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**Introduction**

At first glance, it would appear that since law schools in China are operating in the context of a very different political system to those in England and Wales, they would not have much in common when it came to a consideration of the pressures exerted upon legal education by external actors. However, in broad terms, law schools in both jurisdictions are faced with pressures to change the education they deliver in order to satisfy the agendas of political actors outside their immediate environment. As Zhou and Palmer comment in their analysis of Chinese legal education in the following chapter:

“it is perhaps better to see China as possessing a ‘political-legal’ culture—rather than a legal culture …The continuing traditional influence of strong government, and the dominant position of the Chinese Communist Party in the administration of justice, mean that law and the legal system have strongly political and administrative dimensions.” (Zhou and Palmer PAGE)

In England and Wales, the pressures on law schools to deliver outcomes specified by external players, while not exactly the same as those felt by Chinese law schools, are nevertheless numerous.

**The Changing Relationship between Law Schools and the Legal Profession**

Both higher education and the legal profession are undergoing a shift away from traditional professional self-regulation towards regulation by market forces. The legal profession has seen the loss of traditional monopolies, the introduction of competition and the loss of much of the Legal Aid system (Abel 1988 & 2003, Green & Sandbach 2016). Higher education has undergone a process of massification with rates of participation rising from around 1/5 to nearly 1/2 in the last thirty years. The proportion of school-leavers going on to some form of higher education is currently 49.8% (Department of Education, 2018). The benefits of that expansion in terms of diversity and social inclusion are obvious, but there have also been significant drawbacks. The increasing number of students going to university has raised the question of who should pay for higher education and the answer in England and Wales has been the students themselves, with university fees rising to full cost at £9,250 and the Government introducing a student loan scheme hoping to ensure that all students can afford their education (Student Finance England, 2019). The question of value for money has in turn led to two further developments. The first is an increased emphasis on employability as the object of higher education, rather than the wider liberal education goals articulated by Robbins (Robbins 1963). The second has been the introduction of business management techniques to ensure quality of provision, so that we are all now familiar with concepts such as outcomes-focused course design and the idea of academic freedom has been tempered by the ‘reasonable management request’.

The result of these changes has been the marketisation of higher education in England and Wales with employers and students encouraged to make informed choices based on key sources of data such as the National Student Survey, the Destination of Leavers of Higher Education Survey and now the new Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) (Office for Students, 2019) to complement the longstanding Research Excellence Framework (REF). TEF rankings of teaching quality in institutions as Gold, Silver or Bronze are drawn from a range of data, including course completion, the National Student Survey and Destination of Leavers in Higher Education and they may soon impact on the level of fees that universities can charge for their courses. This data, compiled into league tables for universities and individual courses, can have measurable, but generally modest, impacts on student recruitment when rankings change (Broecke, 2015). Regardless of the degree of their impact and even if other factors are more significant, league table rankings certainly inform management strategy in many English and Welsh universities (Catcheside, 2012).

The legal profession has also been introduced to competition and external quality controls by the Legal Services Act 2007 (Boon, 2010). In its first year of operation, the Legal Services Board, established by the Act to oversee the regulation of all legal services by the respective ‘Approved Regulators (including the Bar Council, the Chartered Institute of Legal Executives, the Council for Licensed Conveyancers and the Solicitors Regulation Authority), described itself as “… the independent body responsible for overseeing the regulation of lawyers in England and Wales. Our goal is to reform and modernise the legal services market place by putting the interests of consumers at the heart of the system, reflecting the objectives of the statute that created us, the Legal Services Act 2007” (Legal Services Board, 2011).

**The Solicitors Qualifying Examination**

It is in this context that the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) have outlined radical changes to the way in which solicitors will qualify from September 2021, proposing the introduction of centrally set and assessed examinations of legal knowledge and procedure, ethics and legal skills, to be known as the Solicitors Qualifying Examination (SQE). The framework for the proposal has already been approved (LSB, 2018) and, although final approval is still outstanding, the general expectation is that SQE will go ahead from Autumn 2021. Few UK law schools can afford to ignore these changes.

The Bar Standards Board are introducing similar changes for Barristers (Bar Standards Board, 2019), but they are less radical and retain the existing stages of qualification envisaged by the Ormrod Report; academic, professional (comprising institutional training and ‘in-training’) and continuing education or training (Ormrod, 1971, para 185). The Ormrod requirement for a graduate profession led to the establishment of what has become known as the Qualifying Law Degree as the first stage of qualification for Barristers or Solicitors. Law Schools are free to offer any law syllabus they choose, taught and assessed as they see fit, provided the degree has been validated as required within their University and the wider HE sector. But for the course to be recognised for the purposes of professional qualification it must meet the professions’ stated requirements for a Qualifying Law Degree, which were until recently articulated in a Joint Statement (Joint Academic Stage Board, 2012). At present, aspiring Barristers and Solicitors go on to take the Bar Professional Training Course or the Legal Practice Course to be taught and assessed in the legal knowledge, procedure, ethics and skills appropriate to their chosen branch of the profession. Finally, candidates undertake supervised work experience as Pupil Barristers or Trainee Solicitors to complete their initial professional training. This chapter will focus on the changes to the way in which solicitors will qualify in the future (SRA 2017).

The SRA proposals abandon the requirements for a qualifying law degree, the Legal Practice Course and a training contract. These are replaced by the requirement for a degree (or equivalent), not necessarily in law, and passing two centrally set assessments – the Solicitors Qualifying Examination Stages 1 and 2. Intending solicitors must also undertake qualifying work experience supervised by a solicitor, although the solicitor’s role is limited to ensuring they have an opportunity to learn from experience. Finally, candidates must pass character and suitability requirements. The proposed SQE Stage 1 assesses ‘Functioning Legal Knowledge’ in three multiple choice question papers: 1) Business, Dispute Resolution, Contract, Tort, 2) Property, Wills, Solicitors Accountants and 3) Public Law, Legal System, Regulation, Criminal. There is also a Legal Skills assessment on Legal Research and Writing (SRA, 2019). All assessments are centrally set and assessed. SQE 2 comprises five skills assessments that must be taken and passed in two practice contexts of the candidate’s choice, making a total of ten assessments. The skills are: Client Interviewing, Advocacy/Persuasive Oral Communication, Case and Matter Analysis, Legal Research & Written Advice and Legal Drafting. The practice contexts are: Criminal Practice, Dispute Resolution, Property, Wills & the Administration of Estates and Commercial & Corporate Practice. SQE 2 assessments are likely to last one hour and involve the use of simulated clients. Both SQE 1 and SQE 2 assessments will include unflagged ethical questions. The SRA will provide candidates with their scores for each of the modules, but will not provide grades for the examinations beyond "pass" or "fail" (Solicitors Regulation Authority, 2019). The SRA expect that many candidates will take SQE part 1 before their work-based experience, and SQE part 2 at the end of their work experience. However, some City Law Firms have already indicated their intention to get their trainees to pass SQE 1 and SQE 2 as early as possible at the start of their work-based experience so that as much of their training as possible can focus on the specialisms they will practice (Law Society Gazette, 2018a).

**Concerns about the Solicitors Qualifying Examination**

One key difference between the proposals and the current arrangements is that a law degree or equivalent is no longer required for qualification. Another is that in future neither the law schools nor the profession are to be involved in the certification of competence to practice (Solicitors Regulation Authority, 2017). At present the law schools certify sufficiency of legal knowledge (by awarding a qualifying law degree or a Graduate Diploma in Legal Studies) and sufficiency of procedural knowledge and professional skills (Bar Vocational Course, Legal Practice Course) and professional practitioners certify fitness to practice following supervised ‘in-training’ as a Pupil Barrister or Trainee Solicitor. During the consultation process, the SRA expressed concern about differential pass rates on LPC courses and assumed that the reason must be differential assessment standards (as opposed to entry standards or teaching standards) (SRA 2011). They did not expressly say but might be assumed to have been equally worried about incompetent solicitors being able to sign off incompetent trainees to become incompetent solicitors of the future. In any event, they have taken control of the assessment of day one competence themselves and hired a private training company, Kaplan, to administer the SQE for them (Law Society Gazette, 2018b). This is a significant reduction of professional self-regulation and does not appear to carry the profession’s support (Hall, 2017). No one doubts the right and responsibility of the SRA to act in the public interest to ensure that newly qualified solicitors demonstrate high and consistent standards of competence, but many of the stakeholders consulted by the SRA have expressed considerable concern as to whether the SQE is a necessary reform or fit for purpose. Concerns include loss of status as a graduate profession (particularly with regard to competitor law firms internationally), a refusal to benchmark the QAA against the national qualifications framework and whether the SQE is in effect a lowering of entry standards. Another concern is the inability for candidates to qualify in specialist areas ranging from Employment Law & Family Law to Intellectual Property and Mergers & Acquisitions (SRA, 2016a). Despite the project being entitled ‘Training for Tomorrow’, the idea of a general practitioner of law is anomalous, since modern solicitors are all specialists to a greater or lesser extent and likely to be considered negligent if they were not (Legal Services Consumer Panel, 2010, para 4.13). Finally, there are a number of concerns that the proposals will have a negative impact on equality of entry into the profession. It is not clear that the proposals will be any cheaper and the structure and nature of the assessments may have a negative impact on diversity by favouring candidates with aptitude for and experience of the assessment methods relied on and, particularly, those that can afford additional tuition and revision support (City of London Law Society, 2018a).

A recent special edition of the Law Teacher (2018, Vol 4), entitled ‘From LETR to SQE: Reforming legal education and training in England and Wales’, provides a detailed review of the SQE and identifies many of the concerns that the Law Schools have. Mason & Guth in their editorial ‘Re-claiming our discipline’ condemn the SRA reforms as inappropriate, ‘In our view not only are they significantly flawed in terms of their regulatory objective and pedagogy but they also do significant violence to law as an academic discipline …’ (Mason & Guth, 2018). Mason warns that the structure of SQE1 reduces law and the truth of legal propositions to the ability of a candidate to predict the application of legal thought by others. He call this ‘bleak legal realism’ (Mason, 2018). Guth & Dutton warn that SQE-focused degrees will be dull, lacking options and theory, a poor preparation for legal practice and have the potential to make the inequalities inherent in the legal education system worse (Guth & Dutton, 2018). Morrison warns that multiple choice assessments may stifle creativity in learning and assessment (Morrison, 2018). Hall warns that MCQ assessments have the potential to “trivialise content and threaten validity” (Hall, 2018). Bradney warns that any Law School claiming that their LLB offers advantages in passing the SQE may have to justify their claim to the Advertising Standards Authority and points to two recent complaints against the University of Law as an illustration (Bradney, 2018).

Even the authors of the Legal Education and Training Review (which preceded the SQE proposals) doubt whether the SQE can deliver its intended benefits:

Critics of competence-based approaches have long raised concerns about the ability of competence frameworks to capture the richness of high level professional learning, and highlighted risks of both under- and over-inclusiveness. All of these problems may flow from the current design of the SQE. First, the breadth of the knowledge component (particularly in the SQE1) continues to lock training into a model of preparation for general practice that no longer exists. Combined with breadth assessment through primarily multiple choice questions, and we have a model that can be said to ensure baseline competence in only the most rudimentary sense. Secondly, while many of the core professional skills (research, oral and written communication, advocacy) are constants, newer capabilities are becoming critical. The Report highlighted commercial and social awareness (which is, at least in the commercial context, captured by the new outcomes), but capacities such as a proper understanding of legal tech, project management, and “design-thinking” are all examples of “new” areas of competence currently being emphasised in practice. … Thirdly, there is little to suggest that the SRA has done anything to address, particularly through its assessment design, the impoverished focus on ethics and professionalism, and particularly the need for a broader education in professional values high-lighted by the Report (Ching et al, 2018).

Julian Webb has additionally observed that the SQE approach does little to enable students to obtain a broad range of competences, including the capacity for emotional intelligence, ethical and values-based reasoning, critical and creative thinking, and the ability to deal with high levels of complexity and uncertainty. He says that ‘by underplaying such attributes we do our students few favours, either intellectually or in terms of employability’ (Webb, 2017).

The SQE proposals bundle up the legal knowledge required to pass a qualifying law degree with the procedure required to pass the LPC into the SQE Stage 1 and then test skills in the SQE Stage 2. The net effect is, potentially, to reduce the breadth and depth of legal knowledge required to become a solicitor. The SQE Stage 1 comprises online multiple choice questions (the consultation document suggests 120 questions per 3 hour paper) and appears to focus on straightforward legal issues set in the context of legal practice and procedure. Currently, Qualifying Law Degrees must satisfy the requirements of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Law Benchmark (2015), whose requirements for Law degree outcomes include: ‘viii) ability to recognise ambiguity and deal with uncertainty in law’  and ‘ix) ability to produce a synthesis of relevant doctrinal and policy issues, presentation of a reasoned choice between alternative solutions and critical judgement of the merits of particular arguments’ (Quality Assurance Agency, 2015). By contrast, the SRA say that the depth and breadth of legal knowledge required of candidates in any of the assessments is that of ‘functioning legal knowledge’. This means that a candidate should be able to identify relevant core legal principles or rules, whether derived from cases, statutes or regulatory sources, and apply them appropriately and effectively to client-based and ethical problems and situations encountered in practice. Candidates will not be required to recall case names or cite statutory authority except where specified (SRA 2019). It is not clear how legal complexity and ambiguity can be assessed by questions that take an average of 90 seconds to answer (SRA 2017, Para 52 of the SQE consultation). The effect is likely to encourage students to focus on the application of straightforward principles of law in everyday practice situations without sufficient regard to complexity and ambiguity as required by the QAA Law Benchmark. It doesn’t make clear when a prospective solicitor might be expected to study appellate as opposed to first instance law. Students qualifying without having taken a law degree will be less prepared for practice at the highest standard of competence while students who qualify with a law degree may be thought to have engaged in unnecessary time and expense if they study subjects and topics outside the SQE syllabus. This is likely to impact on professional standards or diversity or both.

Work-based experience is to become ‘an opportunity to learn from experience’. In the Consultation Document the SRA say they will not require firms to make any judgments about whether a candidate is competent to be a solicitor. Instead, they will test their competence by the SQE stage 2 assessments. They will only require the supervising solicitor to sign a declaration that the candidate has had the opportunity to develop some or all of the competences in the Statement of Solicitor Competence through the required period of workplace experience (SRA 2017, paragraph 100). By contrast, under current arrangements every trainee solicitor undertaking a Training Contract has a supervisor who has responsibility for the development of their professional skills in terms of structure, supervision and feedback, not just for providing an opportunity to develop competence and to ensure their competence for their role. It is the supervising solicitor who signs off the final stage of qualification (SRA, 2016). The net result is that there is no requirement for the teaching or supervised practice and development of legal skills. Candidates can simply obtain two years of paralegal work and train to pass the SQE 2 skills test. The question is whether the SQE 2 assessments are sufficient in themselves to ensure candidates fully develop the necessary legal skills for competent practice. The model of Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) is drawn from medical training, but UK doctors take a 5 year medical degree that includes extensive supervised clinical practice and work-based learning, so the comparison would seem to be inapposite. As can be seen above, many legal academics and practitioners doubt that the SQE can ensure the full competence of a day one solicitor as set out in the Statement of Solicitor Competence (SRA 2015). If it cannot, the SQE will effectively lower standards, at least by comparison with current best practice. There are also significant concerns about diversity, including the potential cost of the SQE, currently estimated to be £3,000-£4,500 for a single attempt of SQE 1 & 2 (SRA, 2018c) plus significant course fees. The advantages to students who can afford additional tuition and assessment practice and re-sits are obvious. This, together with the narrow assessment strategy and the potential emergence of a two-tier hierarchy between academic and vocational law degrees suggests that there are grounds for significant concern about the future of legal education and training in England and Wales. The SRA no longer claims that the flexibility of the SQE will improve diversity of access to the profession. Nor does it claim anymore that the SQE will necessarily be cheaper than the current arrangements.

If the SQE is not cheaper, does not assist diversity nor raise standards, one might wonder what it is for and why it is needed. One possible answer is that the effect, intended or not, may be to make it easier to qualify and set up practice and thereby to increase competition in the legal services market. In a parallel consultation on standards and regulation, the SRA considered allowing newly qualified solicitors to open their own law firms immediately upon qualification (SRA, 2018a). In response to feedback concerned about the removal of the requirement for the newly qualified solicitors to remain under the supervision of an experienced solicitor for three years post qualification, the SRA compromised by requiring that they must employ at least one solicitor with three years or more experience if they want to establish their own firm immediately (SRA, 2018b, para 50). This substantially undermines the effectiveness of the rule, because now the more experienced solicitor may be an employee rather than a manager. This rule change is explicitly concerned with removing barriers to competition. Whilst there is no doubt that advice deserts are emerging (Law Society Gazette, 2019) and only the very wealthy can afford access to justice (Green & Sanbach, 2016), we will have to wait and see whether the SQE and related reforms have any positive impact on competition and whether such competition will actually improve access to justice. Mason suggests not, that access to justice can only be affected marginally, and often not directly, by regulators (Mason et al, 2012).

**The threats and opportunities posed by SQE for Law Schools**

The SQE presents a number of threats and opportunities for law schools. On the one hand the dropping of the requirement of a Qualifying Law Degree (or GDLS) may mean that students choose to study other degrees and prepare for the SQE by themselves or by taking a specialised tutorial course, such as the courses offered by Barbrifor the New York Bar exams and now the SRA Qualified Lawyers Transfer Scheme (Barbri, 2019). On the other hand, the requirement for a degree and the legal knowledge required to pass the exams mean that it is likely that many candidates will continue to choose to study a law degree. Also student loans are available for LLB and LLM courses but not for courses aimed exclusively at preparation for the SQE. In terms of cost and flexibility, degree apprenticeships are an obviously attractive option. However, it is not clear whether law firms are currently recruiting a significant number of school leavers onto full degree apprenticeship routes. Data on Solicitor apprenticeship starts is not disaggregated from Business, Administration and other Law apprenticeships (Parliament. House of Commons, 2019, 4.2) but looking at legal recruitment websites suggests that paralegal and CILEx apprenticeships are more popular (Chambers Student Guide, 2019)(LawCareers.Net, 2019).

The great opportunity for law schools is the freedom to design law degrees outside the traditional QLD requirements. The BSB will still require a QLD but will be satisfied by any degree that meets the QAA Law Benchmark. This means that Law Schools are free to redesign their courses with distinct pedagogies and move out of the shadow of the professional bodies’ historic insistence on core foundation subjects and preference for unseen examinations. If desired, more time can be made available for theory, skills, social welfare law, international and comparative law, commercial awareness and commercial specialisms and/or emerging areas such as law & technology. Different teaching & learning strategies can be deployed or extended and law schools can now rethink their assessment strategies if they choose. As Phil Race, amongst many others, insists, assessment in higher education is broken and we spend too much time assessing the wrong things and, even, the wrong people in ways that obstruct rather than assist learning (Race, 2014).

However, although the most common response from law schools has been to condemn and turn their back on the SQE, it will be a brave and confident school that ignores it entirely. Although less than half of all law graduates eventually qualify as lawyers, many more start their studies with qualification as at least an option in mind. A law degree that addresses professional practice and skills and the SQE syllabus and assessment methodology may be attractive to them, especially if it does not sacrifice the other important elements of a degree education. Some law schools will carry on exactly as they are or take the freedom to develop academically interesting degrees that are not yoked to the requirements of professional qualification. Others may choose to develop degrees that prepare students fully or partly for the SQE and the other qualifying examinations. Market forces in the form of student choice (and student satisfaction) may mean that law schools that are neither sufficiently prestigious nor addressing professional practice in some way may be squeezed in terms of recruitment. Some may then have to change their courses out of necessity.

So far very few law schools have expressed an intention to develop law degrees that prepare graduates exclusively to take the SQE immediately upon graduation. As can be seen, many legal academics think that such degrees will have very little to recommend them other than the potentially significant saving of a year of time and fees on the road to qualification. Most law schools who choose to address the SQE are likely to develop courses that address it alongside other outcomes and aim to give their students a head start when they begin their postgraduate (or fourth year) of SQE studies. This approach mitigates some of the concerns about SQE degrees but raises the old debate about whether a law degree is a liberal arts education or a preparation for practice. However, the two need not be mutually exclusive choices. Guth & Ashford have argued for ‘a more nuanced understanding of liberal legal education: one which does not oppose the teaching or exploration of practice relevant subjects or the learning of professional knowledge and skills; but one where these are acquired, if indeed they are, because they facilitate or come with the wider learning that constitutes a liberal education’ (Guth & Ashford, 2014). Equally, Yorke contends persuasively that employability is not inconsistent with good academic learning (Yorke, 2006). If the SQE effectively lowers standards and does ‘significant violence to law as an academic discipline’ (Mason & Guth, 2018), it could be an exciting proposition to deploy innovative and effective pedagogies to redress the deficit and to build a ‘multi-functional’ Law School as Twining suggested 25 years ago (Twining, 1994). For law schools already committed to or interested in clinical legal education, there is an opportunity here to expand or develop experiential learning as part of a strategy to engage students in law, theory and practice in a way that also begins their preparation for the new professional assessments should they wish to take them.

There are many rich resources for law schools willing to take up the challenge. Recent examples include Paul Maharg’s vision of a pragmatist law teaching practice built around experience, ethics, technology and collaboration (Maharg, 2016), Grimes’ survey of experiential learning best practice around the world (Grimes, 2018) and Thomas et al’s extended argument that clinical legal education is the learning of the law and its implementation in the real world through action and reflection that has educational, public interest and employability benefits (Thomas, 2018). Developments in the United States are also interesting. The American Bar Association (ABA) Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools 2014-2015 now require a minimum 6 credits of experiential learning for qualifying post-graduate law degrees and this has given a boost to simulation, clinic and placement modules (American Bar Association, 2015). Clearly the ABA are moving in a different direction to the SRA. In the UK, York University and University of Northumbria are interesting examples of what can be achieved in terms of integrating problem based learning and clinical legal education into academically rigorous degrees. Paul Maharg’s current project is the Simulated Client Initiative which aligns with the prospective SQE 2 assessments (Marharg, 2019). Dunn, Roper and Kennedy have begun to consider if and how clinical legal experience might count towards qualifying work experience (Dunn et al, 2018). Law Schools intending to offer courses that address the SQE will need to develop appropriate SQE 1 MCQ question banks and there is currently a collaborative project among several Law Schools to work on this together. So, although the legal profession, particularly the SRA, is distancing itself from the Law Schools and taking qualification back into its own hands, there are reasons to expect that at least in some law schools, legal practice may take up a larger space in the curriculum than it has in the past.

**Comparing Law Schools in England & Wales and the People’s Republic of China**

As will be seen in the following chapter, law schools in the People’s Republic of China face similar challenges to law schools in England & Wales. The chapter will introduce the familiar theme of a centrally set qualifying examination and a debate about the extent to which law schools should prepare their students for legal practice, set in the context of a (for many) unfamiliar socialist, civil legal system. Since the end of the Cultural Revolution, the PRC has pursued a policy of introducing ‘the Rule of Law with Chinese characteristics’, meaning the rule of law without the separation of powers or any limits on the constitutional supremacy of the Chinese Communist Party (Castellucci, 2007). For an interesting, English language, discussion of this topic by Chinese scholars, see of Rule of Law in China: Spotlight Issues (2016) . The Chinese experience reflects a comparative light on our own debates about regulation and independence as we move beyond traditional professional peer regulation (Deech, 2012)(Mason, 2019), showing a cross cultural recognition of the importance of lawyers and judges in maintaining social stability and promoting prosperity. Which, as we know from recent examples, is not to say that the independence of lawyers is complete or uncontested in either jurisdiction (Observer, 2017)(Amnesty International, 2018).
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**Abstract**

**Legal Education Future(s) – The Changing Relationship between Law Schools and the Legal Profession**

In the England and Wales the relationship between law schools and the legal profession is changing. Both higher education and the legal profession are undergoing a shift away from traditional professional self-regulation towards regulation by market forces. The Solicitors Regulation Authority are proposing to change the way Solicitors qualify, introducing a new, centrally set and assessed Solicitors Qualifying Examination (SQE). One key difference between the proposals and the current arrangements is that a law degree or equivalent is no longer required for qualification. Another is that in future neither the law schools nor the profession are to be involved in the certification of competence to practice. Despite meeting considerable opposition from both legal practitioners and academics, the proposals are set to be introduced in Autumn 2021. This chapter explores the concerns about SQE and the challenges and opportunities the proposals present, both for law schools that may develop courses that address SQE and those that don’t. It concludes that despite the concerns, there is an opportunity of all law schools to redesign their courses with distinct pedagogies and to move out of the shadow of the professional bodies’ historic insistence on core foundation subjects and preference for unseen examinations. It also concludes that for law schools engaged in or interested in Clinical Legal Education there is an opportunity to expand the experiential learning content of their courses in ways that address both professional practice and academic outcomes.
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