.	The content was organized	77.27	22.73	0.00	
	and easy to follow				
		VI. RES	OURCE PE	CRSONS	
	Name of the Resource Persons	Highly	OURCE PE Moderate	Not	Remarks
	·	Highly Effective &		Not Satisfact	Remarks
	Name of the Resource Persons	Highly Effective & Useful	Moderate	Not Satisfact ory	
	Name of the Resource Persons	Highly Effective &		Not Satisfact	2. She explained legal concepts
Pra	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash,	Highly Effective & Useful	Moderate	Not Satisfact ory	
Pra Jud	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22	Moderate 30.43	Not Satisfact ory 4.35	2. She explained legal concepts very properly
Pra Jud Hor	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant	Highly Effective & Useful	Moderate	Not Satisfact ory	2. She explained legal concepts
Pra Jud Hor	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22	Moderate 30.43	Not Satisfact ory 4.35	2. She explained legal concepts very properly
Pra Jud Hor For	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22	Moderate 30.43	Not Satisfact ory 4.35	2. She explained legal concepts very properly
Pra Jud Hor For Mr.	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83	Moderate 30.43 4.17	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00	2. She explained legal concepts very properly2. He is good interpreter
Pra Jud Hor For Mr.	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 75.00	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00	2. She explained legal concepts very properly2. He is good interpreter
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 75.00	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00	2. She explained legal concepts very properly2. He is good interpreter
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Dr.	Name of the Resource Persons h'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court h'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro	Name of the Resource Persons h'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court h'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Dr. Pro Ov	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had pertise relevant to the sessions	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court . Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful 2. Programme is very good.
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had pertise relevant to the sessions	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful 2. Programme is very good. 24. All speakers confirmed
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had pertise relevant to the sessions	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful 2. Programme is very good. 24. All speakers confirmed themselves with the topic and
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had pertise relevant to the sessions	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful 2. Her speech is useful 2. Programme is very good. 24. All speakers confirmed themselves with the topic and discussed with participants and
Pra Jud Hor For Mr. Ms. Adv Ms. Dr. Pro Ov ex	Name of the Resource Persons n'ble Ms. Justice Anjana kash, ge, Patna High Court n'ble Mr. Justice R. Basant mer Judge, Kerala High Court Anil Malhotra, Advocate . Geeta Ramaseshan vocate & Activist . Susheela Sarathi, Advocate L. N. Suman fessor, NIMHANS verall, Resource Persons had pertise relevant to the sessions	Highly Effective & Useful 65.22 95.83 95.83 75.00 66.67 95.65 63.64	Moderate 30.43 4.17 25.00 33.33 4.35 36.36	Not Satisfact ory 4.35 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	 2. She explained legal concepts very properly 2. He is good interpreter 2. Kindful and very good speaker 2. Her speech is useful 2. Programme is very good. 24. All speakers confirmed themselves with the topic and

	VII. HOSPITALITY					
	PROPOSITIONS	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Remarks	
a.	Arrangements for my reception and transport to and from railway station/ airport	79.17	16.67	4.17		
b.	Services at the reception counter	70.83	29.17	0.00		
c.	Hygiene and facilities in the room	75.00	20.83	4.17		
d.	Quality of food	58.33	41.67	0.00		
e.	Arrangements in dining halls	70.83	29.17	0.00		
f.	Assistance from travel desk for changes in travel reservations	60.87	39.13	0.00		
		VIII. GEN	ERAL SUGG	ESTIONS		
a.	Three most important learning achievements of this Programme					

	communication techniques and skills required by Family court judges.
	19. For Family court judges all sessions are very useful.
	20. Concept, aim and object of Family Courts have been imparted.
	21. To perform promptly; to update our legal knowledge; to understand
	the present needs and future challenges for legal community.
	22. Clarification on the various issues; exchange of views, views of
	experts.
	23. Procedure for disposal of matrimonial disputes, child custody,
	communication skills.
	24. How to handle family disputes by effective mediation, role of judges
	in settling disputes between spouses, care to be taken while granting
	custody of child, awareness while awarding alimony or maintenance.
b. Which part of the Programme	1. Session of 27.07. 14
did you find most useful and	Special communication skills – something different from complexities of
why	provisions out of textbooks we deal with.
	2. Interaction, question and its resolution.
	4. Whole part of programme found most usef to my work and enhance
	my skill in handling family matters.
	8. All the programme were useful for our court functioning.
	9. Communication Skills
	10. The lecute of Mr. Justice R. Basant, Mr. Anil Malotra
	11. Academic Part- Programmes pertaining to the process of
	Constitution, mediation.
	12. Special communication skills required by Family court judges is the
	most useful programme.
	13. Problems shooting by resource persons.
	14. Role of Family Courts in protecting the Rights and interests of the
	Children; Special Communication techniques and skills required by
	Family Court judge; Strengthening the Family Courts of India:
	Challenges and contradictions (group discussion)
	15. Judging Family disputes, Role of Family Courts ensuring equal rights
	and techniques and skills required because judges always busy in
	disposal of cases requiring units in short period of working hours then
	experts gained knowledge throughout national and internation and share
	their experience.
	16. Judging Family disputes; Issues and concerns; effective use of ADR
	methods in resolving Family disputes,
	17. Judging Family disputes; Effective used of ADR, NRI Marriages and
	Divorce; Strengthening the Family; Role of Family Courts; Rethinking
	Role of Lawyers
	18. Session 8- After divorce they lose the love and affection of the
	parents.
	19. Communication Skills – we judges being trained in different way
	need be trained to improve communication skills.
	20. Lectures by Justice R. Basant and Advocate Anil Malhotra
	21. All programme are useful
	22. Role of Family courts in ensuring equal rights in matrimonial disputes
	because the family judges mostly engaged in such types of cases.
	23. Communication skills
	24. Session No 9 by Ms. Susheela certainly this session helped to manage
L	trial proceedings of matrimonial cases.

c. Which part of the Programme did you find least useful and why	 Session 7- Role of Lawyers – legislatures has given provision u/s 13 of Family Court Act, Family Courts are bound by Law. Lecture delved by LN Suman. Effective used of ADR- method in resolving Family Disputes – role of family courts. Every programme had its own value and importance in day to day work of principals judge in disposal of justice related to family disputes, No any part of the programme find lest useful because it is very useful for gaining knowledge for solving disputes in daily court tenure. Psychological perspective to determination of the best interest of the child. Psychological perspective to determination of the best interest of the child. Session 10- 27.07.2014- Many loop holes in the Act Session five because the Resource Person (chair) has not permitted to dispute the perspective to determination of the set of the set the set the set of the set the set of the se
	air our thinking properly. 20. Lecture by Dr. LN Suman because not supported by legal citations. 22.All parts of programme were useful
d. Kindly make any suggestions you may have on how NJA may serve you better and make its programmes more effective	 Involvement of all participants should be enhanced by giving optional exercise for spontaneous involvement may be appreciated; Period of learning may be increased. Session 7 of this programme – Role of Advocates. By organizing and conducting more programmes and by providing more programme material. It already serves us better and all the programmes are most effective. The training period should be enhanced, lecture of faculties and resource persons be distributed among the participants, Resource persons may be invited from Harvard Law school, Yale Law school etc. Resource persons for the same subject may be changes so that the repetitions can be avoided when it is more than the second visit to the participant. More time should be provided to the participants to share experiences. NJA should post study material of all the program on the website. Supply of reading materials well in advance to the participants in their place of their posting; NJA is best place for gaining knowledge within 3 days and a fresh latest case laws through experienced resource persons and to interact with problems from different judges in various states, came from remote areas of India, to invite experienced persons of every field to share with judges. By making the training for 10-15 days. It is better if a session on psychologist not psychiatrist is also included so that different facets of those foreign subjects are included. Participants should be informed well in advance to the participants through the Hon'ble High Court. NJA should launch programme at SJAs with the panel of resource persons of NJA. Kindly arrange programme for judges of Mahila Courts (District Judges, handling cases filed under the provision of POSCO Act (Prevention of Children from Sexual Offences Act 2012).