**STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FORM FOR SELECTION BOARD MEMBERS**

Name (number) of the evaluated candidate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| **The purpose of this form** is to draw attention to the possibility of focusing the evaluation of the commissions in the final selection of a suitable candidate for the position of judge also on criteria other than legal knowledge and experience. This form is presented only as a possible alternative to the partial unification and objectification of criteria and competences, which, together with legal knowledge, are also highly desirable in the performance of the demanding function of a judge. It is thus up to the selection committee to what extent it will use this form or be inspired by it during the interviews.  The purpose of the selection committee should be to select a candidate for the position of judge who, in addition to professional knowledge, will also have such a personality setting, character traits and character that will allow him to approach his work with humility, empathy, but also detachment, context and promptness. A judge should see his or her work primarily as a service to the public, he or she should be able to explain decisions to the parties.  The evaluation areas are inspired by the outputs of the international project "Portrait of Judge” (no. 2018-1-0662 "The Portrait of a Judge – a multi-dimensional model of competencies to be measured during the procedures of selection, evaluation and promotion of judges)". The questionnaire is not a professional psychological examination and does not replace it. Rather, it guides possible thematic targets and initial questions in interviews with candidates and the identification of target appropriate competencies, the overall evaluation of which can help the committee to select the most suitable candidate. The recommended interview time is about 1 hour with each candidate.  **Exemplary questions from** committee members – depending on the situation, the conversation may go in different directions, if possible, to determine the level of evaluated competences.   * What do you think are the current problems of our society? * What are your interests? * What do you read/listen to? (books, podcasts, philosophical view of the world...) * What do you think a judge should be like? * What is the purpose of his work in relation to society? * Why do you want to pursue this profession, what are the expectations? * What would you do if a party declared that...? * Are you aware of any of your prejudices, if so, from what experiences do you have them?   **Other questions:**  **Space for notes:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation of candidates**  The evaluation of the candidates may not only be based on the current interview, but also on other information available from the court file and the candidate's previous experience. It is recommended that the evaluation is first carried out by each member of the Commission individually and then the individual candidates within the Commission are voted on. In the event of an ambiguous result, further joint discussion (possibly with some candidates) may take place, followed by a new vote.  **Evaluation method**: committee members evaluate candidates by awarding points **(0-5)** for each evaluation area. Points are mainly used for the needs of committee members for mutual comparison of individual candidates. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Argumentative, persuasive, and expressive skills** (ability to formulate an opinion clearly and comprehensibly, ability to explain complex problems comprehensibly, to argue logically and methodologically correctly, to distinguish the essential from the irrelevant, constructiveness of thinking, decisiveness, erudition). | | | | | | |
| **Points:** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **2. Independence, impartiality (ability to be objective, ability to detach oneself and awareness of** social contexts, ability to distance oneself (restraint), ability to draw objective conclusions, ability to realize and test the possibility of one's own prejudices, ability to avoid influence and opportunities for influence, ability to resist environmental pressure). | | | | | | |
| **Points:** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **3. Ability to cope with workload** (mental and physical resilience, readiness to take on additional responsibilities, ability to work quickly under pressure and concentration while maintaining a quality standard, ability to prioritize, ability to deal with stress, ability to cope with setbacks, ability to react promptly adequately to a situation – improvisation). | | | | | | |
| **Points:** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **4. Empathy, cooperation** (ability of normal interpersonal communication, helpfulness to colleagues and judicial apparatus, optimization of work procedures, ability to delegate, ability to empathize, respects colleagues and other legal professions, does not have narcissistic tendencies). | | | | | | |
| **Points:** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **5. Motivation, openness** (ability to perceive the judicial profession especially as a service to society, tolerance, and assertiveness towards participants in the process – ability to respond to various situations and their expressions, openness to new procedures and modern technologies, willingness to further educate and self-educate, flexibility, ability to motivate oneself and others). | | | | | | |
| **Points:** | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Space for notes, overall evaluation** |