

## **City of London Law Society - Training Committee**

MINUTES of meetings the CLLS Training Committee held at the offices of Cleary Gottlieb, City Place House, 55 Basinghall Street, EC2V 5EH at 4.00 pm on 4 August, 2016

### **PRESENT:**

Caroline Pearce, Cleary Gottlieb Hamilton & Steen (Chair)  
Patrick McCann, Linklaters  
Ruth Grant, Hogan Lovells  
Hannah Kozlova Lindsay, Berwin Leighton Paisner  
Stephanie Tidball, Macfarlanes  
Frances Moore, Slaughter and May  
Ben Perry, Sullivan & Cromwell

### **ALSO PRESENT:**

David Hobart, CLLS

### **APOLOGIES:**

Catherine Moss, Winckworth Sherwood  
Lindsay Gerrand, DLA Piper  
Rita Dev, Allen & Overy

The meeting was convened to discuss the following issues:

#### **1. To complete the review of the discussion points arising from the SRA's Training for Tomorrow: SQE**

##### **Pathways to qualification**

The problem with not setting pathways to qualification is that those who are less informed about the consequences of their choices are likely to be disadvantaged. Allowing market forces to operate to see off poor performing course providers (those with poorer published results), is not sufficient.

It also leaves a significant grey area on equivalence.

##### **The QWE**

The battleground is likely to be what will count as experience, the equivalence issue again. It should be supervised by a solicitor and have a minimum period in each work area. The SRA could look at the CILEx process for qualifying experience. The aim should be to raise standards across the board not just to maintain them. There is still the two tier worry on this issue.

Those coming into the QWE will have a narrower range of knowledge (just the SQE 1 subjects) and be one year younger. Firms will have to adapt.

Should the contentious seat be mandatory when some currently satisfy this requirements on a two week course? It was noted that if not, the UK would become even further apart from the US and internationally.

## **The SQE**

Does Brexit need to be factored into these reforms? Is this now the right time to be undertaking an overhaul of the process when higher cost to firms seem an inevitable consequence.

Is the reason for concentrating on the reserved activities in the SQE a proxy for risk?

The SRA is not clear on the standard setting for the SQE and there is no convincing evidence, as yet, that the SQE will be set at a sufficiently high level nor how it will be benchmarked.

What is the attitude of the leading universities to SQE 1, will they need to take on a new faculty to undertake it?

The SRA has probably underestimated the time required to get from a law degree to SQE 1 because of the technical law to learn and the different exam technique required. Six months has been suggested as the time frame. The LPC providers are giving no assurance it will cost less than the LPC.

Will law firms make it a condition of offering QWE, that students will have undertaken a LPC equivalent and passed the exams? Again this gives rise to two tier worries.

There should be graded results, this will give students a chance to shine. There are practical difficulties for firms as QWE offers are being made earlier.

## **2. Additional committee member(s)**

It was agreed that we would advertise for one or two additional committee members, so as to widen the membership base if we can, it being an important time for the committee. The vacancy would be advertised on the CLLS website and members were invited to put forward other possible candidates.

## **3. Presentation to the committee of the QLTS assessment methodology from Jenny Crewe (Law Society)**

It was also agreed that the committee would take up Jenny Crewe's kind offer to give a presentation on the QLTS' MCT and OSCE assessment methodology and a meeting would be arranged for this purpose.

.....

Chair