

Consultation Respondent	Consultation Feedback Summary	IPReg Response
CIPA Education Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedure does not take account of judicial review given the potential serious reputational damage.</li> <li>• Include procedure within Accreditation Handbook.</li> <li>• Section 1 could be confusing as it deals with accreditation not withdrawal.</li> <li>• Students do not necessarily understand the different roles of IPReg and any QAA body.</li> <li>• Consultation suggests concern regarding the standards of certain offers and so “is obliged to take remedial action in the guise of the paper’s procedure” and considers IPReg should provide anonymised examples to enable parties to comment appropriately.</li> <li>• Item 3.5 – does not accept a circumstance for a course not to be able to run until its end.</li> <li>• Procedure “contains some potentially serious flaws which IPReg needs to address”:</li> <li>• Item 2.1 – need to determine if there is prima facie case justifying action.</li> <li>• Items 2.2. &amp; 2.3 - seeks significant concern example.</li> <li>• Item 3.1 – seeks transparency of Education Group powers, Board &amp; Chair roles and how decision made.</li> </ul>	<p>For reference, overarching comment.</p> <p>Accepted, to appendix (or link) to <a href="#">Handbook</a>.</p> <p>Accepted, section has been limited.</p> <p>Accepted, for consideration in scheduled broader Handbook review.</p> <p>This is not the case (but if it were, it would not be appropriate to provide an example of a currently accredited provider, even if anonymised).</p> <p>Amended to emphasise the importance of immediate discussion and mitigation during a live course with the aim of preventing this scenario.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made regarding verification of indicated risk.</p> <p>Accepted, examples provided.</p> <p>Accepted, more information provided.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 3.1 – notice on precise concerns, 28 days to make representations including at Board meeting.</li> <li>• Item 3.3 – a written reasoned decision with reference to the evidence on which it is based; no publication of decision prior to end of the appeal timeframe.</li> <li>• Item 3.8 - confusion between “review” and “appeal”; “case different and additional to that provided at item 3.1” means this is a new decision, not an appeal.</li> <li>• Item 3.8 – confused appeal procedure risks Judicial Review; allow an appeal on reasonable grounds and who hears it not involved in original decision.</li> <li>• Item 3.8 – considers six weeks an appropriate timeframe for appeal.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted, amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made to clarify there is an appeal (rather than review) opportunity.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made.</p> <p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p>
CITMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes this positive action, though “high-level” procedure would benefit from some specific details.</li> <li>• Trigger examples may provide guidance.</li> <li>• Seeks details on process leading up to withdrawal, timetables, what an intervention programme might look like, how identify frivolous complaints, track and monitor issue, roles at different parts of the process.</li> <li>• Suggests details of Education Group are published.</li> </ul>	<p>For reference, overarching comment.</p> <p>Accepted, examples provided.</p> <p>Amendments made to reflect verification of indicated significant risks and that IPReg will liaise with the qualification provider to determine clearly defined and time-framed objectives; have not sought to provide detail on an intervention programme as this will vary according to the circumstance.</p> <p>The Education Group is a working group of Board members. In considering education matters the</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 3.4 mentions an alternative provider, this is not feasible in the case of Nottingham and what would emergency provision look like in such a circumstance.</li> <li>• If issue is identified early on in an academic year?</li> <li>• Issues regarding re-takes and who would host these.</li> <li>• Appeal provisions need more thought so robust and judicially fair, suggests 10 working days for an appeal and 10 working days reply deadline for IPReg.</li> </ul>	<p>IPReg Board is advised by its Education Group, which it has established to discuss in detail issues relating to the provision of attorney education. The Education Group reports to Board, it does not have delegated authority of its own.</p> <p>Accepted (this is also the case for the PEB Final Examinations), footnote amendment references that one of the education work plan items is to expand the qualification pathway options.</p> <p>The objectives and related timeframes set will reflect this. Amended to emphasise the importance of immediate discussion and mitigation during a live course.</p> <p>Should this become relevant to a circumstance, this would depend upon a range of factors, and would be determined as appropriate to that circumstance.</p> <p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p>
Name withheld at request of respondent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support IPReg looking to introduce a written procedure for dealing with this issue, should it arise.</li> <li>• Paras 3.1 &amp; 3.2 – amend “would” to “will” to provide certainty</li> <li>• Para 3.1 – change “asked to provide a written response” to “invited to provide written submissions and (if requested by the provider) to be heard”</li> </ul>	<p>For reference, overarching comment.</p> <p>All proposals accepted, amendments made.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.3 – include an explicit requirement for decision to the provider to be supported by written reasons</li> <li>• Para 3.3 – publication of decisions should be made only after the time for appeal has expired</li> <li>• Para 3.7 – “expectations and timeframes” too vague</li> <li>• Para 3.8 – 21 days for appeal so consistent with timescale for making an appeal in civil proceedings</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p>
<p>Nottingham Trent University</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define withdrawal circumstances, an informal process, define set goals, link to Accreditation Handbook.</li> <li>• Consider a definitions clause and consistency of use.</li> <li>• Accreditation Handbook sets out the standards for the FLQ and not for the ALQ, as is Nottingham’s offer.</li> <li>• How will “concern” and “significant concern” be measured; and if part of annual reporting mechanism how to ensure not relying solely on student feedback.</li> <li>• Will it be a unanimous or majority decision?</li> <li>• Identifies considerations regarding a live offer and what would constitute “extenuating circumstances”.</li> </ul>	<p>For reference, overarching comment.</p> <p>For reference, overarching comment. Amendments made as follows through this section. Terminology reviewed for consistency.</p> <p>Whilst the Handbook syllabus and credit weightings relate to the FLQ, the standards and learning outcomes apply equally to the ALQ.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made (and for consistency of terminology, “risk” and Significant risk” have replaced “concern” and “significant concern”).</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made to clarify that the Chair will have the casting vote should there not be a consensus.</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made to reflect the importance of immediate discussion and mitigation during a live course to hopefully prevent a live course ending prematurely.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require a defined and delineated appeals process and criteria and framework for appeal.</li> <li>• “Sufficiently significant” versus “significant concern”.</li> <li>• Item 1.2 – link procedure to litigation skills course providers, Accreditation Handbook also to cover ALQ.</li> <li>• Item 1.3 – what constitutes risk and who decides if implementation plan remedies it?</li> <li>• Item 1.4 – what is a significant risk and “accreditation standards” in 1.3 vs. “quality standards”?</li> <li>• Item 1.5 – criteria for shorter accreditation period? Annual reporting requirements to take account of internal reporting processes and dates.</li> <li>• Items 2.1 and 2.2 – define “risk” and “concern” levels and what is meant by “indication of possible quality issue” and against what criteria it is assessed.</li> <li>• Item 2.3 – what is a programme of support and who to do; appropriate timeframe and remedial options mutually agreed; and clarity of what is meant by “dedicated accreditation exercise assessment”.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted, amendments made to appeal process.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made so consistent terminology, “significant risk” now consistently applied.</p> <p>Provided link (in footnote) to litigation skills course Outcomes. Scheduled Accreditation Handbook review to include consideration of specifying ALQ syllabus and credits.</p> <p>Board decision, with Chair to have casting vote should there not be a consensus.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made so consistent terminology applied.</p> <p>Scheduled broader Accreditation Handbook review to include timeframe criteria consideration; annual reporting timeframe is for individual agencies to determine.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made to include examples and consistent terminology applied.</p> <p>Not always appropriate for mutually agreement and programme of support would vary according to the risk. Amendment made to provide clarity on what is meant by a “dedicated accreditation exercise assessment”.</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 2.3 - website reporting to include guidelines and circumstance due to risk to reputations.</li>   <li>• Item 3.1 – clarify whether unanimous or majority decision, enable submissions before any decisions are made and afford opportunity to make oral representation.</li>   <li>• Item 3.2 – what is meant by “all other avenues” and define “severity of the issue is so pronounced”.</li>   <li>• Item 3.3 – Board to provide written reasons for the decision and provide 28 days for response.</li>   <li>• Item 3.4 – how achieve timeframe to choose another provider; suggest a face-saving opportunity.</li>   <li>• Item 3.5 and 3.7 – define “extenuating circumstances” and clearly delineate protocol/withdrawal plans for teach-out using an independent moderator/verifier.</li>   <li>• Item 3.8 – afford minimum 28 days for appeal; suggests substantial review of the appeal clause.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a remedy option (relating to notice of identification of a significant risk), not an absolute. Publication of a decision to actually withdraw accreditation would be made in keeping with the IPReg Publication Policy.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made.</p> <p>Accepted, removed the former and amended the latter.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made.</p> <p>Every opportunity will be afforded to address significant risk(s) prior to, and within, procedure.</p> <p>Removed “extenuating circumstances” and made clear the importance of immediate discussion and mitigation to try and ensure that a qualification cohort can run to its natural conclusion.</p> <p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p>
Patent Examination Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would value defined circumstances/specific criteria.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted, examples offered to provide guidance.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear who decides, approval process/body unclear.</li> <li>• An independent person should hear appeal, not the IPReg Chair if involved in the original decision.</li> <li>• Some ambiguity whether “review” or “appeal”.</li> <li>• 20 working days a reasonable appeal timeframe.</li> <li>• Considers the word “extenuating” (paras 1 and 13) is misleading as it indicates “circumstances that tend to diminish culpability”, propose instead “exceptional”</li> <li>• Para 14 implies qualification provider undertakes review.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted, amendments made.</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted, consistent terminology applied.</p> <p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p> <p>These paragraphs were part of the consultation paper; removal of “extenuating” from procedure.</p> <p>This paragraph was part of the consultation paper.</p>
Queen Mary University London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify trigger circumstances (and be explicit on matters outside of procedure e.g. complaints unrelated to teaching and learning), provide a structured evidence verification procedure, providers to assist in assessing plausibility of any complaint.</li> <li>• Providers have opportunity to submit written observations ahead of, and to provide oral argument in front of, the decision board. One month notice.</li> <li>• Clarify how IPReg Education Group and Board make decision and information on the former.</li> <li>• Statement to set out exact reasons for withdrawal.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted; amendments made to clarify circumstances in which the procedure would, or would not, likely apply; and explicit on the need for verification.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made (though notice timeframe proposed as 21 days).</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made.</p> <p>Accepted, amendments made.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review vs. appeal, limitation of “case different and additional”, considers appeal grounds should be able to challenge any aspect of the Board’s decision.</li> <li>• Person(s) who considers the appeal should not have been involved in the original decision.</li> <li>• Publication of a decision prior to it becoming final could inflict irreparable reputational harm.</li> <li>• Case for appeal should allow for a calendar month.</li> </ul>	<p>Accepted, amendment made so clear it relates to appeal and possible appeal grounds identified.</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted, amendment made.</p> <p>Accepted that 5 days is insufficient, amended to 28 days in keeping with Appeals Rules.</p>
--	---	--