



PEER REVIEW CIVIL CRITERIA

<i>Suppliers Name:</i>	<input type="text"/>	<i>Case Reference Code:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Peer Reviewer:</i>	<input type="text"/>	<i>Date:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Client's Name:</i>	<input type="text"/>	<i>Fee Earner:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Category:</i>	<input type="text"/>		

A. Communication with the Client:

Please circle one only

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. How well does the adviser appear to have understood the client's problem? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 2. How effective were the adviser's communication and client - handling skills? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 3. How effective were the adviser's fact and information - gathering skills? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 4. How effectively was the client informed of | | | | | | |
| a) the merits (or not) of the claim, and | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| b) all developments? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |

B. The advice:

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. How legally correct was the advice given? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 2. How appropriate was the advice to the client's instructions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 3. How comprehensive was the advice? (For Family, see over) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 4. Was the advice given in time/ at the right time? | | | | Y | N | N/A |

C. The work/ assistance:

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. If no other work was carried out, was this appropriate? | | | | Y | N | N/A |
| 2. If any further fact-finding work was carried out | | | | | | |
| a) how appropriate and | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| b) how efficiently executed was the work? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 3. If any other work was carried out | | | | | | |
| a) how appropriate and | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| b) how efficiently executed was the work? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 4. How effective in working towards what the client reasonably wanted/needed was any further work carried out? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 5. If no disbursements were incurred was this appropriate? | | | | Y | N | N/A |

6 How appropriate were any disbursements incurred	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
7. Where this is necessary did the adviser consider/ advise on/act on an effective referral?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
8. Throughout the file how effectively did the organisation use resources?	1	2	3	4	5	
9. Did the adviser or their work in any way prejudice the client? If yes, provide details overleaf.				Y	N	

Overall mark	1	2	3	4	5	
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	--

Please write any further necessary comments legibly and clearly on the additional paper provided

Family

B.3

a) How comprehensive was the advice in relation to divorce?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
b) How comprehensive was the advice in relation to children?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
c) How comprehensive was the advice in relation to ancillary relief?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
d) How comprehensive was the advice in relation to injunction	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
e) How comprehensive was the advice overall?	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

Please record what you think are the Matter Types and/or the Outcome Codes are for this file

For a Legal Help/Controlled Legal Representation file:

<i>Matter Type 1</i>	
<i>Matter Type 2</i>	
<i>Staged Reached</i>	
<i>Outcome for the Client</i>	

For a Certificated file:

<i>1st Outcome Code</i>	
<i>2nd Outcome Code</i>	
<i>3rd Outcome Code</i>	
<i>4th Outcome Code</i>	
<i>5th Outcome Code</i>	