Training for Tomorrow: Regulation review

Consultation questionnaire form

This form is designed to be completed electronically—in MS Word. Please save it locally before and after completing it.

# Questions for proposal 1

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

BLS agree with the proposal only if it does create greater flexibility providing the criteria is clear, good and that standards are maintatined as we are concerned about inconsistent approaches for 'equivialent means'.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

The risks are that the criteria is not clear and also providers may not have the resource to check everything, and therefore, there are inconsistences which creates quality issues for the profession.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

There may be extra resource costs imposed on educational providers to undertake this work of assessing equivalence of qualifications etc.

# Questions for proposal 2

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

We agree partly with the proposal if correct measures are put in place and the information of checking equivalence of the academic stage of training is able to be borne by the providers without excessive cost to them and difficulties of obtaining information. It will be better if students are not hindered by the certificate stage so we like the proposal but see risks section.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

How will educational providers know that students have passed a qualifying law degree or CPE without laboriously and esource intensive checking?.This will be a cost and a risk. Currently a list is sent to the Law Society by each provider to state that students have passed. With joint degrees these cause issues as to whether a student has done a full module. How will providers check without it being time consuming? This is not the place to consider solutions but the method of checking must seriously be considered to prevent professional admittance problems as well as cost implications.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

Yes

See answer to 1 and 2 above.

# Questions for proposal 3

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

We agree with the proposal, duplication is unnecessary. We are assuming this does not apply to non- UK students.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

Concerns about possible inconsistencies between education providers checking prior learning especially the smaller instituions which may impact on professional standards.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

# Questions for proposal 4

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

We agree with the majority of the proposal because for those firms that are large and/or have good training procedures it may be acceptable. However, the training regulations do give protection to trainees.

Question 2: Do you agree that we should not specify any of the terms of the training contract? Or are there particular arguments which would justify the regulator requiring employers to incorporate regulations 11 and 12 into all training contracts?

Question 3: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

If the firm is a small practice organisation it may be a disadvantage if these terms are not within the regulations to protect the trainees.

Question 4: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

No

# Questions for proposal 5

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

BLS supports this proposal.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

No.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

No.

# Questions for proposal 6

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

We do not agree with this proposal. If the distinct areas of law and the contentious and not-contentious requirements are removed, this may create difficulties as it will be down to the firms interpretation of what should be covered. This is a risk especially where firms are not monitored effectively on this.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

The practice skills standards are not as defined as the Training Regulations. Firms, therefore, may e.g. only want to stay in two areas e.g. corporate and property or say an area is contentious when it is not within the existing Traing Regulations interpretation. The proposal would affect the quality of the final product.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

No.

# Questions for proposal 7

Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal?

We partially agree with this proposal to remove the requirement for student enrolment. The benefit would be to remove the extra cost from the student. However, the signposting of ensuring that those students who have character and suitability issues are brought to the attention of the SRA.

Question 2: Are there any consequences, risks and/or benefits that have not been outlined?

The risk is that unless the imperativeness of disclosing character and suitability issues is clearly highlighted, issues which should be are not disclosed sufficiently early. This could be detrimental to the profession.

Question 3: Are there any costs that have not been anticipated?

Not aware of any.

Thank you for completing the **Consultation questionnaire form**.

Please save a copy of the completed form.

Please return it, along with your completed **About you form**, as an email attachment to trainingconsultations@sra.org.uk, by **25 February 2014**.

Alternatively, print the completed form and submit it by post, along with a printed copy of your **About you form**, to
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