

Do you support the extension of voting rights and representation on the Professional Board to all grades of member within the Chartered Institute?

Response Please state reasons

Yes

-

Yes I think doing so will enable Cilex to receive an honest view of all grades of Cilex members,

Yes however, there should be stricter guidelines for the selection of representatives on the

professional board, to ensure such appointments consist of eligible qualified Cilex

Yes A better cross section of views from the membership can then be obtained.

Yes A better response rate to enable you to listen to a wider group

Yes A more balanced and comprehensive outcome is likely if all grades are included in voting rights.

Yes A wider range of members will reflect the membership

Yes All are invested in CILEX so why should they not have a say?

Yes All categories of members have a place within our organisation and should be treated with parity. It is only by involving all categories of members that we can gain true full representation of our membership and understand and deal with their needs and priorities.

Yes All CILEX members should be represented.

Yes All CILEX members should have the right to vote on matters that affect them be it now or in the

All CILEx members, including students, should have a voice. Students have chosen CILEx as their

Yes career path and therefore there is no reason why they should not have voting rights.

Yes All grades are unique members with unique needs and should be represented accordingly.

Yes All grades following Cilex route should be entitled to vote

Yes All grades of members deserve to have their say on matters.

Yes All grades of members that have to pay a subscription to be a member, should have voting

All grades of membership are still members and deserve to have a say on the activities of their

Yes membership board.

Yes all grades should have the opportunity to be represented

Yes All levels of membership should have the opportunity to vote.

Yes All member should have a say.

Yes All member should have an input

Yes All members are affected by any elected change therefore should have the right to vote.

All members dispute where they are in their career or qualification journey deserve a vote and

Yes a right to voice their thoughts

All members have a vested interest, newer members on initial grades may have a better idea of

Yes how the envisage the future of the role of a Chartered Legal Exec.

All members of CILEx should be given the right to vote and sit on the professional board

Yes otherwise we do not have a fully representative vote and board

Yes All members pay their membership fee so should have the opportunity to vote on matters which will affect their membership/qualifications/anything else connected.

Yes All member's should be able to influence decision making.

All members should be able to influence the future of the profession. It is simply wrong to

Yes prevent such a large proportion of members from having any say.

All members should be adequately represented and have a voice in relation to the future of

Yes CILEx.

All members should be entitled to vote where they pay a subscription fee. All grades of

Yes members should be represented on the Board as long as there is a fair and transparent

selection procedure that does not allow for members to be slotted into co-opted positions with out fair competition.

- Yes All members should be equal and be able to have their say and vote regardless of member status.
- Yes All members should have a say
- Yes All members should have a say in these sort of matters.
- Yes All members should have a voice
- Yes All members should have the right to a vote.
- Yes All members should have the right to vote and be represented, regardless of membership. All members should be able to cast their vote as outcomes ultimately affect all members and in continuance of the culture of inclusivity.
- Yes all voices have something to share of importance, if the majority of those voices are at lower grade, this may be giving important intelligence
- Yes Any decisions that are made, effect everyone who has a CILEx membership, regardless of grade. Everyone should have a say.
- Yes Any definition taken will affect every member regardless of their grade
- Yes Any member and trained lawyers and qualified to degree, diploma and master's of law or legal practice, should have the same voting rights. We live in a democracy and that means, as long as someone qualified in law, should have the same voting rights.
- Yes Anyone who pays an annual fee to CILEX should be eligible to vote.
- Yes As decisions will ultimately affect all members they should be entitled to vote.
- Yes As it affects all members we should all have the chance to vote.
- Yes As membership has widened and there is recognition that not all will want to progress to become a Chartered Legal Executive (Fellow) as it, it seems far more inclusive to open up voting rights to all grades.
- Yes Associate members have been ignored for far too long.
- Yes Associate members need a voice
- Yes Because all active members should have a voice.
- Yes because all member grades have a vested interest in CILEX and should be allowed to vote on the things that represent them.
- Yes Because every member should have its voice heard, regardless of whether they are at chartered status or not.
- Yes because if CILEx represents all grades of member, all grades should be able to have their voice heard. CILEx members en route to qualification have invested in this qualification and should have a right to influence what that qualification will look like by the time they qualify.
- Yes Because some of us are seasoned ILEx Associates with vast experience now unable to advance in our careers, seek exemptions or benefit from the routes available to newer members now, and no equitable alternative recognising our skills, experience.
- Yes Because they are our future, it affects them.
- Yes Being able to vote and have a say in regulating and directing the institute will be fantastic.
- Yes Believe it would make much more inclusive.
- Yes Breadth of opinion.
- Yes Chartered Legal Executives are providing a tremendous service to the Legal sector.
- Yes CILEx is about increasing diversity in the legal marketplace so it is important that our own governance reflects this.
- Yes Cilex is an inclusive organisation opening up a legal career to people who would not normally work within the law - their views should be represented at all levels.

Yes CILEX lawyers have the same practicing rights as solicitors and have often the same academic background. They should have the same voting rights and representation too.

Yes Decisions made by CILEX affect all members, not just CLE's so I agree all members should have a say in what happens with CILEX overall - including this decision regarding a regulatory move to the SRA.

Yes democratic to do so

Yes Diversity of opinion

Yes Diversity of thought, background and qualification is more important than ever. Cilex is traditionally a route for those people who could not study for a law degree. All those involved of any grade should therefore have a voice.

Yes Don't understand what the current restriction is so why not

Yes Encourages membership to get involved and be interested at all levels. It then represents all those who are members of CILEX not just those who have obtained Chartered status.

Yes ensures representation by for all members

Yes Equal for all

Yes Equal opportunity

Yes Equality

Yes Equality for all members

Yes Equality of opportunity

Yes Every member is impacted and should have the same rights.

Yes Every member should have a say, equality

Yes Every member should have any input. Even if each grade's opinion should be considered separately.

Yes everyone has a right to a vote

Yes Everyone should be involved and have a say

Yes Everyone should get a say in the way they are governed and proposals made etc. with this should also come a representation of the grades throughout CILEX on the board so that each grade feels represented.

Yes Everyone who has been admitted and pays should have a voice.

Yes Everyone who is paying for a course or who is qualified should be entitled to vote.

Yes Everyone's opinion matters

Yes Extension of voting rights and representation will diversify the law.

Yes Fair and balanced approach

Yes Fairer and gives a voice to all members.

Yes Fairer decision making

Yes Fairness

Yes Feel all should have a day

Yes For reasons to do with inclusivity extending voting rights to all members is preferable.

Yes Given that there are many 'un-Chartered' people who rely on CILEX to further their education as an alternative to the more traditional legal routes, it is fair that they are able to have a voice/vote on important matters regarding access to education and what their end qualification will look like in the legal world.

Yes Gives equal rights to all

Yes Greater involvement in democratic process

Yes Having attended a meeting and having a better understanding of what is being proposed, I am happy with rights and represent being agreed.

Yes I agree

Yes I agree with the consultation

Yes I believe all members should have a say on matters that affect them not just Fellows.

Yes I believe all members should have the opportunity to be consulted.

Yes I believe every member should have the same rights regardless of level of membership.
I believe it fair that all paying members, no matter their grade, are properly represented and are given a voice in the running of the organisation. It's like the American's saying: no taxation without representation.

Yes I believe that everyone should be entitled to an opinion and say in matters that concern them.

Yes I can see no reason why all grades of membership should not be entitled to vote on matters affecting them and the organisation they are part of.

Yes I do as it is important for all members to have a say in how the body representing them is run.

Yes I feel all members should have the mechanism to put their views forward

Yes I know many CILEX members are graduate stage who have not yet managed to complete the portfolio and they are wonderful lawyers with sometimes huge amounts of experience and expertise and their votes should be included too.
I makes all specification understanding or knowledge.
Its related back understanding
Right
Choice or decision

Yes Freedom access to all men's guards

Yes I support the extension of voting rights. I oppose the extension of representation on the Professional Board to all grades. Members of the Board should have considerable experience and demonstrated ability (by Fellowship) to make reasoned decisions.

Yes I think all grades of membership should be able and encouraged to apply for such positions.

Yes I think it is important that all members have a right to their views being heard.

Yes I think it is very important for legal executives to get the recognition they deserve. This provides a service to members nuy also the public who appoint us

Yes I think its a good idea for everyone to have a voice and express their opinions

Yes I think that the Institute is for all of us.
I think that those who are regulated by the organisation should have a fair say in it's management

Yes I think this is fairer to extend it to all members of CILEX

Yes I think this is the correct way forward for CILEX and all its members.

Yes I would like a vote myself rather than merely the right to address the AGM.

Yes If decisions affect all members it makes sense to consult the membership.

Yes If everyone has a say it will be more reflective of the organisation as a whole.

Yes If the intention is for 'lower' grades of membership to effectively be separate career paths, then they should have a say in relation to the Professional Board

Yes If the organization says it represents all then all need to have a say in its running

Yes If we are representing all grades then only equal and fair they have voting rights.
If we are to promote equality of oppportunity and challenge the legal sector then we must practice what we preach and look at changes to our own governance & constitution to ensure equality for all members.

Yes

- Yes If you are a member of an organisation then you should be able to have an equal say.
- Yes If you are part of the professional membership, whatever level, you should have a say. Some people are highly trained but choose to stay at a lower level due to other commitments. This does not mean they should not have a say.
- Yes Important for EDI
- Yes In order to provide equality of opportunity across the membership
- Yes In the end these decisions are effecting all of us.
- Yes Inclusive
- Yes Inclusivity
- Yes It articulates more interests in the running of the body and engender absolute loyalty and legitimacy
- Yes It gives a true reflection of the general members
- Yes It is a positive move forward
- Yes It is fair that everyone involved in CILEX should be entitled to have their say
- Yes It is fairer
- Yes It is imperative that all members are given an opportunity to express their views and air their thoughts.
- Yes It is important because it will not only affect Fellows but those that have started on their CILEX journey as well as they will be the Fellows of the future.
- Yes It is important for equality that viribg rights should be extended
- Yes It is important for the views of all members to be considered as decisions impact on all members.
- Yes It is important for the voices of members to be heard in important decisions which will affect their profession. Democracy is positive, however there should be minimum voting thresholds to be reached before decisions can be made - similar to those observed in the practice of Company & Partnership law.
- Yes It is important that all members are catered for and have the chance to have their opinions heard as to the future of CILEX. Issues for one grade will be different from other grades and we should not have decisions based on limited knowledge
- Yes It is important that in these radically changing times where access to justice is clearly being eroded that everyone involved in the legal profession has their say, and a vote is one way of expressing this. Too many changes are being made without consultation or rather ignoring folk at the "coalface".
- Yes It is important that student members have a vote on the future of their professional body. It is important that the views of those at the beginning of their careers are fully considered as those entrants are the future notwithstanding any current lack of full membership. Equally, any members with current practising membership suspended due to illness need to have their views considered. Further, any retired members have vast experience that would be a valuable contribution. It would be discriminatory to view those members as having nothing valuable to contribute.
- Yes It is important that we have the right to give a vote on decisions which ultimately affect us.
- Yes It is important to encourage those just starting out in the profession and it is a way of engaging with members from the outset.
- Yes It is important to get a hollistic view.
- Yes It is important to give a full voice to the membership.
- Yes It is more democratic and inclusive
- Yes It is more inclusive and encourages input and representation for all levels.

Yes It is sensible and fair for all members to have equal voting rights regardless of status.

Yes It is wholly appropriate fair and equitable

Yes It just makes sense bearing in mind the majority of members will eventually reach fellowship, they should definitely have a say

Yes It should be open to all members for the purpose of fairness

Yes It will be more inclusive

Yes It will enhance fairness in bringing good governance and transparency in our legal systems.

Yes It will enhance the status of the all our members

Yes It will give a greater diversity of representation.

Yes It will give a more representative view across CILEX members on issues, and backs up what CILEX is about

Yes It will help to ensure that CILEX acts in a manner that is in the best interests of all members.

Yes It would make it fairer to all and not just the few

Yes It would seem more equitable for a paralegal, for example, to be capable of voting on changes to internal regulations that would immediately affect their role.

Yes It's a form of progress to be recognised more

Yes It's fair

Yes It's important to gain the views of every member regardless of the grade and to understand those views

Yes It's good that those who are affected have a say

Yes It's important that all grades can be fairly represented at Board level.

Yes Lower grades should have the ability to influence policy as they make up the majority of membership and pay fees.

Yes Make it more democratic

Yes makes sense to make the organisation more democratic

Yes Member equity, I see no disadvantage in allowing a wider group to participate in voting. There is a case that by NOT including them they are excluded indirectly due to age/socio-economic background.

Yes Members have a right to know what they are entitled to and should be given recognition for what they have achieved, no matter what it is within the system.

Yes More democratic

Yes More diversity of opinion.

Yes more inclusive

Yes More inclusive and representative result will be given.

Yes More representative of all grades from the profession on decisions affecting them

Yes N/A

Yes No objections

Yes Open governance

Yes Opens representation to a wider pool.

Yes Parity and opportunities

Yes parity at all levels

Yes Principle of flexibility

Yes Provided that a member is invested in the qualification, they should have a right to vote

Yes provides more equality to all members regardless of grades

Yes Provides the opportunity for more diverse representation

Yes rights of the member

Yes Seems a fair suggestion.
Yes Sends a clear message of equality
Yes So that they can all have their say
Students are often those most effected by the changes made by CILEx. Representation should be inclusive.
Yes Supports inclusivity

The current board is self appointed and narrow minded. I deprecate the abolition of the regional elected Council which gave a broad spectrum of opinion.

I think a broader band of experience and hopefully of ages will benefit representation.

Yes
Yes The move is all accommodating which is progressive.
The work CILEx does and the decisions made should have the support from all members, not just Fellows and above. Those completing their qualifications, or are continue to work as a CILEx Paralegal, should be party to decisions which affect their careers. Otherwise, why bother being a member at all until you qualify?
Yes There will be greater inclusivity, and hopefully, diversity of opinions by including Chartered Members and not just Fellows. This may, however, make the process of decision making more difficult as more people will attend meetings.
Yes This allows inclusivity of all members to vote on matters that are important to all
Yes This is not a "yes" "no" answer. In a proper democracy then it is right that eligible people should be able to vote but you cannot and should not "bend" rules to ensure that you get an outcome that you want.
Yes

this prevents it being dominated by the 'lucky ones' who have reached higher in the CILEX tree. grassroots should always be listened to more than the established seats.

Yes This will benefit all concerned
Yes This will make it more inclusive and afford every level of membership the right to participate in any future decision making that pertains to the Chartered Institute.
Yes This would be fair
Yes This would be for the benefit and interest in fairness.
Yes This would give an objective overview and governance within the organisation

Yes This would help the General Public understand that we are all qualified professionals.

To be inclusive and so that those attaining their CILEx qualification are better informed and able to provide their opinion to help shape the future as they will be the future of CILEX
Yes To enable more people to respond and react.
Yes To have proper representation and CILEX to know their shortcomings.
Yes To represent all working with CILEX
Yes To value the opinions of everyone involved.
Yes Ultimately a truer reflection of membership
Yes voting rights and representation on the Professional Board to all grades
Yes We are all members and should all have a say
Yes We are meant to be a members body, not a dictatorship run by the Board
Yes we should all have a voice
Yes We're all in it together!

- Yes Whilst I have some concerns about merit and votes by popular appeal rather than substance. It would be entirely undemocratic and “Democratically Illegitimate” and thus unconstitutional whether to UK generally or CILEx’s own to support a class-based membership where voting rights are qualified by Grade of Membership.
- Yes Therefore all CILEx classes and membership grades paying the required fee and keeping their memberships in “Good Standing” should be able to vote and a seat on the Board rather than a qualified democracy of voting rights amongst property owning Greeks for example.
- Yes Why not?
- Yes Why would you not allow all members the same rights in the organisation.
- Yes Wider basis of opinions accessible.
- Yes will provide a greater depth of knowledge from a wealth of legal members from a variety of grades of knowledge
- Yes Yes to get a fair representation of views from all grades.
- Yes Yes, all members of CILEx should have a say in their education and career.
- Yes Yes, so that all grades of members are represented at Board level
- Yes Право голоса имеет каждый член Cilex ,который прошел регистрацию .
- No .
- No a
- No As a Past President and Chair of the Royal Charter Working Party I consider that extending voting rights and representation to all members (including paralegals) will dilute the brand of a Chartered Legal Executive.
- No because it is important to have those who are fully qualified voting
- No Before creating further confusion and division, I believe that it is important for Cilex to resolve the current discriminatory situation which they have allowed to develop, whereby highly experienced Chartered Legal Executives who used to undertake advocacy but no longer do so, are barred from further progression.
- No Chartered Individuals have more to gain/protect.
- No CILEX members encompass many people with varying levels of commitment and competence. In my experience it is appropriate that only those who have demonstrated the commitment and skills to achieve FCilex grade should have full rights in the organisation.
- No Devalues fellows
- No Extending the voting rights to a greater pool of members may be a good thing but I do not think this should be extended to every member grade immediately on becoming a member of CILEX.
- No Fellows have a wider understanding of all of the steps required to become a fellow, and will have greater experience. Voting should be limited to fellows.
- No Fellows have much more experience of the industry and have fulfilled their commitment to CILEx whereas part qualified members etc have not yet the experience or commitment. However bearing in mind as you are proceeding without the Fellowship on board then I question the point anyway.
- No Full qualification represents a commitment to the Institute. It could be detrimental, to all concerned, to have persons voting who have had very little experience of being part of the Institute or, perhaps, have no real intention of finalising studies with the Institute.

rights, representation, and eligibility for certain positions to all member grades may have potential disadvantages or concerns associated with them. Here are some possible disadvantages or criticisms of these proposals:

Reduced Representation for Fellows: The extension of voting rights to all member grades might dilute the influence of Fellows within the organization. Some Fellows may argue that they've attained a higher level of expertise and experience, and as such, their voices should carry more weight in decision-making.

Quality of Decision-Making: Critics might argue that expanding representation on the Professional Board to all member types, including trainees and students, could lead to decisions that are less informed or less focused on the long-term interests of the organization. They may question whether those with less experience should have an equal say in shaping policy.

Potential for Conflicting Interests: With a wider pool of eligible candidates for the President position, there could be concerns about conflicts of interest or political maneuvering within the organization. Some may worry that the election process for President could become more contentious.

Impact on Organizational Direction: Allowing members at various levels to participate in policy work and decision-making could lead to shifts in the organization's priorities and direction. Some members may fear that this could disrupt the existing mission and focus of CILEX.

Administrative Challenges: Expanding voting rights and representation to all member grades may bring administrative challenges in terms of managing the increased participation and ensuring a fair and efficient decision-making process.

No

No I agree with some extension but believe that there should be a minimum level of CILEX study required in order to be eligible. I definitely don't agree that Affiliates should have voting rights.

No I agree with some extension of voting rights to various grades.

No I believe it is in the interests of all members that only Fellows due to their years of experience should vote

No I believe only Fellows should vote to reflect the Professionalism within the body

No I believe only fully qualified members should have voting rights

No I believe that members should have demonstrated a commitment to Cilex (i.e. by completing examinations and qualification criteria) before being able to vote on matters that affect the institute.

No I believe these should be limited to those who have gained more experience in the industry

No I believe voting should be limited to those members who have fully completed the stages to qualification otherwise you may have the opinion and votes from those members who do not intend to qualify or practice in Law and have no real interest in CILEX.

No I consider that in order to vote, one must achieve a certain level of qualification. What that level ought to be, I cannot say, but it makes little sense to allow brand new CILEx members with no legal experience to vote on matters which they may not understand.

I do not believe that at what could be the very early stage of a trainee's career, the member would have sufficient experience and knowledge to make reasoned judgments as to decisions that would affect members with years of relevant experience, perhaps those with over 5 years membership

No

I do not see a reason to give this extension

No

I do not support the extension of voting rights and representation

No

I do not think new entrants will have a sufficient grasp of the institute and its workings to vote.

No

I don't think it's right to change things so that even a trainee can make these sorts of decision

No

I feel it should be qualified individuals with experience

No

I feel only Fellows would have enough experience to sit on the board.

No

I feel this is an attempt to water down the views of the core membership, who are FCILEX.

No

I have concerns that opening up further rights for non Fellows dilutes the effort and expertise that Fellow members have put into their qualification.

No

I have no faith in the SRA

No

it will diminish not enhance the positive differences a legal exec can bring over a solicitor

I can't see any positives for the members of CILEX

No

I have no strong feelings about this - but you have given me only 2 choices of response! On balance, I feel major decisions should be made by those with the most experience in the profession.

No

I have worked hard to gain CLE status to be in a position to vote. It seems very unfair that now I have qualified the tables are wanting to be changed.

No

I think earning voting rights should be a privilege afforded to those who incur the cost and time to fully qualify.

No

I think only Fellows have earned the right to vote but I don't see an issue with non Fellows joining the Professional board provided they are given a mandate to focus on the same grade.

No

I think that all grades need to qualify before obtaining voting rights.

No

I think there should be different categories for voting and representation. Issues relevant to a CLE could be less visible/important to a trainee or paralegal.

No

I think you should earn the right to vote through qualification

No

I think you should have obtained qualification first

No

Insufficient level of qualification, voting rights are an earned privilege

No

It has always been for fellows which are those who are qualified and therefore taken time to qualify and achieved qualification. Opening it to everyone allows anyone and everyone to join at any level and change the institute when it should be for qualified members to make the decisions on important matters.

No

It is currently well calibrated for its purpose. It should be for qualified lawyers only to vote.

No

It should be reserved to qualified persons

No

It should be restricted to those who are authorised which the main purpose of the organisation. However votes should be allowed in circumstances where a decision affects non-authorised members

No

Limited to fcilex

No

Limited to Fellows

No

Lower membership levels are not sufficiently qualified or experienced.

No

Maintain the status of Chartered Legal Executives.

- No Members can join at pretty much any stage of their career. Those at the early stage of their career may not have the experience to vote in the best interests of the membership as a whole having been limited in exposure to the challenges faced by CILEX members purely due to their time as a member.
- No Membership at ground level is too easy to obtain. Anyone can fill in a form and become a member with very little qualifications.
- No My view is that unqualified members don't yet have sufficient experience to make that judgement call.
- No Need to be fully fledged fellows
- No No
- No no
- No Not needed
- No Only Fellow of experience should be entitled to vote
- No Only full CILEX lawyers should be included as they have completed the necessary training. Only fully qualified members, ie: Fellows, should be allowed to vote. Others are just endeavouring to attain membership and, as such, should not be allowed to vote until they are members.
- No only if they are qualified members and not students
- No Only qualified lawyers should have voting rights.
- No Only qualified lawyers should have voting rights.
- No Only those who have successfully undertaken a course of study should be able to vote or sit on the board. Simply paying for membership should not suffice, those who have not undertaken a course of study cannot represent those who have or the needs of the public in relation to legal services. If paralegals become chartered then I agree that they should have these rights
- No Should be limited to Fellows
- No Should stay with Fellows only
- No That is my view
- No The dictionary definition of a Paralegal is "a person trained in subsidiary legal matters but not fully qualified as a lawyer" and providing such individuals who do not have the necessary academic qualification with practising rights will diminish the public's confidence and perception of the qualification, especially by use of the word "Paralegal"
- No The Fellowship Grade has been earned and should come with with some exclusivity
- No The majority of initial grade of membership are members of the community that are simply trying to qualify/ using Cilex as a way to bypass the training contract to cross qualify so won't partake so would be a wasted venture.
- No The potential watering down of the status of Fellows.
- No The voting should only be for the portion of members who will be effected the most
- No There are a lot of unqualified members who work in SRA regulated firms who do not care how we are regulated because it does not affect them. In my view only those members who have a vested interest in the voting results should be allowed to vote, such as fellows and authorised and regulated lawyers.
- No There is no need to change the current system. Extending voting rights risks in balance. There is practically no barrier to becoming a junior member of CILEX. Extending rights to all would likely result in junior members holding the lions share of votes.

- No There should be no extension of voting rights.
- No This dilutes the influence of experienced practitioners
- No This is a right that should remain exclusive to Fellows of the Institute. If members and paralegals wish to do the necessary work to become Fellows then the right to vote will have been earned.
- No This should be a privilege afforded to fully qualified "Legal Execs"
- No This should be limited to experienced members with a proven track record of work, study and commitment to advanced professional qualification and advancement within the profession.
- No This should be reserved only to CILEX Fellows. CILEX Fellows have worked extremely hard over the preceding decades for our qualification to be taken seriously and for us to be deemed on a par with our solicitor colleagues. Watering down our organisation with non qualified individuals on professional boards is entirely counter-productive and once again makes other organisations, such as the law society etc, look at CILEX as an organisation related to paralegals not qualified lawyers. This is extremely detrimental for those of us who are Fellows and makes us want to leave CILEX and get cross qualified as solicitors as CILEX currently seems more focused on supporting those who are not qualified than those who are.
- No This will dilute the status of Fellows in the perception of the public. EDI is too politically charged with special rights bias and is in fact the opposite in practice of meritocracy. EDI is a by-word for socialist activism. CILEX should accept that there are diverse views held amongst its membership and by pushing the EDI agenda it is disenfranchising a significant proportion of that membership.
- No To retain integrity it should be limited to qualified grades.
- No Until fully qualified I feel lesser rights should be in place.
- No Voting rights and representation should be for those who are fully qualified and pay their yearly subscription
- No Voting rights should apply to fellows upwards. Members below this grade may not proceed to fellowship and therefore should not hold voting rights.
- No Voting rights should be for the higher grade members as it is more likely that they will have more experience.
- No Voting rights should be limited to cilex fellows
- No Voting rights should remain with fellows
- No Voting should be for those that are Chartered- ie those that have achieved the professional level in the organisation.
- No Voting should be limited to qualified members. Otherwise what is to prevent thousands of unqualified lawyers joining to vote against a substantial topic, such as this one. Voting rights should be earned
- No Voting should be restricted to those that have demonstrated commitment and capability
- No Voting should only be available to those who have achieved the full qualification. A member who has not successfully completed any of the qualification could have a say in how the organisation is run.
- No We need persons with experience of legal life on the Board, all grades of members may not have been involved in the legal profession for any length of time to understand who is best placed to represent their needs.
- No We should not water down the integrity of F.CILEx and higher.

- No We still have a long way to go in terms of ensuring recognition amongst colleagues and the general public, and it is important to focus, and make sure we are on the same page. It is possible that some of the member categories (especially student ones) may have competing incentives when exercising their voting rights, which could undermine the integrity of the CILEx position.
- No When I was a Junior member of CILEX - I did not full understand the actions undertaken by a qualified lawyer, therefore I do not think it would be appropriate for junior members to vote on matters affecting qualified members.
- No Whilst learning the industry, shaping it shouldn't be a right.
- No X
- No Younger or Newer members (Affiliate to Student) I think need to have a minimum period of time before they unlock the right to vote. I am not adverse to the extension, but I feel as young CILEX Fellow changing career is always an option at a young age.

Do you agree that the CILEX President be appointed from an eligible pool comprising of Chartered members?

Response Please state reasons

Agree -

Agree -

Agree .

Agree a

Agree A broad pool is most appropriate.

Agree A Chartered member is best placed to fulfil the role given their first hand experience.

Agree A CILEX president who has trained within CILEx will be more beneficial to members as in theory, they will be more in touch with the membership.

Agree A member will appreciate the issues faced within the membership and quality worth protecting.

Agree A pool of certified professionals with common standards - it just makes sense, and provides a career path for those who want to hold such a position.

Agree Again because members are entitled to vote on what they are involved in.

Agree Again it is sensible and fair for this to be open to all members.

Agree Agree

Agree Agree. This will provide for a President with considerable experience of our profession.

Agree Agreed with reservations depending upon the question who defines the "eligible pool" and the criteria.

Any eligible member should be able to be nominated for President.

The President should be chosen from the membership , not just from a board member.

All members should be entitled to vote for the President.

Agree That said the President should be a Chartered Member

Agree Appointing from within the eligible pool accesses experience, knowledge and in-depth understanding on how the organisation benefits its members and the public

Agree as above

Agree As above

Agree As above

Agree As above

Agree As above.

Agree As long as the candidates have the legal qualifications, he/she can be appointed as CILEX President.

Because Chartered members have worked hard and passed their examinations and usually have a good track record of experience within their particular field of practice

Agree

Agree Because it needs to be someone who understands the world of Legal Executives.

Agree because of the importance of the |president knowing the role of CILEX

Agree Because the role requires experience and knowledge of the profession

Because there are some very experienced and knowledgeable paralegals with years of experience who would be suitable for the position -

Agree again it is positive inclusion.

Agree Because they will know this issues facing us from personal experience

Agree

Because they would have a working understanding of the CILEx qualification process and better understanding on how it can be improved

Agree Best placed to do the role

Agree Best, because they have gone through the full process and value what they have.

Agree Better choices for all members of good candidates

Agree But only FCILEX Chartered members. Not if paralegals become Chartered. Again, this is a watering down of the professional status of FCILEX and would result in CILEX losing sight of it's main objective / purpose, which is to support Chartered Legal Executives. Everything else CILEX does to expand membership for income purposes should be viewed as an added extra and not a reason to water down the status of FCILEX within CILEX as an organisation.

Agree Chartered members are best placed to vote for their leader

Agree CILEX need to be represented from within its members

Agree CILEX President be appointed from an eligible pool comprising Chartered members

Agree CILEX President is a prestigious role and one that requires knowledge of our rules, regulations and procedures. This is best gained from hands-on experience gained through the member journey to becoming a Chartered member. Also, by restricting that role to Chartered members gives other members aspiration to achieve Chartered status if they wish to become involved in the Board and ultimately run for President.

Agree CILEX President needs to be fully aware of CILEX issues - only a Chartered CILEX will be able to do so.

Agree common sense

Agree Current system works well

Agree Don't know or haven't read enough about it, but this seems sensible.

Agree eligibility to this office should be reserved to Chartered members so as not to devalue the role.

Agree Ensures consistency within CILEX

Agree Experience counts

Agree experience counts for a lot.

Agree Experience of profession

Agree Fair.

Agree Fairer system

Agree Fairness

Agree Fairness

Agree Fairness

Agree Fine

Agree First hand experience of what it is to be a CILEx Lawyer

Agree Good idea

Agree Greater involvement of membership in democratic process

Agree How could anyone else carry out such a role competently

Agree I agree

Agree I agree that the CILEX President be appointed from an eligible pool comprising of Chartered members

Agree I agree with this proposal cilex members are best in making decisions concerning their own affairs.

Agree I believe someone from within the chartered member is best placed to represent the interest of CILEX members and would know better than anyone coming from outside.

Agree

Agree I believe that a person that is already a CILEX member will be best suited to being President, rather than somebody that is not.

Agree I believe the CILEX president should be chosen from an experienced and qualified Legal Executive.

Agree I can't think of a reason why the President of CILEX should not be a Chartered member.

Agree

Agree I consider that only an experienced CILEX person has the necessary knowledge and skills to act as a figurehead for our organisation.

Agree I do believe the person who is President should be someone who has completed their CILEx studies and gained Chartered status. That way they know the process from start to finish and have a good understanding of it.

Agree I don't see what other option there could be

Agree

Agree I think CILEx's President should be one of CILEX's own. As a leader and poster face of the CILEx brand & image it is vital they identify as CILEx with the core CILEx values and ethos which derives significantly by one's socialisation and influence and experience.

Agree I think it is important that the Cilex President has the knowledge and experience that comes from being chartered and from completing the full the qualification journey. Unqualified members will only have a degree of this experience. It would be weird for Cilex to be represented by an unqualified person.

Agree I think that the President needs to have a certain level of experience to be in a position to fully understand the challenges members may face and to be able to represent their members efficiently.

Agree I think this is fairly self evident - members will want their president to be 'one of their own' and have trodden the full path as a Chartered Lawyer.

Agree I think this is important as only someone that has gone through CILEX qualification is in the unique position to understand the process and what affects CILEX members.

Agree I think this is still important to ensure that the President is able to have the most impact.

Agree If a member has achieved chartership, they have been reviewed and approved as a fully fledged member of the profession and should be entitled to apply to join its governance.

Agree If the individual is a Chartered member of the Institute then he/she has earned the right to become President

Agree If they are representing us they should be one of us

Agree In order to fully understand the needs of CILEx members, how to represent them, and how to facilitate change for the better, the CILEx President must have gone through all levels of qualification first.

Agree In order to provide equality of opportunity and representation across the membership

Agree Increases recognition and enhanced career development for paralegals

Agree It encourages wide participation and inclusiveness

Agree It is a case of the best candidate for the role irrespective of their position.

Agree It is essential that the President is a practising CILEx member, has personal knowledge of the qualification route and has a good few years of experience actually doing the job.

Agree It is important for the leader of the organisation to come from the very top echelons of the organisation.

Agree It is important the the President reflects the group that he/she represents. Chartered members understand the needs and aims of the membership.

Agree It is important to have the right person.

Agree It makes sense

Agree It makes sense for the head of the organisation to be a member, familiar with the challenges and benefits we all face

Agree

Agree It seems fair that those who have been members for some time and who have committed to qualifying should form the selection pool.

Agree It seems like the most equitable approach.

Agree

Agree It should be someone who has the interest of CILEx and its members at its heart ; and so a Chartered member should have that

Agree It was not easy for me to find structured information about the role and responsibilities of the CILEX President, so I am having to err on the side of caution.

Agree It will give an adequate representation by the chartered lawyer

Agree It would not make sense for the president not to be a member

Agree It's fair

Agree It's fair

Agree

Agree It's appropriate that the CILEX President should be appointed from its Chartered members, who understand the institute and how it works.

Agree Knowledge and experience important

Agree Leading and serving the CILEX board and its members is an excellent opportunity for the member.

Agree Level of experience is important for this role

Agree Logical proposal

Agree Maintain the status quo it has worked for many years

Agree makes sense

Agree Makes sense

May or belong to all right full of learn
Maybe or be in long proved right
Maybe or belong through worth or ported interests.
Agender

- Agree Right
- Agree Members understand the interests of the profession best.
- Agree Merit based is good practice
- Agree More checks...more scrutiny.
- Agree More choice
- Agree More diversity established
- Agree More inclusive.
- Agree More professional
- Agree Most democratic route
- Agree N.a
- Agree N/A
- Agree N/A
- Agree no
- Agree No objection to
- Agree No objections
- Agree Only a Chartered Legal Executive can understand the issues Chartered Legal Executives face
- Agree Only CILEX members understand the issues that face CILEX members so the eligible pool should be from within.
- Agree Panel will be more diverse.
- Agree Paralegals are now part of CILEx so they should have equal rights.
- Agree People other than Fellows may bring different experiences and view points, which could benefit every member.
- Agree personal experience within the CILEx profession
- Agree Probably better placed to deal with those who are the contemporaries in other organisations. Understanding the process.
- Agree Reasonable.
- Agree Same answer as above
- Agree Same as above - eligible will have experience and knowledge who to appoint
- Agree Seems sensible.
- Agree Self explanatory
- Agree She/he needs the right expertise to do the job.
- Agree Should be a fellow
- Agree Should be a fellow of CILEX only
- Agree Should be Fellow
- Agree Should be someone who understands CILEX
- Agree should understand cilex
- Agree Slightly pointless having a president from elsewhere
- Agree Someone who has been through the system know the problems
- Agree sufficiently experienced
- Agree That person is more likely to represent Chartered members better.
- Agree The best person for the role is someone with direct experience.
- Agree The best rise to the top. Judge those eligible on their skills, not their level of membership.
- Agree The Chartered members have attained qualification and worked as CLE's / Chartered Lawyers and therefore have direct understanding of challenges and issues faced.
- Agree The CILEX President should be a Chartered Member of CILEX.
- Agree The elected president should be able to appoint their own Team
- Agree The law society has a President.
- Agree The more senior of the CILEx members should have an opportunity to sit on the board and bring their experience and wisdom to the position
- Agree The most experiences members should be eligible for president.
- Agree The most important thing is that the president is the right person for the position it should not be restricted unnecessarily
- Agree The Posts of Pres & vice pres should be fully qualifieds
- Agree The President must be CILEx Qualified in my opinion, so that they have direct experience of the members which they represent and are in touch with day-to-day "in the trenches" issues/experiences of a CLE/Cilex Lawyer.
- Agree The President represents the public face of the Institute so should be drawn from Chartered Members only
- Agree The President should be a fully qualified member.
- Agree The President should be a person who has been through the full CILEX cycle and can therefore speak with experience.
- Agree The President should be someone that has the experience as well as the training in all aspects of the Profession.
- Agree The president should be someone who is a Chartered Legal Exec to represent the members
- Agree The president should come from the pool of the members they lead
- Agree The president should have an understanding of Cilex processes.
- Agree The qualification and expertise should be known for the role but its important that as a member, they're also working to progress and empower the membership that they are also part of.
- Agree The question does not exclude other persons such as leaders in education or members/former member of the judiciary. The introduction of the word "only" before "Chartered" would have clarified the matter.
- Agree The status of the role requires specific eligibility criteria based on specialism and experience
- Agree These people will best know the core values.
- Agree They are more likely to understand the issues effecting members.
- Agree They have earned their place as a lawyer. CLE are aware of the pressures and work involved to become a lawyer and would make an excellent president to represent those that are still studying. This is important when requesting change.

Agree They have proved commitment and Capability

Agree They know best who is needed to represent them.

Agree they should be a member and understand the difficulties faced by members

Agree They should be chartered.

Agree They should be seen as credible by their peers.

Agree They understand the process and what it takes to do these courses

Agree They will be able to identify what the qualities would need to be.

Agree They will have a good insight into the organisation.

Agree They will have a greater understanding of what CILEX members want

Agree They will have an understanding of CILEX members/grades and would be able to represent us.

Agree This allows the best cross section of representation.

Agree This is a fair approach.

Agree This is a hugely important role. The President represents the organisation and needs to be well informed and be carefully appointed.

Agree This is because it will bring benefits to someone who is already a recognised member of the Cilex community.

Agree This is more democratic

Agree This needs someone who has travelled the path all the way to the top, so they can relate to all members.

Agree This needs to be extended to apply to all members of ILEX as currently it does not reflect all areas.

Agree This opens up the position to a wide selection of members. Which encourages a greater selection pool.

Agree This will ensure that whoever is appointed truly understands matters from a CILEX member perspective.

Agree This will give adequate representation

Agree This would allow representation of all backgrounds and would allow for members to consider the appointment

Agree This would be fair

Agree This would seem sensible.

Agree This would seem the best course of action.

Agree To actively promote diversity and equality

Agree To ensure the correct person is appointed.

Agree To maintain the reputation of CILEX

Agree To not allow this is surely discrimination?

Agree To understand the role of a CILEX Fellow

Agree We should be able to appoint our president as chartered members.

Agree We should be represented by one of our own

Agree Why not

Agree Will have more knowledge of how the cilex process works.

Agree Will help to keep CILEX independent and address the needs of its members.

Agree Will open representation to a wider pool but still limit to chartered members so those with high level of knowledge and skills.

Agree Yes as the key question is that of ability and suitability.

Agree Yes as they should in theory have the best interests of the CILEX family at the forefront of their presidency

Agree Yes as this would mean that an active member would be reflected from the top.

Agree Yes I agree, appointing the CILEX President from an eligible pool consisting of Chartered members will ensure the high standard of focused regulatory services will be maintained, through a profound knowledge of the existing challenges and opportunities faced by current members.

Agree Yes, because such members ought to know and have a great sense of the value of what it takes to qualify as a Coilex professional.

Agree Yes, because they've got the knowledge and experience to support their appointment

Agree Yes, this increases diversity and brings in a larger pool of ideas which will benefit CILEX and its members.

Agree Президентом Cilex может быть каждый дипломированный членов ,но с учетом его опыта и знания .

Potential for Conflicting Interests: With a wider pool of eligible candidates for the President position, there could be concerns about conflicts of interest or political maneuvering within the organization. Some may worry that the election process for President could become more contentious.

Impact on Organizational Direction: Allowing members at various levels to participate in policy work and decision-making could lead to shifts in the organization's priorities and direction. Some members may fear that this could disrupt the existing mission and focus of CILEX.

Disagree

Disagree A paralegal can't represent CILEX within judiciary & law Society / Bar

Disagree Although a Chartered member has the same experiences as the membership in general, my view is that someone with "external" eyes may help to bring something new to the membership.

Disagree As a Past President I was very concerned that the role of President was reduced as a result of the last governance review. I consider it essential that the President is a Fellow; has completed the relevant qualification and is an experienced lawyer.

Disagree CILEX President should be someone who is experienced in making strategic decisions. Legal education is not necessary for this.

Disagree CILEX President should be voted by Members from an eligible pool of Chartered Members

Disagree Devalues fellows

Disagree Fellowship Grade must be held in high regard and I believe the Fellows are better placed to move us forward.

Disagree He or she should be from any grade. We are all members of the same institute.

Disagree I am firmly of the view that only those who have completed their qualification should be eligible for President.

Disagree I cannot see a definition for "Chartered members" or terms of eligibility and therefore cannot agree.

Disagree I do not consider this is appropriate

Disagree I don't see any reason that the President should not be selected from any class of member, provided they have the requisite skills and experience.

Disagree I don't think this role should be open to anyone.

I once again believe the whole membership should have the right to vote for someone who is going to be determining their future albeit in part.

Disagree The old school tie syndrome and who one knows not what one knows has crept back into society hence why there have been many poor appointments

I think if fully qualified members my answer may be different but I do not want decisions in relation to my future made by non fully qualified members

Disagree

Disagree I think that it should only be open to the most senior grades (CILEX Lawyer)

Disagree I think this should be opened up to extend it to all members of CILEX, no matter what their grade or ranking of membership

Disagree I think this should be reserved for the most senior grade of members.

Disagree If an individual wishes to be entitled to such an appointment, then they should be sufficiently committed and motivated to qualify by academic examination in law.

Disagree It needs to be more open.

It should be open to all Fellows and balloted accordingly. CILEX is becoming increasingly disconnected from the Fellowship particularly in the regions.

Disagree

Disagree It should be open to any and all members. not just a select few, otherwise croneyism and Old Boy's Club allegations could happen.

Disagree It should not be restricted to the members only. someone not a CILEX member but be the better for members interest.

Disagree Maintain the status of Chartered Legal Executives.

Disagree More dumbing down.

Disagree Needs to be a FCILEX

Disagree No - for the reasons set out above. Fellows have a wider breadth of experience, have committed to the 'client care' elements of study and have a greater understanding of regulation.

Disagree No point in fellowship if paralegals are given same rights

No should be from Chartered legal Executives only as have achieved the professional level in organisation- open to all to achieve this but requires passing level 6/7 or equivalent exams- vital in my view to understand the profession.

Disagree

Disagree No, this should remain the preserve of Fellows of the Institute

Disagree Not necessarily

Disagree Only a fellow can represent fellows

Disagree President needs to be a duly authorised legal practitioner not necessarily an existing CILEX member

Disagree President should have to be a member of a regulated institute not necessarily CILEX

Disagree Should be a fellow

Disagree Should be a Fellow as most senior member

Disagree should be from ALL members

Disagree Should be open to all

Disagree The Cilex President should be appointed on a vote of the entire membership following a competition with profiles circulated for all members to form a view on fitness and appropriate experience to be appointed to President.

Disagree The CILEX president should only be a person who is an authorised person

Disagree The CILEX president should only be appointed from qualified members, ie: Fellows for the same reasons as previous.

Disagree The importance of finding the correct person for the role overrides a need to have a Chartered member presiding.

Disagree

The President should be able to represent all levels of our membership, including those who are qualified. While fellows can do this for students or other membership grades having once been them, other grades cannot represent fellows if they have not been one where issues which specifically affect qualified members arise or when collaborating with other membership bodies whose Presidents are vastly qualified. The President should be appointed only from Chartered Lawyers/Chartered Legal Executives. Improving the status of Legal Executives will not be enhanced by a Paralegal president. It looks bad for a start.

Disagree

Disagree The president should be qualified at the highest level

Disagree The president should be someone who wants the job, regardless of their qualification.

Disagree

Disagree The president should come from Fellows.

Disagree the President should only be a Chartered lawyer as they will have the real time experience of the struggle to become a fellow, advocate or practitioner.

The president's experience should not be limited to those who have gained CILEX membership. In my view the suggestion is short-sighted and will not help the CILEX grow and diversify, enabling to compete in an ever changing world of business. It may be better for the appointment to come from outside the professional altogether.

Disagree

The table of proposed grades is rather confusing as there is no grade included for current fellows who do not have practice rights. I feel as the leading representative of CILEX the president should be the equivalent of a current Fellow. I do not feel it appropriate for a paralegal or any other grade of member to be the president as I feel a person in that position should have undergone the process of becoming a lawyer to fully appreciate the role.

Disagree

Disagree This needs more information - what constitutes an "eligible pool" ? How is a Chartered Member appointed to the eligible pool?

This should be reserved only to CILEX Fellows. As above. CILEX Fellows have worked extremely hard over the preceding decades for our qualification to be taken seriously and for us to be deemed on a par with our solicitor colleagues. Watering down our organisation with non qualified individuals on professional boards is entirely counter-productive and once again makes other organisations, such as the law society etc, look at CILEX as an organisation related to paralegals not qualified lawyers. This is extremely detrimental for those of us who are Fellows and makes us want to leave CILEX and get cross qualified as solicitors as CILEX currently seems more focused on supporting those who are not qualified than those who are.

Disagree

Disagree Unnecessary as long as they have appropriate qualities/expertise.

We should not water down the integrity of F.CILEx and higher. Paralegals should not have chartered status. This undermines what CILEx have worked so hard for over the years. A president who is not at least F.CILEx simply would not have the level of understanding of the journey to qualification required to understand the strength of F.CILEx when looked at as a different entity to a Paralegal. It would lead to the

Disagree homogenisation of F.CILEx and undermine F.CILEx's professional standing.

Disagree Whilst someone being a Chartered member is likely to guarantee a certain amount of experience and understanding, there are also those that have taken more unexpected routes who can offer something valuable

Do you have any comments regarding equality issues that may arise from our proposals to amend our governance and constitution?

Response

-
.
a

Administrative Challenges: Expanding voting rights and representation to all member grades may bring administrative challenges in terms of managing the increased participation and ensuring a fair and efficient decision-making process.

Loss of Exclusivity: Critics might argue that by extending these rights and opportunities to all member grades, CILEX risks losing the exclusivity and prestige associated with being a Fellow.

Incentive for Advancement: There may be concerns that removing certain privileges or distinctions for Fellows could reduce the incentive for members to strive for higher grades and qualifications within the organization.

All are equal

Anything affecting the status of existing members or Fellows cannot be good for CILEX. It is important to protect this route into law for those of us from non privileged backgrounds. If CILEX wishes it's membership to continue their support they need to look after that membership particularly those that do not attend University.

As above. I think that the proposals are a significant backwards step.

As stated above, CILEX members provide excellent services to the Legal sector and we need to be represented across board and regulated by the SRA like Solicitors. We almost do similar work and in some cases we have more hands on experience due to our rigorous training.

CILEX lawyers may become inferior and regarded as second class lawyers.

CILEX members are already classed as "lower" than Solicitors so this might be a more positive step.

CILEX should be all about equality as that is the purpose of the organisation. We bring people to the legal profession would otherwise not be able to practice

concern that the hard earned prestige of being a fellow may be eroded

Constantly changing our titles adds yet more confusion - please stop this. It's expensive for firms to keep changing business cards and offers no continuity.

Equality and fairness is important.

Equality and woke issues should not be allowed to dominate the purpose of CILEX.

Equality is a Marxist dogma. Any governance should be made on competency only.

Equality is essential but this must be balanced by the importance of not diluting the qualification/s and the view of CILEX individuals. We have fought this throughout my membership and this is key for CILEX lawyers future. They must be recognised as equals in the legal community

Equality must mean equality.

Equality should mean diversity of thought not allowable groupthink.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) should be a constant consideration in the appointment of officials. One of the best features of CILEX is the ability to improve social mobility for those from underrepresented and low-income backgrounds. The appointment of officials should champion EDI and represent the diversity of its members well.

Everyone should be treated fairly regardless of route for qualifying

Good to see fairer representation

Greater allowance should be made for disability and its effect on employment.

Have concerns about the transfer to the SRA. This is utter madness.

How do you propose that the SRA are going to make equality better in the profession when it is some solicitors who indeed are the ones causing issues of equality. We do not want to be seen as equal

I am concerned about the impact that the CPQ seems to have had on equal opportunities for Chartered Legal Executives. This has caused much confusion for CILEX members and no doubt members of the public.

I am concerned regarding how this will affect those that will remain as Chartered Legal Executives because they are unable (or do not want to) do the further qualification necessary to become a Cilex Lawyer. In my employment it is simply not possible to achieve this qualification as there are no opportunities for advocacy. It already feels like those who remain a Chartered Legal Executive are going to be left behind and be ignored because of the revised scheme.

I am concerned that my hard earned qualification is being eroded and downgraded by the proper changes. As a Fellow I am not overly impressed with the rhetoric on practice rights.

I am for the proposals and agree with the reasons cited for the potential change in governance. Provided that the SRA is on board with promoting the parity between suitably qualified Chartered members and Solicitors (and it is important that they are), I believe the change in governance will serve to simply the respective standings of a Chartered Lawyer and Solicitor to the public.

I am worried about the equality issues that will arise if we become regulated by the SRA. The idea seems mad. I don't know many Solicitors who understand the CILEX qualification nor do I know many Solicitors who see CILEX members as 'equals'. I would call for CILEX and CILEX Regulation to demonstrate their own principles of conduct and resolve their differences before a bad decision is forced through which we may all regret in the future. The word 'Brexitee' comes to mind!

i believe it will reduce inequality and some law firms not even giving Cilex titles and instead calling them solicitors

I believe the constant need for equality reduces practicalities .

I cannot see why this is relevant,

I do not agree that the proposed changes will have the impact on consumers as stated in the consultation; if that were to happen it would have happened already and it hasn't. The narrative of the proposal repeats what has been said by CILEX for the past few years; however, they have done nothing to put into their words into practice therefore I have no confidence that the proposals will create change, either as stated or at all.

I do not have confidence in another governing body understanding, respecting or protecting us or our values

I do not really understand the question.

I dont agree with suggestions but I think that equality issues are provided for already in CILEX- it is an open forum for all to progress- if they work hard enough and succeed.

I don't think that we should change to be chartered lawyers. Lawyers is a term that is used by every person who is unqualified and I think it will devalue our qualification.

I fear CILEX members will lose their voice

I feel there should be a weighting based on the number of people at a set grade when election is due to ensure each grade are properly represented when decisions are made.

I find it disgraceful that CILEX has ridden roughshod over the qualifications of Associate members, downgrading them to Paralegal status (which historically means someone without legal qualifications). Furthermore as a Fellow of the Institute of Paralegals my professional status appears to have also disappeared thanks to CILEX.

I have concerns that the SRA may impose further requirements for already CILEX-qualified lawyers which may affect our ability to practise. i think it is good to constantly review regulations to ensure they are not outdated and they are effective in gaining non-basis, well-rounded views

I think it would be a mistake to "get into bed" with the SRA and we should embrace our uniqueness and not be lumped in with solicitors. I think that will signal the end to CILEX

I think there is a risk of downgrading of fellows and not confident in the changes of titles.

I trust the Institute will always look to equality and, no doubt, this forms the foundation of the Institutes ethos.

I worry about Fellows like me who no longer work in private practice, who do not work for regulated firms and who have developed their careers away from the specialism into which they qualified. For example, I qualified with a specialism in Litigation, but now I work in-house for a charity and have a whole different specialist skill set. I do not feel that CILEx represents my interests or hears my voice.

If anything it will broaden participation so resolves issues which may currently exist.

If it isnt broke...

If the changes to the regulator go ahead, I think it is imperative that the widest pool is able to participate so that any issues that arise can be properly voiced and dealt with.

If the SRA governance will means parity between CILEX Lawyers and Solicitors then I am for this. I am often faced with ignorance, even from my employer.

In my view adequate consultation should be carried out.

It is important to be proactive in supporting that diversity in the profession increases.

It would create parity with solicitors

Maintain the status of Chartered Legal Executives.

Maybe explain them in this form and I would know about them.

My biggest concern continues to be the proposals reference changing regulation to the SRA. I am concerned it will further the divide between CILEX and Solicitors. I also feel the current approach taken by CILEX is making those members who are engaging with the process feel disrespected and not listened to, we show our views on the proposals made and that a large majority are against the proposals and CILEX seemingly ignore those views and proceed anyway.

My concerns with CILEX are with the constant changes to the titles of CILEX members and qualified lawyers which are confusing both to lawyers and public. There is in my opinion confusion between qualified lawyers and students as the distinction is not made clear. We were once called, Fellows - fine. Then Chartered Legal Executives - fine. But now the latest proposal includes various titles and can't keep up with. For example 'Chartered Paralegal' which is just very misleading as to whether they are qualified lawyer or not.

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/a

Needs hierarchy

Nil

Nil

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

None at present.

None at the moment

None come to mind, the proposals seem fair and reasonable.

None identified as long as we fulfill and meet current equality and diversity legislation

None other than above

None that I have seen to date

None.

None.

None.

None. CILEx (formerly ILEX) has always been an inclusive organisation with equality of opportunity for all who wish to join and obtain a valuable and valued legal qualification.

Not at the moment

Only that I hope you are going to provide equitable qualification routes for older Associates who cannot benefit from modern routes available but have effectively and technically been apprentices working under required supervision for decades.

Only the the practice of law has long been fiercely guarded by an over whelming majority of white men, consciously or not, which has meant that talent of all different descriptions has struggled to emerge, be nurtured and encouraged to progress to senior levels. Let's not fall into the trap of being too prescriptive about what we all envision as the ideal governance and leadership as we inevitably recruit in our own image. A wide diversity of people who are able to succeed, without being expected to emulate the "traditional" lawyer is essential to develop a profession that is as diverse as the population it serves.

Please stop pushing identity politics agendas.

Plenty, and this space is too small to list all of the issues. The constitution needs major reforms, it is seriously out of date.

Power pointed hand

Power pointed rights

Solutions

Interest

Detailed set of knowledge.

Require more information on this question - no comment

SRA and solicitors profession treating CILEX members as a lower status than solicitors. Better to stay separate where CILEX is recognised and respected by its peers and regulatory body.

SRA I feel are not the right department to take over a stand alone institute.

Step into the right direction. Thank you for taking our views into consideration and acting upon them.

Surely this will improve equality

The change from an elected Council to an appointed board has resulted in a narrow minded arrogant viewpoint and if not contempt for the membership, certainly a "we know better" approach.

The board appoints members in its own image and lacks the breath of opinion that the elected Council brought to the organisation.

The cancellation of the branch network and of regional officers has diluted the historic link between members and the Institute that was for so long the hallmark of the institute.

The Institute is now autocratic and remote.

Its membership may be diverse and even equal but CILEX is no longer the welcoming and inclusive organisation that it was.

The cost element of having to undertake additional training/ exams to reach the required qualifications of place of work. Those unable to afford this are more likely to be impacted.

The current inequality issues may not be addressed, which include the level of discrimination currently faced by CILEX fellows in the legal profession. There is currently lack of knowledge when you tell law firms and practising lawyers that you are undertaking the CPQ. Currently Women, those from ethnic minorities have a fairer chance of qualification through the CILEX route.

The law is very clear on equality issues. What is lacking, there's still discrimination against women and ethnic minorities within the legal profession, just like other professional bodies. It's therefore important for CILEX to abide with the Equality Acts of Parliament.

The proposed amendments undermine what has already been achieved and the adoption confirms that the existing qualification is just "not good enough". In my past experience of managing both Legal Executives and Solicitors there are excellent in both current qualifications and equally poor in both. I have encountered very intelligent qualified lawyers who cannot "do the job in practice"

I believe this will create a two tier system where those from poorer economic backgrounds who currently achieve the existing qualification are are excellent practising lawyers will be regarded as inferior to the top tier.

There is already a serious equality issue within CILEX in view of the preponderance of women.

there needs to be equality between CILEx and SRA members

This shouldn't be an issue if you make it a priority to ensure that equality and diversity are at the heart of every decision. My view has always been that Cilex is there to challenge the historical, fundamental lack of equality and diversity at the heart of the English legal system.

We have always been proud to stand apart and have the ability for all walks of life to have access to becoming qualified. The solicitor route and SRA gave an non equality

We will be more equal to solicitors.

Whilst I agree voting etc should include all members, I do not agree with a move to be regulated by the SRA, the equality issues that will arise from that is a worry. This is being sold to members as a way to make things equal between CLE's and Solicitors but I only see CLE's disappearing in a cloud of solicitors who already don't consider us equal.

Whilst I believe in meritocracy, I also believe those that are massively unrepresented in law (non-white people, women etc) should be given a better chance. We can only create a more diverse and proportionally represented society if those in higher positions can be seen by the marginalised people they represent.

Whilst it is reasonable to say that one has to ensure equal opportunities, there has to be a realistic point that the purpose of CILEX was to provide another route to become an authorised lawyer. To extend as CILEX suggests removes the entire purpose of CILEX

Will the CPD requirements keep the same?

Yes

Yes

Yes - all appointment processes should be transparent and communicated to the membership.

Yes - I am a fellow chartered legal executive and I still have to explain the difference between paralegals and CILEX to people so this will only be a further step back

Yes - serious concerns that the SRA will dumb down the roles provided by CILEX and further many reservations which have to not been addressed at all

Yes - The disparity between Chartered legal executives/lawyers and solicitors still exist. I do not see this being addressed in the the new proposals. This is troubling as the only reason I did not pursue the LPC and solicitor route after my undergraduate law degree was the fact I had no family financial support and the apprenticeship route was the only way forward. As such, it seems unjust that i should now be affected financially due to lack of recognition or even stigma surrounding the Chartered route.

Yes I believe Cilex should be regulated by Cilex.

Yes, diversity is at the heart of Cilex. It's always been the most diverse branch of the profession. The proposal, especially around regulation, risk destroying the heart and soul of Cilex

Yes, most Solicitors are paid considerably more and have more resources available to them. CILEX has always supported those with academic ability who have not sat within the elite affordability to qualify, and therefore it follows that this is likely to reduce social mobility and equality to qualify

Yes, the suggestion that current, highly experienced, Chartered Legal Executives will remain unable to qualify for practice rights and thereby progress further, as they do not currently conduct advocacy (but did many years ago), is discriminatory against both age and experience.

Yes. F.CILEx would lose what they have struggled to achieve regarding professional standing and would not longer be treated or viewed on an equality basis with solicitors (as F.CILEx currently are by the industry, if not by CILEx itself).

Yes. I am concerned the proposals will see a Double-Headed Solicitors Regulation Authority as the Body of a regulatory dragon with two new Legal Professional Brands being the Law Society (Solicitors) and CILEx (Legal Executives). I am concerned CILEx Regulation will be a regulating body without a head and thus concerned about the job security at CILEx Regulation and if you take this proposal to it's extreme then ultimately there is concern for all smaller regulatory bodies including the Bar Standard Board given this sets the train in motion for a mega regulator law society similar to those run across the pond and on other sides of the world.

I am also concerned that should the Law Society receive two heads in which both heads instead of running symbolically will compete for supremacy with each other like that of two Houses of Parliament in the Palace of Westminster competing for the Prime Minister if both were entirely elected Houses.

This would send the wrong message to consumers because Legal Regulators whether as Heads or Bodies are designed to promote one message and one mandate "To

Protect the consumer in England & Wales in the provision of legal services particularly reserved legal activities" NOT compete with each other for supremacy but work together and fill various gaps and discrepancies in the legal market

Yes. I don't like the term paralegal, since it degrades the expertise of the ACILex members. Jurist or Legal advisor, for ACILex members with an LLM degree is better. I, e.g., have an LLM degree and I focus on international business. I have right of audience at the Court of Arbitration Astana International Financial Centre, a Common law jurisdiction. It is strange to designate me as a paralegal.

You will be allowing unqualified members into a governance position. No other regulator would do this. Isn't this just a woke ideal which will dumb down the importance of CILEx as a profession.

Your proposed titles are too confusing for me, never mind the public! If the intention is to create equality, then we should all have the same title and become solicitors. As anyone with a degree, not just a lwe degree, can now undertake the SQE and qualify as a solicitor, those people would have less knowledge and understanding of law than CILEx Lawyers but still have less hoops to jump through to qualify as a solicitor. The real issue is route of qualification, with non-degree holders being seen as less. This is what needs to change. If you must change title, just make it lawyer for everyone. Your proposals are perpetuating the inequality.

Имея опыт в генеалогическом расследовании с 2004 года, я пришел к выводу что некоторые статьи в управлении и навыков в юриспруденции надо немножко скорректировать . Я имею ввиду что ,а именно:

- 1.наследство можит получить близкий родственник ,а не дальний родственник.
- 2.компании не реагируют на поступившие обращения от клиентов;
- 3.грубость со стороны сотрудников компании не приводит к положительным результатам;
- 4.некачественно и не углубленно проводится поисковая работа среди компаний(например : hoopers, fraser&frazer,);
- 5.есть факт подделки документов ,а компании не реагируют на вопиющий факт;

Do you agree the proposed new membership structure is simpler and provides a clear progression route to Chartered status?

Response Please state reasons

Agree -

Agree .

Agree .

Agree A better reflection of the membership

Agree A much better set up with clear roles that will make more sense to consumers, plus provides clear progression.

Agree Again - there is only a choice of 2 answers to this - but I don't really know and I think time will tell. On the whole, the changes that have taken place over recent decades have become confusing to those of us who are busy in our careers and not fully engaged with Cilex Governance. So to the general public will be even more of a mystery. The system needs to settle down, long term, to have a chance to gain traction in the legal career framework and particularly in public awareness.

Agree Agree

Agree agreed

Agree Anything to simplify this is progress

Agree As rightly stated, the consumers often are not sure what designation to apply to chartered Legal Executive. Therefore, it will be adequate for the status to change to Chartered lawyer.

Agree As somebody who is doing foundation CPQ with a goal of completing all of the levels, I would be pleased if it could be recognised that I am studying to become a Lawyer in addition to my Paralegal role. Students on the SQE are labelled as "Trainee Solicitors" so I think it is only fair that we get to do the same.

Agree As stated above, the current system is unfair and unequitable towards older ILEX Associates. I hope to see something done about that such as accepting references from old employers, clients and colleagues. It is depressing watching apprentices pass me by in seniority, status and salary for all these years yet be told by CILEx my only route is to sit my last 2 exams.

Agree Being called a Lawyer is more recognisable than legal executive.

Agree Better assessment method.

Agree Can only be for the best.

Agree Chartered Lawyer, as a title, should replace Chartered Legal Executive, including for reserved work.

Agree Clear and easy for the public and other professionals to understand

Agree clear membership is required

Agree Clearer parameters.

Agree Clients do not understand the CLE title. Earlier in my career, I was often asked if I could carry out the work they were instructing or, sidelined by clients who wanted to speak to a solicitor. I no longer use CLE as my title being an Associate at my firm. Most clients understand what a lawyer is, designated fellows as Chartered "x" Lawyer is clearer to clients what we do and will help market our services.

Agree Easier for the public to understand

Agree Essential to ensure new and existing members can identify the membership structure adequately

Agree Fully support

Agree greater possibilities and choices for studying at various levels to suit the needs of the person

Agree Greater uniformity

Agree Having clearly identified simple structures would assist new applicants and existing members on current statuses. However the employment competency requires reviewing and changing. Even though now you have to show 2,300 you still have to prove your eligibility in accordance to the 27 criteria's which is not always possible. It's disappointing that after graduating you find yourself stuck as you cannot prove your work. Almost like it becomes redundant and difficult to justify to your employers who will clearly make less money if a paralegal work on the matter instead of a qualified lawyer/ solicitor.

Agree I agree but I must say the very public spat between CILEX and Cilex Regulation was not reassuring at all.

Agree I agree it's clearer

Agree I agree that it is simpler but it also means that those studying to be a Cilex Lawyer who have completed foundation stage and have not yet completed advanced stage are not recognised as they currently are with the two stages: paralegal and advanced paralegal.

Agree I agree with this proposal

Agree I believe Cilex members are over looked, forgotten about or even looked down upon for not attending university. A Chartered status will give us a higher platform

Agree I believe it does appear to streamline the process and could potentially make it easier to progress, although it remains to be seen

Agree I found it easy to understand which in turn should make it easier to explain to others thus resulting in increased recognition.

Agree I have not analysed this but it appears so

Agree I think it is more professional , Paralegals will be chartered, showing that we have a qualification.

Agree I very much agree and the step back from CILEX Advance Paralegal to Trainee Lawyer is welcome.

Agree I was messed around for years whilst qualifying.

Agree In the public eye, it is currently too distant from a parity with solicitors.

Agree increases recognition and enhances career progression with a clear route

Agree Information is clear

Agree It appears logical and fair giving opportunity

Agree It does

Agree It does provide a very clear progression route.

Agree It is back to what it was when I qualified. Student - trainee - qualified. Had to Google legal technologist!
It is clearer for the public and will finally enable us to move away from a title including the word "Executive" which does not mean anything. 'Lawyer' and 'Paralegal' communicates to the public and employers what we are and our level of qualification.

Agree It is helpful for the profession and the public

Agree it is important to have the progression route clear both from members point of view and the public, so everyone can understand their options of pursuing a career with CILEX

Agree It is more straightforward

Agree It is much more inclusive for those who decide to end their journey at paralegal level

Agree It is self explanatory

Agree It is very easy to follow and understand

Agree It may give consumer a clear and easy idea.

Agree It provides clarity for clients and consumers.

Agree It recognises people with academic degrees such as LLB and GDL/CPE.
It simplifies and clarifies the title.

I was not allowed to use my professional title as it had confused the board of executive directors and other senior managers.

Agree Simplification of the name and getting rid of 'executive' will be very helpful.

Agree It will be less confusing for those not familiar with the current arrangement.

Agree It will be much better making it clearer for all to understand as the way things are currently causes a great deal of confusion.

Agree It will hopefully make it easier for the general public to understand who and what the professional grades are.

Agree It will more closely align with other professions and will potentially increase the gravitas of the members.

Agree It will put to rest any confusion

Agree It would be fair.

Agree It's simpler

Agree Maintain the status of Chartered Legal Executives.

Agree Membership tiers are more clearly outlines.

Agree More open process

Agree Much simpler umbrella terms to cover the diverse range of experience and roles

Agree Na

Agree Na

Agree no choice to abstain - I neither agree or disagree as only time will tell

Agree no reason

Agree Not entirely sure about this.

Agree Not sure

Agree Probably - there seems to be mass confusion at the moment so anything that makes the structure simpler can only be a good thing.

Agree Providing members comply with the rules

Agree Recognition at all levels beneficial

Agree Regardless of whether a member is CILEX or SRA qualified, law is law. Indeed, having passed the core subjects in law, what matters is the foundation of law and not electives courses. If a lawyer wants to practice family law or construction law, that is fine. You don't need all the different areas of law, to be the best lawyer. Hence, the different routes doesn't mean one is better than the other.

Agree Seems reasonable.

Agree Simpler

Agree The current structure with numerous membership grades is confusing. The table in the consultation is clear and easy to understand.

Agree The distinction between Fellow and CILEX lawyer is removed.

Agree The existing membership structure is ok and functional

Agree The inclusion of professional experience is long overdue and welcomed. As a technologist myself I am please to see the inclusion of this role.

Agree The membership structure has been a bit hard to understand at times so any simplification is welcome.

Agree The membership structure will enable people to see where they are heading rather than the uncertainty and confusion over titles and stages that they are at in their careers

Agree The multiple membership grades appeared confusing to members and to the profession. The implementation of 'advanced paralegal' grade did not land well with students on their way to CLE/CILEX Lawyer qualification. I feel this newly proposed, simplified progression route, clearly sets out the stage in a member's career and is easily understandable by those in the legal profession, other professions and the public.

Agree The new member knows from the outset what they are entering into and what is clearly required of them to progress to the next stage, to reach the final qualification stage.

Agree The new proposed membership structure would hopefully eliminate confusion from clients in terms of 'Paralegal/Solicitor/Chartered Legal Executive'. The proposed 'Chartered Paralegal' and 'Chartered Lawyer' will be more widely understood titles.

Agree The new route will make it easier for new qualified members getting practice rights.

Agree The new structure is simple and appropriate.

Agree The path to qualification appears to be clear.

Agree The previous structure has always been complicated to navigate and often puts people off considering CILEX as a career path

Agree The progression makes sense. However there should be a clear path from the Paralegal route into Chartered Lawyer route. Also the infographic on Page 6 of the CILEX presentation suggests equality between a Chartered Lawyer and a Chartered Paralegal, that must be avoided. If there is to be public trust and confidence then Chartered Lawyer should be the only position highlighted and enhanced.

Agree The progression viewed from within is fine but to a third party/client it is still somewhat of a mystery.

Agree The proposed new membership structure is more straightforward and provides a clear progression route.

Agree The proposed structure does seem simple and straightforward. Even more so than previously however simplifying structures must be allowed to come with compromises to high standards and quality assurances.

Agree The structure needs to provide a clear pathway which the new structure will provide for both law students and paralegals

Agree There is currently lack of knowledge when you tell law firms and practising lawyers that you are undertaking the CPQ or you are a qualified FCILEX.

Agree Think more clear clarification of the structure is needed

Agree This is along the lines of a Chartered Surveyor etc, to show that you have obtained the necessary training and qualifications to specialise in that job.

Agree This is also not a "Yes" No" answer. The system has changed significantly since I qualified & frankly, I am not sure what is what any more. If it is obvious that a member has acquired Fellowship status and the appropriate rights (for say reserved activities) then yes, this should be identifiable and provided with a designated name.

Agree If there are just the additions of different levels to make it "worthwhile" this is nonsense - there is no equivalency as a Solicitor.

Agree This is such a great proposal that will enable many Cilex members and students to get qualified in their respective chartered fields of law.

Agree This makes sense to me and I hope will remove further mystery about who and what we are

Agree This will be of benefit moving forward.

Agree This will provide for a clearer career ladder and simplifies the whole process.

Agree This will undoubtedly help the ambition of members in identifying a clear career route.

Agree titles are easier for the layman to understand

Agree Transparency and clarity needs is key to employers and recruiters understanding our value

Agree Well explained in the guidance.

Agree Yes but it is a shame it came to late for me as I felt, along with many other fellows, let down to the point that older qualifying fellows were not looked after and I changed regulator to the CLC

Agree Yes but should be called lawyers on quailfying rather then fellows...to many different terms.

Agree .

Agree Yes everyone develops at different stages of their lives and a clear progression path as now proposed makes this easier

Agree Yes however the technician section seems unnecessary

Agree yes its very clear on the qualification is required for each grade.

Yes on

Ys on all points

Yes, all points

Yes but all on the points

Yes! backed points

Agree Yes! Stated

Agree Yes the new structure is clear on how to progress.

Agree Yes, I feel this has been lacking over the last few years. I qualified as FCILEX in March 2017 and there have been numerous changes since then, and I find the current approach quite confusing especially the route to qualification

Agree Yes, it is a shame it did not happen sooner!

Disagree *

Disagree .

Disagree 4 levels are not simpler and I suspect meaningless to those outside the law and I see no reason for two levels of FCILEx and professional titles- that is simply confusing. Chartered Legal Executive is the correct title for both at top level- why add more confusing differences to those outside Cilex??

Disagree a

Disagree A key role of CILEX is to promote the professionalism of its members. Unfortunately it seems that member titles change over time. The danger is that any gains in communicating to the public (and to employers!) what each title means and convincing them that the person is capable of dealing with tasks assigned to them is lost when job titles then change.

Absolutely not. I found it interesting and yet somewhat disturbing that even at our graduation ceremony on Saturday this week the president in her speech said that she set out on the CILEx route because it meant should could do and achieve everything she wanted to. She then went on to promote the further advance practice rights that need to be acquired and what it would/could mean for those who obtained them. I would like to say that I found the president engaging, inspiring and very personable, but I cannot agree or support the idea that the most recent round of changes (having seen many over the years) present, especially where many of us, just like the president, started out and have worked very long and very hard to achieve experience and senior positions in teams and firms, to have to prove ourselves even further and yet again to get to the same level as solicitors/be 'recognised' for things like Land Registry work and to continue the fight for equality amongst professionals, is worthwhile. None of this is what was promoted or advertised to me when starting out, and I expect to join many others I know, including some at senior partner level, who are now leaving CILEx and joining CLC and/or the SRA in order to continue their work, for regulators that see and appreciate the hard work and ability that we have already demonstrated. This is all very disappointing at an already uncertain time. The further time, expense and 'self-congratulation' is simply not worth the further burden and heartache that is being ased for, and this must be urgently addressed and a decent explanation given, as well as re-structuring or removal of these rights, and change to the qualifications already awarded, before there is no body and no membership left to be regulated, by whoever wishes to have it.

Disagree Adds a layer of confusion

Disagree All a little confusing already and adding more will confuse matters more. Cole's should remain as Cilex and just promote themselves more as a regulator. Clients just want a competent lawyer and do not care what the title is or who they are regulated by so long as they get a good service.

Disagree Ambiguity around Trainee lawyer. Is there a need for a chartered paralegal?

Disagree As someone who is not in private practice - I now find I am not sure where I stand within CILEx. Quite stressful to think all my hard work over the years may be for nothing.

Disagree CILEX and the SRA have not disclosed how current Fellows will be able obtain Practice Rights - this creates uncertainty for those who have been qualified a long time. The worry is that the SRA will make it more difficult in order to push potential CLE's to do the SQE instead, leading to less diversity in the legal world.

CILEx grades (GCILEx to MCILEx) have already been changes recently. This was and is wholly unpopular with the majority of graduates who see MCILEx as a backwards step. Introducing yet more confusing titles is not helpful to those looking to move into the profession, or for consumers who will have yet more titles to try to understand.

Disagree CILEx seems to be more complicated

Disagree Confusing

Disagree Downgrading Fellows from lawyers

Disagree Fine as it is, you are just complicating it by adding new titles

Disagree Frankly, it is an absolute mish-mash. It confuses me, let alone the general public.

Generally it is OK, but there is a specific element that I find very confusing.

I had always understood that there were three types of lawyer: Barristers, Solicitors and Chartered Legal Executives. When I was trying to explain to people what I was doing / studying, I would always say this and explain that I'm going to be the third type of lawyer that you've never heard of.

Disagree Will there now be four types of lawyer, to include Chartered Lawyers? Or are CLEs no longer entitled to call themselves lawyers?

I'm about to qualify as a CLE. Will I still be qualifying as a lawyer (albeit not a Chartered Lawyer), or has that changed? Or, because I don't work in a reserved area of practice, will I converted to a Chartered Lawyer in 2024?

You haven't included CLEs in the diagram of the simplified structure on p.6, even though it sounds as though they will continue to exist!

The table on p.7 suggests that with the CLE Apprenticeship I will be a Chartered Legal Executive, because the CILEX Lawyer Apprenticeship did not exist when I enrolled and I haven't got any Practice Rights Top Ups to-date. But then p.8 suggests that I might be able to use Chartered Lawyer after all?! It's really unclear and confusing.

Disagree Having chartered paralegals will just create more confusion. Law firms run by solicitors already struggle to understand the grades of cilex membership

Disagree Having had colleagues who completed the previous route, the new route to qualification seems bureaucratic and laborious in comparison to the SQE.

I agree in part in respect of the terms of Chartered Lawyer and Chartered Paralegal (although that may cause confusion in itself ; ie questions may be asked of a Chartered Paralegal - are you legally qualified to give me advice type question . I do not agree with the term Legal Technologist, that suggests that the member is using technology to provide legal services and isn't legally qualified, they should be referred to as Legal Apprentices which is what they are.

Disagree I am not exactly clear on the process from the proposal documents.

I am still not convinced this change is necessary. It would have been preferable to have the status of the existing qualification reflected as on par with solicitors rather than insisting on an additional level of qualification to do the same job.

Disagree I am unclear why there is a need for a 'Chartered Paralegal'. The overarching theme of your consultation (which has appearance less of a consultation and more of a dictation of what you intend to do regardless of the view of the members) is that this is to simplify things for the consumer. I fail to see how the introduction of a Chartered Paralegal achieves that as it seems to me to be an additional title which is similar to CLE or Chartered Lawyer and is likely to lead to confuse a consumer, not clarify

Disagree I believe it is a risk to the status of a Chartered Legal Executive and the institute itself.

I believe it will cause more confusion not less. The world does not know who CILEx lawyers are now; the body should be working hard to change that not attempting to further complicate matters by changing something rather than fixing it. I have been before several judges and had to explain what CILEx is and why I have the right to stand before them. I have been a fellow for almost 20 years and have had my own practice for 7 so, in my view, the changes aren't going to fix the issue.

- I cannot see the reasoning or thinking behind a further dilution of titles. The public will not know the difference between a private client legal executive and a probate legal executive. As a fellow I have no idea of what a legal technician is. There is no need to change the membership structure or titles we just need to market and explain to people what we already have - this has never been done. This is just change for changes sake and is not in the profession or public interest
- Disagree
- I disagree and agree, I do not believe it makes it simpler. I can see the logical having been someone who has gone through the process and reviewing the eligibility criteria but my concern will be how this is understood by the public.
- Disagree
- I disagree that this is necessary.
- Disagree
- I do not know as I qualified a few years ago
- Disagree
- I do not see a reason to change the structure
- I do not think the progression route was unclear to begin with. However, I do agree that the distinction between difference levels of Paralegals is an improvement, particularly for those working works a Paralegal qualification.
- Disagree
- I don't believe it offers further clarity or a clearer route for progression.
- I don't find this simpler and continue to be more confused every year new proposed changes are introduced. The goal posts continue to change to the point it is difficult to know myself as a Fellow member of CILEX what title I would need to use.
- Disagree
- I don't see there was anything wrong with the existing structure it made me want to get qualified so I had more say in my day to day work and in relation to CILEX decisions.
- Disagree
- I don't feel that anything is entirely clear at the moment.
- Disagree
- I don't think it's been set out well or publicised.
- I don't think that the additional layers simplify anything if anything they make it more confusing and would require clients to research more than they do now.
- Disagree
- I don't understand the new membership structure
- I feel strongly that the Chartered Lawyer title should be extended to FCILEX members without the need for the practice rights top up. Introducing yet another level of qualification level is (a) confusing and (b) detracts from the dedication and skill set that Fellows have already demonstrated in becoming Chartered Legal Executives.
- Disagree
- As a Chartered Legal Executive, I find it disappointing that CILEX continue to 'move the goal posts' and introduce additional (and seemingly non-sensical) levels of qualification. I don't believe these are a benefit to CILEX members, or indeed the general public.
- Disagree
- I feel the current structure is just as clear
- Disagree
- I feel you are lowering the level of a chartered legal executive who qualified under the old scheme
- I felt that the legacy route and membership grades were easier to follow and understand. I also fear that having a CLE / Chartered Lawyer (?), a CILEX Lawyer (CPQ qualified), and a Chartered Paralegal may only serve to saturate the chartered status and cause more confusion among the public.
- Disagree
- I find the new qualification and membership structure extremely confusing
- I have been a Fellow and Chartered Legal executive since 2004. I now have to get an additional qualification to do what I have been doing for years. I feel like the legacy members are having their qualification de-valued and you are saying that the new route is better than the old route so the legacy members are not as good as the new ones.
- Disagree
- I have read all the information and still struggle to understand the proposals. Why is there a need to keep changing the route to Chartered Status? Apprentices currently do not have the same options as non-apprentice trainees.
- I have tried many time to wrap my head around the new membership structure and I'm still none the wiser. How are the public and other professionals supposed to have confidence and know what we are when, as a CILEX Fellow, I can't work out what I need to do or if it's necessary for me to become a CILEX Lawyer. The introduction of additional CILEX titles will, in my view, further confuse members of the public but also provide cause for employers to negotiate lower salaries.
- Disagree
- I just don't think what you call us will make a difference. The consumer wants someone who knows what they are doing and will give them cost effective advice.
- Disagree
- I must admit I'm not familiar with the proposals. My concern at the moment is allowing the SRA to regulate us.
- I qualified as a Fellow in 1984 and I have been for some years a partner in a firm of solicitors. Quite frankly all that has been achieved is a confused structure of progression and status. You have already demoted my qualifications and experience without notice/consultation by introduction of "Chartered Lawyer".
- Disagree
- I see no issue with how it is
- Disagree

- I still find it very hard to understand which courses I need to follow, and how to attend these courses, to fulfil the requirements of the chartered status. Why not use the Coursera.org platform? Much easier.
- Disagree
- I strongly disagree. There is no reason to change the membership structure. In my view, the proposals are MORE confusing. The issues with people not respecting and/or recognising the importance of Chartered Legal Executives will not change with this proposal. If anything it will be more confusing for people in and outside CILEx. How can CILEx call themselves "The Chartered Institute of Legal Executives" if its members are not referred to as Legal Executives. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes to titles and I would consider moving across to another route to qualification if it went ahead!
- Disagree
- I think chartered legal executives who qualified before the changes should be awarded the same practice rights as CILEX lawyers. Why should I have to go back to study and pass more exams with my fellowship qualifications and vast experience?
- Disagree
- I think it creates more confusion. The progression to Chartered status, in my opinion, is clear and I do not see or understand why CILEX considers that yet more change is needed. In my view, this only serves to create greater confusion. I have not seen the research that suggests why a new membership structure is necessary. Who have CILEX consulted? Where is this research?
- Disagree
- I think that it is pointless.
- It is still confusing.
- This is perhaps the 3rd or 4th change of title, names etc in 10 years?
- Disagree
- Consistency would be welcome and beneficial.
- Disagree
- I think the system works well in its current form
- Disagree
- I think there is a need for consistency not change. Constantly changing titles etc is the cause of confusion not the titles themselves. Stop changing the titles and allow people to understand them.
- Disagree
- I'm more confused than ever and Cilex seems to want to continually reinvent itself constantly, rather than focusing on its core offering - a solid specialised alternative offering to solicitors.
- Disagree
- I'm unclear on what you are changing.
- Disagree
- I'm unclear what these are and the routes feel like shifting goal posts. In addition, I feel my qualification has been watered down by the introduction of practice rights top and the distinction between "lawyer" and "Cilex Lawyer".
- Disagree
- These additional rights make Fellows have to work harder to educate colleagues that we can practice law.
- Incentive for Advancement: There may be concerns that removing certain privileges or distinctions for Fellows could reduce the incentive for members to strive for higher grades and qualifications within the organization.
- Resource Allocation: Expanding participation in decision-making and policy work may require additional resources, both financial and administrative, which could affect the organization's budget and operational efficiency.
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree
- It does not cater to existing fellows at all and just makes things more difficult for them
- Disagree
- It is convoluted and illogical to add so many layers and titles and expect anyone to view that as simple or clear. The current situation is simple and clear (or was, until CILEX decided, without consultation, to bring in the CILEX Lawyer qualification, open the doors to paralegals and then decide to create a Chartered Paralegal qualification as well). Solicitor is simple and clear. The SQE is simple and clear. CILEX need to learn from that.
- Disagree
- It is in the public interest to be completely transparent as to membership grades. If you surveyed the public would they know the difference between lawyer and paralegal? Do they know what a Technologist is? Probably not. So whilst it is better for professionals it may not clarify things for consumers
- Disagree
- Disagree
- It is just as convoluted as the legacy route
- Disagree
- It is more complex. As a Fellow practising for over 20 years, I do not see why I should have to pay to acquire practice rights in order to be able to use the title Chartered Lawyer. I suspect a lot of people in my position will agree, leaving a 2 tier title which will confuse further.
- Disagree
- it is never clear process for cilex membership. There are always changes which make it confusing. time needs to pass without constant changing
- Disagree

It is so complicated with so many different job titles etc. Again, it is simply making it unnecessarily complicated and watering down our qualification (those of us who are Fellows). These are such backwards steps. There should simply be CLE and Trainee CLE.
Disagree It is still confusing.

It is unclear what the benefit is for Chartered Paralegals. As per the consultation document, a Chartered Paralegal will need to have 5+ years experience and advanced qualifications. The amount of effort and money required to obtain that status is not currently reflected in the job market. Paralegals are paid less than trainee lawyers although a Chartered Paralegal will have more experience and knowledge than a trainee lawyer. It would be quicker and cheaper for someone to become a lawyer than a Chartered Paralegal.
It is also unclear how people who study LLB outside of CILEX can become a Chartered Lawyer. Most people aged 16-18 do not know of the existence of CILEX and do not understand the alternative careers into law. It seems that those who study LLB will be cut off from accessing a career as a lawyer through CILEX.
Disagree It is very unclear and there are now too many roles.

Disagree It isn't broke. It doesn't need fixing. Stop wasting time on things that make no difference to careers, employment etc.
Disagree It may be clearer from day 1 but what about the past, they've only just changed. Please stop changing things annually (or biannually) and get a decent system in place.
Disagree It seems horribly complicated to me. The route to qualification as a chartered legal executive has always been perfectly simple.

Disagree It was difficult enough for people to understand what a CLE is, but this improved from 2010-2019 through stability and consistency. Now the changes have led to complexity and complete confusion to every except a few people at CILEX.

Disagree It wasn't difficult before, the changes have made it more confusing for new and existing members, there's no real reason for it and it's a move of the goal posts from what existing members were told before and during their qualifications. It's ridiculous that CILEX have been allowed to do this.

Disagree It will just create even more confusion

Disagree It will, but it is perverse to consider that 25 years ago (when I was still conducting advocacy in my daily role) I would have been able to progress to Chartered Litigator & Advocate (Civil), whereas 25 years later my age and experience means that I am in a role which no longer requires me to conduct advocacy and I am therefore unable to progress further. This is prejudicial on the grounds of age and experience. There should be a route available which does not require ongoing practice of advocacy.

Disagree It would be simpler if all Fellows were simply called Chartered Lawyers rather than Chartered 'this and that' Lawyer to prevent confusing messaging.

Disagree It's already clear

Disagree It's unclear where current members will fit into the new structure

Disagree It's becoming too complex to understand for the older members. Also CILEX seem to be confused, thinking they have to continually compete with the SRA or Law Society.

Disagree It's unnecessarily convoluted

Disagree Makes it easier to obtain Chartered status

Disagree More clarity and quick responses to members enquiry. There should be a portal where all the necessary criteria and steps are explained clearer to new members as per choice of exams, criteria to progress to Chartered status. The present mode of information is confusing.

Disagree More complicated

Disagree n

Disagree no

Disagree No - still unclear

Disagree No it is too caught up in the special rights by the back door EDI agenda.

Disagree No qualification route within CILEX is simple.....

Disagree No the new membership seeks to create more job titles; if the purpose of reform is to improve public understanding more focus should be placed on understanding why being a Chartered Legal Executive is misunderstood.

Disagree Not sure how this is going to work in practice. If it does work, it would work with regulation by CILEX. I don't see this being something that the SRA need to regulate in order to happen.

Disagree Not sure I understand it enough to comment.

Disagree Not sure it's simpler

Disagree Nothing wrong with the present system, this seems an attempt to justify change for its own sake

Proposals are limiting and dumb down the chartered legal executive title. You are also severely restricting the potential for progression of those who are qualified / qualifying and making the traditional routes more appealing.

Disagree Rather complex system of 'paralegal' titles which to some potential clients may appear cumbersome

Disagree see last answer. Too many and frequent changes - confusing to public and lawyers.

Disagree Seems to be overcomplicating what was/is a tried and tested, easily understandable system.

Disagree Should be left the way it is, as it works.

Disagree Should only be one chartered status

Disagree Simpler with chartered legal executive & paralegal

Disagree So what happens to those who are CLE but dual qualified with CLC to recognise our work within the regulated sector?

Disagree Some 11 years after the Royal Charter and CILEX are still trying to work things out. Way too late.

STOP MESSING ABOUT WITH MEMBERSHIP GRADES! Every time you change them you undermine our standing. Far from enhancing it. My employer has lost all confidence in CILEX as a regulatory body and you are largely seen as a joke. Your own "telephone advisors" don't even understand it. None of your staff seem to be able to explain the recent changes or the qualification route. My assistant left CILEX because her questions were unanswered, her tutor didn't know. One drama after another. 2 recent new members of staff at the firm ditched their studies with you for the same reason. The qualifications you provide get whittled away until we have no confidence in our own grade of membership. I wish I had just qualified via the SRA with my degree in the first place. Cilex do not respect their members. You just keep asking for more money to change my job title to allow me to do the same thing I have been doing for years. Stop trying to change and start embracing what you told me you were when I signed up to study all those years ago which is a reputable alternative route to qualification. All you need to do is work on public awareness. As a qualified I can no longer follow the crazy number of membership grades and job titles you have. It is an absolute farce.

Disagree That is my view

Disagree The addition of Paralegal levels obviously complicates matters and seems unnecessary. Surely the goal should be to lead paralegals to proper legal qualifications? Creating 2 levels of Chartered LEs is confusing and effectively demotes most existing Fellows. The term Trainee Lawyer will create obvious confusion with Trainee Solicitors. Technologist is not a happy term but other may like it ...

Disagree The current structure is a market brand in itself. Changes may have a negative impact on that.

Disagree The current system has been in place for a long time. Changing it does not make it clearer, the new structure is not clearer at all. Litigation, advocate are all legal words and unknown to the general public. What does chartered lawyer mean, it's no more complicated than chartered ex

Disagree The end result is not known!

Disagree the fact that it keeps changing makes it more difficult to understand. too many changes too frequently. it is very hard to explain to an outsider, how to qualify as cilex.

Disagree The focus seems to be all about the route to qualification, but it is not clear to me how this would work for CILEx members beyond qualification. This seems to be an attempt by CILEx to make the qualification more attractive and to tempt potential members away from training as solicitors.

Disagree The introduction of chartered paralegals is an oxymoron. There is no need to charter paralegals, it will only confuse consumers more. Solicitors already refer to CILEx fellows as paralegals, please do not water us down any further.

Disagree The name change is all its seems to be.

The new structure is easier to understand. However, consideration must be given to the many FCILEX members without practising rights and how their position and value may be affected by the introduction of the new structure. Consumers are unlikely to appreciate the distinction between a Chartered Legal Executive and Chartered Paralegal and, therefore, this change is likely to further complicate the position for Chartered Legal Executives who are already often seen as nothing more than "senior paralegals".

Disagree The new structure is more complicated and convoluted. It also feels like gaslighting of F.CILEx because our own body are suddenly telling us we are not good enough and not on par with solicitors and now we need more qualifications to have professional standing - which we already had before CILEx, our own professional body, decided we are not good enough!

Disagree The old structure was arguably simpler to understand but did not exactly enhance the status of the Chartered Elgal Exec. The proposal is flawed. A 'Chartered Paralegal' would just cause even more confusion with the public and the wider legal profession.

Disagree

- The proposal seems very complex. For example, myself, as a practising lawyer with many years of experience, I would not be a 'Chartered Lawyer' as I do not have a law degree and my practice area does not allow for 'top up' rights. I do not agree that this amounts to equality in the profession.
- The proposed changes would not make any significant impact.
- The proposed new structure causes considerable confusion in terms of the various progression levels. The changes to titles will not be able to be a one size fits all where there are now many members with multiple specialisms which is probably going to be a trend in the future, particularly if members want to set up their own firms.
- The proposed new structure does not properly support existing FCilex members and further I do not agree with the whole approach the paralegals which seems calculated to diminish and not enhance the role of CILEX
- The proposed new structure is more complicated than the current system and will create more confusion
The proposed structure appears to be more confusing on the face of it. I am particularly concerned that the changes will reinforce existing views held by some in other areas of the legal profession, that chartered legal executives are not 'real lawyers'. Unfortunately, as a chartered legal executive practicing in Criminal law with 10+ years ppe, I envisage that the proposed changes may do more harm than good as they appear to water down the traditional title of Chartered Legal Executive.
- The public have little knowledge of who Chartered Legal Executives are. Constantly changing the name will not encourage awareness but rather foster distrust, as new names come and go. The best approach will be to maintain the name we have and work on raising awareness of what this means
- The question is spun to give the answer you are wanting. We see you.
- The route looks more complicated and will lead to confusion.
- The structure has been in place for a long time and lots of people understand it. It seems wasteful to now change it without much thought or conviction.
- The structure is more complicated and clients will be more confused. The aims and objectives could be achieved by disseminating greater information to the public and sensitively challenging those actually within the legal profession who still refuse to accept FCILEx as the qualified professionals they are.
- The new proposals appears to support that view and are very disappointing.
- The way to qualify as a CLE was never particularly difficult to understand. I think it could also leave those of us who are CLE's i.e. Fellows, as appearing to be less experienced.
- There being a difference between those on the paralegal chartered route and those on the CPQ route who become regulated paralegal but have different post-nominal letters is confusing and makes it seem there is a difference between the the types of paralegals at the same level.
- There is no provision for current Legal Executive Fellows close to retirement who are esteemed experts in their field but have not gone through the route of a Practitioner qualification. These would be lost in the general pool of Legal Executives. I would hope that CILEX will allow their status to remain as Fellows on an equal status of a Practitioner until such time as all current Fellows have left the profession.
- There seem to be a lot of variables
- There should be only three levels, as there was when I qualified, ie: those who are doing their exams, those who have passed their exams and are doing their qualifying employment and those who are appointed Fellows. There is no need for any other levels. PS: everyone, even those who come in with a degree, should have to start at the bottom.
- There this will only cause more confusion
- There will be confusion over the status "student" vs "trainee" lawyers from employers and probably the public.
- This is a dumbing down of requirements for practical experience
- This is the most convoluted, disorganised, unnecessarily complex and illogical proposal I've ever read. The recent change to "CILEX Lawyer" made a simple title with clear, easy to understand terminology that the public could understand at ease. The proposal is nothing short of nonsense
- This may cause greater confusion as you will have both Cilex lawyers and Chartered Legal Executives and it doesn't appear altogether clear where Chartered Legal Executives are in the new scheme.
- To be truly simplified, there should just be two levels as there were originally. One for those who have yet to complete their qualification and one for those who have.
- To much relied on 'exams' rather than experience
- Too many grades - it is confusing. Risk losing value in "Chartered Legal Executive" position.
- too many routes become confusing
- Undermining existing fcilex and or forcing them to study again to get cilex lawyer, despite being fcilex for many years
- V

Disagree What about those fellows without practice rights?

Disagree Whilst the progression route may be simpler, I do not believe the structure is simpler.

Disagree xxx

Disagree Yes it is simpler, but this is at least the third attempt in 15 years, yet you fail to get it right time after time. Your proposals as they stand will just cause more confusion. A Paralegal by most accepted definitions is a NOT qualified person, so we cannot have a title "Chartered Paralegal" both qualified and not Qualified in the same title. Looking at the chart on page 6, please remove Chartered Paralegal, rest is fine.

Disagree You are diluting and increasing confusion. Just keep it as it is. Every other authorised lawyer does not have multiple memberships statuses.

Disagree You have made it more difficult for part time women to obtain the advocacy qualification.

Disagree You have more than one qualification identified by the same membership. It is totally confusing and not fair on more qualified members

Disagree You have pushed through a new framework already and left existing members behind. Why now after such a short time do you think you have the right to make further changes? What you actually need to do is stabilise what you are doing, take more time to think things through and stop your schoolyard spat with the regular. Think about how these things after your membership on the ground and give us the right to vote on changes as serious as a change in regulator.

Disagree You have recently changed membership grades already, to change them again so soon will just cause more confusion

Disagree You have three distinct memberships, but the roles, duties and responsibilities of those are unclear, and again seem to undermine the non-degree route to qualification. Someone undertaking an apprenticeship will have more hands-on experience than a newly qualified solicitor, but is only achieving a title of Legal Technologist. What the hell is a Legal Technologist? Ridiculous and unnecessary labelling, seemingly to appease the SRA, who continue to undermine our qualifications and experience. The proposals also undermine those of us who qualified on the legacy route and require me, as a family practitioner, to undertake advocacy training when I do not want to undertake advocacy, but I need to have that extra qualification to set up my own firm, it is a nonsense. I have solicitor colleagues who do not undertake advocacy. It seems we are constantly having to prove ourselves to the SRA and LSB, yet they are required to do less study and less training to become a solicitor. Why are we pandering to this inequality? It is time to stand up and make clear exactly how we are superior to solicitors, not equal to them.

Disagree you keep changing it and it becomes more involved every time but the same is not being seen in Solicitors training structure

Do you agree the addition of a distinct progression ladder for paralegals leading to Chartered Paralegal status will enhance public trust and confidence in the delivery of legal services?

Response Please state reasons

Agree 00

Agree -

Agree .

Agree A clear distinction will assist the public to distinguish.

Agree Agree mostly, but I'm not sure the public will understand what a paralegal is.

Agree agreed

Agreed again with reservations. Agreed only provided greater information will need to be disseminated in public information advertisements outside of the legal profession and also clarity is needed within the profession with challenges brought by CILEX where needed within the profession.

One only has to read the Law Society Gazette to see practising Solicitors who call FCILEX professionals "paralegals".

Agree

Agree

Although it is a more complicated position, it indicates they are regulated. There should be a progression from paralegal to lawyer.

Agree Any form of clear career path, regulation and opportunity is a good thing

Agree Anything that enhances the public trust should be seriously considered.

Agree Anything that makes the qualification understandable and transparent is good for everybody.

Agree Anything which can create a path towards building trust and confidence in the legal community I support but this ministry be backed by an infrastructure that ensures those members are properly regulated

Agree As answer 7 above. This will help members of the public to have confidence in our professional body and the delivery of professional legal services.

Agree As paralegals will receive the recognition they deserve, rather than be considered as a lesser grade of lawyer

Agree As somebody who is working in a Paralegal role but is yet to complete the foundation stage; it would be nice to have that distinction once I have done my final exams next year, to show that in addition to being a Paralegal I have worked for qualifications which give me better legal knowledge and skills.

Agree As someone who has been employed as a paralegal I think it is important for there to be a clearly identified role which people can understand and trust.

Agree At present paralegal is a misunderstood term and anyone can use that title. Having a protected title of Chartered Paralegals will help public confidence

Agree At the moment anyone can be a paralegal but to achieve chartered status assures the public that they are regulated

Agree Becoming a paralegal is often a career of choice but currently does not have a specific career progression route so introducing this is a positive step

Agree But communication of this to the rest of the legal industry must be handled extremely carefully if we are to avoid any confusion (whether innocent or otherwise) which might affect the parity afforded to our qualified members.

Agree But I still view it as a power grab by CILEX which has effectively extinguished my professional status as an Associate Legal Executive and a Fellow of the Institute of Paralegals.

Agree Clear career paths and for the public to have a clearer understanding.

Agree Currently paralegals do not have much professional representation as a career and often gets overlooked. Having a progression ladder enables those who wish to work as a paralegal to further this if they wish

Agree Each step is clear.

Agree Fairer

Agree fantastic chance to gain recognition and progress towards being a chartered lawyer.

Agree Feel may aid understanding of different roles

Agree For paralegals leading to Chartered Paralegal status will enhance public trust and confidence in the delivery of legal services

Agree For the reasons stated at 8

Agree For years we have been treated like the under dog in the industry and almost in the shadows of solicitors and yet the works carried out is the same. Though the law society acknowledged cilex the same cannot be said for all firms.

Agree Gives people more choice and value added to their career and profession

Agree Gives people who do not wish to be fully fledged legal exec / solicitors a chance to be recognised for the hard work.

Agree Giving greater clarity

Agree Grades must be simpler for the public to understand. This means they should be fewer and clearer. Chartered paralegal and chartered lawyer only. Not a hundred different letters and titles at each stage. How are the public to know who is qualified and who is not?

Agree Having Chartered in the status and protecting this status will enhance public trust and confidence.

Agree Historically the public and other lawyers have looked down on paralegals and not recognised the vital role they play within our profession. By giving them Chartered status this would indicate a 'quality Mark' to consumers and other legal professionals.

Agree Hopefully this would encourage Paralegals to become CILEX members and achieve qualifications and regulation in the public interest.

Agree Hopefully to avoid confusion by the public

Agree I agree

I agree that a set career progression for paralegals is helpful, although I think there will continue to be a lot of confusion between paralegals, student lawyers & trainee lawyers, both for the public & employers. Many part time CILEX students & graduate members are effectively working in paralegal roles. The new trainee lawyer grade attempts to correspond with a trainee solicitor straight out of university, however the role in practice is not the same, a CILEX graduate having more than likely been working for a number of years while studying.

Agree

I am an Associate Member of CILEX and have been a member of CILEX for more than 10 years. I have worked in Family Law for more than 17 years and have learnt a lot over the years and feel that a Chartered Paralegal status, will enhance public trust.

Agree

I am inclined to agree as the public have a clearer idea of what a lawyer is.

Agree

I don't think it will change the consumer view but it will aid those who want to be a paralegal as a career and not qualify

Agree

I suspect that this will benefit the paralegals but am not so sure on how interested the public will be but it certainly will not be detrimental.

I think having a distinction between the grade paralegal and Chartered will help public understanding of the difference, often paralegal is just used as a generic term which can lead to confusion for some.

Agree

I think it will but it is difficult when the head of the SRA refers to CILEX members as paralegals - even Fellows!!

Agree

I think that having a chartered status is likely to be a title the public will understand.

Agree

I think think it will have much impact

I was proud to progress in 1995 from a paralegal to an Associate Legal Executive in the 90s and hate the new changes to our titles. It just adds insult to the injury of CILEX's inequitable approach towards older members as already discussed in my previous offer. Other than that, I agree with the statement public trust and confidence is vital.

Agree

I would have greatly benefitted from this in my time as a paralegal and I think firms and clients would too. It would give paralegals a greater sense of responsibility and a clear framework for progression.

Agree

I would hope it would.

Agree

it could be more client oriented

Agree

It defines the role played by the layer of professionals previously recognised as Associates. It is important they be fully recognised and regulated.

Agree

It is a sensible route to take

Agree

It is important that Chartered Paralegals are distinguished from Paralegal, a role that is not protected.

It is time that Paralegal's are recognised for the excellence work they do with professional and regulated status. Most legal firms could not function without the role they conduct and it is in the interests of the employer to ensure that they are appropriately trained and regulated.

Agree

It seems sensible as some don't want to be lawyers.

Agree

It will give the public more confidence

Agree

It will help remove the stigma of a paralegal.

Agree

It will make it clearer and easier for all to understand.

Agree

It will provide a clear pathway, ensuring that progression takes place in a structured manner.

Agree

It will show that they have studied and have been assessed to have a certain level of knowledge and have certain duties and responsibilities, just as CLE and Solicitors have.

Agree

It's important they are legal qualified and receive that recognition

Agree

Know they have had training

Made rolled

Available

Oponionrer in heart

Yes

Agree

Agree

Makes it clearer for all concerned

Agree

Many paralegals will never want to progress to CLE but be highly specialised and capable lawyers. Chartered paralegal provides them with recognition of their abilities as a lawyer.

Agree

Many people do not recognise Paralegals' expertise

Agree

more straightforward

Agree

No comment.

Agree

no reason

Agree

Not only will it enhance the validity of paralegals' careers, it will also help firms shape paralegal's career progression.

Not really because too many Assistants give themselves the title of Paralegal so I don't think the public or the profession will notice the distinction.

Agree

Not sure

Agree

Not sure the general public understands the meaning of the word paralegal which is all embracing

Agree

Opportunity

'Paralegal' has been used for years simply to describe a person who is not qualified, and a lot of the time not even studying, but hands on in the job. I was not aware until recently that there was a register of paralegals. I think Chartered status will give those who are not ready to progress further or who do not want to, the recognition that they deserve as they are a very important part of a law firm. It will also give the public some comfort that the person they probably deal with for all routine matters do actually know what they are doing.

Agree

Paralegal have for years been seen at 'nothing' by certain legal entities

Agree

Paralegal is a term too liberally applied, making it subject to a standard of professionalism would recognise quality work and remove those not up to scratch.

Agree

Paralegals are in demand and need to reach the highest status in their profession

Agree

Paralegals are valuable part of team

Paralegals contribute a lot to the legal profession and I agree that there should be both recognition and a progression ladder for fee earners who choose to remain Paralegals.

Agree Paralegals have an important role in legal services

Agree Paralegals will be recognised as having a qualification because not all lawyers do.

Agree Paralegals work incredibly hard and deserve recognition.

Agree People like identifiable labels

Agree People trust a 'chartered' profession

Agree People will become more aware of what cilex lawyers are and gain confidence

Agree People will understand better the distinction between paralegal, chartered paralegals and Cilex lawyers.

Agree Probably

Agree Properly regulated paralegals are key to ensuring that the public are protected from persons who claim to be lawyers / paralegals but have no professional qualifications.

Provides clarity to consumers of equivalence in level of qualification and therefore allows them to compare the ability of CILEX Lawyers and solicitors. It also provides consistency of standards of conduct and practice applied to both CILEX Lawyers and solicitors

Agree Public will assume Chartered qualified but at lower level of expertise than lawyer

Agree Require clear progression ladder for public to understand

Agree Sets a professionally acceptable standard

Agree Showing professional membership and having achieved a particular level generally assists in increasing public confidence

Agree Since paralegals have joined CILEx, they should have equal rights to recognition and progress.

Agree some paralegals can do a lot of the work that a solicitor can, they just need to be supervised. Its good for them to have this recognition.

Agree The Chartered status is good but CILEx will need to raise that awareness.

Agree The Chartered status, I believe, attracts a level public trust.

Agree The public will clearly see that the paralegals are attached to a well recognised governing body.

Agree The public will have confidence.

Agree The public will I'm sure be a lot more confident in seeing individuals with Chartered Paralegal status.

Agree The role of paralegal is easily overlooked and treated as a stepping stone to further qualification. Whilst that is often the case, there should be a robust option for people who want to build a career as a paralegal. They underpin the whole profession in my view!

The use of 'paralegals' in the sector is inconsistent which leads to confusion and uncertainty. Having a clear progression for this branch of the profession will enable greater professional progression by them and also provide greater certainty for the public who deal are served by Paralegals.

Agree There are too many 'paralegals' with the title but not studying law.

Agree There should be alternative routes to Chartered status.

Agree This allows for recognition and attainment irrespective of whether you choose to follow the path to being a CILEX lawyer.

Agree This is a straightforward indication that the paralegals are subject to regulation- will enhance public confidence.

Agree This new structure will help to drive public trust and confidence in the provision of services.

Agree This will demonstrate to the public and they are suitably trained and qualified to provide the legal services they are tasked with.

Agree This will give Paralegal's career options.

Agree This will help CILEX Paralegals to stand out from the unregulated Paralegals

Agree To date the CILEX paralegal qualification has always appeared to be a qualification 'on the way' to lawyer. It will be empowering for those paralegals who wish to obtain this qualification as a standalone.

Agree To enable more inclusion

Agree Totally agree that this would benefit all parties and show trust and confidence, often paralegals are seen as the poor cousin Cinderella staff who are the backbone of any legal organisation

Agree Updating paralegal eligibility should be paramount

Agree Vaguely agree - I have no strong feelings but I suspect that (as in the title 'paramedic' etc) if it has a chance to 'bed in' in public awareness, people will know that this is a trusted and qualified professional.

Agree yes

Agree Yes , this will add a lot of confidence and trust as experience as Paralegal is an important part of legal experience

Agree Yes and also this will be more helpful for paralegals in showing them, and their peers, what they can aspire to.

Agree Yes because tailored path of training.

Agree Yes it is vitally important that the public gains trust in the Legal Profession which has had a poor press of late.

Agree Yes. It will give the public a better understanding of that paralegal's level of experience and knowledge. The role 'paralegal' is very diverse. It can range from entry level up to career paralegals with many years experience. It's important the level of experience is easily differentiated.

Agree Yes. It will make it clear to consumers what "Paralegals" are and what they can and can't do.

Agree Будущий юрист должен повышать свои знания то есть проходить повышение квалификации.

Disagree "Chartered" denotes that someone has completed all qualifications. Paralegal in the CILEX sense is the ACILEX and GCILEX/MCILEX grade previously which suggests that the qualifications are part completed.

Disagree "Para" indicates a lawyer who is not fully qualified.

Disagree *

Disagree A

Disagree A 'Chartered Paralegal' would just cause even more confusion with the public and the wider legal profession.

Disagree A new grade of Chartered Paralegal puts another grade of profession into an organisation trying to simplify qualifications so that a member of the public understands what their skills actually are.

Disagree A Paralegal by most accepted definitions is a NOT qualified person, so we cannot have a title "Chartered Paralegal" both qualified and not Qualified in the same title.

Disagree A paralegal chartered or not is to work alongside a qualified lawyer so the level of trust is implicitly restricted. This won't change regardless of being chartered or not.

Disagree A paralegal has always been able to qualify as a chartered legal executive by obtaining the necessary qualifications.

Disagree A paralegal is by definition someone who is unqualified. If they want to become qualified then become a legal executive.

Disagree Adding additional professional statuses will only add further confusion for consumers

Disagree adds confusion

Disagree All the reasons above. Stop undermining yourselves and start embracing. The only people who have ever undermined my standing in my firm or made me feel like I don't level peg with a solicitor is you. Well done!

Disagree Already have existing structure that works why change it if it works.

Disagree As above

Disagree As above. It makes us look as if we are an organisation of non-qualified individuals. It is really quite saddening that after decades of work to promote CLE's as being on a par with solicitors and seeking to gain equality that CILEX is now an organisation solely for those who are not qualified. Those of us who are qualified and have been for several years are deeply disappointed by these proposals. It will only lead to the public being confused and thinking that CILEX regulated individuals are not qualified lawyers and will put us back decades.

Disagree As stated above, the public do now know who we are so they will not care about the proposed changes. CILEX should be spending its resources marketing CILEX lawyers and their specialisms rather than wasting money trying to fix something that's already broken.

Disagree Chartered legal executives are often seen as paralegals with qualifications. Adding chartered paralegals just creates more confusion

Disagree Chartered means qualified and paralegals are not qualified. Chartered legal executives should be left only.

Disagree Chartered paralegal is not really a useful idea

Disagree cilex should not be taking on paralegals in one hand and attempting to join SRA and show parity with solicitors as well. This does not show a level playing field

Disagree Consumers are unlikely to appreciate the distinction between a Chartered Legal Executive and Chartered Paralegal and, therefore, this change is likely to further complicate the position for Chartered Legal Executives who are already often seen as nothing more than "senior paralegals". Those holding Chartered Legal Executive status with not practicing rights (like myself) will, in my opinion, struggle even more under this new qualification to explain their position and value.

Disagree Convincing members of the public that Chartered Legal Executives are 'proper' lawyers is hard enough, I think to explain the status of a Chartered Paralegal may well confuse matters rather than improving trust and confidence. I think the more status levels exist, the greater the conu

Disagree Distinction between labelling of paralegal and chartered paralegal not the same as distinction between trainee lawyer and chartered lawyer

Disagree Doing so may though open affordable legal services and professions for some paralegals, yet it could be to their disadvantage if fewer public members show interest in their service provision. Also, others may view it as a creation of a two-tier system where public members prefer to patronize legal services delivered by chartered fellows /solicitors, not chartered paralegal status if they deem such a role a lower legal profession path. At the same time, depending on the market demand for legal services, it could be regarded as an affordable option for obtaining legal advice by many.

Disagree Don't understand this move.

Disagree Don't think the general public understand what a paralegal is.

Disagree For me, the distinction between Chartered Legal Executive and Chartered Paralegal is not clear enough. I still get offered PA and EA roles because recruiters do not recognise my status as a qualified lawyer. Aligning CILEX with paralegals is not going to help improve this situation.

Disagree From an outside perspective a paralegal is an unqualified lawyer regardless of whether they are chartered. The point is that they should not be subject to the same level of liability that a legal exec is.

Disagree Happy as it is...already difficulty to pass the course.

Disagree Having regard to the dictionary definition, I believe the General Public's perception of a Paralegal is someone who is not fully qualified. How can a paralegal have Chartered status when the purpose of a Paralegal is to assist a qualified Lawyer? The information is unclear on this point. Are we diminishing the qualification of Lawyers by raising the standing of "assistants"? For too long, we have had unqualified persons carrying out legal work; this can prove detrimental to clients. The GMC would not permit unqualified persons to operate on patients.

Disagree I

Disagree I am not sure that members of the public would be able to differentiate between the different grades of paralegals. I am not sure members of the public even understand what a paralegal is. But this grading system would be important to those on the paralegal route. To help increase the importance and understanding, there needs to be much more educating to the public by various methods, which should include buy in from law firms and the like.

Disagree I am not sure the public understands the different roles sufficiently for trust and confidence to be affected by this change. I would have preferred a "don;t know" option.

I am of the view that paralegals require regulation and should have a chance at qualification but I don't agree that this will enhance public trust or confidence. A layman off the street has no clue what a paralegal is. Even those within the industry have varying views of what a paralegal's role is. As the public are not minded to educate themselves as to what a Chartered Legal Executive is, I find it difficult that they will seek to educate themselves on a Chartered Paralegal.

Disagree

I am unsure to what extent members of the public accessing legal services understand the current distinction or will understand any future distinction. I am also unsure whether employers will understand the distinction and be able to advertise a Chartered Paralegal's services properly and therefore remunerate them accordingly.

Disagree

I believe that chartered status should be reserved for Fellows and Lawyers

Disagree

I do not agree that a paralegal needs to have a chartered paralegal status. I think these changes are overcomplicated and are unnecessary.

Disagree

I do not believe that the general public are overly concerned with these matters - all most consumers care about is cost.

Disagree

I do not have experience to have an informed view

Disagree

I do not know

Disagree

I do not think the proposed change will have any affect on public trust and confidence or awareness as to a CILEX qualified person.

Disagree

I don't believe that the change in title will affect the way in which Cilex members or Cilex paralegals are perceived

I don't feel that this will lead to any difference in public trust and confidence as the distinction could potentially make it more confusing as to what the differentiation is. Ultimately people just want trust that the person assigned to do the job is doing it competently and I don't think an "enhanced" title for paralegals will change that.

Disagree

I don't really understand why Paralegals should be given Chartered status. I worked as a Paralegal for many years in a regulated firm without a legal qualification. When I started studying with CILEX (legacy route), I was a member of CILEX. I would expect that such regulation was enough in the public's eye. I struggle to see a difference in role or responsibility between what would be a Chartered Paralegal or a Trainee CLE / Trainee Lawyer / Trainee Solicitor / Trainee CILEX Lawyer.

Disagree

I don't see how this would make any difference to the public. They don't know the current process and won't know or care about the new one.

Disagree

I don't think it will make any difference. Many firms already have their own paralegal grades.

Disagree

I don't think so. From my experience members of public want to speak to a lawyer, rather than a paralegal.

Disagree

I dont think that the public will be interested in learning the distinction.

Disagree

I don't think the "public" will have any idea as to the status of a Paralegal.

i dont think the public actually care abot designations and progression. Things have always seemed to be fine in the past with the route.

Disagree

Why complicate things?

Disagree

I don't think the public pay enough attention to job titles let alone understand the differences and I don't think the public will differentiate between a chartered paralegal and a non-chartered.

Disagree

I don't think the public understand "chartered" and would assume that paralegals working on their cases/matters are doing so under regulation. Nevertheless, I do see a benefit within the legal community to enable paralegals that are not working under supervision to be able to identify themselves as Chartered Paralegals and so there is still some value in this change.

Disagree

I don't think the public would have an opinion either way. I have seen no evidence of issues with public trust or confidence prior to this.

Disagree

I dont think this will make the public understand the paralegal level any better. it is a term used to describe so many staff in law firms, from those doing basic admin to those practically doing the work of a FCILEX or Solicitor. But I fail to see how adding chartered for some will help the public as it depends on what firm they are in as to what work they are given/expected to do.

Disagree

I doubt it and my comments above still apply.

Disagree

I feel this will just add to the confusion

Disagree

I still don't believe the general public will understand the role of a paralegal.

Disagree

I think any paralegal should follow the Legal Executive or solicitor route and this would only water down the legal profession and reduce costs. It is a race to the bottom.

Disagree

i think its a bit overkill to be honest. I'm a paralegal doing CPQ foundation having already done the L3 certificate and i have no desire to add "chartered" to my title. chartered lawyer makes sense in the same way as chartered accountant does, but i don't think it's needed for the paralegal stage, and i really don't think the general public are that bothered about it.

Disagree

I think most clients would prefer the advice of a fully qualified person rather than a Paralegal. The term Paralegal can encompass many different people including those with no legal qualification. This in my view is not good news for CILEX paralegals.

Disagree

I think the term "paralegal" is wrong and that the public does not understand what is meant by the designation.

Disagree

I think the title of Paralegal is misleading.

Disagree

I think, from my experience, the public will be most interested in ability and competence rather than an increase in statuses. More statuses are likely to confuse the public, who more often than not are simply looking for "a lawyer".

I would like a further explanation of how this is supposed to be viewed and what the intention of it is? It seems to me that it may belittle the qualification and status of Associates, Graduates and Fellows and downgrades the salary and progression expectations of these levels, becoming a further competing industry. I agree with the stepping stone route, and in work experience, but I would like to know whether those making the decisions are in practice to see how these all affect us working day in and day out to uphold what it is that CILEX ask of us.

Disagree

In my experience the public perceive a Paralegal as an unqualified lawyer so giving a 'Chartered' status may devalue the Chartered Lawyer status.

Disagree

Incentive for Advancement: There may be concerns that removing certain privileges or distinctions for Fellows could reduce the incentive for members to strive for higher grades and qualifications within the organization.

Disagree Resource Allocation: Expanding participation in decision-making and policy work may require additional resources, both financial and administrative, which could affect the organization's budget and operational efficiency.

Disagree Increasing the status of paralegals may reduce the status of those who have worked hard to achieve full qualification. It makes me wonder why I bothered to complete the full qualification if I could have achieved recognition with less work

Disagree It already works

Disagree It blurs the line between qualified lawyers and non qualified lawyers and I believe adds further confusion

Disagree It creates parallel routes which can only be confusing to consumers. How are they supposed to understand the difference between a Chartered LE and a Chartered Paralegal? What will be the difference(s)?

Disagree It is clearly just a money making exercise for cilex. Adding chartered status will not to anything to enhance the public trust and confidence in the delivery of legal services

Disagree It is ludicrous, in my opinion. The new group on the block undoubtedly making demands to be more like the actual fellows. It will further harm the cilex brand.

Disagree It is more confusion. If a paralegal wants the public trust as a professional lawyer then they can become one via the SQE or FCILEX route.

Disagree It reinforces an incorrect impression that they are paralegals, rather than academically qualified lawyers. CLEs are not paralegals who have 'progressed' further up the 'ladder'. They have passed L6 exams.

Disagree It undermines the strength and integrity of qualifies status. If a paralegal wishes to be viewed as a qualified professional then they can become F.CILEx or a solicitor. The routes to qualification are already in existence and already open to all with apprenticeship routes and the SQE. To add a lower level of chartered status would undermine trust and confidence in the competency of legal professionals, not the reverse.

Disagree It will confused public a Paralegal is not a Chartered Legal executive

Disagree It will mean a lot of work for paralegal who have already done so much work and study in specialising in their subject. Recognition for what they have done would be better.

Disagree It will only enhance trust if the general public understand how it works. Greater understanding is required by the public for this to be effective.

Disagree Keep fellowship as only chartered status

Disagree n

Disagree Neither agree nor disagree - why is that not an option? I can't see it doing any harm, but I doubt its a major consideration either.

Disagree no comment.

Disagree No one outside of the legal sphere cares, it's a route to qualification only

Disagree No, I don't. Why would I. It seems like a complete waste of time. Everyone views paralegals as unqualified and assisting the title will do nothing to change this.

Disagree No. The whole "paralegal" concept is confusing. The term has become bastardized. Is a paralegal a "super lawyer" in the same way that a paratrooper could be said to be a "super soldier"? Or does the public interpret the "para" prefix as indicating "not quite a proper lawyer"? I do not believe that the public cares a jot about job titles or what route has been taken to qualification as long as they get their business done.

Disagree No. Public don't see qualification routes etc. They need reassuring of competence, skill and qualifications

Disagree Not really sure what difference it would make?

Disagree Paralegal is a misunderstood term. Fellowship is not.

Disagree Paralegal is a non-protected legal title and can apply to anyone practising law who has no qualifications at all (which is not detriment at all to a non-qualified paralegal). Should have stuck with the already established Legal Executive title and added different 'stages' to that prior to gaining 'Chartered' status. Same applies for 'CILEX Lawyer' - just silly.

Disagree Paralegal is an overused term - often to denote low paid fee earners. It needs to be clearer that they have additional training. Chartered helps but unless more marketing is done to the public will be dropped.

Disagree Paralegal is just another term that the general public and many in the legal profession do not understand. What does a paralegal do that is different to a Legal Executive or Solicitor, probably nothing. Making them Chartered does not change the issue there is here. It has not changed the perception of a legal executive - it is customer and brand awareness that does this and CILEx does nothing to highlight the difference in the public arena.

Disagree Paralegals are generally universally understood and again I think it diminishes the status of the members

Disagree Paralegals are not considered by the public to be more than assistants to qualified lawyers.

Disagree Paralegals are not lawyers and this will confuse the public

Disagree Paralegals are seen by consumers as being somehow inferior to lawyers, which is absolutely not the case.

Disagree Paralegals come from all areas and with all types of backgrounds. I don't think putting chartered in front of the title will make a difference.

Disagree Paralegals have always been an outlier and trying to incorporate a 4th layer of professional will simply confuse and do nothing to enhance public trust and confidence

Disagree Paralegals have never been qualified. We worked really hard to get our Chartered status and chartered and paralegal should not mix. It will lessen the meaning of Chartered Legal Executive.

Disagree Paralegals means different things in different firms. The responsibility always vests with the principal in any event.

Disagree Paralegals should be encouraged to pursue qualification as a Chartered Legal Executive. CILEx is meant to represent Legal Executives.

Disagree Obtaining our Charter was hard-fought. Not clear how CILEx can grant Chartered status to paralegals unless they pursue the Legal Executive route.

Disagree Paralegals should be included within the CILEx membership grades. A CILEX Advanced Paralegal and then a Chartered Paralegal makes it all far too confusing.

- Disagree Paralegals should have a formal route or recognition, but the inclusion of paralegals into CILEX further diminishes and confuses the status of the CILEX Lawyers. CILEX Lawyers should not be grouped with the lesser qualified paralegals
- Disagree People are often being called Paralegals when in some circumstances they have no legal qualifications or experience within a legal environment.
- Disagree People only seem to identify with either the terms solicitor or lawyer.
- Disagree People still don't understand what a Paralegal is and the perception is still that they are unqualified. Creating a chartered paralegal will lead to confusion alongside the other 'lawyer' qualifications and what the difference is.
- Disagree Please see my reasons above at Q7
- Disagree Public do not really understand or know about CILEX.
- Disagree Public don't know what LE are let alone Paralegals
- Disagree Public trust and confidence will be hard to secure in the light of recent events within the profession.
- Disagree Questions may still be raised as to the level of experience and in what situations they can provide advice.
- Disagree See above
- Disagree See previous comment regarding levels - you're either fully qualified or you aren't. Introducing more career paths complicates things for everyone
- Disagree See response to previous question.
- Disagree Seems fairly pointless. Enhance Acilex offering (many never finish and it could be an intermediate qualification more in its own right).
- Disagree Should only be one chartered status
- Disagree That is my view
- Disagree The chartered paralegal is still not an independent practising professional given they will work under a regulated lawyer - solicitor/CILEX Practitioner in a regulated entity
- Disagree The current structure of qualification is sufficient.
- Disagree The general public have no interest in this not do they care about it. This is simply dividing up and splitting out colleagues and making it harder for everyone to do their jobs. Creating new barriers and opportunities for discrimination. The proliferation of titles will confuse.
- Disagree I think the concept of a Chartered Paralegal is misplaced.
- Disagree The proposed structure confuses a paralegal status that is through the CPQ route and those via the chartered paralegal route.
- Disagree The public aren't bothered they only want to know you can do the job and what you charge
- Disagree The public aren't really that involved, this seems like change for the sake of change
- Disagree The public do not understand the term. They only recognise Solicitor/Chartered Legal Exec.
- Disagree The public don't know (nor want to know?) what a paralegal is. Even with Chartered status you'll have firms referring to "paralegals" - will the public appreciate or care about the distinction?
- Disagree The public don't know what a Paralegal is or does now so it won't make it any more clear
- Disagree The public generally are unclear on the distinction between a paralegal and a lawyer and often use the terms interchangeably. The proposed changes will do nothing to alter this.
- Disagree The public have no or little knowledge of the Cilex.
- Disagree The regulation of Paralegals is already sufficient.
- Disagree The status of a paralegal makes no difference to an employer. They should be encouraged to reach FCILEx status as opposed to their own rather meaningless charter
- Disagree The title Paralegal is already well known in the legal sector and by the public, adding Chartered won't make a difference to public trust, but may be beneficial to those Paralegal's entitled to use it.
- Disagree There are already enough confusing parallel titles and professions in the legal field. Adding yet another with no real clear understanding what the function of the profession is or the purpose serves no useful function, confuses the public and is a waste of money. If a paralegal would like to obtain a qualification, there are many available (Legal Executive, Barrister, Solicitor etc). I cannot see any benefit to adding yet another professional title to the mix and no public benefit to doing so.
- Disagree There are currently too many paralegals who are insufficiently regulated or not regulated at all and who are misleading the public with what their status permits them to do and not do as regards reserved legal activities. A Charter status indicates that a person is a qualified practitioner, whilst many choose not to become fully legally qualified, there is no clarity for the public on the lines being crossed. To bestow a charter upon professionals who are not fully qualified in any field will mislead the public and confuse them more.
- Disagree There is no clear definition of what a Paralegal is, their role, duties, obligations, or how it differs from a lawyer or solicitor. What is the benefit of being Chartered? Solicitors are not Chartered, so how is this equal? Your proposals are creating more confusion, not clarity.
- Disagree There is no justification for this change. The public are confused enough about the reference to paralegals and this will not help
- Disagree There should no difference between paralegal and chartered paralegal. All that is required is degree, diploma or master in law or legal practice.
- Disagree This is just a money making exercise, clearly it's not needed
- Disagree This just looks like a way to market paralegals as qualified lawyers. Its misleading
- Disagree This will only create more confusion in the minds of the general public.
- Disagree This will only serve to create division in the legal world which benefits no-one. The public is well aware of the role of a Paralegal and there is no need for this to be addressed in more confusing ways

- Disagree Those members of the public who understand what the term paralegal means will be unlikely to draw a distinction between a Chartered Paralegal and simple a Paralegal. Given that paralegal is not a protected term, being a Chartered Paralegal seems like an unnecessary measure.
- Disagree titles do not give confidence
- Disagree Too many designations will cause confusion.
- Disagree Too many steps
- Unless being a Chartered Paralegal permits them to carry out certain activities without the need for supervision (which is highly unlikely) then I see no benefit to this. What functionality does a Chartered Paralegal serve?
- Disagree It will run risk of disrupting pay amongst paralegal and give employers objective reason whilst not worth anything substantive to pay less; paralegals should be paid and incentivised based on experience, not their job title.
- Disagree Using the term "Paralegal" of itself infers something less than a fully qualified lawyer. The use of "Chartered" is as a consequence inappropriate and somewhat degrades its use when applied to Fellows.
- Disagree Whilst I think it is wonderful to offer this. I do not think public trust will be enhanced.
- Disagree Whilst members can remain paralegals if they so wish, why should they be awarded chartered status when the purpose of the royal Charter was for Legal Executives, not paralegals. The general public will not care, the profession will note you are removing regulation from paralegals if you change to the SRA
- Disagree Will make no difference
- Disagree Without creating awareness it will be difficult to enhance public trust and confidence.
- Disagree X
- Disagree You are dealing with the mind set of legal professionals at management level and they don't generally rate paralegals so, in my experience, are unlikely to let them do any "real" legal work.
- Disagree You are spinning the question again.
- Disagree You have not managed to gain public trust and confidence for Legal Executives and I cannot see it happening with Paralegals. STEP have made a better job of promoting their members, albeit in a limited area, of law than you have. Changing regulators to the SRA has nothing to do with public trust and confidence.
- Disagree You need to put more energy elsewhere in getting people to understand what a CILEX lawyer is
- Disagree You've effectively downgraded part qualified lawyers and introduced the role of a paralegal where there wasn't one before. I think you've downgraded the status of Legal Executives in doing this and you certainly have not made this clear to either students or the public.

Do you have any additional observations on the proposal to introduce a new Chartered Paralegal

Response Please provide details

- Yes A total mistake. Membership is falling, it was around 22,000 a few years back yet despite desperate attempts to increase the numbers by buying the institute of paralegals membership appears to be around 16,000. As per my answer to 7 & 9. A paralegal is NOT a qualified person, so the title Chartered Paralegal is an oxymoron.
A very good idea but the position of a Paralegal should not be presented as equal to a Chartered Legal Executive/Chartered Lawyer but as an important but subordinate role. A client should have confidence in the qualifications of someone handling their case.
- Yes All paralegals should be regulated
- Yes Appears unnecessary in light of the grade amendments raising from the introduction of CPQ.
- Yes As above
- Yes As above.
- Yes As above. I totally disagree:
Bringing paralegals into the CILEX umbrella honestly felt like the start of watering down the high legal and practice standards CILEX had and had worked so hard to establish. To then bring in a lower legal of chartered status undermines the integrity of the F.CILEx standard and CILEx as a brand.
- Yes Chartered legal executives are often seen as paralegals with qualifications. Adding chartered paralegals just creates more confusion and encourages people to spend money on a qualification which most employers will not recognise in terms of either status or pay
- Yes Chartered paralegal is a contradiction. Paralegals are already undervalued and underpaid despite providing a valuable contribution. This is an incentive to progress and qualify. Adding this title is just a means of generating more membership fees.
- Yes 'Chartered Paralegal' is an oxymoron. 'Chartered' suggests qualification whereas a 'paralegal' is unqualified. CILEx should focus on qualified lawyers and members aspiring to be qualified lawyers. There was never a need for an Institute of Paralegals, and CILEx should never have taken it over.
- Yes CILEX is building a paralegal membership basis which far exceeds the authorised members. What is not clear is why when the SRA would not regulate these. How can you award chartered status to paralegals when the royal charter was for legal executives.
- Yes Don't do it.
- Yes don't think it aids transparency about the cilex brand. does not help parity with solicitors either
- Yes Fellows of the Institute of Paralegals, who by definition already have more than 5 years legal experience, should be given automatic Chartered Paralegal status. The fact that you haven't done this implies to me that you see us as a cash-cow to make money from in fees.
- Yes For staff retention alone, this route provides an avenue for those who want their skills to be recognised/ formalised.
- Yes Has to be clear that chartered paralegal is not a fellow or qualified lawyer I do not agree to give paralegal chartered it will confuse public
- Yes Having objected to the use of "Chartered" in the description of the qualification I feel that the introduction of a paralegal qualification is appropriate and will encourage a standard of quality and oversight
- Yes Hopefully yes
- I am happy for a Paralegal to have a professional status.
- Yes I think however that the title of Chartered should apply only to those members who have a reserved activity rights.
- Yes I am not convinced the Royal Charter provides for the introduction of a "Chartered Paralegal" standard.
- Yes I believe the role of a paralegal and public understanding will very much come down to the area of law which they are working in.
- Yes I do not understand what you are trying to achieve by introducing a Chartered Paralegal qualification. What is the purpose and function? If I can't understand it, how can it possibly be in the public interest?
- Yes I fully support any proposals to enhance the status of paralegals and members
- I have encountered many in working practice who are very skilled and yet do not have the desire to take on the CILEx route to qualification. Excellent support is their aim and it would provide a recognition that not all legal support staff are the same.
- Yes Those with the skillset who wish to remain in that role would benefit from the recognition as would the profession.
- Yes I spent years as a legal secretary before formal qualification and it would have been nice to have had the skill and experience I gained during that time noted. I then moved to paralegal whilst qualifying. One firm would not accept me as a "fee earner" so I think it is important to have this recognised.

Yes i want to understand if i qualify to chartered lawyer as i qualified to practice general civil litigation and personal injury i also am an LLB holder

If Chartered Paralegals are to be introduced, CILEX must ensure consumers understand the difference between Chartered Legal Executives and Chartered Paralegals as this is already an issue for FCILEx members who are often seen as senior paralegals. Furthermore, CILEX should also ensure that qualification routes available facilitate the move of Chartered Legal Executives to Chartered Lawyer status.

Yes

Yes In view of my answer above, I consider that it would be watering down the legal profession and a dangerous move.

Yes It appears to be a job creation scheme for CILEx

Yes it does not mean anything. it is not a qualified lawyer; so what is the necessity?

Yes It is a ridiculous idea.

Yes It is nonsense.

Yes It is unnecessary, when people can advance via CILEX and or Solicitor routes this development seems to fulfil no purpose and is unlikely to assist consumers but merely to confuse.

Yes It is unnecessary.

Yes It really just seems like a money making idea and unnecessary. Paralegals are already able to be regulated and reprimanded by the SRA. It's an initial step for most so why does it need a status? Put simply it doesn't.

Yes It should not be allowed to happen. You are watering down the status of Chartered Legal Executives by pursuing this proposal. Nor do I understand how CILEx believes it can do this without breaching our Charter.

Yes It will blur the lines between paralegals and FCILEX. It will undermine and water down the status of FCILEX and confuse consumers massively.

Yes It will give clarity and a clearer understanding for consumers once created and publicised

It will lead to a lot of confusion as achieving a qualification/apprenticeship standard tends to contradict the definition of a paralegal. Who is a paralegal after this is introduced? Would the term mean anything at all? If it means many things it means nothing.

Yes

Yes It's a ridiculous idea, there are plenty of routes to train as a lawyer already

Yes

It's a really bad idea as chartered paralegals will also invariably be encouraged to become fully qualified lawyers. Its good for personal progression and demonstrates a level of achievement which remains useful should one leave the legal profession

Yes

Yes It's too similar to chartered legal executive title and will confuse the public as to qualified status

Yes

Yes makes sense for Cilex paralegals to be recognised as regulated individuals due to rigorous training process they undertake

Many professionals in the industry still do not recognise chartered legal executives as being equivalent to solicitors, so it is unlikely they will recognise the value of chartered paralegals.

Yes

Maybe the graduate level could incorporate being a chartered legal executive or even practice rights. It doesn't seem fair or just that it takes so long to acquire this status when our employers are happy to sign off our level of competency much sooner

Yes

My only concern about the proposals would be the impact on people being employed in house (for Government etc) who then state that only a certain 'level' of CILEX can be recruited (ie CILEX lawyer only), and those currently not at that level would not be able to continue without an additional qualification - which the government would be unlikely/unable to pay for, meaning that the individual will have to find that funding or leave their employment,

Yes

Further, I think that it would assist if the progression/side step to solicitor was more clear. I appreciate the point of these proposals is to build the awareness of CILEX lawyers and be clear of their standing and merit, but in some firms there will still be necessity to qualify as a solicitor to receive the same pay and benefits, and at the moment the step from CLE to Solicitor is unclear and lengthy- which is discouraging.

Yes

needs to be a clear and understandable document

Yes

Needs to go more on experience than 'exams'.

Yes

None

Yes

Not additional but same reason as above.

Yes

paralegal is a trainee - you are simply giving them a title

Paralegal is not a job that aspires to 'charter' status. It should be a stepping stone to solicitor or whatever CILEx latest suggestion for a qualified lawyer becomes.

Yes

Yes

Please see the above.

Yes

Realistically, I consider that only law firms and legal professionals will give any weight to Paralegal status. Clients and consumers will likely only make the distinction between qualified and unqualified persons, and not give thought to the experience of the unqualified person.

See Law Society of Upper Canada AKA Law Society of Ontario regulation structure as:-

L1 = Self-Employed Lawyer (Practice Law)

Yes L2 = Employed Lawyer (Practice Law)

P1 = Paralegals (Offer Legal Services)

www.lsao.ca

Yes see previous answers.

Yes Should be requirement for qualification

Yes Still Confusing re chartered lawyer & CLE

Yes The criteria is very similar to 'trainee lawyer'. I think it would be hard, for someone like myself, who hasn't decided whether they want to fully qualify or stop at paralegal status and therefore choosing a membership grade will be difficult

Yes The employment competency requires reviewing and changing. Even though now you have to show 2,300 you still have to prove your eligibility in accordance to the 27 criteria's which is not always possible. It's disappointing that after graduating you find yourself stuck as you cannot prove your work. Almost like it becomes redundant and difficult to justify to your employers who will clearly make less money if a paralegal work on the matter instead of a qualified lawyer/ solicitor.

Yes The FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be given the option of calling as Solicitors.

Yes The paralegal role is an extremely important role in the legal profession and should be recognised as a career in its own right. Obtaining Chartered Paralegal designation would evidence the level of experience and recognition that individual deserves.

Yes The switch to paralegal status for Associate members was a backwards step which destroyed their longstanding professional status. You did this by equating them with untrained, unqualified, inexperienced paralegals. Offering them Chartered Paralegal status may go some way towards rectifying that appalling error of judgement at CILEX.

Yes The very title of Paralegal defined by the University of Law is "used as preparation for qualifying as a solicitor, as the work often mirrors that of a trainee". They are not fully qualified legal professionals, and any elevation of standard or professional status will dilute that of those who are fully qualified.

Yes This is critical for me. I am currently a Cilex Paralegal and I have had extensive legal experience including implementation of legal technology) in an in-house setting and do want to progress to Chartered Paralegal status. It is a good move and provides a path for progression for those with appropriate experience.

Yes This is great progress for Paralegals and gives them clear career and education guidance. Highly supportive.

Yes This muddies the waters and is unnecessary. The word Paralegal is extremely out dated and does not in any way accurately reflect the level of skill and knowledge of those in that role. The title wouldn't be understood by most of the public.

Yes This qualification allows for peoples skills to be recognised.

Yes This should be completely separate and distinct from the Legal Exec qualification not muddled up in the middle of the qualification route. It's not helpful to part qualified lawyers, it turns them back into secretaries rather than reminding employers and the public that they studying to become LAWYERS not assistants

Yes This will provide consumer confidence as 'Chartered' is widely understood by the general public

Yes Trainee and Student lawyer levels look to be interchangeable terms for the public and the difference between them appears to be too technical for the public to care- so why bother with the two- why not choose one terms and put them all in that bracket.

Yes We should cease pushing use of the word paralegal. The public generally think this means a simple clerk or paper shuffler. Also they've seen a barage of American TV programmes and understand the word/role in a different way. often more negative. That we are not 'real' legal practitioners. Also this causes confusion with bodies such as NALP and Inst.Paralegals. leave things the way they were please.

Yes Where would a paralegal sit within the hierarchy of a firm with a number of CILEX grades? Better that they be offered a route to become a qualified legal executive. Also, where does an Apprentice fit in with a paralegal grade?

Yes Yes, how do you propose to protect the status of CILEX Fellows and ensure they are not regarded as glorified paralegals when you are promoting the CILEX Paralegal brand?

Yes You need to decide what is important to you. Your members or some new plan you have probably paid someone to draw up which tinkers with appearances. You have already introduced a new qualification framework for CILEX Lawyer. That should be sufficient. If you are going to press on and introduce yet another change you need to make sure that proper in depth information is published for members which deals with all questions in detail. You completely failed to do this with the previous new CILEX Lawyer route and you need to learn from this.

Yes Your staff cannot explain and don't understand the changes recently made. Stop trying to run when you can't even walk!

Yes Дипломированный помощник юриста должен иметь опыт и знания и обладать аналитическими способностями.

Do you agree the use of the Chartered Lawyer titles will assist legal professionals, employers and the public to better understand the status and specialist nature of CILEX lawyers?

Response Please state reasons

Agree

-

Agree "Executive" has been 'misused' by Conveyancing Executives, Probate Executives etc. for so long that it has watered down "Legal Executive" and the public associate the names "Solicitor" "Barrister" and "Lawyer" probably more to someone who has the necessary qualifications.

Agree

"Lawyer" covers a multitude - we have gone the extra mile to obtain qualification and I believe it should be recognised.

Agree

Absolutely yes. 'CILEX' is confusing for members of the public.

Agree

Absolutely, some lawyers, let alone the public do not know what a Chartered Legal Executive is. There is no misunderstanding of lawyer.

Agree

After a considerable period the Legal Executive title is still not well understood

Agree

Agree - but where does it leave the Chartered Legal Executives?! How many individuals will this change impact i.e. how many CLEs will be left once the change of titles happens (because they work in reserved areas and don't have the necessary practice rights)?

Agree

Agree but it's just spin really. There are far more important solid grounds that CILEX should focus on such as creating immediate access once Fellowship has been granted to set up oneself as a Sole Practitioner with full rights under s12. legal services act.

Agree

Agree largely. Again, it will need to gain traction in public awareness and stop changing every few years! I remain disappointed, for example, that when I am asked to countersign someone's passport application form, my job title (Filex or even similar!) is not among the long list of suggested professionals who may do so. Yet Solicitor, Barrister, even 'photographer' or qualified legal secretary is listed. I have raised this with Cilex before - but it has remained the same for years. It is as if we don't exist as a trusted signatory of a passport application, despite being entitled to become a District Judge!

Agree

Agree that it is a term which is easier for the public to understand, but should be available to all existing Fellows.

Agree

allows the public to compare and have a choice/select based on suitability of the situation

Agree

Although I feel

Agree

It is more around the industry to promote and discuss what these titles mean too

Agree

Although this needs to be better communicated globally.

Agree

At present there is still unfortunately a lack of clarity by some in relation to CILEX and the connection with being a lawyer. A

Agree

Chartered Lawyer title will cement exactly what the role encompasses and at what level.

Agree

At the moment, the general public has minimal awareness of the current titles.

Agree

be positioned similarly to solicitors.

Agree

Because although there is more recognition now than back in the 90s, there is still a lot of work to do. I know, I am still living the nightmare!

Agree

Better than Legal Exec

Agree

But there should be just one title 'Chartered Lawyer' not half a dozen (or more) derivatives

Agree

But they should not be allowed to dilute the purpose of cilex

Agree

Chartered Lawyer definitely sounds great.

Agree

Chartered Lawyer will provide confidence that the person is regulated. However I am not entirely convinced what this name

Agree

change will add over and above Chartered Legal Executive?

Agree

'Chartered Legal Executive' is SO much more impressive a title than 'CILEX lawyer'. See for example job advertisements in the Law Society Gazette.

Agree

Chartered status generally seems to confer a quality mark for the professional

Agree

Chartered title implies quality. Anyone can call themselves a legal executive.

Agree

CLE is not understood by the public and always needs to be explained so having 'lawyer' in our title should help.

Agree

Clear distinct naming conventions will aid the general public in understanding the status and specialist nature of CILEX lawyers.

Agree

Currently those who are legal executives are often overlooked because people do not understand the title and what they can and

Agree

cannot do so having a clearer title will enable us to be seen and heard more

Agree

Definitely. As a Fellow I constantly have to explain my qualification & how it equates with solicitors. The term legal executive is not

Agree

recognised by the general public as a person qualified to practice law, & does not accurately describe the role.

Agree

Employers and public think chartered legal executives are not lawyers

Agree

Enhance status

Agree

Especially with ADR

Agree

Even these days, not many people know what the titles mean, at least this has lawyer in it

Agree

Far too often the public are bamboozled by the actual qualification of the person who is dealing with their case.

Agree

for clarity

Agree

Gives them a better status and not look like the lowest in the industry.

Agree

good view for the public decisions.

Agree

Having 'Lawyer' in one's title is self-explanatory. Clients and consumers will likely have no idea what 'Chartered Legal Executive'

Agree

means, including whether or not they are qualified lawyers.

I agree "Chartered Lawyer" better assists consumers, the public and professionals and Employers to better understand their status as "Authorised Persons" pursuant to the Legal Services Act 2007

Agree Regarding the title to confer specialism I should think it would be prudent to borrow from The Bar which uses the protected legal title of "Barrister" for all "Authorised Persons" qualified to practice law via The Bar Standards Board however as a workplace title and to connote the specialism for advocacy they often use in court orders and are referred to in Court as "counsel" such term has become by custom of trade so associated with The Bar that perhaps it would be misleading to the consumer to hijack such term now centuries later and also refer to "CILEX Advocates" as "counsel" even though they are largely doing the same thing and perhaps even meeting the Oxford English Dictionary definition of the same

Agree Given CILEX's Advocates ability to become both "Litigators & Advocates" linking the two traditional contentious legal services together I would suggest the more appropriate specialist title or workplace title for a CILEX Litigator & Advocate would be "Attorney" and depending on their specialism for Civil, Family or Crime putting in the appropriate prefix before the word "Attorney" based on that specialism (i.e. "Civil Attorney")

Agree I agree that it is a more accessible description than Chartered Legal Executive, especially as a lot of businesses use the role description "Legal Executive" to describe someone with no qualifications at all which always irritates me!

Agree I agree that this will be a better title than Chartered Legal Executive as I have had frequent queries asking if I am qualified to certify documents for example. Chartered Lawyer is similar to Chartered Accountant so I think this is a better title which people/public will understand

Agree I agree with this proposal

I agree. Although I note that Existing Fellows who work in reserved areas and do not hold practice rights will have to remain as Chartered Legal Executives. This of course comprises a significant number of existing members. It also feels like another missed opportunity to allow experienced Fellows to "self-certify", as most can and do conduct litigation on a regular basis and whilst advocacy experience may be less than equivalently experienced solicitors they will certainly be better placed than newly qualified solicitors.

I note the The SRA has committed to "work with CILEX to ensure that appropriate routes exist to allow Chartered Legal Executives who qualified under the legacy route without Practice Rights to obtain them."

Agree At what cost? This is the difficulty with the current model and why so few have chosen to take up these Practice Rights.

Agree I always have to explain what I do as a Legal Executive without fail. Lawyer is a very easily recognisable title.

Agree I believe that generally speaking the public know what a lawyer is. I believe that adding Chartered to it will give some indication the role is regulated and qualified.

Agree I believe there will be normal, non legal people who have no idea what a Chartered Legal Executive is. They certainly will not believe that they have the same practice rights (within their chosen area) as a Solicitor; whereas most people should know what a Lawyer does. People work so hard for their qualification, they deserve a title that gives them recognition.

Agree I do agree that 'Chartered Lawyer' is easier for a lay consumer to comprehend than CLE. To someone without inside knowledge of the legal industry, CLE does not really give any immediate or obvious indication of what a CLE actually is and does.

Agree I do agree that it will ensure everyone knows who is who but it devalues the old legacy members as you are basically saying we are no longer fully qualified and what we have been doing for the past how every many years was not as good as the new route.

Agree I do believe that the public will better understand the status and specialist nature of Cilex Lawyers by having Cilex titles and details of specialism that correspond with those of Solicitors/Lawyers that have taken the traditional qualifying route.

Agree I have no issue with the term "Chartered Lawyer"

Agree I have not personally experienced any issues with my current title but agree that people will recognise the title lawyer more so than legal executive.

Agree I hope so but this must be supported by communication to all of what that means. As CILEX we continually struggle and strive to build understanding of who and what we are and the extensive experience and talent we offer but we remain an unknown, misunderstood group who continually have to prove their expertise as a lesser understood qualification. I hope this will ultimately lead to equality and recognition for us rather than the general view that we are 'not as good/not as qualified/not as talented' as a solicitor. Nothing could be further from the truth but it continues to be a battle. If this can be a positive step towards us not having to explain every time that the fact that we are not 'a solicitor' does not mean that the public are receiving a reduced level of capability. This has driven me to distraction for the last 30 years and I hope this can now be improved. I was determined not to qualify as a solicitor and to remain loyal to the CILEX qualification despite the changes that have been imposed including additional qualification requirements. It does feel like a mission at times and I hope that we are now moving towards better times and recognition.

Agree I hope that in theory this will make the professional qualification clearer for the public to understand.

Agree I often have to explain what my legal qualification is. It is not widely understood.

Agree I refer to myself as a lawyer as to use legal executive usually ends up with me having to explain that legal executives, solicitors and barristers are all lawyers.

I strongly disagree. There is no reason to change the membership structure. In my view, the proposals are MORE confusing. The issues with people not respecting and/or recognising the importance of Chartered Legal Executives will not change with this proposal. If anything it will be more confusing for people in and outside CILEx. How can CILEx call themselves "The Chartered Institute of Legal Executives" if its members are not referred to as Legal Executives. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes to titles and I would consider moving across to another route to qualification if it went ahead!

Agree I think it will further enhance the existing position

Agree I think it will help but it will be difficult in my case as I work for a local authority and deal with different areas of law.

Agree I think it will show to the public that we are as qualified as a solicitor in that particular area. It will help us get more work hopefully!

Agree I think public do get confused with terminology of legal executive, and by definition using the word lawyer means qualified and experienced in advising on law.

Agree I use the term lawyer at present, people tend to be familiar with the term lawyer.

Agree I work in the public sector and majority of people ask what a Cilex is, or what Cilex does, they do not understand that it is the same as being a solicitor.

Agree I'm still very unhappy that you didn't adequately consider the impact of the change on those FCilex "people" who've quite rightly called themselves "lawyers" for decades, because that is what they were, when you took away the right to use the term from some of us.

Agree If we can also use job title

Agree I'm in agreement with this however I do not agree that this solve the disparity between CILEX and Solicitors.

Agree In my experience it is more obtuse and difficult to refer to "Chartered Legal Executives" as the title appears like it is less than a solicitor or barrister. By incorporating the word Lawyer, it is a clear stamp and identifiable term which clients and other stakeholders are familiar with and respect.

Agree In my experience, which I believe is universally accepted by all members of our profession, we are already treated as professional lawyers and represented in the vast majority of firms of solicitors. Coupled with the untiring work of our governing body in continuing to advance our status.

Agree It clears ambiguity

Agree It is a better distinction between the various memberships.

Agree It is a clear indicator in my view

Agree It is a move in the right direction

Agree It is a simpler title which is more readily understood.

Agree It is believed that 'Chartered Legal Executive ' is an accepted title. For example ,see the jobs adverts in the Law Society Gazette.

Agree It is often difficult for members of the public to understand the title of chartered legal executive and often causes confusion and the assumption you are a legal secretary. The word lawyer is more generally understood.

Agree It is one title, rather than two, from the same institute.

Agree It makes more sense as the public are not really aware of what a Chartered Legal Executive is where they understand a little more of you call yourself a lawyer.

Agree It should assist in any confusion that currently exists.

Agree It should provide greater clarity.

Agree It will help the public- which is not much interested in any distinction in "name"

Agree It will make it much clearer for all to understand the level of the individual.

Agree It will still take a lot more work and greater acceptance by other lawyers and the courts for CILEX to achieve anything resembling parity e.g. will a CILEx lawyer become an Officer of the Court in the same way as solicitors are and will CILEx lawyers be permitted to certify a Bill of Costs?

Agree It would be preferable if 'lawyer' were a protected term that all those who are qualified to practice law could utilise. Until lawyer is a protected term this might assist but it also leaves it open to non-qualified legal staff to use the term which could be too close to 'Chartered Lawyer' to avoid confusion.

Agree It would give a clear idea

Agree It's about professional recognition

Agree It's clearer.

Agree I've lost count of the number of times I've told someone I'm a CLE, just to be asked what's that. When I explain they say 'oh you're a solicitor' which then requires further explanation. I usually tell people I'm a lawyer if asked which doesn't generally prompt any further questions. I think using the title 'Chartered Lawyer' would ease confusion both within the legal profession, amongst other professionals and the public.

Agree Lawyer is an inclusive title

Agree Lawyer is far more recognised as a profession and term

Agree Lawyer is understood. The previous would always involve making a comparison to chartered accountant and architect.

Agree Like accounting, town planning, or housing, the chartered status will give confidence to employers and public that the person is a qualified lawyer and professional.

Agree Most people know what a Lawyer is, however as it is not a protected term and this creation of the new term should help with that.

Agree Most people think of a Solicitor/Legal Executive as being a Lawyer, so this just confirms this.

Agree Much clearer

nobody knows what a CILEx fellow is and employers don't take use seriously, they know nothing about practice rights, too, so anything to help with that is welcome

Agree

Not sure on this one to be honest

On confirming my status as a Fellow of CILEX I am continually asked if i am a "paralegal". I then have to explain the role of a Solicitor and a Chartered Legal Executive as no one understands the role. There is a lot of discrimination in the workplace and generally as to the role of a Chartered Legal Executive.

Agree

Once again modernising the status of cilex members is long overdue

Agree

People don't understand CILEX

Agree

People need more clearance and understanding of specialist lawyers

Agree

People often confuse us with secretaries and don't understand that we are qualified lawyers. This change may help

Agree

People think that a Legal Executive is like a PA or EA, they do not associate the term with being a lawyer

Agree

People who use legal services will always recognise the word "lawyer".

Agree

please see answer to Q9 above.

Agree

Possibly, I'm not fully convinced

Possibly, if the profession is moving to a merged status, but what exactly will Chartered Lawyer mean - Fellowship, relevant practising rights (for reserved activities) etc? How will this be relayed - there is already a lack of knowledge on CILEX Advocates - what difference is this going to make

Agree

Provided it's adoption is widespread, and accepted by the wider legal industry

Agree

Provided that the title is limited to those that have reserved activity rights

Agree

Provided the "Chartered" tag is used only to describe the qualifications of those at the most senior levels of attainment within the Institute.

Agree

Provided there is an explanation available to all parties

Agree

Public see fellow as lawyer but this title must only be open to chartered fellows fully qualified

Quality intakes

Spiritually felt terms

Access

Agree

Obaervated hands

Agree

Recognising specialisms will help

Agree

See above.

Agree

See answer to question 9.

Agree

Seems self evident. The term "Lawyer" is unequivocal and understood.

Agree

Simpler and clearer

Agree

simpler to understand

Agree

So long as there is information about exactly what Chartered Lawyers are.

Agree

Stated above.

Strongly agree, from a lay persons perspective, lawyer trumps legal executives. This would also serve to bridge the gap between legal execs and solicitors

Agree

The Chartered Lawyer title should replace ALL Legal Executive designations. It is just better for all parties concerned.

Agree

The chartered Lawyer titles will assist legal professionals, employers, and the public and better understand the status and specialist nature of CILEX.

Agree

The Chartered Legal Executive title was a bit misleading.

Agree

The Chartered status has always helped employers understand the status and specialist nature of CILEx Lawyers

Agree

The confidence factor will build up.

Agree

The current title Chartered Legal Executive doesn't make it clear to the public that you are a lawyer

Agree

The language is more familiar to the public.

Agree

The public at large do not know what a chartered Legal executive is . They consider us to be paralegals .

Agree

The public don't know what a chartered legal executive is and we mostly all call ourselves "lawyers" anyway.

Agree

The public will understand the term chartered and the term lawyer and the term paralegal. They do not understand 'cilex'. I do think the term 'chartered specialist lawyer' may be helpful

Agree

The term 'lawyer' is the generally the term that matters most to the general public. The terms 'chartered' 'advocate' etc mean something to legal professionals, but not to the general public.

Agree

The term lawyer is widely understood by the public and profession.

Agree

The terms 'Executives' does not in any way elude to the persons qualification throughout the proffession and by the public the term 'Lawyer' is understood.

Agree

The title chartered is very important and provides evidence of the individuals status and qualification to provide the legal services.

Agree

The title provides a guarantee for the exercise of the legal profession.

Agree

The titles are clear and convey the relevant member's area of expertise, along with the fact that they are dealing with a qualified lawyer.

Agree

The use of the term "lawyer" will undoubtedly help. However, those holding Chartered Legal Executive status will, in my opinion, struggle even more under this new structure to explain their position and value. The Chartered Legal Executive qualification and title appears somehow redundant under the new structure and consumer are likely to continue to lack understanding of what Chartered Legal Executives are and can do.

Agree

- Agree The word "lawyer" in the title will help the public understand what it means to be a Chartered Legal Executive. Currently, they are not aware that Chartered Legal Executives are specialist lawyers.
- Agree The word Lawyer is a "catch all" for those in our profession
- Agree The word Lawyer will definitely help in people understanding the status and specialist nature of CILEX lawyers.
- Agree There needs to be enforcement for misuse, monitoring. Anyone seems to be able to claim anything. Paralegals are already claiming to be lawyers, chartering paralegals takes it away from the cilex members.
- Agree There was no box to state that I neither agree or disagree. It may assist other legal professionals and employers but double that it will make much of a difference to the public in general.
- Agree These simple clear titles were suggested back in 2015! They still need tweaking, so instead of Chartered litigator & advocate (Family) why not Chartered Family Litigator & Advocate. Qualification, area of law etc in that order.
- Agree This may enhance the understanding of the public members of the quality of specialist legal advice as could be obtained from a solicitor who is qualified as an SRA Solicitor.
- Agree This will increase knowledge and awareness of Chartered Lawyers.
- Agree This will provide more opportunities for CILEX lawyers to become the lawyer of choice
- Agree This would clear up different titles but there needs to be clear understanding on how current Fellows can use this title and training required
- Agree To confirm that they are a lawyer and not a paralegal
- Agree When you say you are a Chartered Legal Executive most people ask what is that. You then return with specialist lawyer. It makes sense to change titles for better understanding and recognition.
- Agree Whilst I agree that the term 'Chartered Lawyer' will be a simpler and more user friendly term to adopt, I feel strongly that the Chartered Lawyer title should be extended to FCILEX members without the need for the practice rights top up.
- Agree Will clearly be able to see their specialism of the lawyer/paralegal
- Agree Yes
- Agree Yes 100%, everyone knows what a lawyer is but no one really understands what a legal executive is (often seen as paralegals)
- Agree Yes because most members of the public know of lawyer , solicitor and Barrister. They do not know much about chartered Legal executive.
- Agree Yes I agree and would enhance the "specialist nature".
- Agree yes- I hope the new title may assist with recognition of the level of qualification achieved
- Agree Yes the term Legal Executive arguably (and incorrectly) implies somebody who is not qualified and/or is generic.
- Agree Yes, subject to the caveat re my previous comments.
- Disagree I do not agree that legal professionals, employers and the public need to have a better understanding of CILEX lawyers. All the different titles create confusion, dilutes the profession in general and creates a feeling of who on earth are we?!
- Disagree *
- Disagree .
- Disagree A
- Disagree A lawyer is a very general term. Chartered Legal Executive is a brand which is well-settled on the market.
- Disagree Adding chartered to everything only diminishes the value... There are too many chartered institutions in the UK and the very word is not trustworthy
- Disagree Adding more titles to ones that are not understood only takes us further down the rabbit hole. You will disagree but you did ask the question and cant expect always to get the answer you are wanting.
- Disagree Adds a layer of confusion. The public understand clearly enough the existing terms.
- Disagree Again, I have very serious concerns that the introduction of yet more tiers will dilute the title 'Chartered Legal Executive'. People are aware of CiLEX however I would struggle to explain the difference between Chartered Lawyers and Chartered Legal Executives without making Chartered Legal Executives sound somewhat second rate in their own professional body. We are already competing with other more established legal professionals (Solicitors and Barristers) and so creating a new tier of qualification above us in our own organisation only exacerbates this issue. I would personally, rather see CILEX focussing their efforts on increasing the profile and supporting all of those who are qualified Chartered Legal Executives without creating more potential career barriers in the process. I hope this can be looked at further.
- Disagree Again, you are making titles complex, confusing and misrepresentative. Would I be a Chartered Lawyer or a Chartered Litigator and Advocate (Family)? As I do not undertake advocacy, you are forcing a title on me that is misrepresentative of what I do. All you need to help the public understand is a decent marketing campaign.
- Disagree All changes made to date in how CLE's are referred to has not made any difference in my opinion. The issue is that CILEX have not proactively pushed for CLE's to be treated equally to solicitors without the need for further applications and portfolio's to be done.
- Disagree Other legal professionals attitudes towards alternative route of qualification is what needs to be addressed, not continuous changes to CLE titles.
- Disagree All the same. What's important is the quality of service.
- Disagree Any title with the word 'lawyer' in is preferable to the 'Chartered Legal Executive' title, as people recognise the word lawyer, solicitor or barrister as being synonymous with a qualified legal professional. But I am not sure people would understand the difference between a Chartered Lawyer and a solicitor. Much more education / PR needs to be given to the legal sector and the public about the equal standing of CILEX lawyers to solicitors, and the fact that CILEX lawyers carry out their qualification whilst specialising in their area of law simultaneously.

Anyone working within the law uses whatever title they wish to adopt and the same applies to most professions - it does not mean they are appropriately qualified. No-one seems to enforce the use of titles particularly at the moment with the use of Probate Executive for example.

Disagree As above - because there will still be Chartered Legal Executives this may just add to confusion - especially when lawyer can be used as a generic job title which encompasses Chartered Legal Executives who are not, and would not, call themselves Cilex Lawyers or Chartered lawyers.

Disagree As above, you are just muddying the waters and reducing trust and awareness

Disagree As above.

Disagree As above.

As I understand it both Chartered Lawyer and Chartered Legal Executive will still be titles - is that not more likely to lead to confusion?

Disagree As stated above the public get confused enough with reference to paralegal, litigation executive etc. There is a clear defined structure at present

Disagree Be a Barrister, Solicitor or FCILEx, the average person just thinks of us all as lawyers now anyway. There is nothing distinctive in being called a lawyer. I mention it to lay persons and it does nothing to identify me as FCILEx.

Disagree Because lawyer is a catch all term which can be used by people who are and aren't qualified. It's not specific to CILEX. Because no one will know what this means. Some members are already sharing stories on having to explain they're not 'solicitors or counsel' when attending hearings, and others are just becoming aware of what Legal Executives are. To once again change the name adds further confusion and is unnecessary.

Disagree By having effectively two layers (at least) of qualified lawyers but operating under different titles it seems unlikely to assist either the public or employers. I am a CILEX member & Partner in a law firm and have long since become confused by the mixing and matching of titles and requirements to qualification but as I am close to retirement I am not going to get over excited about it. the whole thing has already become confused and the sense is that the CILEX organisation now operates in a bubble divorced from the reality of the members they represent

Disagree CILEX has existed for many years with the CLE title - by requiring further applications (and fees - both application and renewals) it feels like the goal posts are unnecessarily moving

Disagree Cilex has not been great at raising the profile of its membership previously and I am not convinced an increase in titles will assist. I think it may confuse the public even more.

Disagree CILEX is clearer

Disagree CILEX is still listed as ILEX on many court documents and legislation therefore a further change will take more time to have any material effect

Disagree CILEX regulation only currently regulate Fellows and Practicioners and CILEX Lawyer is only a brand, it doesnt help anyone, it confuses the public who will try and work out the difference between a Solicitor and a CILEX "Lawyer" and think they are one and the same.

Disagree CILEX/Chartered Legal Exec is an established title already well understood which has taken years to establish. Changing that will set CILEX lawyers back and mean that the new title will again have to fight for recognition

Disagree client want a lawyer - the majority do no understand the differences

Disagree Does not elevate the need to explain what our job involves - no improvement here. The new title should only apply to Fellows only have fulfilled all training and studying requirements ie not apply to members.

Disagree Don't see how it makes any difference over chartered legal executive name.

Disagree Employers may be but not the general public as they do not understand the difference between solicitors and CILEX let alone CILEX status during progression to become a CILEX lawyer.

Disagree F C I L Ex is quite sufficient

Disagree For the reasons already stated.

Frankly, I don't believe that there will be any difference in recognition of the public between FCILEx, Chartered Legal Executive or Chartered Lawyer. Legal professionals and employers should know the difference (a failing of CILEX if they don't) and the public don't care. It's just a name.

Disagree I am concerned that it may be simply adding greater complexity and possible confusion. There are bigger issues to address, such as the current prejudicial treatment of longstanding, experienced Chartered Legal Executives.

Disagree I am not sure the public will know the difference even after the changes between a CILEX Lawyer and a Solicitor

I believe that all Fellows should be allowed to use the title CILEX Lawyer as we all do similar work in our respective specialist areas under Firms with Solicitors. We have similar clientele and duties to deliver a desired outcome for the service user

Disagree I believe that, as is the case currently, employers and the public will have no better understanding of the difference between solicitors and Chartered Lawyers. The title will indicate that the person is a qualified lawyer, but there will be no better understanding as to a Chartered Lawyer's role and specialism.

Disagree I believe the distinction will lead to inequity between Solicitors and FCILEX. Lawyer would suffice.

Disagree I believe the public won't have any interest at all in understanding the titles of legal professionals. In the legal profession there are so many different titles applied to job roles in various practices which don't reflect the qualification of the individual. It may assist legal professionals and employers.

Disagree I believe the use of 'lawyer' waters down the qualification. The vast majority of employing firms are more than aware of the structure, nature and titles of professionals. The public do not. The use of larger, "factory/call centre" type firms of the terms lawyer/executive/paralegal for unqualified staff is the biggest source of confusion for consumers.

Disagree I believe there is general confusion over the status and expertise of CILEx qualified people and adding more or changing titles is not going to assist and/or cause further confusion. I am regularly referred to as ILEx which I understand hasn't been around for a number of years. It has been confusing with the recent restructuring of CILEx lawyer bands to understand to what each means, and whether my qualifications have been relevant for the roles I have sought.

Disagree I believe using specialist designations would pigeon hole CILEx members, with others believing they are trained in their specialism only. It would give the impression that CILEx members so not have as broad a range of training as solicitors.

Disagree I consider the proposed titles may cause confusion. When I served on Council (until 2016) and after we were awarded the Royal Charter in 2012 we always referred to Fellows as Chartered Legal Executive lawyers.

Disagree I do not think any further changes are needed at this time. You are trying to solve a problem that doesn't really exist.

Disagree I do not believe this will help better the understanding, it will just be something different.

Disagree I don't think it will assist and could potentially create more confusion. The title of "Chartered Legal Executive" has already been long established. I think the focus should be on informing the public, employers etc and promoting the fact that CILEX are qualified lawyers and therefore competent to do legal work to the same standard as other lawyers e.g.solicitors.

I don't think it will make one iota of difference.

Disagree

Disagree I don't even really understand where I (as a qualified and regulated Practitioner) fit in - how will anybody else?

Disagree I don't think it will make a half penny's worth of difference. In the minds of many legal professionals at management level Legal Executives are seen as glorified admin. I doubt that a name change will alter their opinion.

Disagree I don't think it will make any difference and changing the title - again - may add to confusion - most other professionals don't understand what Chartered means anyway

Disagree I don't think many people outside of the CILEX sphere will understand the difference between a CILEX Lawyer and a Chartered Legal Executive. Legacy Chartered Legal Executives find their position now significantly devalued.

Disagree I don't think that it would change anything at all.

Disagree I still feel that I am treated as a poor version of a Solicitor

Disagree I strongly disagree. The general public understand what it means to be 'Chartered'. Focus should be on promoting CLE not introducing a dual system

Disagree I think all current Fellows should be able to use the Chartered Lawyer title and the ones who have Practice Rights should use Chartered Lawyer & Advocate. I will go back to the concern I have raised all along in that current Fellows who have done the job, including advocacy, for many years appear to be being 'kicked to the curb'. Why should we now have additional expense to obtain a qualification that in reality is not going to make any difference whatsoever to the job. Is the public now going to think Chartered Legal Executive means you are a legal assistant rather than qualified? I am a lawyer and have been for almost 20 years, my professional body is Chartered so why can I not be a Chartered Lawyer? I have no issue with the term Chartered Lawyer as I think it will give the public some confidence but I find the whole thing rather worrying for us who have been around for a while.

Disagree I think CILEX changes titles too often to offer any certainty. I think Chartered Lawyer adds nothing and sounds lower than Chartered Legal Executive.

Disagree I think it gives the impression that they have qualified in that one discipline and nothing else. A fact that is equally true of the majority of solicitors but not implied by their title which suggests a general knowledge and training in the law.

Disagree I think it is a strange designation. CILEx lawyer is much clearer.

Disagree I think it will add to confusion rather than clarifying it. I don't see anything wrong with the current system.

Disagree I think it will be an extremely difficult task to secure understanding of the CILEX status generally.

Disagree

Disagree I think that the Chartered Lawyer title remains very confusing to employers and the public. I regularly get "So you're a Solicitor"

Disagree I think that the public will still be confused

Disagree I think that the term lawyer is used by everyone who is unqualified and will devalue our qualification.

Disagree I think the public will misunderstand regardless of the title given to chartered members because they will be ignorant to the different routes to qualification.

Disagree I think the public, when informed that someone is a lawyer, will ask if that individual is a solicitor (or a barrister) and I don't think it will necessarily help to raise the standing of CILEx qualified lawyers.

Disagree I think the term "Chartered Lawyer" actually cheapens the title. A "lawyer" can technically be anyone who practices law - qualified or not. Therefore, there are many unqualified professionals who use the term "lawyer". This is now diluted the term "lawyer", and the public may not fully comprehend the weight of what "Chartered" really means. I feel as though Chartered Legal Executive carries more weight and better reflects the qualification. I will continue to use the title CLE and will not use the title "Chartered Property Lawyer" for this reason - I am sure many others will feel the same.

Disagree I think there will still be confusion as solicitor is the more generally recognised and understood title and I imagine even with these new titles, an explanation will still need to be given when describing a CL's role by reference/comparison to the work of a solicitor

- Disagree I think you are creating a two tier system which reduces the confidence in those older members who qualified under the old system as chartered legal executives who quite frankly I believe had a harder route to qualifying than under the watered down apprenticeship route.
- Disagree I think you would have to do a great deal of education to help public and employers understand the changes - I believe that using what has in England and Wales been a very generic word without guarantee a specific qualification, runs the risk of leading public to not understand they are instructing someone with specific qualifications.
- Disagree I work in an insurance company and head up the claims team. I make decisions on legal matter everyday. i have no practice rights as I do not need any for my role. I will therefore, not qualify as a Chartered Lawyer. CILEX does not recognise in-house lawyers and the number that do not work in private practice.
- Disagree I would again reiterate the response I have given to question 7 above. I am a CILEX Fellow and the overwhelming feeling I have after reading the proposals is that CILEX is trying to downgrade Fellows to be perceived as advanced paralegals instead of Lawyers. It's really disheartening to read to be honest.
- Disagree If CILEx believes this then it has failed in one of its key objects as a representative and regulatory body i.e., it has not done enough, especially since 2011, to educate the public and other professionals about the status and specialist nature of Chartered Legal Executives
- Disagree If SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients.
- Disagree I'm very lucky that my employers appreciate and understand CILEX lawyers. However, the public don't and never have (I've been FCILEX for 11 years) - I'm concerned that yet another change of name will simply confuse them further.
- Disagree In 20 years I have never been questioned about my professional qualifications , using the title Chartered Legal Executive Advocate has always been a mouthful and it doesn't fit onto forms but making me a Chartered Lawyer will just cause more confusion. It is an American term being used to try and cover all eventualities and it is not necessary. Barristers , solicitors and Legal Executives all have different roles to play with overlaps in various places
- Disagree Introducing yet more confusing titles is not helpful to those looking to move into the profession, or for consumers who will have yet more titles to try to understand.
- Disagree Introduction of a new designation undermines the work done over decades to raise the status of CLEs and will cause more confusion
- Disagree It is hijacking a normal word without any proper authority or justification and is bound to create confusion with Chartered LEs. How is the consumer to understand and recognise the difference? The research relied on was not carried out with consumers but only CILEx Members and the contemporaneous reports do not support the finding now cited. The confusion is between solicitor and legal executive and creating 2 levels of CLE (also divided into more than 10 categories!) cannot seriously be expected to reduce confusion!
- Disagree It is meaningless, unless the solicitor's branch adopts the same terminology.
- Disagree It was difficult enough for people to understand what a CLE is, but this improved from 2010-2019 through stability and consistency. Now the changes have led to complexity and complete confusion to every except a few people at CILEx.
- Disagree It will have no change in my view.
- Disagree its another change so last year it was cilex lawyer this year it is chartered lawyer. Next year it could be something else. It's confusing and dilutes the value of the FCilex qualification, it's hard enough getting the public to recognise the existence of a FCilex as a qualified legal professional (versus a solicitor) let alone there now being a further distinction between Fellow and Chartered Lawyer. I have looked into the SRA's SQE because of this.
- Disagree its just confusing additional titles a lot of unqualified people call themselves lawyers
- Disagree It's still too complicated because of distinctions relating to practising rights.
- Disagree Keep it simple - too many different titles and variations
- Disagree Lawyer is all encompassing term. Will not improve public understanding.
- Disagree Lawyer is traditionally a term used for a generic legally trained individual. To now try and ring fence this to just relate to CILEX is going to cause more confusion. Either use something entirely new or stick with what we have.
- Disagree Legal professionals and employers already understand what a Chartered Legal Executive is, and the change to "Chartered Lawyer" won't mean anything more except to increase snobbery from those firms who believe that solicitors are "better" than Chartered Legal Executives.
- Disagree Legal Professionals are already aware
- Disagree Loss of Exclusivity: Critics might argue that by extending these rights and opportunities , CILEX risks losing the exclusivity and prestige associated with being a Fellow.
- Disagree My client trust me already
- Disagree n
- Disagree No because we will still have to distinguish that we are not "solicitors"
- Disagree No because you have undermined it any further changes will not lead to clarity. Just makes you look like clowns and us by implication.
- Disagree No keep it simple don't change current titles it's already too confusing
- Disagree No, as above it will merely create greater confusion adding more layers to mystify the public. It will also not enhance understanding within legal professionals and many solicitor employers as adding more layers.
- Disagree To assist the public with a better understanding public education should be undertaken. There is no need to create more complexity which the public are not invested in understanding.

No. Strongly feel it would be much more confusing both for the public and within the profession, and could further undermine the existing differences between how CILEX people are treated compared to trainee and qualified solicitors

Disagree not sure on this one. because there are so many different levels of a CILEX professional.

Disagree Not unless it is clear which Chartered Legal Executive is more senior to another Ed chartered legal executive. At present the qualifying employment and training period prior to becoming a Fellow made the progression clear within the firm and to the public. There will be too many "Chartered" qualified people.

Disagree Only if it applies to all fcilex

Disagree Our Fellowship tag is still not understand by consumers - so changing a label is unlikely to improve anything.

Disagree People fully understand Chartered Legal Executives already. Change for change sake?

Disagree People have no idea what it all means already and I worry that further title changes is just going to complicate this further

Disagree Quite happy to call myself a Cilex lawyer

Disagree Ridiculous - membership grades recently changed and whilst, this time, appreciate being consulted I do not think this at all necessary

Disagree Sadly, we still live in an age where the term "Solicitor" seems to be the recognised term for a Lawyer.

Disagree Same as above.

Disagree See above I think this will add to confusion. Not to mention the impact on those already practicing at top levels without the additional practice rights

Disagree see above the public only understands Solicitor and Barrister, you haven't educated them to understand what a LE is.

Disagree See above.

Disagree see previous answer. There should be clear distinction with the qualified lawyers and those that are students or in training - regardless of what stage they are at with their progression towards lawyer.

Disagree Soft option

Disagree Solicitors are referred to as lawyers so it will not make it clear

Disagree Status - yes, but not the specialist nature. To a layperson, "chartered" probably just means "regulated", not "specialising in...".

Disagree Tend to agree that inclusion of the specialist area in the title could help but, as mentioned above, the danger is it leads to a far greater number of titles overall which could then become confusing.

Disagree That is my view

Disagree the adoption of a generic term to describe a distinct category of legal professional is confusing and will lead to consumers and overseas lawyers misunderstanding the professional status of the person they are dealing with

The change of title does nothing to aid public understanding. Rather, it adds to existing confusion. It is already unclear to most consumers what the difference is between different titles (e.g. Legal Executive, Solicitor etc) and this simply compounds that confusion. It does not indicate what the status of a "Chartered Lawyer" is. Legal professionals are able to carry out reserved legal activities by licence from their regulator. The professional body for one branch of the legal profession creating a new title for itself does not change in any way the status of the lawyer. They are either authorised to practise or they are not.

Disagree There is also no benefit to helping anybody to understand the "specialist nature" of CILEX lawyers. In fact, it is unclear what this "specialist nature" is. CILEX lawyers carry out the relevant reserved legal activities that they are authorised for which are essentially the same as other legal professionals such as solicitors. There is no specialism that needs to be understood from this in the same way that there is no need for solicitors to introduce sub-titles to try to distinguish their "specialist nature". CILEX lawyers are legal practitioners. That is all that the public need to know.

Disagree It will also create confusion amongst the public. If one type of regulated legal professional is "chartered" does that mean they are better than another? Why is a solicitor or barrister not "chartered"? Also, what is a "lawyer", is a solicitor, barrister etc not a lawyer?

Disagree This seems like an entirely unnecessary vanity project which does nothing to help the public or anybody else, for that matter, understand what qualifications somebody has or what job they do in comparison to anybody else.

Disagree The change will confuse people. It is just for CILEX to make more money

Disagree the changing of titles makes it confusing for members of the public, legal bodies to understand our profession. chartered lawyer is slightly better than some of the previous titles

Disagree The Chartered Lawyer titles are sub-divided into contentious and non-contentious reserved areas, with further sub-divisions for unreserved areas, and for Chartered Legal Executives, which you have stated causes confusion, remaining for existing Fellows who do not hold practice rights! Wouldn't appear on the face of it to provide a simpler way to understand the titles. Why not have a standard designation of 'Chartered Lawyer' with the status in brackets after, e.g. Chartered Lawyer (Property), Chartered Lawyer (Civil), Chartered Lawyer (Employment)? Those with (Civil) or (Family) or (Crime) would then denote qualified litigators and advocates.

Disagree The current system has been in place for a long time. Changing it does not make it clearer, the new structure is not clearer at all. Litigation, advocate are all legal words and unknown to the general public. What does chartered lawyer mean, it's no more complicated than chartered existing structure that works why change it if it works.

Disagree The current titles work fine. Introducing different titles will only create confusion. Cilex should be concentrating on other more pressing issues than changing titles. It's absurd

- The general public don't care about this, not do employers. To continually split out and tinker with the status of chartered legal executive undermines the existing and growing confidence in the qualification, but it in fact increases discrimination around qualification routes. The proposals increasingly show a lack of confidence in the qualification and route. Employers are well aware of the differences between legal exec and solicitors, but this persistent need to tinker only serves to highlight the differences and make it seem lesser standard of lawyer. Please stop!
- Disagree
- The necessity for explaining the difference in the qualification of a Legal Executive (Chartered Lawyer) from that of a Solicitor or Barrister will remain, whatever the modern labels that may be used.
- Disagree
- The new titles demean those that remain at Chartered Legal Executives and make them second class to the new Chartered Lawyers title when many CLEs have years more experience.
- Disagree
- The only title required is Charter Legal Executive or Chartered Lawyer or Chartered Attorney. These changes risk creating even more confusion; CRL and CILEX should be endeavouring to better promote the specialist nature of CILEX professionals; CILEX currently do very little of this with the wider public or in London.
- Disagree
- The public and the profession, so not need a new title entering the field. Even CILEX Lawyers or Fellows etc., as well as 'paralegals' and Associates, are still confusingly referred to as 'the Solicitor'. if I had a Pound for everytime someone has called me a Solciitor over the past few years, i could probably retire.
- Disagree
- The public don't understand and don't care
- Disagree
- The public see "lawyers" amd sometimes break that down into solicitor and barrister. Any title outside of that will likely require some explanation, whether Chartered Legal Executive of Chartered Lawyer.
- Disagree
- The public will not suddenly understand what a Chartered Lawyer is over a CILEX Lawyer or Chartered Legal Executive. The change just makes CILEX and its members look like a joke, changing names more time that prince.
- Disagree
- The title isn't the problem, the snobbery in the solicitor profession is.
- Disagree
- The title legal executive has served me adequately for 21 years - changing it to chartered lawyer is deeming. Are solicitors going to become chartered lawyers too!?
- Disagree
- The titles Chartered Legal Exec or Chartered Lawyer, I do not feel, will make a difference in the understanding of the public without greater involvement from CILEX changing public perceptions. Initially, the Legal Exec route was a method of becoming a lawyer and advertising yourself as such. Now, for those who qualified as Legal Execs. appear to be unable to continue calling themselves a lawyer. The available routes are also limited to a small number of disciplines. As the goal posts have been moved, there is a feeling that it can be done again.
- Disagree
- There are too many roles and it is unclear who fits into which category.
- Disagree
- There was no problem in understanding the current system
- Disagree
- There will still be uncertainty when compared with solicitors/barristers
- Disagree
- These days there are so many titles it doesn't really matter. I don't think people are paying too much attention - everything is far too watered down in an over saturated profession.
- Disagree
- Thinl there should only be one title of lawyer for all
- Disagree
- This has not made any difference so far to those of us who are Chartered. People do not know what a legal executive is. We are specialist lawyers and this needs to be highlighted to show that we are more qualified than solicitors in our field, not that we are inferior which is the current perception. Employers do not look for your title but your experience. It is going to make no difference in the legal employment market place.
- Disagree
- This is convoluted. Spend time and energy promoting and supporting FCILEX. Create a way of ensuring practice rights for FCILEX if that is the only real issue and stop just throwing more titles and confusion into the mix which undermine FCILEX completely.
- Disagree
- This is something no one I have spoken with understands at all. It feels like a lot of resources have been thrown at a concept designed to gaslight F.CILEx practitioners. It our own professional body is know telling us we are less than or simply not good enough at the high quality and standard we have already achieved then there seems little hope. We all may as well do the SQE because at least no one is shifting the goalposts of the solicitor's brand.
- Disagree
- This is still confusing for me I'm afraid. The consultation piece makes reference to Chartered Legal Executives and CILEx Lawyers, but refers to them interchangeably and causes confusion. I am unclear as a CLE what my new title would be, if at all. Part of the consultation seems to suggest a change in title, yet other parts don't?
- Disagree
- This is the worst idea you've ever come up with
- Disagree
- This is unnecessary. More should be done to bring aware of CLE as a title. Changing the name will achieve nothing
- Disagree
- This may confuse people
- Disagree
- this will just downgrade fellows further
- Disagree
- To increase the parity with solicitors it should be Solicitor (Chartered) which would be a better way to introduce parity, whilst acknowledging the route to qualification
- Disagree
- To many different types will be confusing and the types on offer are limited. What about more specialist Fellows who do not fit into the categories that are suggested. Some work in Data Protection, Others in Higher Education, Some are Generalists! What will they be called? In my view it should be kept simple stupid i.e. simple Chartered Lawyer.
- Disagree
- Too many different titles with also separate legacy titles
- Disagree
- Unclear how those who are trained in CPR advocacy are considered automatically as a lawyer when those of us who work in the court of protection are not
- Disagree
- Unless the different titles are advertised on firms web pages how else will the public know?

- Disagree Utter rubbish. It's a poor excuse to extort more money from fully qualified Legal Execs. The only way to inform employers and the public is to have Legal Execs recognised and referred to correctly as legally qualified alongside solicitors. As a fully qualified Legal Exec I am disappointed that all of a sudden I'm regarded as not being a lawyer when that's what my existing qualifications already mean. I think this change is a huge failure on CILEXs part to all its existing members and current students. I wouldn't be surprised if CILEX membership falls dramatically over the next few years. I wouldn't recommend anyone to follow this route now.
- Disagree We already have the well-established title of Legal Executive. Why muddy the water even further? If the intention is to change the titles again (following the most recent changes which I also disagree with, for the same points I am making in this consultation) then I am seriously flabberghasted...
- Disagree We are Legal Executives and have worked hard to become so. A lawyer can be anyone, it takes away that title that we have worked for. Will CILEX become the Chartered Institute of Lawyers as a result of the changes? If not, it just causes more confusion.
- Disagree What is the difference I will sti have to explain to my clent what a chartered lawyer is
- Disagree Whilst CLE is very confusing for people the suggested solution could still sound long winded and confusing to a layperson.
- Disagree Why have a difference between chartered legal executives and chartered lawyers? In doing so you cheapen the chartered legal executive title that we have worked so hard to get equal status to solicitors in so many areas. It is a shot in the foot for no benefit.
- Disagree Lawyer is used by the public as a generic term but Solicitor and Chartered Legal Executive have a professional title that is still useful to the public, adding Chartered Lawyer merely muddies the waters for the public and, as stated above, weakens the present top level of FCILEx.
- Disagree You need to do more to educate the profession on the status of chartered legal executives. Simply changing a name will not achieve this.
- Disagree You need to do more to show what we are and what we do. It has become protracted and complicated that people don't understand it

Are there any other specialism(s) that should be included in the list of Chartered Lawyer titles?

Response Please specify

Yes

*

A CILEX lawyer is a specialist lawyer and therefore their area of practice should be included in their title, however, whether their area of practice is included in their title should be within the discretion of the individual lawyer

Yes

Yes

A local authority specialism.

Yes

Absolute clarity that they are equivalent to solicitors as CILEx promises to deliver when it offers an alternative route to qualification

Yes

Advisor or Consultant

Yes

All areas of specialisms included to avoid ambiguity

Yes

ALL of them, including non-specialism lawyers.

Yes

All specialists

Yes

Area of specialism should be included (in brackets) after the certification status

Yes

At present I cannot find the list, but I know that Property Lawyer and Corporate Lawyer were given as examples. From my own experience, 'Litigation Lawyer' and Insurance Lawyer should be included. Or dispute resolution - as of course not every dispute is resolved by issued proceedings/ litigation.

Yes

Banking and Finance

Yes

Certain areas of law I feel should be taken into account such as IP and Data Lawyers.
Chartered legal Advocate

Yes

Chartered Commercial Lawyer, Chartered Data Protection Lawyer and Chartered Intellectual Property Lawyer

Yes

Chartered DR Associate please. I'm at the top of my game. I just wanted to be recognised for it. I can't be the only Associate feeling this way.

Yes

Chartered immigration lawyer for those of us who want to limit their practice to immigration practice as Office of Immigration Office allows practitioners in immigration to title themselves as immigration lawyer

Yes

Yes

Chartered legal executives

Chartered Local Government Lawyer / Chartered Public Sector Lawyer - Recognising the unique role of a lawyer operating in the public sector. An equivalent of the status afforded by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy for example.

Yes

Yes

Chartered Mental Health Lawyer

Yes

Chartered Mental Health Lawyer

Chartered Paralegal

Yes

Yes

Chartered Personal Injury (PI) Lawyer

Yes

Chartered Practice/Paralegal Managers

Yes

Chartered Property Lawyer

Yes

Commercial

Yes

Commercial & Business Law

Yes

Commercial, Commercial Contracts, Construction.

Yes

Commercial/Contract for in-house lawyers

Yes

compliance and regulation skills

Yes

Contract

Yes

Contract and Commercial

Yes Corporate

Yes Corporate / In-house
Costs Lawyer.

Yes Professional Support Lawyer.

Yes Court of Protection

Yes Court of protection

Yes Court of protection

Yes Court of Protection work.

Yes Court of Protection.

Yes Data Protection, which is a growing area.

Yes Disputes specialisms. I do not like the term "litigator". Those engaged in disputes work are generally focussed on avoiding litigation.

Yes Elderly client area of work which is becoming more and more needed in view of the large number of elderly, vulnerable, people needing legal assistance

Yes Employment

Yes Employment

Yes Employment law

Yes Employment lawyers! This proposal excludes committed and talented members of the legal profession.

Yes Employment.
Environment
Planning
Public

Yes

Yes Every area should be accounted for across CILEx and solicitor - insurance is always missing for CILEx

Yes Family lawyer

Yes Fellows -please see reasoning set out in my answer to question 7 above.

Yes For any specific lawyer, they could add this onto their title. For example, personal injury CLE

Yes For example, Contract lawyer.

Yes Graduate equals competent/practice rights/fellowship

Yes I don't know.

Yes I think it should be flexible and open to CILEX members to include a niche area of specialism. I think providing an exhaustive list would prove difficult.

Yes I work in the Court of Protection. I think there should be a public law specialism

Yes I work inhouse and would describe my specialism as Commercial or Contracts (although inhouse remit generally wider than contracts). CILEX Lawyer to describe that indicates that there isn't a specialism when in fact the whole point of CILEX is specialist lawyers. Commercial could be confusing for e.g. Commercial Property Lawyer. Chartered Commercial/Corporate Lawyer? I also feel there is an opportunity to promote CILEX as inhouse lawyers more generally.

Yes If the simple Chartered Lawyer route is followed then absolutely otherwise there is a danger of creating a two tier or speed title that will impact Fellows through no fault of there own.

Yes if there is an option yes

Yes If you do go ahead with this terrible idea, there could also be "Commercial" or "Civil" generally

Yes I'm open to the concept.

Yes Immigration

Yes Immigration

Immigration

also not clear why Immigration practitioners aren't able to undertake immigration-related JR work in the UTIAC without supervision -- this type of work involves knowledge of public law and isn't all that closely related to the civil litigation courses in the traditional sense, also not clear why being a CILEX advocate is required for civil litigation practice rights (required for JR work in the UTIAC) -- the work does not require advocacy, as higher rights of audience are needed for this and counsel needs to be instructed, anyway -- makes no sense and further undermines the CILEX lawyer standing within the greater legal profession

Yes

Yes Immigration, family, housing and crime

Yes Immigration. People who already provide this and are regulated by OISC or SRA should be allowed to have full rights to practise under CILEX because they have the same rights through OISC and SRA.

Yes

In house?

In order to be current there needs to be a recognised specialism of "Chartered Paralegal - Legal Operations"/Chartered Lawyer - Legal Operations. I am not sure that Legal Technologist covers the more operational side of things that technology supports such as Spend Management, Outsourcing (including use of Shared Service centres (for example India/Hungary), transformation itself, digitisation, etc.

Yes

Yes Inhouse

Yes In-House

Yes in-house

Yes In-house or commercial?

Yes Insurance (Claims) lawyer.

Yes Intellectual Property

Yes Is litigation included?

Yes It concerns me that, as a CILEX practitioner, we are only recognised in the area we qualify yet solicitors can move across fields without further qualification - it would be nice if there was a bridge to allow this.

It is not clear where CLEs practising in Court of Protection work fall. It is not criminal, civil, or family law, nor does it fall into any of the reserved non-contentious or unreserved areas mentioned. It is also distinct from other types of public law. I am myself one of these CLEs, and am confused what title I should aspire to and whether practice rights are in fact necessary for me because none of those offered seem to apply to me. Guidance would be greatly appreciated. The Law Society's Accredited Legal Representative (Mental Capacity) status is open to solicitors, barristers, and CLEs, with no requirement for additional practice rights for CLEs. I hope that could be taken into consideration.

Yes

Yes Just saying yes so I can comment here. Chartered Lawyer is another silly title.

Yes Litigation

Yes Litigation.

Yes Local Government and what about Planning?

Yes Many CLE's specialise in Planning Law, especially those in Local Government.

Yes Maybe each area of law should have its own specialism?

Yes Mediation/ADR

Yes Medical Law, Child Care and Practice, Housing Law, etc.

Yes Members who have sufficient legal experience for example please legal voluntary work

Yes More clarity if anything as to current professionalism that are already covered.

Yes no opinion other than more titles more confusion

Non-Reserved Areas of Practice

Chartered Protection Lawyer

- Preparing Bundles for Court of Protection work
- Liaising with clients and ensuring a suitable Litigation Friend is appointed were required
- Billing client accounts
- Drafting Witness Statement
- Legal Research

Yes

Inter alia

Yes

Not sure.

Perhaps a new name for Fellows who have been working in their field post qualification for over 4 years and longer if you factor in time pre-qualification .

Yes

Perhaps giving titles for practising rights such as Chartered Family Lawyer.

Yes

probate

Yes

Probate and all areas not currently included

Yes

Professional discipline

Coronial

Yes

Yes

Professional discipline/Regulation

Public Law, Aviation, Shipping, and / or any other practice area a current FCILEX is practicing outside of the areas already listed (and specialised, so a general title would be less effective)

Yes

Public notaries.

Yes

Regulatory

Yes

Regulatory Lawyer

Yes

Solicitors should also change to lawyer

Yes

Something appropriate for Fellows who now work in-house and therefore have a broad range of skills that go beyond their original specialism. Personally I would like to see the charity sector recognised, because there is a whole range of charity law and governance that comes with this sector, and ever-changing challenges around regulatory compliance. Similarly data protection for Fellows who have moved into DPO roles.

Yes

Specialist Property sectors; I specialise in Leasehold Property transactions (lease extensions, enfranchisements, right to manage, right of first refusal etc) so I don't deal with every day conveyancing. I struggled to find examples of some of the 'conveyancing' tasks in my Practising Rights portfolio, as the 'conveyancing' tasks were too specific to conveyancing work.

Yes

Specified knowledge

Spiritually felt terms

Yes

Yes

The area the lawyer actually specialises in so it is clearer for the public to have an understanding

Yes

The current specialisms covered by CILEx would be a good place to start.

Yes

The proposal doesn't consider any element of public law plus specialism

Yes

There are so many areas of law that you cannot possibly cover them all, are those that are not

Yes

included lesser than those that are?

- Yes There needs to be clarification for those people not dealing with standard areas such as conveyancing or probate
- Yes There should be cilex lawyers, cilex fellows (no practice rights, supervised) and trainees. Then there should be paralegals and trainee paralegals. The public DO NOT UNDERSTAND anything past 'member'. Make it easier not harder: I could ask anyone in my family - they would not have a clue of any difference.
- Yes There should be no block on any practice rights listed under s.12 legal services act.
- Yes Trust law
- Yes Trust lawyer
- Yes What sector they specialized in ie litigation, family, conveyance
- Yes What specialisms are envisaged currently in the proposed title.
- Yes Where does employment sit?
- Yes Yes I consider an amalgamation of the Association of Cost Lawyers would be more appropriate than the proposal to join the SRA Regulatory Body who in my opinion are pretty useless and do a dis-service to the profession

Are there any other considerations CILEX should take into account when considering the impact of these changes?

Response Please provide details

- Yes A further issue to clarify membership and titles for it's members would be for Cilex to put arguments forward and seek to change the current framework so that those who qualified over 10 plus years ago need not undertake further "training" to obtain practice rights and are required to have supervision of a solicitor when some of those CLEs are in the Partner/Director role in a number of law firms. This makes for disparity amongst those who qualified many years ago and newly qualified lawyers.
- Yes Additional costs to members and employers should be kept to a minimum and automatic recognition as Chartered Paralegals should be given to Fellows of the Institute of Paralegals.
- Yes All areas should be recognised not just chosen areas.
- Yes All aspects going forward should be considered together with a possible need to revisit.
- Yes Allow individuals who want to practice on specialised areas to qualify without the onerous requirement to qualify as Legal Executive such specialisation as Chartered immigration law, Chartered family lawyer .
- Yes Always keep its members and the impact on them in mind. There is still an overall worry that CILEx qualified members are not consider equal to solicitors or are not recognised as well.
- Yes Any changes should result in a tangible simplification for the public, who already find categories of lawyer confusing. Going from one Chartered to three Chartered titles would likely increase the confusion.
- Yes as above
- Yes As above - how easy will it be to progress from CILEX to CILEX lawyer. will there be support available.
- Yes As above.
- Yes As above. The cost to members to have to retrain is disgusting
- Yes As long as the majority of members are ok with the changes, then that is the only consideration I feel appropriate (and those who object should confirm that they have read consultations and attended webinars rather than just saying no).
- Yes As mentioned above, consider the impact of the new structure on those holding Chartered Legal Executive status. This status appears of little significance under the new structure.
- Yes As stated above you are lowering the status of chartered legal executives as being lower than The new Cilex Lawyers
- Yes Ask the membership and commit the survey results as being binding on CILEX.
- Yes Changing designations undermines the awareness built up over a long period
- Yes Cilex members should be treated the same as solicitors by the SRA
- Yes CILEX should be considering all of the members who have qualified and how the dilution of that qualification impacts upon the brand for CILEx Lawyers.
- Yes CILEX should consider how upset their FCILEX members are as a result of the treatment of CILEX towards them and how CILEX seems to be acting in a way that undermines public trust in the institution and strength of FCILEX as a professional title. CILEX should consider the disdain and contempt they are showing to FCILEX members by communicating to us, and the legal industry through their actions, that we are less than and our qualification is somehow no longer good enough. CILEX should stop focusing on their organisational financial bottom line and realise supporting the integrity of FCILEX and FCILEX members is more important than money.
- Yes CILEx should consider the fact that the term "Chartered Legal Executive" has been around for years, and if the name/titles keep changing, they will never have consistency. How can the profession and public recognise and understand CILEx when the name of their lawyers keeps changing?
- Yes CILEx's proposals will confuse the membership and the wider public (as well as employers).
- Yes Common Professional Examination, Postgraduate Diploma in Law, Master of Law in Legal Practice.
- Yes Communication, how will these changes be communicated across law firms and general people and businesses?

Yes Concerns over Cilex lawyers losing their status and rights were we to be regulated by the SRA. We need some form of protections to be in place before agreeing to this.

Yes Consulting their members which you are doing, at last, and not embarrassing them by public arguments with regulators.
To consider again whether you are really simplifying matters with so many new "Chartered Lawyers".

Yes Continued change with no clear direction and consideration for legacy CLE's risks alienating a large proportion of the membership. It is clear that neither CILEX or the SRA are concerned with the worry to existing CLE's about their current roles within both private practice and in-house positions, a lot of which will be in quite senior positions - all this seems to do is place a spotlight on CLE's by saying that suddenly their CLE status is no longer sufficient for them to do their jobs - if employers end up thinking the same because if this process, how will this affect jobs?

Yes Continuity
Costs are becoming more and more prohibitive. The exam structure is very one sided in its offering to females over males - males learn very differently but Cilex has honed in on an exam process that favours female learning styles.

Yes Costs to employers of updating merchandise/business cards etc.

Yes CPD requirements

Yes Creating more than 10 new titles risks being completely overwhelming and is bound to cause huge confusion.

Yes Diversity

Yes Do not allow Cilex to be swallowed by the Law Society.

Yes Don't do it . Overall there is too much uncertainty

Yes easy to understand information to the public

Yes Ensuring no changes to what current qualified members will be able to do in the future is key.

Yes Existing Fellows who work in Local Government or general practice whose job roles do not fall within a specific practice right area and therefore would not be able to meet the requirements for practice rights

Yes Fcilex for many years. Many don't want to study anymore but want to be recognised for their lengthy years of experience and knowledge in their field

Yes For members with an advanced law degree, the designation Chartered or CILEX Legal advisor should be available. From my reading CILEX members do not want the change to SRA for regulation. It seems to be going ahead for public reasons which don't seem to stack up (no recent research provided) and the solicitors profession do not want CILEX nor do they respect them for the work they do.

Yes Further clarification is needed for CILEX Fellows as to whether we now HAVE to obtain practice rights. You can read all the guidance/notes available and there's no straight answer in the whole lot of it. It seems like it's being pushed and that CILEX Fellows are now downgraded. It's frightened a lot of people into thinking they now have to obtain these.

Yes Further confusion as to what we actually do/are qualified in. Stick to Legal Executive and build the re-brand on this already established legal title. It is like going back to square one!

Yes Historical route of qualification which reflects badly on those who have struggled long and hard to obtain their qualification

Yes How can people already working as Legal Technologists gain recognition? I see that an apprenticeship is planned for new talent, but you should really consider enabling people who are already practicing to come under the CILEX wing.

Yes How this change is (1) communicated to members (2) communicated to the legal services industry (3) adopted by members and (4) adopted by the legal services industry

Yes How this will impact Fellows moving forward and their standing in the legal community.

Yes how this will impact the profession

Yes How those CLEs working in reserved areas not covered by civil, family, or criminal should or could gain practice rights, or whether they could use the proposed title Chartered Lawyer notwithstanding.

- I am a chartered legal executive and there are certain tasks i am not permitted to undertake with the land registry (signing of certain certificates for first registrations as an example). Consultation with the land registry to change this on the basis of being a chartered lawyer would be helpful to assist with certain roles. Also for example, as a chartered legal executive i cannot be signed up to Barclays online portal for conveyancing transactions. This is only for SRA members but it would be good if this could be followed up with Barclays to allow chartered members of CILEX to also be able to register as users provided they have Chartered status with CILEX.
- Yes
- I am sure there are, but I leave that to others
- Yes
- I am uncertain as to the extent, if any, of changes for a Fellow working in house and for their (non-legal business) employers, if any. I have seen no guidance upon this.
- Yes
- I answered yes as it would seem silly to say no when we do not know the outcome of the changes or what may occur in the future. Any unseen impact should be addressed as soon as they arise.
- Yes
- I couldn't agree more the importance of improved recognition for CILEX Lawyers as having parity with Solicitors. I work in a top 50 corporate law firm and still face judgement that I'm CILEx qualified. Like I am not of equal standing to solicitors. Until recently, I wasn't allowed to give a simple undertaking to cover £500 fees on account because of my CILEx status. Even now there are conditions attached. This is humiliating. The rise of the SQE route is becoming popular and widely accepted amongst solicitors, yet the CILEx route is still frowned upon. CILEx need to do more to bring us in line and gain us respect and I think the proposal to bring us under the SRA and call ourselves "lawyers" is definitely the right move.
- Yes
- The only area I'm slightly confused about is what current FCILEx lawyers need to do to gain this status. Are we automatically transferred over to be "CILEx Lawyers" (I have done the level 6 and qualifying portfolio 4 years ago) or do we have to undergo further exams/assessments? I personally was relieved to put my exam days behind me, so the thought of proving myself further does stress me out!
- Yes
- I feel that the proposals are likely going to cause more confusion. At the end of the day, the general public are not going to care what term is used to describe a fee earner. All they want to know is 'is the person qualified to give me the appropriate advice?', 'How much is it going to cost?' And 'how long is it going to take?'. Therefore, I do not feel 'chartered paralegal' or any other change is going to matter.
- Yes
- I feel the cilex level 3 should be extended as a lot of hard work is not considered
- Yes
- I like being distinct from solicitors in terms of my qualification route, my governance and title. Merging with the SRA feels like it waters down the distinction and hard work done to date to highlight and celebrate that. Also proposed titles feel like they weaken rather than strengthen our positions on the ground. Very sad at that aspect of the proposed changes
- Yes
- I presume that (despite having been a practising Fellow for 26 years) my current role where I do not need to gain additional rights, my title would be 'chartered lawyer' but not indicate my long experience as a litigator and now specialist insurance lawyer. This will eventually take on a 'meaning' of no having specialist skills or being a general 'legal' assistant in a high street law firm. That would be demoralising for some, such as myself.
- Yes
- I qualified in 2002. I do not have "practising rights" as they were not available then. I do not even know what they are. I am a generalist, just like many solicitors of my generation. Will I now have to chose an area to specialize in and take more exams? Do my 21 years no count for nothing?
- Yes
- I re-iterate, I think these changes further damage the potential reputation of existing Chartered Legal Executives and our career progression opportunities.
- Yes
- I simply want to add the importance of replacement title for a Chartered Legal Executive to bring them in line with a Solicitor and regarded as such . This is vital as the workplace differences between the same including grade/title within the firm, pay (I believe this should be brought in line with pay scales for Solicitors) and out to the wider public.
- Yes
- I suggest that these proposed reforms should be implemented, slowly and enough notice period should be given to Cilex members prior to implementing them..
- Yes
- I would like the SRA to also recognise that Chartered Lawyers to also have the authority and right to train soon-to-be lawyers/solicitors it should not be limited to those qualified under SRA
- Yes
- If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.

Yes If SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients.

Yes If these changes come into being they will denigrate the existing status of a chartered legal executive

Yes Impact on CILEX lawyers working in-house (such as myself)

Yes impact to members and job roles

Yes In my opinion this may cause further confusion with the public and clients; the inclusion of unqualified members (including paralegals) may dilute the brand. It is perfectly simple and straightforward for those who wish to do so to qualify as a Fellow of the Chartered Institute.

Yes In my view the only confuse matters further and that will be exploited by the same old dinosaurs who have a negative perception of CILEX already

Yes Is all of this (i.e. name change, regulated by SRA) really going to make any difference to the perception of University educated legal professionals when they are considering employing CILEX members? Over the years that I have been a member of CILEX things on the ground have not changed one bit. We are paid £10,000 less than solicitors and treated like "glorified admin".

Yes Is the long run aim to merge with the solicitors' profession?

Yes Is there any additional guidance to be provided for CILEX lawyers qualified via the legacy route?

Is there any reason why we could not be considered competent to have practice rights or fellowship when we graduate?

It just seems like an unnecessary hurdle especially when you have been a member for more than 17 years

It is very challenging for moms with families to meet the current requirements especially when employers don't tend to give you the time off to work on a portfolio separately and in your own time. In my experience most employers just want you to get on with doing their work. So, it's hard to catch the balance and we are often left feeling burnt out.

Yes

More to the point it contributes to the lesser treatment we get from others in profession, who look down on us as though we aren't competent when we are.

In addition to this, it also contributes to the imposter syndrome.

The profession needs to be seen to be doing more to assist us in this area.

Maybe creating a pool could assist with tackling this challenging area.

Yes it all seems a bit pointless

Yes It is diminishing the CLE professional qualification

Yes It should be as easy (and cheap) as possible to move to a new job title. I work in an unreserved area of law and the sole reason I have not become a CILEX Lawyer (I'm currently a Fellow) is that I would have to pay.

Yes Lawyer cannot be protected

Yes Lean on the courts and other institutions to give CILEx lawyers parity and equal standing with solicitors and stop us from being treated as inferior to solicitors.

Yes Listen to the overwhelming majority of members that the changes to the SRA are more harmful than helpful.

Yes Listen to your members. The vast majority object to these proposals.

Yes Lots but as the Board does not talk or engage with us, cant see the point. The Board only talks at us, despite them meant to be our representatives, who we should have control over etc.

Yes Maintaining our unique identity and status as Fellows.

Yes Making sure members are informed in plain English without the waffle. CILEX have become increasingly verbose of recent months/ years.

Yes My answer in 14 above applies here.

Yes Not all trainees work in firms - I work in house and receive little acknowledgement nor tailored insights to practice.

Yes Not coming mind at the moment but do stay commercially aware and up-to-date on the current framework and settings

People know and trust Solicitors because the title has been around for centuries. Patience and hard work is required to build the same level of knowledge and awareness of Chartered Legal Executives. Consistently changing the name to try to get something the public understands does not serve that purpose, and will only make life harder for those of us who actually practice the law as Chartered Legal Executives

Yes

Please consider the impact to your longstanding and qualified members who appear to be overlooked in your proposals. It feels that CILEX goalposts have really changed in recent years and not for the better of its qualified membership.

Yes

Please correct me if I am wrong. I have not seen the research that CILEX say they have undertaken which shows there is confusion about

Yes

Please focus on all of your members, not just those who work in private practice and all the new students whose training fees you are hoping to attract.

Yes

Please see above answer about Chartered Legal Executives. I have very strong concerns that we will now be seen as less able due to the proposed title change. The literature from CILEx and the SRA do not instil confidence as we seem to be the forgotten ones. We are the reason CILEx still exists!

Yes

Please see comments above, willing to discuss this direct during this process if it helps

Yes

Pls make your passing marks more achievable because at the rate you are accepting qualified members there will be zero qualified cilex practitioners in the near future, including myself.

Yes

Provided CILEX lawyers/fellows will retain their current status and still be able to practise as we do now, I welcome a move to SRA for the purposes of governance and public reassurance.

Yes

Public confusion we already have 3 bands of lawyers being fcilex solicitor and barrister to add anymore would water down

Yes

Public perception

Yes

Questions

Yes

Reintroduce GCILEx for L6 Graduates.

See my answers above. Proper consideration review and, if necessary, undoing or amending any changes that simply do not work for those of us in practice is needed. Detailed, evidenced and proper explanation must also be provided, with working examples and a thorough and decent exploration is not too much to ask of you when these changes affect so many. I for one am fed up of defending the never ending changes and trying to work out the different routes and levels and it needs to be addressed once and for all - why do solicitors not have any of this? They, too, are 'specialist lawyers'.

Yes

Simplify, simplify, simplify! The more complex and the more options for various titles, the more confusing for the public. Solicitors are either paralegals, trainees or solicitors - it's simple and the public understand. That CILEX is unique and needs unique regulation reflective of the group of represents. Keep CRL and abandon the proposal for regulation by SRA immediately please

Yes

That there may be backlash from solicitors who may resent from their perspective the growing parity of the Cilex lawyer and themselves. Also, what it may or may not mean for them.

Yes

That, rightly or wrongly, the word "lawyer" has become a generic term to the public to include Solicitor, Chartered Legal Executive, Licenced Conveyancer, and non-qualified fee earners. A "Chartered Lawyer" will not be seen as a distinct qualification regardless of what marketing is done.

Yes

The ability of long standing Fellows of a certain age to complete training requirements and provide evidence of competencies when they are now focussed on much more complex work.

Yes

The actual lawyers.

Yes

The changes will take a considerable time to practitioners to get used to and to formulate into their professional lives

Yes

The cost to employers for changing stationary - the impact on parity for those working in conveyancing yet to gain practice rights. Its a mess atm and needs to be tidied up.

Yes

The current system has been in place for a long time. Changing it does not make it clearer, the new structure is not clearer at all. Litigation, advocate are all legal words and unknown to the general public. What does chartered lawyer mean, it's no more complicated than chartered ex existing structure that works why change it if it works.

Yes

Yes

The effect on CLEs who don't want to obtain practice rights.

- Yes The effect that the new title has on legacy members who now have to take another course to get that title despite doing the job for years. Shouldn't there be some concessions for the years of practice.
- Yes The embarrassment this is causing cilex members
- Yes The employment competency. If cilex is meant to be on par with solicitors why do we go through this arduous process of proving our competency showing 27 criteria's ? Do solicitors do this?
- Yes The feelings and views of those that are effected, as highlighted previously I am completing this consultation but I have doubts as to whether we will actually be listened to.
- Yes The Fellows have kept your organisation going and have been the lifeblood of your organisation for many years and you should demonstrate more loyalty, they have been pushed out of sight with this exercise and its bound to have an effect on their mental health. Fellows also continue to pay your income and there is a lack of fighting on their behalf with things like the Land Registry not recognising Fellows as "conveyancers", if we continue to pay an income, we deserve a better representation.
- Yes The impact on Chartered Legal Executives who do not wish to upgrade to include practice rights and will likely possess more expertise than a newly qualified Chartered Lawyer, thereby effectively downgrading their title. The impact on existing, long term members and FCILEX. We have been part of your journey for partita and equity with the SRA and other parts of the legal profession (Solicitors) and should be recognised as equals, without distinction.
- Yes The impact on long-standing loyal Fellows.
- Yes The interests of its members in stable governance/decision making, as it reflects on all members' reputation. The legal sector is already confusing to consumers who do not understand that not all firms are equal - this is nothing to do with how firms are regulated or the status and titles of the staff. It is down to the regulation of the sector as a whole not because of individual regulatory statuses.
- Yes The opinions of your membership. CILEX does not seem to consider this very important it seems.
- Yes The organisation appears too self indulgent and needs to look beyond itself to the profession as it operates in the real world. Neither the public or employers will be assisted by the imposition of the proposed new regime. The introduction of the additional layer of paralegal is a step likely to diminish the stature of CILEX
- Yes The outreach of members should be far greater before any changes take place.
- Yes The overall protection of all CILEx members
- Yes The points I have already raised about inequity. Remove the snobbery and arrogance; recognise established, credible skill and expertise of your members.
- Yes The possibility of moving to a regulator who appears not to be interested in giving paralegals any recognised professional status
- Yes The purported objectives are not supported by the majority of CILEX members who are satisfied with their regulatory body. Ultimately it appears to be only a change of regulator which is not supported. CILEX Regulation is seen as fair, transparent and providing consistent outcomes.
- Yes The quality of the learning and qualifications
- Yes The risk to the status of our institute within the Legal Profession and the General Public in allowing individuals to practice without full qualification.
- Yes The route I have taken is not recognised by other regulatory bodies so what does that mean for me if CILEx decide to move to the SRA? Will I need to requalify, pay more for PI?
- Yes The uncertainty it is creating and whether CILEx will continue to have a place in the market. At this rate I might as well qualify as a solicitor (at least it would be certain)
- Yes The understanding of the public in relation to the status of individuals within the system is extremely important. We can call ourselves what we like but if the man on the Clapham omnibus has no idea of the meaning as they would with "solicitor" or "barrister" then the point is lost to a degree and we must not throw the term "Chartered" about willy nilly.
- Yes The views of their core F.CILEx and above members! Stop treating Chartered Legal Executives as though the title is something we should no longer be proud of. It is! We worked hard for it and for recognition and standing. Our own legal body should be championing us not making us feel second rate. F.CILEx is a brand and level we should be allowed to be proud of. It is not broken. It does not need fixing. We are all good enough and respected within the legal industry....just not, it would seem, by CILEx. Ironically.
- Yes The work based learning part should be less complex in line with the SQE students.

- Yes Their members and offering transparency in what they are doing and their intentions as well as their accounts being available.
- There is a danger of creating a complex structure that the Public and employers may not understand and which may then prevent an appreciation of the quality of CILEx lawyers. Chartered Lawyer sounds akin to Chartered Accountant. People understand that role when in need of accounting services and are able to distinguish for themselves whether that accountant is a tax specialist, etc and appoint for the role. The same goes when choosing a solicitor. So I see absolutely no sense in making the distinctions being suggested which hints at a lack of confidence in CILEx lawyers abilities, when they are actually very good.
- Yes There needs to be a better distinction so that the general public understand the process of our training and status.
- Yes There should be no additional cost to CILEx Associates as we were previously called and no additional hurdles. There will be Fellows of the Institute who will be naturally excluded as the financial burden/busy work life balance to undertake those additional qualifications will undermine their existing status. Further the costs of leaping through the "new hoop" will not be recouped in their career.
- Yes There is also a risk that those Fellow who do not proceed this route will find their salaries also devalued as only the new qualification will achieve the existing salary level being paid.
- Yes They are complicated, misrepresentative, and further widen the disparity between us and solicitors. Your proposals are making me feel less, unworthy and inferior to solicitors. I have always been a staunch supporter and believer in CILEx, but now I feel that you are letting me down, that your effort to create equality is in fact doing the exact opposite. You need to think about your membership, not just survey results.
- Yes They need to see what the public think and feel about this. I have asked my client base and they are just more confused with the new terms than what we have already. This change should be about simplification not complication which is the outcome of these changes
- Yes They should take in board the views of its members why change when it's not broken
- Yes They should take into account their complete failure to increase the profile of their current membership before trying to change things.
- Yes This is all about public awareness of who and what we are. I believe that CILEX lawyers are more often than not better trained and better grounded than most members of the solicitor's branch. This what we should be pursuing. CILEX should be striving to achieve the position that acquisition of Fellowship, or "Chartered Lawyer", status automatically brings with it equivalent rights in all areas including reserved areas. Fellows are still regarded by many as managing clerks, and this includes the Land Registry and many lenders and other organizations. We are not regarded as "proper" lawyers" and it will take more than a name change and an even more complex membership structure to address this.
- Yes Those who wish to cross-qualify via the SQE, making that transfer easier.
- Yes To avoid losing professionalism
- Yes To widen the list means that it is watering down the title that people do vaguely understand. please keep promoting equality so that there is more diversity in our profession.
- Yes too much change
- Yes Training/education for the judiciary, particularly in the Family Court. I have to ask for permission to appear before the court for most of my cases and only a few will allow me to understand my own advocacy. Change will likely add further confusion and for my lawyer status to be further 'looked down upon'.
- Yes We need to be considerate for our colleagues who have recognised protected characteristics and how these may delay or hinder progression without any reasonable adjustments
- Yes What happens to this qualification if it moves to regulation by the SRA. Will Fellows with the appropriate rights automatically become solicitors? If not, why not as they are being regulated by the SRA. Has it actually asked and listened to its members who object to moving?
- Yes Better recognition of CILEX lawyers and their capabilities is important and should be supportive but not sure entirely what some of these proposals are actually aiming to achieve!
- Yes Wherever you've asked a question relating to the public you need to realise that they don't understand and don't care
- Yes Whether the issue rests with the CILEX model itself or lack of understanding around the CILEX model or whether it is due to a title. More outreach should be done to enhance public understanding.

Whilst I appreciate the differences between a CILEx Lawyer & Chartered Legal Executive, I just feel this could have been dealt with in a fairer manner. This has caused a lot of confusion among members and which terminology to use. A Chartered Legal Executive is a qualified lawyer in their own right but cannot call themselves a CILEx Lawyer which is a protected title. However, it would appear that emails / publications from CILEx and / or CILEx Regulation seem to use the terms interchangeably making it hard to distinguish between the two. I think it causes confusion because I am a lawyer regulated by CILEX, but not a CILEx Lawyer. I wanted to reach out because this appears to have caused immense confusion for members and I can only imagine how confusing this may be for members of the public.

I was in my 1st year of Level 6 (legacy route to qualification) when I first heard of the new route to qualification. I must admit this felt as though the goal posts had been moved for many and it caused a lot of worry and concern for those qualifying via the legacy route. Moreover, the fact that after 2025 (from memory) no one will be able to qualify as a Chartered Legal Executive is a further concern. I, and I am sure many other Chartered Legal Executives, are concerned of the impact this may have on equal opportunities for Chartered Legal Executives.

More worryingly, I recently saw a post online where a person had just qualified as a Chartered Legal Executive or was coming up for qualification. However, her firm advised that she would then need to complete the CPQ (with whatever exemptions are offered) or the SQE to cross-qualify as a Solicitor. It seemed as though they had previously supported this person qualifying as a Chartered Legal Executive only for their view to change once the CPQ was rolled out as a replacement, providing parity with qualified Solicitors.

My concern is that if I apply for a new job, whilst this will usually advertise a placement for a Solicitor or a Chartered Legal Executive, this will now include CILEx Lawyer. Therefore, making it harder to secure employment in certain roles. I can only see this being less favourable in the future for Chartered Legal Executives.

Yes

Why change something that has gone from strength to strength over the 24 years I have been a member - sad really

Yes

Why it's needed and how it affects the current members. What else can be done to raise the profile of Legal Execs.

Yes

Will FCILEX be able to apply to become a solicitor without the need of having to take the full SQE having spent thousands on education it is unfair to then cross qualify as a solicitor you have to take the full SQE

Yes

Yes - The disparity between Chartered legal executives/lawyers and solicitors still exist. I do not see this being addressed in the the new proposals. This is troubling as the only reason I did not pursue the LPC and solicitor route after my undergraduate law degree was the fact I had no family financial support and the apprenticeship route was the only way forward. As such, it seems unjust that i should now be affected financially due to lack of recognition or even stigma surrounding the Chartered route.

Yes

Yes those in limbo and not yet qualified under the new system. Constant goalpost changing is my experience. Yes we need to make it clear that CILEX is a body which provides an equal service to the Legal Profession as solicitors and barristers do. A legal exec is not someone without knowledge and in many instances can be a better all-rounder than many solicitors who have become too specialised.

Yes

Yes, the hard work of the members and students. Many of whom are studying to prop up 20 plus years of experience and who are constantly being faced with changing goalposts and the increasing perception of a lower standard of qualification. Please listen to us when we say we don't want this.

Yes

You need to have a very serious look as to whether these changes are necessary, if you really feel they are, you need to have flexibility in routes to move to the new system and a very long lead in time.

Yes

You need to listen to your members, in my view moving to SRA regulation will be a great disadvantage to your membership. I am a Fellow and have been for over 40 years. I was offered financial support by an former employer to qualify as a solicitor. I did not wish to then and do not wish to now. SRA regulation is to me like turkeys voting for Christmas!

Yes

Yes You should think about what you are actually trying to achieve and why. The Chartered Lawyer proposal seems very poorly thought through.

Yes Your members!!! I sincerely hope you aren't going to levy more fees for this nonsense!

Your public understanding and confidence points are strong ones. They do become undermined somewhat if there remains this large cohort of Chartered Legal Executives who have not obtained practice rights.

One solution which would be very fast to achieve would be to have a Chartered Family/Civil/Criminal Lawyer to whom the regulator grants rights of Litigation but decouples them from rights of audience.

This suggestion has been put to CILEx Regulation a number of times who insist that these rights must be afforded at the same time. However, it was not until the Courts Act 1971 that these rights of audience were extended.

I see no reason why experienced lawyers who do not wish to conduct advocacy should be required to always remain as a Chartered Legal Executive and never be able to conduct litigation (as of right) because of such a rigid mindset.

Yes This would allow a "self-certification" route with minimal risk to the regulator.

Do you agree that increasing the independence of our regulatory model through delegation to a body that is structurally, financially and operationally independent

Response Please state reasons

Agree

.

Agree

A great idea

Agree

A regulator should be independent to be fair to the public

Agree

Access to justice

Agree

Accountability and trust and confidence

Agree

Although concerned SRA more in favour of solicitors rather than legal executives

Agree

Always good to have a separate entity for regulatory purposes. Accountability.

Agree

An independent regulator is important.

Agree

An independent regulator separate from the organisation that it is regulating is more transparent and should provide confidence to consumers etc otherwise there is the danger of accusations of self-regulation which is difficult to negate when CILEX Regulation Ltd is owned by CILEX Ltd.

Agree

An independent regulatory body is always going to be a good thing and certainly will enhance public trust and confidence in regulation.

Agree

An organisation can't really regulate their own work, I think it's important that an independent body does that.

Agree

Another step to becoming solicitors?

Agree

Any regulatory body is always more effective the more independent it is from the subject matter of its regulation

Agree

Because the SRA is officially recognised worldwide.

Agree

CILEX Regulation has that independence.

Agree

Currently confusing difference between CILEX and CRL

Agree

Definitely as the public may previously have perceived a conflict of interest

Agree

Doing so may inform the public that Cilex is not built for monetary gains but for the provision of the same quality legal education and qualification as done by SRA.

Agree

Everyone knows the SRA, we want to be in the body as Solicitors

Agree

Everyone loves an independent regulator

Agree

Fairer

Agree

For the reasons set out in the question

Agree

For the reasons stated at 16

Agree

Having an independent body will increase consumer confidence.

Agree

Having an independent organisation ensures transparency and reduces the risk of bias

Agree

I agree

Agree

I agree with this proposal

Agree

I am unsure to be honest but current regulation does not feel robust enough as a member of the DT for a number of years I have sat very few times. This concerns me that we are not regulating close enough. If I add the fact that I applied for an another position over 12 months ago and still have not had any response or feedback I am thinking that there is a serious lack of management in our current regulatory team.

Agree

I believe that having a professional body and its regulator that is practically the same body (or at least appears to be) reduces transparency and accountability

Agree

I believe we should be regulated by the SRA. The public have had hundreds if not thousands of years to be familiar with a solicitor or barrister and in the UK the main regulator is the SRA or bar. In order to increase public trust and confidence in regulation we must be seen as on par with our counterparts.

Agree

I certainly hope so in any event.

Agree

I do agree with this statement though there is a concern that autonomy is not thrown out with any other regulator taking over the regulatory role and Cilex is devolved to a second-class level of legal qualification

I do to an extent and in principle. But I do not agree this is best done via the SRA. CIL3S currently do a excellent job and crucially understand the professionals they regulate. The SRA do not and frankly their performance as a regulator, particularly in recent times, leaves a huge amount to be desired. The Axiom-Ince debacle being one such example.

Agree

Agree I don't think it will have much impact

Agree I don't think many people have heard of CILEx, and CILEx regulation sounds like CILEx is regulating itself.

Agree I don't think the public will care, but it makes is simpler for us

Agree I feel that the two separate regulatory structures could be confusing to the public

I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:

1. People see us as equals - which would be great.
2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.

Agree

Agree I have no comments to make.

Agree I neither agree or disagree.

Agree I said I agree but not sure what difference it will make to the public - other than the SRA is recognised. I see no problem here providing CIL3S members have equality with solicitors

Agree This would enhance the status of CILEX in the public perception

Agree I think delegation to a well known legal regulatory body will help people understand that CILEX lawyers are qualified lawyers/

Agree I think it makes perfect sense to be regulated by the SRA who are not financially dependent upon CILEX.

Agree I think it's very important that this transition happens. It will definitely improve the status of CILEx and it's members and promote confidence from the public. I would hope that it would avoid a repetition of the inner arguing that took place between CILEx and CILEx regulation too, which was frankly embarrassing.

Agree

Agree I think so. And perhaps we would get more understanding and respect from solicitors if all regulated by the same body.

Agree I thought CILEX Regulation was more independent of CILEX than the SRA is of the Law Society. I totally agree that separate regulation is crucial - going to a regulatory body that doesn't understand how CILEx works is probably not the best step to take.

Agree

Agree I would hope this will help the public in recognising our role. If CILEX own members, such as myself, have little trust and confidence in the organisation I cannot see how the public possibly can.

Agree

Agree If it is the SRA then yes as will be same as how solicitors are regulated

Agree ILEX is currently not adequate in dealing with the promotion of its members and an independent body would extend the awareness.

Agree Independence is always preferable to enhance trust and confidence, as there is less likely to be any potential conflicts of interest.

Agree Independence is key

Agree Independent, fair ombudsman

Agree It is a long standing body that the public will have heard of and will create a sense of unity on professional standards and regulation.

Agree it is already independent

Agree It just creates a sense of transparency and the likelihood of non-biased accountability

Agree it makes the transaction more simple for the consumer and they are more likely to have confidence that the professional is knowledgeable in the specific area

Agree It will allow the public to understand the standard we are all held to and will unify this.

Agree It will appear to be fairer

Agree It will assist consumers recognition of CILEx lawyers

Agree It will be easier for the public to identify that CILEX lawyers and paralegals are regulated legal professionals if regulated under the SRA.

Agree It will be transparent in all transactions when the CILEX permits, if necessary.

Agree It will create big trust and confidence in the regulatory of Cilex members.

Agree It will potentially allow for greater independence and growth in making more considered steps towards recognition and equal footing.

Agree It will provide the same benefits as the SRA provides to Lawyers/Solicitors that qualify through the traditional route.

Agree It works for Solicitors.

Agree It would enhance public trust

Agree It would lead to a perception of greater transparency.

Just a change in the name alone is likely to cause less confusion. Our own members do not fully understand the difference between CILEX as the approved regulator and professional body and CRL as the regulator. There is therefore little hope that consumers would appreciate the difference. In comparison there is far greater consumer awareness of the SRA and given the complete difference in name I would suggest the consumer would be easily able to differentiate.

Agree

Agree Keeps all legal services under one umbrella.

Agree More transparent

Agree my answer is in the question

Agree None to give.

Agree Not biased in any way, clearly independent view

Agree Not really sure

Agree Not to limit overall checks and balance to few detached individuals whose interest is highly questionable.

Agree One body for one profession

Agree People still don't understand CILEx

Agree Perception of independence in-still belief lack of bias

Agree Possibly.

Agree Potentially but not under the proposed structure for the reasons already outlined.

Agree Provided that the new regulatory body reflects the status of CILEX lawyers

Agree Reduced conflict issues.

Agree Regulation from an external body is likely to improve consumer confidence and also sets us on a par with other professionals. It no longer creates an 'us and them' division. Independent regulation has to be the gold standard.

Agree Risk if Conflict of interest - reduced (from the public perspective)

Agree

Agree Slightly agree, however, I don't think in practice the outcome would be achieved.

Agree Sra are well known

Agree SRA is a more respectable organisation -- CILEx Regulation is not fit for purpose, also there should be uniformity within the professional obligation for lawyers

Agree SRA is a well recognised body for this purpose.

Agree SRA is known. If they can assist in demonstrating that we are the same then that is a positive to me.

Agree SRA is respected and trusted . I would prefer to be regulated by the SRA

Agree SRA would seem to be the obvious choice and would avoid confusion and add clarity.

Agree That helps to avoid conflict of interests but also check and balance, including public trust and confidence in regulation.

Agree The arms length approach builds trust.

Agree The consumer will be confident that the regulator is truly independent rather than being a subsidiary of the membership body

Agree The existing regulator is inefficient and not fit for purpose, transferring to a specialist regulator will bring huge benefits to our members and enable us to be seen with parity with our solicitor colleagues

Agree The majority of firms are regulated by the SRA. It makes sense for members of CILEX to be regulated in the same way as their peers to allow consistency throughout the legal sector, regardless of route to qualification and practising title. This will also make it clearer for clients in having all legal professionals regulated under the same body.

Agree The proposed delegation of regulation to SRA will provide great benefits to Cilex members in terms of status, and recognition by lenders and other institutions.

Agree The public are not aware of CILEx regulation, unlike the SRA

Agree The public will have confidence in the SRA a more known entity to them.

Agree The public will understand it better.

Agree The regulatory model through delegation to a body structurally, financially and operationally independent from CILEX will enhance public trust and confidence in regulation.

Agree The SRA has a long history of legal regulation. I cannot see that this is a negative. my only concern is if the SRA view CILEX lawyers as 'junior' to solicitors and how that will be managed.

Agree The SRA is a well known institution.

Agree The SRA is more widely known (mainly due their membership being far greater) it will help the public to recongnise the standards we are all held to.

Agree The SRA is well known and highly reputable

Agree The SRA treats its members with respect and deals with queries. You can speak to people and they respond. You should hand your entire operation over to them, in my opinion they are a far superior organisation.

Agree The structure will gain more strength

Agree This gives a governing body, which is recognised by all.

Agree This is in line with the thinking in all other Professional Bodies.

Agree This is sensible but it should still remain with a body which understands the CILEX route and role and this will not be acheived by CILEX practioners' regulation being subsumed into a body which it's own members do not think is fit for purpose.

Agree Trust

Agree We see this in other professions. It distances our profession from deciding on issues within CILEx and avoid any bias towards members and enhances the public trust and confidence in regulation.

Agree Yes

Agree Yes - there must be a separation

Agree Yes a new perspective from another body I feel will help enhance public trust and confidence.

Agree Yes but not with the SRA.

Agree Yes, again most people are aware of the SRA and understand what that body does.

Agree Yes, but it should be CRL with any necessary reformatations, not SRA

Agree Yes, I believe it also gives the public more confidence in the profession

Agree Yes, it would make sense for the SRA to regulate CILEx. We already follow the SRA CC and CILEx CC. People are more familiar with solicitors than lawyers. This will hopefully help them see us as equals.

Agree Yes. And it would avoid duplication of what is essentially the same function required in law firms. But would this work for Cilex/Filex qualified lawyers who do not necessarily work in law firms? I would not know. I happen to work for a law firm, but could equally work in the same role for a corporate underwriting agency - and I believe and some Cilex lawyers work in local Govt.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Disagree Distinction between Cilex regulation and SRA regulation won't much concern the client

This is because what CILEx is proposing to do is to create a super or mega regulator. I have seen these mega and super regulators in other common law jurisdictions. The problem is the bigger things become the harder they are to move due to bureaucratic red tape.

Think of it like a speed boat vs an oil rig.

Which of the two are going to be the most versatile and able to turn on a dime and adapt the rapid change and growth?

There is more versatility in a smaller structure, more control and more focus when things get too big, they divide into East and West and schisms occur. The Tower of Babel teaches us this whether one takes it for its religious significance or not.

Smaller regulators, like small business are the life blood of our society. Maggie knew this. For legal regulators should be like small businesses in one particular sector with a mandate "to protect the consumer in the provision of legal services in England & Wales"

When legal regulators become too big super or mega societies they become like an oil rig which cannot quickly steer its course away from an iceberg as quickly and easily as a speed boat.

The legal services market is evolving fast. Its needs in an ever increasing heterogeneous society altering quickly and the need for its legal structure and framework to stay close behind is ever becoming the more important.

It cannot do this in a super or mega Society Legal Regulation Model

Disagree

(a) This is a loaded question when that goal is achievable with CRL

(b) There is no evidence at all that consumers lack trust and confidence (save following the embarrassing public spat)

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

"Not the right time" should be the response, until SRA resolve the axiom "blackhole" !

Disagree

Revisit in 18-36 months

Disagree

A

Disagree

A regulator is a regulator. It does not matter which regulator regulates.

Again the public are not concerned. The SRA is separate from the Law Society and that has had a very

Disagree

negative impact on the Law Society and its members.

Am concerned we will be 'lost' amongst the solicitors being the core of the SRA who will not

Disagree

understand the CLE requirements and concerns and am not impressed with the attitude of the SRA

Disagree

As long as there is a genuine and fair regulation in existence, I do not think it matters.

Disagree

Better to stay with CILEX Reg Authority.

By working together we keep costs down and improve communication and growth. If CILEx need a

Disagree

truly external option as a sounding board they can improve communication with the Law Society.

Changing regulator from CRL to the SRA will not enhance public trust and confidence in regulation at all. CILEx members' have been regulated well without any significant, (or at all), any fault being found with the conduct of regulation. Transferring regulation to the SRA is damaging to CILEx Lawyers and entities particularly when under the watch of the SRA a law firm has stolen £64million from clients. CILEx has a duty to its members as well as the public and therefore the suggestion that the SRA regulatory model is going to enhance public trust and confidence at all is totally incorrect and misleading to members.

Disagree

CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree

Disagree CILEX already has public confidence. Nursing and Medical Council regulate their own members.

Disagree Cilex has always satisfactorily represented its members.

CILEx member and graduates are separate professionals from solicitors and I believe that distinction is essential. That distinction will no longer be if the regulator is the same and I'm concerned that this will give rise to CILEx professional being officially seen as lesser than solicitors.

Disagree

Disagree Cilex regulation as I understood it was independent in its practice and robust in its standards.

Cilex regulation has worked absolutely fine and there is no need to change to SRA. I have not

Disagree

experienced any difficulty with public trust

CILEx Regulation is already supposed to be independent of CILEx pursuant to the provisions of the Legal Services Act 2007. In addition, the Legal Services Board is the over-arching regulator and is entirely independent. In addition, anyone who works in a law firm is already regulated by the SRA! Cilex Regulation is independent from Cilex so this does not seem to be a question that makes any sense.

Disagree

Disagree

CILEX Regulation is independent. A monopoly would undermine the public trust and confidence and, if we are regulated purely by the SRA, this will create a monopoly.

Disagree

Cilex should remain independent to protect its status of being a specialist lawyer

Disagree

compare with the Police and the IPC

Disagree

CRL dictates that I have to have my client accounts independently audited each year then reviews that audit. You are asking me and my firm to be regulated by a professional body that has allowed a law firm to steal £64m from it's clients accounts without noticing. I believe we have a higher degree of scrutiny with CRL. You are potentially now asking us to pay further fees as the SRA have stated that members will have to prop up the compensation fund to pay the short fall - I would need assurances that that would not apply to CILEx members.

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Do not believe there is any mistrust in present Regulator.

Disagree

Don't believe it will work.

Disagree

Donot want to be regulated by SRA, look at the mess they are in with Axion and Ince

Disagree

Explain why you think it is a good thing

Disagree

From experience the SRA are not that liked and trusted by a lot of people.

Disagree

From my experience CILEX members appear to be better regulated eg submitting a CPD log. Many solicitors do not maintain their CPD

Disagree

Have you read the articles on this?

Disagree

Have you seen the track record of the SRA? have you asked Solicitors what they think of the SRA and given the option would they stay with them? Anecdotally I would say not. Again its watering down our independence and we just become another number on a roll. The exact reason why I prefer being

Disagree

FCILEx

Having had experience of "whistle blowing" and the shocking lack of professionalism by the SRA resulted in clients being exposed to two further years of at best negligence and at worst financial malpractice I disagree.

Clients attempting to track down deeds and file from an intervened firm did not receive a response for months from the SRA and only after a legal firm intervened. Even then it took two months for a response.

Disagree I am afraid to say that there is a lack of communication and care for clients.

Disagree How is it any different to SRA and solicitors?

Disagree I

I am deeply concerned about the proposal to allow the SRA to regulate CILEX. See my answer regarding equality.

Disagree

I am greatly opposed. It is unnecessary. I think an awful lot of time and money has been spent on the question of delegation to the SRA which is flawed. Why will delegation of regulation to the SRA enhance public trust and confidence? Where is the research that supports this? Surely the well publicised mess of Axiom Ince needs to be taken into account and is a most concerning factor.

Disagree

Disagree I am happy with the current structure of regulation.

Disagree I am not convinced the public are concerned about this when they instruct a lawyer

I am not sure the public is aware of how regulation is at present - again would have preferred a "don't know" answer.

Disagree

I am slightly confused by the question because I thought the current regulator CILEX Regulation is independent from CILEX.

Disagree

I believe CRL as a regulatory model is structurally, financially and operationally independent already. the ability to be regulated by CRL whether you are a solicitor or legal executive has not been marketed since it came in. Changing regulators to the SRA is not something that Legal Executives want, in fact most solicitors do not want to be regulated by the SRA so why are we not promoting our regulators to solicitors? Public have no idea what the regulation element of law firms means for them. They want to know that the person they have working for them has the knowledge to complete their job.

Disagree

I believe the CRL is already independent and who ever regulates us will have to be paid for by our membership fees.

Disagree

I believe the main priority of the public is swift, fair and impartial regulation that upholds high standards, rather than any specific regulator. Any member of the public complaining about a regulated person or firm is unlikely to be satisfied with the outcome if the finding is not in their favour, irrespective of the structural position.

Disagree

I can't believe this is still being considered. CRL represents Cilex members well and can focus on our specific needs solely. I am 100% against this proposal

Disagree

I do not believe a layman off the street really takes a view on this point one way or another. I anticipate that just knowing a professional is regulated is enough. I have never investigated the regulatory body of a professional I have personally used.

Disagree

I do not believe there is a lack of public trust and confidence in CILEX's regulation. This feels like it has come from an internal dispute and come out of control now effecting the public and your members. I actually believes this could have the opposite effect, giving the impression that CILEX are not happy with how they are being regulated and so can simply jump ship to someone else.

Disagree

I do not consider that the public actually care too much about professional regulation. In my experience the SRA does not enjoy a particularly good reputation among its current members (i.e. solicitors).

Disagree

Disagree I do not consider there is a need for the current regulation to be changed

Disagree I do not know enough about this to comment

Disagree I do not understand why CILEX is not good enough for this purpose.

I don't agree. Do you have any interest or trust or confidence in other regulatory bodies such as FSA, or various in the health service sector, or public sector?

Disagree

I don't know that the public distrust CRL but I know the legal profession distrust the SRA

Disagree

I don't think CRL has been ineffective. And I don't think the public will understand or see any difference if it changes to SRA but the regulated profession certainly will. If they had wanted to be solicitors and regulated by SRA, they would have chosen a career path that enabled that.

Disagree

I don't think it will have any impact on how the public views CILEX. There are not aware of the current structure and will have little awareness of any change to this.

Disagree

I don't think it will make any difference to the public whatsoever.

Disagree

I don't think that the public have the slightest interest in our regulatory model

Disagree

I dont think the public care about that. They dont understand the SRA or Onbudsman let alone another body or route. Cilex is attractive because it is ours - not operated or influenced by another body.

Disagree

I don't think the public pay this much attention.ypu would be better served trying to increase the trust solicitors have in cilex

Disagree

I don't think the public think about regulation!

Disagree

I don't think there is any issues with the independence. Whereas the SRA has shown a stark example of financial mismanagement which it cannot now fund without an increase in PC fees - purely to pay compensation for their oversight

Disagree

I don't think what is being proposed is that independent and will just confusion and blurring between the bodies.

Disagree

I doubt most members of the public are aware of the different regulatory bodies and are likely to only find out if they are dissatisfied with the service provided.

Disagree

I doubt the public are generally too concerned. Those that are would be concerned whoever was undertaking the role.

Disagree

I have always believed that we should regulate our own.

Disagree

I have raised this proposal to pass regulation to SRA with several clients. They think it would mean we are trainee Solicitors. I can see no evidence of the Public interest issue, yet I can see the Board ignoring its members. One point you make is our costs of £367 v SRA £306. Given that SRA regulates over 10 times more people, they do not appear to be cost efficient. Let alone the Axiom Ince issue. It would also result in CRL or a legacy body having to regulate the 9,000 not qualifieds, what happens to them? You say currently consumers are confused as to who regulates lawyers. In 18years as a litigtor I have been taken to LEO about 20 times, never upheld, never taken to eithr SRA or CRL, so why do we need thsoe two bodies? There still would be 2 regulators, SRA & legacy CRL , so isnt that a huge flaw in your argument. Why would I as a CLE be regualted by SRA is a comment made by some of my clients does that mean I am a trainee Solicitor? We are not the same as Solicitors, so again why would we be regulated by them. It is odd You, the Board said we cant have branches, so you closed the network down, Law soc still has branches. I have seen no evidence of your Public interest argument. Clearly there are issues, you say you subsidise CRL, they say you dont.

Disagree

Going forward if you as CILEX can in effect sack CRL, doesnt that mean you can sack the SRA if you dont like what they are doing?

Disagree

I have read the consultation and I feel there is something missing. It does not make sense why we need to change regulator.

Disagree

I have seen no research that proves this nor that the SRA will provide any of this.

Disagree

I see no difference between this and the SRA

Disagree

I slightly disagree, but do not feel strongly about it. The reason for the disagreement is fear that the SRA would set CILEx Lawyers/CLEs to a lower standard than solicitors, and will not allow progression to the same level as solicitors without additional work (such as the SQE). The Regulator should also understand the needs of CILEx members. I feel as though the SRA will view us as "secondary" to solicitors.

Disagree

- Disagree I think CILEX should regulate themselves to ensure we are not lost within the SRA and forgotten about
I think it is a mistake to transfer CILEX delegation to the SRA when we already have a regulatory body
- Disagree and I think we should remain separate from the SRA.
- Disagree I think it will be difficult to enhance trust and confidence generally especially if CILEX is regulated by
the SRA given recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.
- Disagree I think that it will make no difference whatsoever, and will only serve to blur the lines between the
professions. Barristers have always operated a separate regulatory system without any issues, and I
fail to see why CILEX should not do so.
- Disagree
- Disagree I think that unless there is a completely separate body established, the public will always be cynical
about regulators.
- Disagree I think the current model works and I see no reason to change it.
- Disagree I think things are working as they are and the removal of Cilex Regulation as the regulator will be an
issue because it will remove a team dedicated to Cilex members and who understand the whole
qualification process as well as the regulation of members from the equation. The SRA already has a
large amount of people it regulates and adding another group of people would be detrimental to the
Cilex members. It may also make the Cilex membership redundant.
- Disagree
- Disagree i think we should be regulated by the SRA so that we are perceived as being on the same level as
solicitors. The public generally dont perceive us to be in the same same category. We should be.
I think we should stay separate and stick to building on the brand that has already been established
through many painful years. I don't the public in general really cares. You should focus on enhancing
your member's trust and confidence.
- Disagree
- Disagree I think you are living in an echo chamber. I am sure that all your surveys and evidence show that the
pubic think of little else but how the legal profession is regulated. Ask the right questions and you will
obtain the answers that you want. The public does not care. CILEX Regulation is more than separate
enough from CILEX to continue doing the job it is doing.
- Disagree
- Disagree I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of
cilex lawyers
- Disagree I want a Regulatory body which has the best interests of CILEx at its heart and works for us.
- Disagree If Cilex broaden the chances of people qualifying to practice in several field , it will in no distance time
be recognised by people being represented by those lawyers and by extension the wider public. The
problem now is the strict restriction of people to progress easily to practicing stage. If OIC lawyers
have the confidence and trust of the public why should cilex lawyers not have confidence and trust of
the people. Members should be allowed to qualify easily to practice various areas of law as stated
above. In so doing members of the public would come to terms with practitioners of cilex when they
are being represented
- Disagree
- Disagree If the SRA regulate cilex professionals it is most likely people that are cilex trained will be more widely
accepted as equivalent solicitors
- Disagree If you are talking about the SRA then this is body that has grown way out of its power and needs to be
reigned in a little
- Disagree
- Disagree If you mean do I agree to switching to regulation by the SRA, the answer is: no!
- Disagree I'm happy for CILEx Regulation to remain our regulator
- Disagree I'm unclear whether this question is geared to CRL or SRA? I support a move to SRA

In 20+ years a client has never asked who the regulator was, they just want to know that you can do the job. If CRL cannot do a job of regulating, then that Board should be dismissed and a new proposal made. Is CILEX suggesting that CRL cannot do this job and if so, what has changed over the last decade or more? CILEX lawyers and firms should be regulated by a CILEX regulation authority

Disagree

Disagree Insufficient information to know

It completely undermines the chartered legal executive status. If we can't trust our own regulator what does that say about the lawyers it creates?

Disagree

Disagree It has not been fully explored or explained

Disagree It implies CILEX isn't capable of doing it itself and has to delegate.

It is not the perception of independence of the body but its effectiveness that matters. Furthermore outsourcing regulation to a regulator of another part of the legal profession will add to confusion and regulatory over-reach by the SRA and SDT

Disagree

It is unlikely that the public is aware of the status of the current regulatory model and are more likely to be concerned that there is one than the specific provider.

Disagree

It may be a good idea but in reality the public have no idea or interest in such matters therefore this step would make not a jot of difference to public trust and confidence. The question appears to be a further example of the internal self indulgence which exists in this area.

Disagree

It should stay as it is, we want CILEX regulation not SRA to continue and it should be made more clear

Disagree

what there has been such a public fallout with our current regulator.

Disagree

It will be seen as just another layer of bureaucracy

Disagree

It will have no impact on public trust and confidence.

Disagree

its fine as it is. no need to change

Disagree

its not helpful to the public

Loss of Control: Transferring regulation to the SRA means relinquishing direct control over the regulatory process for CILEX members. This could impact how CILEX members perceive their association with the organization.

Member Confidence: Members might be concerned about potential changes in regulatory standards, processes, or disciplinary actions when oversight shifts to a new regulatory body.

Resource Allocation: While CILEX might focus more on education, it would still require resources to ensure the quality of its education programs, maintain membership services, and support its members in various ways.

Transition Challenges: The transition itself might involve logistical, administrative, and communication challenges that need to be carefully managed to ensure a smooth process.

Ultimately, whether or not CILEX decides to transfer regulation to the SRA depends on a variety of factors, including its strategic goals, member feedback, legal and regulatory considerations, and the potential impact on its identity and reputation in the legal field.

Disagree

Most Clients are not bothered about who regulates. It is not a concern. They just want a job well done. I am not convinced that the SRA is bothered about its own members interests so they will not be bothered about CILEX - it's poorer cousin. I have read the SRA document on the proposed changes and attended an online presentation with Linda Ford and the SRA members and I was not filled with confidence. Change CRL into an independent body instead.

Disagree

My concern with moving regulation to the SRA is how this will work in practice ie will the SRA understand CILEX lawyers and their route to being fully qualified? Currently CILEX regulation concentrates solely on CILEX members and I cannot see how the public trust in regulation will be higher if delegated to the SRA

Disagree
Disagree n

No credible case for change has been made out. This stinks of internal politics. I would also oppose sra regulation in the strongest terms. Sra are not a reputable body and are most similar to an Italian Mafia. No evidence has been provided as to how this is going to make it better for the public. This is all about cilex v crl.

Disagree
Disagree
Disagree
Disagree
Disagree
Disagree
Disagree

No further comments
No. Likely to cause confusion.
Not necessarily
Not sure it will matter
Please see previous comments.

Public trust in the SRA should not be any greater than in any other regulator. Particularly when all I seem to read about is junior lawyers being struck off for minor errors and mistakes while senior and powerful solicitors getting fines and ticked off for truly shocking and deliberate conduct.

Disagree

Publically diverting responsibility from a CILEx organisation will suggest that there is something wrong with CILEx and that they cannot be trusted to regulate their own members. We should work to adopt similar practices to the SRA and publicise this, but not outsource the work

Disagree

Regulation by SRA will result in an actual merger which in turn will lead to Chartered Legal Executives being seen as lower than solicitors. At the moment the status of FCILEx is more and more widely seen as equal. Why depreciate it?

Disagree

Regulations is already delegated to such a body in CRL

Disagree

Same as above

see above. Changing to the SRA has little to do with public trust and confidence. You should promote your members to the public and their knowledge, professionalism and behaviour will speak for itself.

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

See before
See below

Should stay within the cilex profession for the purpose of fairness and we feel better among our peers

Disagree

Strongly disagree with move to the SRA. I think it will further devalue CILEX members. SRA unlikely to look out for best interests of members.

Disagree

That is my view

Disagree

That is the current position with CILEx Regulation - switching the regulator to SRA will diminish CILEX as a body

Disagree

The benefits of an independent regulatory body have not been fully or adequately clarified. I don't agree or disagree but I don't think the case is clear yet.

Disagree

Disagree

The current CRL model is perfectly sensible and well suited to the unique approach of CILEx members.

The current inequality issues may not be addressed, which include the level of discrimination currently faced by CILEX fellows in the legal profession. There is no guarantee the situation will not change again, whereby the SRA would have complete autonomy over CILEX.

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

The current regulation body CRL are doing a fine job.
The current regulation regime is fine, if it isn't broke don't fix it.
The current regulatory system works well. CILEX Regulation's opposition to these proposals is evidence of its independence from CILEX

Disagree The current system is tailored to the CLE profession. The current system is already sufficiently independent and there are no issues with public trust and confidence

Disagree The current UK regulatory scene is entirely unfit for purpose. The confusing nature of multiple regulators competing for business which was introduced for political reasons to try to create a market of regulators is confusing to professionals and the public alike. The public have no idea how the links between the professional bodies and the regulators work so making this change will make absolutely no different to them whatsoever and will probably pass them by without notice. It is so irrelevant to them, there is almost no point in trying to argue that as a basis for doing it. If it is a good idea in itself for governance reasons then fine, but it will not make one iota of different to public trust and confidence in regulation.

Disagree The distinction of qualification within the Legal Profession will remain regardless and that will be the General Public's view.

Disagree The general public are not going to know the difference between regulators. They will not know the difference between Cilex and the SRA, and they are unlikely to really care. All they want to know is that there is a regulator. Therefore I do not think the proposed change is going to enhance any public trust.

Disagree The level of leading questioning and spin here is off the scale.

Disagree The members are quite happy being regulated by CILEx Regulation. We do not want to be regulated by the SRA which seems to spend its resources fining small firms for innocuous reasons rather than brining down large firms who steal client money, of which there have been several examples this year and which the SRA has done nothing about, or at least not enough. SRA members think CILEx is mad for wanting to transfer its membership to the SRA which is an antiquated body that is run badly.

Disagree The professional sector does not demonstrate public confidence and trust in the SRA which is concerning. As a result this does not enhance public trust in it.

Disagree The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who.

Disagree The public barely know who the LSB and SRA are, never mind CRL. I barely have knowledge of the Council of Licensed Conveyancers and none for the Intellectual Property Regulation Board. There are off-shoots of our profession already in existence, so why move us to the SRA, who do treat us as inferior and inconsequential? That is not acting in the best interests of your membership. If you want an independent body, make it so that CRL are independent. It appears CILEx have set up CRL to fail. This in-fighting is not helping CILEx members and is making a mockery of the professionalism your membership has fought hard to achieve. The general public have no idea about legal practice and the separation of regulation. They just want to know who to complain to when things go wrong, and even with solicitors they don't understand when to report to the Legal Ombudsman or the SRA. CILEx is not alone or unique in having difficulties in this regard. Again, it comes down to information, which can be provided via good marketing.

Disagree The public do not care about the ins and outs of out regulation. The average member of the public does not know what CILEx is or what legal execs are and moving over to the SRA won't change that.

Disagree The public do not care if they raise a complaint whether it is CILEX Regulation or the SRA. They only want a specified outcome. The existing regime has a clear structure, financial stability and independence. It would only cause confusion and Solicitors clearly object therefore lead to division from Solicitors which is currently managed by having a separate regulator.

Disagree The Public don't who we are or what we do now - they see us as a lesser Solicitor so you to fix that before to try anything else

The public have very little understanding (and probably care still less) of the oversight/regulatory model in place in the various elements of the profession. The current system works. If it ain't broke don't fix it. If the SRA were better then there might be an argument but this is far from certain.

Disagree

Disagree The public is generally not interested in such semantics

The public will have no idea of the difference either way. It is just as easy for the public to contact cilex as it is for them to contact the SRA. In fact it may be more confusing, as the public will think that the SRA regulate SOLICITORS only. Unless the SRA change their name, I see little benefit for the public. All the infighting between cilex and cilex regulation is damaging for consumer trust in the meantime. The sra will absolutely charge more for our practicing certificates and that will adversely affect cilex members.

Disagree The sra are looking at this as a new income stream and not because they want to regulate cilex lawyers

Disagree The public won't care about this either way

Disagree The public, much like myself, will not understand what is going on or why. If we are to be regulated by the SRA (the SOLICITORS' Regulation Authority) then we should all be solicitors, otherwise it is an absolute absurdity.

Disagree The SRA already did, and continues to receive bad publicity due to recent failures, so I think everyone is wondering how they would have the capacity to take on CLE's as well and be proficient at doing so. CILEX need to work with CRL to address its issues and work together to promote public trust and confidence.

Disagree The SRA are no better than the CILEx Regulator.

Disagree The SRA have no interest in bettering the position of CILEX qualified lawyers.

Disagree The SRA is for solicitors. We should not be charging our regular to them. You need to work with the current regulators to settle your differences and move forward together. That would actually give rise to more respect for you amongst members.

The SRA is not considered by Solicitors to enhance the publics trust and confidence so why will it enhance the CILEX confidence. It has only opened the door to an over regulated profession that exists in no other profession other than the medical profession.

Disagree

The SRA regulates solicitors. The Bar Council regulates members of the Bar. There should be no change to regulation of Cilex members. Solicitors, I have no doubt, see the Bar and Cilex members as competition. That much is obvious. I don't believe therefore that the SRA would protect Cilex members and once we are within their grip, they could do anything.

Disagree

Disagree The SRA would not care about the status of CLEX's

Disagree There is no evidence that the existing regulatory model does not work.

Disagree There is no evidence to suggest this. CRL is an independent body and so there would be no change in this regard. Put more funding into the regulation we already have and keep CILEx independent. What us the likelihood that we would see the BSB and SRA merge? Unlikely in my opinion and this scenario is no different.

Disagree

Disagree Think it works really well as it currently operates.

Disagree This hasn't been required to date - and CILEx has been previously been positive of its set up so hard to see the reason for the change

This I'm afraid is shoddy spin. What you honestly should have posed is 'Do you want to be regulated by the SRA'. You didn't because I suspect that if you had of done you would have only invited a resounding NO from the membership and you knew it. Very disappointed by not surprised.

Disagree

Disagree This is a leading question. You are really asking, "Is CRL up to the job". My answer is YES. And if not, they can be required to make changes or deliver what is needed. The fact they did not give CILEX the answers CILEX wanted is not a reason to go rushing to the SRA.

Disagree This is a loaded question. I do not agree with moving to SRA

This question is disingenuous and worded so as to achieve the result CILEx wants. I do not believe the current arrangements impact public trust and confidence in the regulation of legal executives. As a solicitor and FCILEx I can safely say that CILEx regulation is the better regulator. Solicitor colleagues think CILEx is mad to want regulation by the SRA. It will not lead to better outcomes for CILEx professionals or clients - what has damaged public trust and confidence is the open war of words between CILEx and CILEx regulation which has frankly made me ashamed to be a member.

Disagree

We are a unique set of qualified and educated professionals - why do we need to be pocketed under the same umbrella as the SRA when we have worked hard to promote the difference

Disagree

We must be regulated by a body that completely understands what we do , how we get there and what we provide . Cilex regulation does that, the SRA will not . I fail to see how this will increase

Disagree

public confidence and trust

We need to keep our independent status and not be party of the SRA who have problems of their own with solicitors

Disagree

We need to remain CILEX and away from SRA

Disagree

We will become paralegals to the sra. Solicitors have contempt for cilex, read any law gazette article mentioning us.

Disagree

we will never have equivalent status as solicitors through this

Disagree

Where is the evidence that such a body will look after our interests?

Disagree

Why change something that works?

Disagree

Why does an outside organisation need to be taken on to delegate matters that can be carried out by CILEX with modifications to its Constitution and Governance Regulations. We will be paying for that body in addition to CILEX. It's not necessary at a time when money is very tight with most households.

Disagree

Why is it perceived that we are not trusted?

Disagree

Why would it?

Disagree

You have provided no evidence that such change would increase public trust. As far as I am aware, you rely on the Chris Kenny report and that's it. You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this

Disagree

Your proposals will simply make CILEX a branch of the solicitors profession and the poor relation. You did not consider the issue that the SRA is massive and deals with many more solicitors than there are Legal Executives and we will simply become a branch of the Solicitors and very much the poor relations. Given that the SRA and solicitors now can qualify whilst working (copying the cilex route) we will miss being a fully independent branch of the profession, separate from Solicitors.

The matters raised about CRL not being independent are clearly not a real issue as CRL has resisted these proposed changes and yet you still provide the argument that it is not independent enough of CILEX- an argument made to forward your agenda here, not with any actual evidence of the independence of CRL having ever been an issue.

Also noted is that you took less than 5 days to consider the CRL response before deciding that it did not meet your requirements then went off to the SRA to ask it self serving questions

Disagree

Любой учебный процес должен проходить бесплатно,но учитывая время в котором мы живем и какие бывают финансовые трудности ,считаю что время прхождения учебного процесса должно быть финансово закреплен по оплате за учебу теми организациями и компаниями на которые член Cilex можит рассчитывать.Благотворительность должна приветствоваться и помоготь членам Cilex.

Disagree

Do you agree that regulation by the SRA provides opportunity to establish and maintain consumer confidence that lawyers, regardless of whether through the CILEX route or the Solicitor route, enter

Response Please state reasons

Agree absolutely

Agree Absolutely, I also think it will show that the regulator for Solicitors recognises and treats CILEX Lawyers as equal. This is important as I believe the attitude of many employers is that they are not at the same level and this will go some way to disabusing them of that view.

Agree Absolutely. The public and all legal professionals understand who SRA is. I'm often called upon to explain who my regulator is and whether I'm qualified to both consumer and other legal professionals, it's embarrassing. If FCilex were linked to SRA, I think this would increase confidence and understanding immeasurably. I would feel much more comfortable.

Agree Access

Agree Agree but it does not mean that if Cilex produce many lawyers that would be out there representing their clients , the clients will not have trust and confidence in them. The problem is that there less number of practitioners from Cilex than OIC lawyers and Solicitors. Open up the chances for people to qualify as Chartered immigration lawyer , family lawyer, injury lawyers , conveyance lawyers and you will see that in a short period of time the members of the public would be using these lawyers which will engender public confidence and trust

Agree Agree, but subject to CILEX members being properly represented under the SRA regulation

Agree All be overseen by same standards

Agree All CILEx members and solicitors should meet a high standard as our job is to represent the public.

Agree All lawyers are regulated by one recognised body.

Agree As a pre-existing regulator of long standing it would inspire consumer confidence that the CILEX lawyer is held accountable to the same standards as its counterpart solicitors.

Agree as above

Agree As above

Agree As above, this is a big opportunity for CILEx.

Agree As above.

Agree As per my comments in section 16.

Agree As set out above

Agree Avoids confusion amongst public having different kinds of lawyers

Agree But only if public confidence at present is high in the SRA. If there is a poor public perception of the SRA, then this could bring down the reputation of CILEX lawyers if the public feel that there are no issues with current CILEX regulation. But if public perception of the SRA is high, or higher than CILEX Regulation, then this would help increase the trust and perception of CILEX lawyers. Also, if the public feel that CILEX lawyers aren't currently held to such high account as SRA regulated solicitors, then the change would help align the status of CILEX lawyers with solicitors in the mind of the public. But this last point would depend on if the regulation rules were the same for both.

Agree BUT you must absolutely preserve the integrity of Cilex and all that it has stood for. Do not allow protectionist, snobbish, restrictive, practices to sully what Cilex has always been about.

Agree CILEX is currently not sufficient in enhancing its members knowledge and experience and the involvement of SRA would bring recognition to its members.

Agree CILEX Lawyers may actually have more experience than that of SRA solicitors, due to their experience in qualifying.

Agree Cilex members go through strict scrutiny for qualifying and have to maintain high standards

Agree Cilex regulations basically a duplication of SRA rules

Agree Closes down one barrier that creates distance between solicitors and cilex legal executives

Agree Fairer

Agree For consistency we should be regulated in the same way as solicitors. Inconsistency can breed a lack of trust and suspicion that a consumer may be receiving a different service when in fact the day to day service is exactly the same whether provided by someone CILEX qualified for Solicitor

Agree for obvious reasons

Agree Give confidence to clients

Agree gives the impression of parity between solicitors and legal execs

Agree Having read the consultation, I don't disagree with this. However, as a Chartered Legal Executive I am very concerned about my future in law and equal opportunities as a qualified lawyer.

Agree Having several regulators is a duplication and confusing.

Agree Having the same regulator as Solicitor's will promote public confidence that we are held to the same standard (even though we already are!).

Agree High standards are the very least that we must maintain.

Agree I agree only because the SRA is more public facing than CLR.

Agree I agree with the statement and would hope there would not be any discrimination.

Agree I believe also this supports the view that there is minimal difference between CILEX and Solicitors.

Agree I believe the question is worded in a way that is hard to disagree with, but I am slightly concerned that there is no longer going to be much distinction between me as a Cilex Lawyer and me as a Solicitor (I am dual qualified and dual regulated - soon I will be single-regulated).

Agree I believe this move will enhance the status of CILEX lawyers and ensure we are on level footing with solicitors and are seen to be so

Agree I can accept this argument but believe further information and reassurances are required

Agree I couldn't agree more.

Agree I do agree that by solicitors and CILEX being under one umbrella may help lay and professional clients to understand they provide the same standard and CILEX are not the "poor relation". There have been occasions in my experience when a client has been made an appointment to see a legal executive and they have said they want to see a solicitor.

Agree I do agree with this, with the caveat that we do not become absorbed in the SRA and that we hold the equivalent standing and status. This needs to be also promoted by the SRA as a regulator to the public and other stakeholders.

Agree I don't believe the sra or better regulated. They are both as good and bad as each other I. It has simply been around longer so is known to deal with the law and regulation of its practitioners.

Agree I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:

Agree 1. People see us as equals - which would be great.

Agree 2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.

Agree I have nothing to add.

Agree I hope so but the SRA have not traditionally been supportive of CILEX members and I very much hope this attitude would change and we would see equality and acknowledgement

Agree I think cilex lawyers should also be called solicitors vice versa if they are both going to be regulated by sra

Agree I think it is important for this to be the case.

Agree I think it would increase confidence as I work in an sra regulated firm and that I'd be regulated under the sea and it would mean that I could say this to clients.

Agree i think that being SRA qualified builds trust as the consumer believes that the professional has undertaken all legal and regulatory steps to gain the qualification and thus, gives the consumer confidence in what the professional conveys to them

Agree I would suggest there is a higher level of consumer awareness in relation to the SRA and their role. In turn, if consumers saw our members CLE's/CILEX Lawyers regulated by the SRA they would automatically trust that person had reached the required standard.

Agree If the SRA regulate cilex professionals it is most likely people that are cilex trained will be more widely accepted as equivalent solicitors

Agree In an ever changing world consumer confidence is utmost.

Agree It also supports the high standards expected of all lawyers.

Agree It is a recognised regulator

Agree It is simpler to have a combined regulatory body

Agree It offers that opportunity but so does the current arrangements as far as I am aware.

Agree It provides opportunity, but it may not actually improve the situation with regard to recognition of the expertise of CILEx qualified professionals.

Agree It will be a big step in achieving parity with solicitors

Agree It will enhance public trust

Agree It will ensure Cilex route and traditional solitor are more on a par and looks similar when they are and should be the same.

Agree It will provide the same benefits as the SRA provides to Lawyers/Solicitors that qualify through the traditional route.

Agree It will show a bit more equality

Agree It would

Agree It's a more recognised body and private practice lawyers are snobs

Agree Long question but suffice to say that SRA is probably more widely known and it simplifies standards.

Agree Makes sense for the SRA to regulated everyone as they have the expertise.

Agree Makes sense that all legal services providers are regulated by the same regulatory body and held to the same exacting standards.

Agree Many members have been told that they are unqualified or second rate lawyers. This will give public recognition of our status and hold as a quality mark of our years of study and specialism.

Agree May give CILEX lawyers more of a standing if regulated by the SRA

Agree My personal view is the SRA will be an effective and respected regulator and that will increase consumer confidence which can only be a good thing. CILEX members already have to adhere to the SRA Code of Practice if they work in a regulated firm and greater public confidence can only be achieved by our members being listed under the same body as solicitors

Agree n/a

Agree No comment

Agree No comments but agrees with the statement.

Agree One body shows equitable standards.

Agree one umbrella to find all lawyers

Agree One voice

Agree People know the SRA much better than they know CILEX

Agree Possibly.

Agree Public more familiar with SRA

Agree Public perception in this respect this respect is vital

Agree Regulation by SRA will increase public confidence by consumers if the proposals are accepted.

Agree In my experience clients will be aware of the SRA from the terms of business and client care letter.

Agree See 19 above

Agree Some people still see the Law Society as a lawyer's regulator, but as the public become increasingly aware of the SRA, it will be better to be a part of that, and not expect trust to be established in too many regulators performing similar roles.

Agree SRA has more realistic standards to accept students into the profession.

Agree SRA is a well-known brand and is trusted by the public

Agree SRA is better known than CILEX, so if the SRA takes on CILEX lawyers it would probably bring more confidence from the consumers.

Agree SRA is more widely known, and it makes sense to reduce duplication of resources and expertise

Agree SRA is well known.

Agree The CILEX route, or the Solicitor route, enters the profession through robust processes and is required to meet and maintain high standards of competence.

Agree The current regulation is not widely recognised and is insufficient and does not accord with the requirements of other qualified lawyers in the legal environment.

Agree The current system is not working and the public don't know what a legal executive is.

Agree The legal profession, SRA is regarded as the gold standard. Further CILEX studies centre around SRA principles and code of conduct.

Agree The public are aware of the SRA and the role it plays . Seen as a professional body

Agree The public consumer may have a better understanding of how the SRA functions

Agree The regulatory environment is so confusing that the consolidation of regulation can only be a good thing. Rightly or wrongly, the public know the profession of "solicitor" and it is recognised as being a long-standing, trustworthy profession. Associating with the SRA as regulator of that profession will show that multiple professions and professional titles does not mean a watering down of standards and a race to the bottom by regulators competing for membership. A single regulator of all legal professionals would be the best outcome for the public (and is clearly the LSB's desired ultimate outcome). That is some way off but the professions working together to create a common regulator is helpful for the public to understand that there is a single place to go with complaints which holds its members to a common standard rather than there being different standards, rules and regulators for different people doing the same thing.

Agree The SRA Code and other regulatory mechanisms put the consumer at the front of its models. The consumer always feels protected.

Agree The SRA is a trusted body that people associate with diligence, audit and accountability

Agree The SRA is the best option and will finally bring CILEX professionals into the mainstream.

Agree The SRA is the recognised governing body and as such, should be in charge of all Lawyers.

Agree The SRA requires very high standards to be met by lawyers and therefore consumers will be reassured that they meet and maintain high standards of competence.

Agree There is no good reason for there being too different regulators, regulating on the same matters in the same way. It would be beneficial for CILEX members to be regulated by the SRA as this would make the parity of the standard of service provided evident to the public.

Agree They are a recognised body that most people have heard of

Agree This is something I have been wanting CILEX to pursue, I feel this would decrease the disparity between Solicitor and CILEX.

Agree This will help with the structure and the confidence of the public moving forward.

Agree Totally agree as CILEX practitioners have, as you say, entered the profession through robust processes and maintain very high standards of competence which is not always recognised by the public who believe that Solicitors are more qualified

Agree We would be more recognisable as Lawyers by the public

Agree Will provide clarity to consumers as to who regulates lawyers and an even playing field in the industry between solicitors and chartered lawyers regulation wise

Agree Yes - but there should really be equality between those who qualify via traditional route and those who qualify via CILEX. If we are to be held of the same account/standards, why not have us all be Solicitors (if we chose to be referred to as that)?

Agree Yes and hopefully there will be more parity and clarity in relation to practice rights

Agree Yes as the general public aware solicitors have to endure and uphold high standards of compliance and competence but sadly have little to no idea of requirements of CILEX members

Agree Yes but ONLY if cilex are EQUALLY represented. Cilex has never understood or taken seriously enough the lack of respect we face professionally. Instead cilex has made matters of more challenging by watering fcilex down by introducing a hundred different grades and so we are seen as glorified paralegals. The SRA MUST change its name and perhaps then cilex will simply become another route to an equal status as lawyer. It is a simple change but it is absolutely key. If a name change does not happen cilex will let down it's membership and the public and I am awaiting the outcome of this before deciding whether to switch regulator to the CLC

Agree Yes but the Solicitors Regulation Authority should in my view change it name otherwise it could be a retrograde step as it would appear to the public that CILEX lawyers are regulated by solicitors when CILEX is claiming parity.

Agree Yes but time will tell. We are still distinct from solicitors.

Agree Yes, consumer's will probably consider this to be more simple to digest in that there will be one main regulator. Logically this would seem to be more practicable in terms of communicating regulatory rules and any investigations. It will give the consumer just one regulator to go too (if needed), rather than two,

Agree Yes, see comment above.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree A

Disagree Absolutely not.

Disagree A specialist independent regulator can ensure high standards of competence whilst not impairing the independence of the CILEX profession

Disagree Again there is no evidence to support this.

Disagree Again I think the SRA will diminish CILEX' status

Disagree Again, cloud cuckoo land. Regulation is not the same thing as qualification and competence. The CILEX qualification is excellent. Competence is gained and then enhanced through experience. The existence or otherwise of a regulator has no bearing on this at all.

Disagree Are we now saying that those who did not qualify under SRA regulation are less competent than those who qualified under CRL regulation? I am concerned my qualification is being undermined and devalued and I find this disheartening.

Disagree As above

Disagree As above - no to sra

Disagree As above, the suggestion will be that CILEX cannot regulate it's own members sufficiently without asking for help from the SRA

Disagree As above.

Disagree Because things are working as they are.

Disagree Cause confusion

Disagree Changing regulatory body will not make a difference. Clients know we are qualified lawyers. That is all that matters to them. I can count on one hand the people who have assumed I must not be a proper lawyer because I am not a solicitor.

Disagree Changing to the SRA has little to do with public trust and confidence. See above.

CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree

CILEX Fellows value CRL not the SRA. Put an end to this now.

Disagree

Cilex has regulatory its members in the past and why change?

Disagree

CILEx have been making great steps to attain higher rights of audience for its members. There is no mention of those steps being taken by the SRA if they were to be our regulator. It feels as if we'd be left, once again, appearing to be the inferior class of lawyers.

Disagree

CILEX is already known for its highly qualified members. Involving a solicitor's regulator is not going to mean CILEX members will be considered the same as qualified solicitors. Unless the Solicitors profession re-models to allow equal ranking with a CILEX Practitioner and the training is the same it is NOT going to happen regardless of whether or not the Solicitors Regulatory Authority is used by CILEX.

Disagree

Cilex lawyer are currently relegated in the legal profession, therefore regulation by SAR may not necessary change that view

Disagree

CILEX lawyers already work to an extremely high standard.

Disagree

CILEX members are not solicitors, so should not be regulated by the SRA. I consider this would take something away from CILEX's unique status, and have a detrimental effect on the efforts made to ensure CILEX Lawyers have parity with solicitors. If lawyers that are not solicitors are regulated by the SRA, there would exist an implicit assumption that they are not the same, as they do not hold the title that is encapsulated in the S of SRA. This could lead to the public and others viewing them as subordinate to solicitors.

Disagree

CILEX Regulation has those attributes.

Disagree

CILEx Regulation meets all the requirements for a regulatory body to act according to the LSB guidance

Disagree

Cilex route is harder. Solicitors equally work just as hard but they are general lawyers, cilex are specialists. Lumping us in with 100,000's sols will only make us drown out

Disagree

CILEX should stay separately. I appreciate some will also think that solicitors are more qualified than CILEX. However, in my opinion, we are specialised in our areas and this is what makes us so special in comparison to a solicitor. Cilex standards are high and show competence and completely fit for purpose and regulation does not need to change to SRA to show consumer confidence

Disagree

CILEX will be seen as second class. SRA will favour their own.

Disagree

Clients dont care. They just want to know that the job can be done properly.

Disagree

Clients I have represented recently were extremely disappointed by the SRA in addition to clients from 2009. This does not demonstrate that the regulation by the SRA achieves high standards of competence. It does show a worrying lack of competency and organisation.

Disagree

Consumer confidence sits with the profession as a whole. To say 'establish' is insulting to the current regulator.

Disagree

Consumers will judge lawyers by their experience of them and not by which professional body regulates them. I have personal experience of solicitors who fell far short of the standards expected and of CILEx lawyers who have provided a much better service - I do not see the change of regulator guaranteeing a better experience for consumers.

Disagree

CRL can do this as in 18 above. We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it.

Disagree

Despite what cilex may say, having cilex members regulated by the SRA will lead to the destruction of cilex. It is completely absurd that you think the SRA is going to concentrate on furthering the rights of cilex when it would be in the SRA's best interests to have cilex members to qualify as solicitors. With the SRA, cilex will never have parity with solicitors. I have lost all confidence in cilex and completely regret ever qualifying via cilex.

Disagree

Distinction between Cilex regulation and SRA regulation won't much concern the client

Disagree

Distinguishing the ultimate of the lawyer acting for you is not a matter which concerns most members of the general public. Competency is

Disagree

Diversity of the legal professional will be shoved, if the intended proposal is pursued.

Disagree

Do not believe the SRA will be in the best interests of CILEx lawyers.

Disagree

Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Disagree

Donot want to be regulated by SRA look at the mess they are in with Axiom

Disagree

Even solicitors aren't entirely happy with the SRA so for CILEX to be part of that regulatory body I don't feel is a good thing going forward.

Disagree

Feel public have limited knowledge of SRA and CILEX so merging won't make that clearer for them.

Disagree

For the reasons already stated

Disagree

Disagree For the reasons at 19 and CRL have not record of any issues with their regulatory functions at all; whereas the SRA have failed in their duties on a grand scale which is failing their members and the public. The SRA cannot be said to have robust processes otherwise one firm could not have stolen from clients on the scale that Axiom has done.

Disagree From what I can tell, the SRA does not succeed in instilling trust and confidence in the profession, whether amongst the public or its solicitor members.

Disagree Given sra low opinion of cilex, risk is difference in treatment for being cilex member

Disagree Have you read the articles on this?

Disagree I

Disagree I am concerned it will further the divide between CILEX and Solicitors as we will not have an independent regulator arguing for this divide to be reduced.

Disagree I became a lawyer long before the SRA took over. You are taught your high standards and competence. The SRA are not lawyers and should not therefore regulate lawyers.

Disagree I believe it would be difficult to maintain customer confidence if the SRA were regulators given the recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.

Disagree I believe that regulation by the SRA will be confusing to the public whilst ever the title "Solicitor" remains in the title. I believe that the key matter the public care about is that their lawyer is qualified, competent and regulated. I do not think the SRA is held in higher regard by the public than any other regulator, either within law or compared to other professions (e.g. medicine, finance, accountancy, etc.)

Disagree I couldn't disagree more. I don't think that the consumer sees the difference in route as important to them. They just want a well trained and qualified lawyer.

Disagree I do not agree with any changes and believe that CRL should remain. I do not have any confidence in the SRA.

I do not believe the SRA is a good fit for CILEX. I will consider moving to the CCL rather than being regulated by the SRA.

I find the SRA heavy handed and questionable of late.

I am proud to be a specialist CILEX-qualified lawyer. The comments made recently by SRA Chief Executive Paul Phillip at the recent COLP/COFA Conference does not fill me with confidence that CILEX members will be valued.

CILEX lawyers provide specialist legal support and we are a diverse community. I doubt moving to the SRA will enable members to maintain their independence. I have no desire for the regulation to be taken over by the SRA.

Disagree I am a CILEX lawyer and proud of it.

Disagree I do not believe the SRA would provide any assistance whatsoever to CILEX. It is an unwieldy and in my view an incompetent authority who would not promote CILEX at all.

Disagree I do not consider that delegation will necessarily enhance public trust and confidence. After all, the SRA itself is continually being called into question and whether it is fit for purpose.

Disagree I do not consider the SRA will consider the interests of Fellows or members of the institute

Disagree I don't think it will make any difference and it may have the opposite effect.

Disagree I don't think this makes any difference whatsoever to the public but I do think having the SRA regulate the two professions helps to bring some equality to the roles solicitors and Legal Execs play

Disagree I don't believe consumers consider this when instructing a Lawyer. It will be more important for CILEX Lawyers to have confidence in the entity which oversees regulation and to know that entity will treat CILEX Lawyers fairly and with consideration. Will this be true of the SRA?

Disagree I don't believe that it would assist consumer confidence at all.

Disagree I don't see the proposed benefit of moving regulation to the SRA as opposed to CRL would improve consumer regulation and there is a significant risk of CILEX lawyers being seen as 2nd class solicitors

Disagree I don't think consumers are overly concerned whether regulated by SRA or CILEX. However move to SRA will cause a huge amount of confusion and therefore risk loss of confidence.

Disagree I don't think the public choose a lawyer based on these distinctions and changing regulation will be of no interest or benefit to them.

Disagree I doubt it really matters either way. It is more important for Cilex to support and advance the interests of their members, including their most longstanding, experienced Chartered Legal Executives who are currently often barred from further progression due to rules which are discriminatory on the grounds of age and experience.

Disagree I feel strongly that if we are going to be regulated by SRA, the SRA should allow chartered legal executives to be exempt from solicitor exams

Disagree I feel the change of governing body undermines confidence in CILEx professionals 100%
I have always considered that CILEx Regulation do a very good job in regulating our members through robust processes and are highly competent. It seems to me that outsourcing regulation to the SRA may indicate that we have no confidence in CILEx Regulation. Would the Law Society outsource regulation of its members to the Bar Standards Board?

Disagree I have come across many shoddy solicitors in my day, so having a degree, being called a solicitor, and being regulated by the SRA is not the high standard you portray. If the SRA were effective, we would not have the issue with AXIOM on a large scale, or with individual solicitors being repeat offenders breaching the rules. The SRA does not engage as much as you are implying. Maybe if they did increase their practising certificate fee they could afford to provide better support, investigation and regulation.
I honestly don't think the public care who is regulated by who. They will simply care that the lawyer, whether that be a legal executive or Solicitor deals with their matter in a competent fashion.

Disagree This seems to be a CILEx vanity project. The current system of regulation is fine. We are Chartered Legal Execs regulated by CILEx and many of us do not wish to become Solicitors.

Disagree I love the fact that I am a specialist lawyer and that there is a specialist regulator just for Cilex - we are different from solicitors and if the SRA end up being our regulatory body we will just be forgotten about - the name SRA would make us feel excluded, they would always prioritise solicitors over us and the negative press I read about online and the feedback from solicitors about how they feel the SRA deal with matters is shockingly bad. Yes Cilex Regulation can be modernised but I think movement of regulation to the SRA will be the death of Cilex and all the progress made in the last 15 years to increase the public's knowledge of who we are and what we do will have been in vain.

Disagree I put disagree because the question is unfairly loaded. In short, yes it does but no more so than CRL

Disagree I strongly disagree that regulation by the SRA will improve the standing and confidence in Cilex. The SRA has a poor reputation for listening to and standing up for its members as solicitors , I fail to see how they would do so when they do not fully understand our place in the legal world. Cilex members have already made it quite clear that they do NOT wish to change to regulation by the SRA and you should follow the wishes of your members .

Disagree I suspect it won't be a real life consideration

Disagree I think CILEX regulation have been doing the job adequately from a members point of view and as far as the consumer is concerned they just want trust that lawyers are conducting the work competently. We are already regulated through CILEX regulation so I am unsure at present how transferring this activity to the SRA will improve matters in this regard, or for members. I also think if CILEX are to remain a distinct profession it would seem to make more sense to keep its own regulator rather than be governed by a regulator with "Solicitor" in the title, this I think potentially create more confusion all round.

Disagree I think it will only emphasise the difference in routes/qualification/entitlement.

Disagree I think regulation by the SRA may increase consumer confidence but I have not seen persuasive proof that it will. I do not object to regulation by the SRA but I have not been persuaded to agree with it either

Disagree I think the regulation we have is good enough

Disagree I think there is a massive conflict of interest here and in the legal world you would not be comfortable with one entity regulating two distinct branches of the legal profession. The public will not notice the difference and there will still be a "them and us" feel to the profession which I do not believe will ever change.

Disagree I think this will indicate to the public that we haven't been properly regulated in the past.

Disagree I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of cilex lawyers
Disagree If anything I think the opposite will be achieved.
Disagree If CILEx are to become part of the SRA and law society, then members may as well become solicitors. The point is, we are supposed to be independent as members.
Disagree If regulated by the sra how are we distinct? I just end up essentially a solicitor who is less well regarded and paid less. Cilex has not demonstrated that they are unable to regulate members so why the change. The SRA however do make some very questionable decisions. I would not like to be part of a body whose members often don't recognise the qualification I worked hard for

Disagree If the head of the SRA refers to us Fellows as paralegals, what hope does the public have in understanding what we do.

In my experience (which is working within a SRA regulated firm), the consumer is not interested in which regulator regulates an individual as long as that individual is regulated. By coming to a regulated firm, the consumer expects and assumes that the individuals are regulated. However, one would imagine that the SRA's failings in eventually allowing an individual to steal £64m of client money, the fallout from which is just beginning, is likely to have an impact on consumer confidence in the SRA, if anything.

I think all consumers start from the premise that lawyers working within a regulated firm have gone through robust processes and required to meet and maintain high standards of competence.

Disagree

Disagree Insufficient information to know

Disagree involvement of the SRA is deeply inappropriate

Disagree It has been rushed and not fully approved and the implications will not be beneficial

Disagree It is CILEX's job to promote FCILEX. If CILEX are failing to do this, the solution is not to change regulator. The solution is to examine and potentially change CILEX as an institution, so that it is able to get back on course.

It is not the regulator that provides consumer confidence, it is how the adviser works with the client. There is no issue with confidence for existing CILEX members and their clients. I am never asked who I am regulated by. No-one has ever said that they will not use my services because I am not regulated by the SRA. The damage has been done to our brand this year by CILEX pursuing a proposal that its membership does not want and this spilling into the public arena. There needs to be education for customers on how the different levels of legal professionals match. Nothing needs to be changed. This is not rocket science!

Disagree

Disagree It makes no difference what so ever

Disagree It undermines Fellows, and it the public will not understand the difference.

Disagree It will have little bearing on public views.

Disagree its fine as it is no need to change.

Disagree It's not necessary. There is no reason why CRL and the SRA couldn't collaborate to achieve the same objective - it would be simple to pull together a register specifically for the public's use and to work together to promote Lawyer's in general.

Most CILEX member and graduates work in a solicitor firm that is regulated by the SRA. I don't believe that consumer really make any difference as they employ the firm. However, CILEX professionals are specialist in their filed unlike solicitors. Being regulated by the SRA will take away that distinction.

Disagree

Disagree My experience of the SRA does not give me confidence that CILEX members or the public be better served.

Disagree n

Disagree no

No evidence at all that public confidence will be higher if regulated by the SRA. The codes of conduct for both are very similar now so different regulators for different parts very rarely causes an issue.

Disagree

But CILEX will simply become a branch of the solicitors and lose it's independence gradually following this move and the modernisation of the solicitors' qualifications route.

Disagree No further comments

Disagree No the SRA looks after its own and that will not change once you hand over leadership to them.

No we are not the same. Solicitors can practice in any area, we cannot. I cannot, and nor can the Law soc see the logic in your position, or any research on the topic. As already expressed some long standing clients of mine think it would mean that I am a trainee solicitor, so would have less confidence in instructing a Chartered lawyer, IF regulated by SRA. You talk on page 13 that CRL faces limited growth in numbers, yes because you are supposed membership bodies are not getting out in the real world promoting us. So dont blame CRL for your failures. There is a clue in the title SRA, Solicitors regulatin authority, not Lawyers regulation authority. You talk about cost of regulation and that the SRA can provide that scale, if so why are their fees not much different to ours, when they probably should be about half of what CRL charges. I have not seen any evidence of the Public interest test re this.

Disagree

Disagree No, the SRA are not good regulators, just ask any solicitor.

Disagree No. Consumers just want to know that there is someone qualified and regulated who is going to give them advice they can rely on. Whether they are regulated through Cilex, SRA, BSB etc is not relevant to them. Therefore I do not think the proposed changes is going to increase consumer confidence.

Not necessarily, I agree that if recognised by SRA this would bring more consumer confidence but at the same time we have no established relationship with SRA other than supervisory.

Disagree

So how can we feel best placed with them regulating us?

Disagree Not sure, in some instances I am aware of those who would argue that CILEx offers higher alternative standards.

Disagree Nothing wrong with present regulation and SRA incompetent .

Disagree People qualifying via the Cilex route are qualifying via a different route to a solicitor so regulation by the SRA does not seem compatible. I am also aware that as a Chartered Legal Executive I have CPD monitored while my solicitor colleagues do not have to report in the same way. In this respect it appears that Cilex professionals are held to a higher standard currently so that regulation by the SRA may in fact be less robust.

Disagree Please see above, 19.

Disagree Please see an earlier answer in the response consultation but my concern is two heads competing on one body for supremacy rather than working symptomatically alongside each other “ to protect the consumer in the provision of legal services in England & Wales”

Disagree Please see my answer regarding equality. I am troubled by this proposal. It seems like an absolute nonsense to allow a body that is invested in the elitist route to being a Solicitor to regulate a CILEX which is meant to represent a fairer route into law.

Disagree Please see previous comments.

Disagree Potentially, as SRA is already well known and understood, it may help. But it is already too confusing and I do not know how many more changes or consultations members may be willing to engage with. There is no way to keep us distinct from solicitors despite what may be advertised or seems to be being presented as he way it is to be envisaged. More information is needed, please. If you intend that our qualifications are all transferred over, on the basis that many are already headed in this direction, it may assist and be better for the future?

Disagree Publications I have read suggests that the SRA will not apply the appropriate status to CILEX lawyers. CILEX will end up going backwards not progressing if SRA becomes the regulator

Disagree Regulation already has consumer confidence, robust standards and high standards of competence via CRL

Disagree Regulation by a merging of the SRA and regulatory aspect of CILEX is required. Equity and parity is key in this instance. Regulation by the SRA seems to reinforce the false impression that CILEX is somehow second rate to solicitors. It feels like taking several steps backwards. We a specialist lawyers, not solicitors and I'm struggling to see how it's in our best interests to separate from our own body.

Disagree Regulatory consumer confidence is already established. It will be watered down by having to compete with regulation by the SRA and having to explain why solicitors and CILEX are different qualifications. There is the risk that CILEX fellows will be considered as second class to solicitors by virtue of being regulated by a body which until now has not had any involvement with CILEX professionals

Disagree Same as above

Disagree See 16 above.

Disagree See 17 above. We do not want to be regulated by the SRA, it's why we became CILEx professionals rather than solicitors ion the first place.

Disagree see above

Disagree See above

Disagree See above

Disagree See above

Disagree See above re: independence. We will lose our identity in time and that which differentiates us from Solicitors i..e on the job real world experience

Disagree See below

Disagree see comments above

Disagree See my comments above.

Disagree SRA are not like by many and trusted by even less.

Disagree SRA doesn't work efficient enough.

Disagree SRA have a poor record in regulating Solicitors. SRA are likely to undermine our standing as Lawyers in our own right. We will simply lose our unique identity that we have worked so hard to earn.

Disagree SRA is only interested in solicitors and not alternative routes. The SQE was meant to open doors and increase diversity and it was run over by the same law schools who ramped up the fees for the LPC. It is now even more expensive to qualify as a solicitor and I'm concerned CILEX will end up the same way or disappear altogether.

Disagree Sra struggles to maintain consumer confidence on all levels and their disastrous abs ideas have cost millions and their failure to properly regulate firms such as Axiom -ince have left their credibility in shambles.

Disagree Stop apologising for CILEx and F.CILEx! We are a respected profession - we just need CILEx to remember that and start championing us again!

Strongly disagree. The SRA should just be for Solicitors. Including extra designations or professionals is adding to confusion. Plus it may align us with the negative reputation the SRA already has to many members of the public, and legal profession.

Disagree That can be obtained by improving CILEX regulation.

Disagree That is my view

Disagree The current system works just as well

Disagree The general public who instruct me haven't a clue who the sra are or what they do

Disagree the general public will never understand this

Disagree The lack of appropriate recognition for Chartered Legal Executives in the SQE reflects the desire of the SRA to minimise the status of Chartered Legal Executives. Chartered Legal Executives regulated by SRA will be akin to the paralegal members of CILEX

Disagree The only difference is that most people who have required legal assistance have heard of the SRA as opposed to CILEX or CILEx Regulation and that is because CILEX / CILEx Regulation are not good at putting themselves out there to the world at large. I had never heard of them before I started my qualification route with them.

Disagree The premise of the question suggests that Cilex regulation does not do this already. All cilex members employed by firms have to abide by the Sra standards anyway.

Disagree The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who.

Disagree The public confidence in CILEX is high and equal to solicitors.

Disagree The public don't care as long as organisations acknowledge CRL more.

Disagree The recent articles raising questions about Axiom Ince will probably cause a number of people to have reduced confidence.

Disagree Being regulated by the same body (which doesn't even include the CLE / CILEX references in its' title) will probably make it look like we are junior to solicitors. If we were equal in the eyes of the SRA they should change their own name and have publicly criticized The Law Society when the LS said they disagreed with the SRA taking over regulation of CLE's.

Disagree The shambles of the SRA with recent regulatory duties eg Axiom Ince. They are a laughing stock.

Disagree The SRA although established for regulation of solicitors, being the regulatory body for CILEX also would take away from the independence that CILEX currently holds and the hard work and commitment that has been put in to building CILEX as an alternative route to becoming a lawyer

Disagree The SRA do not enjoy a good public reputation

Disagree The SRA has a shocking reputation and the idea advanced by CILEX to use SRA as a regulator appears to have no support amongst members. The prevailing view is that moving to the SRA is an act of self harm. As Axiom Ince has revealed the SRA regulation is partial and concentrates on minor breaches by individual members and small firms whilst appearing to disregard much greater concerns by bigger organisations. It appears to me that consumers would only have confidence in the SRA if they lacked an appreciation of the reality of their activities.

Disagree the SRA has enough to do

Disagree The SRA is dreadful. I've always been proud to be FCILEX - being regulated by the SOLICITORS Regulation Authority diminishes my role and makes me feel second class (something my former employers wholeheartedly thought).

Disagree The SRA is less independent from the Law Society than CILEX Regulation is from CILEX. I think it would lead to the loss of the legal executive profession.

Disagree The SRA is so riven with criticism within the profession that it has lost credibility with those it oversees. A move to the SRA would be a step backwards.

Disagree The SRA is too large in any event. It is ineffective, inefficient and staffed by people who have little to no knowledge of the day to day workings of the average law firm.

Disagree The SRA provides a robust process / route to qualification. CILEx Regulation does too and has already established and maintained consumer confidence.

Disagree I believe that the opportunity is there already.

Disagree Should CILEx move to SRA regulation then all that is likely to happen is that CILEx lawyers will lose their distinctive character and will be consumed by the poorly managed monolith that is the SRA. If the CILEx board really believe that SRA regulation is in the interests of CILEx members they clearly have had no experience of the SRA.

Disagree The SRA should not be involved at all with CILEX. It is a regulator that is not well respected by solicitors so why on earth would you think this is a good idea for CILEX?

Disagree The SRA, whilst independent, is slow and far too bureaucratic and the public and lawyers have little confidence that it delivers reasonable decisions in a timely and unbiased way. It should be subject to audit and review itself.

Disagree The standard are already extremely closely aligned and more should be done to increase awareness of this. Not just by simply attaching the SRA brand.

Disagree There has been significant criticism how the SRA have represented solicitors so do not want this for Cilex.

Disagree There is no benefit I can see. Trust and believe in the CILEX brand and let it flourish and grow. Remove the nonsense levels of membership and support members to start their own businesses with cilex, through support and insurance partnerships.

Disagree There is no necessary intervention of SRA because both have similar regulations in legal issues.

Disagree There is nothing in the SRA proposals which offers any sort of guarantee about their approach and it is bound to be a critical requirement that SRA regulated CLEs make it clear they are not solicitors as anything else would be bound to cause public confusion.

Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Disagree There needs to be more work by the Institute to publicise the experience and professionalism of their members rather than paying lip service to the SRA

Disagree There would be little gain in regards to the move over to the SRA.

Disagree This has never been an issue and it is now becoming one because of the determination to delegate control to SRA. This narrow question is not fairly put - it seeks a narrow approval or non- approval of the much wider operations of the SRA

Disagree

Disagree This will depend, in my opinion, on the particular firm in which the individual professional is engaged

Disagree We are not solicitors. We have chosen a different route and we have trained separately and independently. the SRA was not designed for CILEX lawyers and i would struggle to believe that the SRA have our best interests at heart. whilst i agree that an independent regulator would be the best step, i do not think it should be the SRA. they are under much scrutiny right now. This would not be a good move for the organisation. in my opinion, for what it is worth, CRL and SRA should be disbanded and one new joint and independent regulator should be created.

Disagree We should be able to establish consumer confidence ourselves.

Disagree We will get lost in the SRA's primary role in regulating solicitors. This is a backward step. It will also confuse the public.

Disagree We will loose our independence and identity through regulation by the DRA.

Disagree What is the point? SRA will not understand the specialist nature of CILEX Lawyers and if it is the case CILEX Lawyers are to be regulated by the SRA who are responsible for regulating officers of the court and generalist practitioners of law then there should be a route to cross-qualify that is low cost and straightforward.

Disagree Why would it? Why ask for additional governance?

Disagree Will not make the slightest difference -the public wants what the public gets

Disagree You have fallen out with CRL, this is so embarrassing. The leadership of CILEX really need to consider their positions.

Disagree You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here. We will have the appearance of second class lawyers being regulated by the SRA, it will not improve it.

Do you agree that regulation by the SRA provides opportunity to deliver a consistency of

Response Please state reasons

Agree -

Agree (as above)

Agree .

Agree Absolutely. Although I note the proposal is for CLE's/CILEX Lawyers to be held on a separate register (which is important to maintain our distinct identity) I believe anyone looking at either register would expect those listed to be held to the same high standard. Additionally, and importantly, there will be a consistent approach when it comes to investigation of legal professionals.

Agree Absolutely. The public and all legal professionals understand who SRA is. I'm often called upon to explain who my regulator is and whether I'm qualified to both consumer and other legal professionals, it's embarrassing. If FCilex were linked to SRA, I think this would increase confidence and understanding immeasurably. I would feel much more comfortable.

Agree Again I hope so provided CILEX members are viewed with equal seniority and ability

Agree Again see my earlier comments.

Agree Agree

Agree Agree as carry out the same work although this is not always recognised both by way of salary or public awareness

Agree Agree as long as there is equality between qualifications

Agree Agree with the statement.

Agree All lawyers are working under the same regulation regardless of the route to qualification.

Agree All lawyers should be regulated by the same body.

Agree As 19

Agree as above

Agree As above

Agree as above

Agree As above

Agree As above, the SRA is well known and highly reputable

Agree As above.

Agree As above.

Agree As long as standards do not lower - I believe that the CPD requirements offered by CILEX are better than those of SRA!

Agree As per previous answer

Agree Because it will be the same standard that is applied

Agree Both are providing the same services, so the standards should also be the same

Agree CILEX lawyers follow SRA guidelines in practice already

Agree Consistency across the profession is key with one set of standards etc but separately badged for the Law Society and CILEX.

Agree Consistency is key

Agree Consistency is vital.

Agree Consistency of approach can only be a positive move for CILEX lawyers and will ensure that our skills are recognised alongside those of solicitors as we have for a long time been the poor relation

Agree Consistency

Agree consumers will believe that if they are already dealing with an SRA professional, they are conducting the matter in the proper way that any other lawyer would, 'by the book'

Agree Consumers will look at CILEX Lawyers in the same light as Solicitors I think due to SRA regulation.

Agree Fairer

Agree For the reasons expressed above

Agree For the same reasons as above.

Agree Fully agree

Agree I agree only because the SRA is a more public facing organisation than the CLR.

Agree I agree with this proposal

Agree I believe it will make things better for the Lawyers and Solicitors in terms of uniformity of the regulation, but there is also the chance it will cause confusion as parties may think that lawyers and solicitors are the same thing.

Agree I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:

Agree 1. People see us as equals - which would be great.

Agree 2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.

Agree I think it will force other solicitors to accept that cilex lawyers deliver the same services and that there is equivalence

Agree I think regulation by the SRA may provide an opportunity to deliver a consistent approach. However, I have not seen a clear argument that it definitely will.

Agree I think that a consistent approach could be beneficial in the longer term.

Agree I think the above question answers itself!

Agree I think the public will be reassured if all legal professions are governed by the same board - I think it would make sense for the bar to join too.

Agree I would guess a high majority of the general public do not know what the role of a legal executive is.

Agree I would hope that this could result in Fellows being granted practice rights also given that the SRA are going to likely be our regulators

Agree ibid

Agree If anything CILEX Lawyers are better qualified as they have to do CPD every year, to keep on top of the changes in Law, whereas Solicitors do not have to, it is just recommended but not enforced.

Agree If most lawyers are regulated by the same body, I strongly believe that this will help to level the playing field and improve public perception of what a CILEX lawyer is

Agree If we are meant to be on par with solicitors then the employment competency needs to be reviewed. It makes perfect sense to have one standard for all. Especially in relation to CPD and the recording of the same.

Agree It makes the system simpler which is better for consumers.

Agree It may help give credibility to CILEX members

Agree It provides opportunity, but it may not actually improve the situation with regard to recognition of the expertise of CILEx qualified professionals.

Agree it should make a simpler process and avoid duplication.

Agree It will give Cilex lawyers better public perception

Agree It will make it simpler for the public to understand BUT it absolutely must NOT be allowed to diminish the standing of Cilex members to appear as junior to Law Society ones, which is a risk.

Agree It will provide the same benefits as the SRA provides to Lawyers/Solicitors that qualify through the traditional route.

Agree Legal Executives are currently expected to carry out CPD over and above that of solicitors and the involvement of SRA would regularise that.

Agree More experience and profession-based interest rather personal interest which may unfortunately characterised by whims and caprices instead of being genuine interest for the profession.

Agree My personal view is the SRA will be an effective and respected regulator and that will increase consumer confidence which can only be a good thing. CILEX members already have to adhere to the SRA Code of Practice if they work in a regulated firm and greater public confidence can only be achieved by our members being listed under the same body as solicitors

Agree Of more relevance to dual qualified lawyers is the cost of maintaining two separate regulatory regimes from the same regulator. I do not see the benefit of keeping two separate practising certificates going if they are both from the same regulator.

Agree Often the public confuse the term Cilex layer/fellow and solicitor and being regulated under the same umbrella may alleviate these problems

Agree one code of conduct

Agree One regulatory body for the legal profession makes complete sense.

Agree People might have heard of the SRA

Agree Please see above.

Agree Possibly.

Agree Provided titles are kept simple ie "Chartered Lawyer" that would fit with the SRA approach to Solicitors, who are not distinguished as Conveyancers, Litigators, Commercial. The professional standards expected of them via the SRA are all that are required.

Agree Pure knowledge

Agree Puts the members in parity with solicitors

Agree Same regulations for both Cilex Lawyers and Solicitors is long overdue and quite highly welcomed as to the changes or reforms that are being proposed.

Agree see above

Agree See above

Agree SRA regulation is important as it is a recognised body for solicitors.

Agree Subject to my earlier comments in 18 above.

Agree The CILEX Lawyers and Solicitors delivering the same services must operate to the same high standards of conduct and practice.

Agree The opportunity is there but whether it will deliver the desired outcome remains to be seen

Agree The regulation from SRA will help decrease disparity between the two, which will in turn help increase confidence amongst consumers, that CILEX Lawyers and Solicitors delivering the same services are required to operate to the same high standards of conduct and practice. I am highly in support of this.

Agree The standards will be the same for both.

Agree There will be a form of less discrimination between the two as solicitors are seen as more trustworthy as to cilex lawyers as there is not enough awareness.

Agree They already do provide the same services but it would be recognised.

Agree This does make some sense, yes.

Agree This is not a Yes or No answer. The principle of what is being suggested is correct, but fail to understand why after so long CILEX determines that CRL is not up to the job.

Agree this will hopefully prevent the confusion even within the legal profession let alone the public.

Agree This would go towards being recognised under the same umbrella and therefore that any representation by CILEX members would not be viewed as disparate from the Solicitors.

Agree We have struggled for years to gain recognition as lawyers. Being held to the same standards as Solicitors and regulated in the same way will enhance and promote our arguments for parity and equality with solicitors

Agree Will provide clarity to consumers as to who regulates lawyers and an even playing field in the industry between solicitors and chartered lawyers regulation wise

Agree Yes

Agree Yes but I am concerned that the SRA could become too powerful and oppressive as a super regulator.

Agree Yes but ONLY if cilex are EQUALLY represented. Cilex has never understood or taken seriously enough the lack of respect we face professionally. Instead cilex has made matters of more challenging by watering fcilex down by introducing a hundred different grades and so we are seen as glorified paralegals. The SRA MUST change its name and perhaps then cilex will simply become another route to an equal status as lawyer. It is a simple change but it is absolutely key. If a name change does not happen cilex will let down it's membership and the public and I am awaiting the outcome of this before deciding whether to switch regulator to the CLC

Agree Yes, this may be necessary to educate the general public that becasue people qualify through different routes i.e Cilex or SRA does not mean, those who qualified through Cilex Regulation as solicitors are less competent or qualified because they did not qualify through the SRA training contract route.

Agree Yes, this will promote confidence amongst consumers one regulator will be better placed to ensure consistency of approach.

Agree Yes, this would be easier for the public to understand as currently they see CLE as lesser than solicitors.

Agree Yes. Also hopefully the same requirements regarding CPD, practising fees, etc

Agree Yes. it would increase public confidence

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Agree Юрист всегда должен помочь любому человеку если он обратился за помощью. Вознаграждение за помощь должна быть в разумных пределах, но и должен рассматриваться вопрос об оказании помощи консультации и защиты прав граждан бесплатно(например: нуждающиеся, многодетные ,инвалиды и так далее по защите социальных слоев населения).

Disagree I am concerned about the varied routes into law that are available from CILEX slowly being eradicated if we are regulated by the SRA. This will give the impression to new entries that the best way to be qualified is to be a Solicitor and to obtain a law degree.

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree a

Absolutely not.

A specialist independent regulator can ensure high standards of competence whilst not impairing the independence of the CILEx profession.

Disagree As the Law Society rightly claim, a shared regulator will confuse consumers, bring no benefits to members save for a paltry financial saving that could be achieved through better management and will eventually lead to the loss of the CILEx route to qualification.

Disagree Again, it is not required, they already operate at the same high standards, so again collaboration between CRL and the SRA to advertise this would provide the same results but at much less cost - the CILEX code of conduct is clear and comparatively stricter than the SRA code - but consumers won't be interested, they will seek to know how the firm is regulated, not the individual.

Disagree Again, no evidence to support this.

Disagree all comments above

Disagree As above

- Disagree As above
- Disagree As above
- Disagree As above 19 and 20. There is no evidence that there are high standards of practice by SRA regulated firms; to the contrary there is evidence that the SRA have failed as regulators.
- Disagree As above also CILEX lawyers already deliver their service at a high standard
- Disagree As above, we can have consistency without the need to pass over the responsibility
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As above.
- Disagree As before-the SRA has no interest in progression of CLEX's and the Institute is selling out.
- Disagree As I said earlier, OIC lawyers are trusted by members of the public because they are everywhere but Cilex lawyers are not everywhere. Once Cilex have many lawyers assisting the members of the public in various courts and in various areas of law, the public would be using them
- Disagree As per my reasons above.
- Disagree As stated above don't believe they are any better or worse. Very much liner in what I expect.
- Disagree As stated above, I think consumers judge lawyers on their experience of dealing with them. I very much doubt that consumers check which body regulates them when making a decision as to who to engage.
- Disagree Based on the reported approach of the SRA, I would prefer not to be subject to it. Whether it is consistent with solicitors or not
- Disagree Cause confusion
- Disagree Change of regulator is not required for this purpose, there is no lack of consumer confidence in the current system
- Disagree Changing to SRA has little to do with public trust and confidence. See above.
- Disagree Chartered legal executive already operate to a high standard through their own governing body CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.
- Disagree Cilex has not demonstrated that they are unable to regulate members so why the change. The SRA however do make some very questionable decisions. I would not like to be part of a body whose members often don't recognise the qualification I worked hard for
- Disagree CILEX lawyers act with integrity and consistency now which provides the same level of confidence
- Disagree Cilex Lawyers are being regulated by rules that are pretty much identical to SRA rules
- Disagree CILEX lawyers are distinct from solicitors. They should be represented by a regulator specific to CILEX members.
- Disagree CILEX Lawyers should have the same hierarchies as SRA, but SRA monopolizes legal control in the UK.
- Disagree CILEX lawyers will be seen as a lower class of SRA regulated lawyer
- Disagree CILEX members are not solicitors, so should not be regulated by the SRA. I consider this would take something away from CILEX's unique status, and have a detrimental effect on the efforts made to ensure CILEX Lawyers have parity with solicitors. If lawyers that are not solicitors are regulated by the SRA, there would exist an implicit assumption that they are not the same, as they do not hold the title that is encapsulated in the S of SRA. This could lead to the public and others viewing them as subordinate to solicitors.

CILEX members whether regulated through a traditional SRA firm or a CRL firm operate to the same levels. In fact, CILEX regulated firms operate at a higher level. CRL regulators implement changes quicker than the SRA, work proactively with their firms to ensure the highest levels of conduct and practice. No insurance claims have been made against CILEX entities for dishonesty or misappropriation of client funds unlike the SRA. CRL work with us to make us better - they do not punish and persecute.

- Disagree CILEX Regulation has those attributes.
- Disagree Cilex standards are high and completely fit for purpose and regulation does not need to change to SRA to show consumer confidence
- Disagree Cilex was not associated with SRA failings in the public perception
- Disagree clients are not concerned with this aspect - they want the job done
- Disagree Consumers do not know who and how Solicitors firms are regulated.
- Disagree Consumers don't care who someone is regulated by, what they expect is high standards and continuity/stability.
- Disagree Consumers I have represented do not agree with this and in my career I have been proud to uphold my duties to the Court and Client Consumers in line the CILEX code of conduct.
- Disagree Consumers know very little of the SRA if anything ; in fact under the SRA the level of CPD for solicitors is next to non- existent which is in contrast to CILEX CPD requirements. Regulation by the SRA would be a catastrophic mistake by CILEX for both themselves and their members.
- Disagree Criticism of the SRA within the profession is rife and the public are unaware of the system as it is so a change would be pointless and provide no better understanding of the matter for the man/woman in the street.
- Disagree CRL can do this as in 18 above. We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it.
- Disagree Do not want to be regulated by SRA looking at the mess they are on with Axiom and Ince
- Disagree Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent
- Disagree For reasons given in Q18, I do NOT want to be regulated by the SRA in any circumstances. We already have high standards of conduct and practice and do not need the SRA, we need a body that understands our unique place in the legal world and will shout for us. The SRA will do nothing for Cilex
- Disagree For reasons stated above. Risk is disproportionate number of cilex members being disqualified
- Disagree For the reasons stated above.
- Disagree Have you read the articles on this?
- Disagree How can there be consistency? It is currently the view (whether palatable or not) that the BSB do not regulate robustly, CILEX Regulation is fair and the SRA harsh.
- Disagree I
- Disagree I am of the view that this will simply create a more defined two level system, Solicitors being at the top and CILEX being below them both in the public eye and in the SRA's eyes.
- Disagree I believe it would be difficult to maintain customer confidence if the SRA were regulators given the recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.
- Disagree I can't see how or why regulation by the SRA will mean an increased confidence amongst consumers.
- Disagree A collaborative approach between CILEX and SRA will allow for the same outcome of consistency, whilst allowing CILEX to remain independent.
- Disagree I do not agree with anything in that statement for all the reasons I have already given.
- Disagree I do not believe that changing to SRA will be good for CILEX members in the long run.
- Disagree I do not see any reason for change to the current system and certainly not to regulation by the SRA
- Disagree I do not think the confidence will be improved

The concern raised in the CILEx consultation document at [p.17] of the consumer preferring “provider” rather than “practitioner” is pure marketing and CILEx must step up in terms of promoting its members better than the Law Society promotes its members to the public

I entirely accept the very strong point raised by CILEx on [p.17] of their consultation document which highlights a particular struggle that I have had in terms of achieving lender panels, banks, approved provider lists and insurance cover

I accept all this however Rome was not built in a day. There is a fine line between “trying the same thing over and over again and achieving the same result” but there is also determination and courage to preserve and never surrender in the face of the most significant barriers and discrimination to overcome them

The CILEx brand as was founded in 1872 as ILEX. It received its Royal Charter in 2012.

The Law Society was founded on the 02 June 1825 and received its Royal Charter much sooner in 1831.

To this end, CILEx may well be a newer kid on the block but it doesn't have to be a kid that gives up and says well “if you can't beat join him”. Further we all know who won the race between the tortoise and the hare.

There is still time to persevere down our own path and our own Road to Rome before jumping ship and fusing our more scenic path into one more well trodden congested motorway.

I would prefer to maintain a side street approach to jumping back on the motorway at this time.

Disagree

I don't believe that consumers consider the rule book indicative of the standards. Lawyers are unique whether they are regulated by the SRA or not. Public confidence in the profession is mixed depending

Disagree on experience

Disagree I don't think it would improve it. They qualify differently.

Disagree I don't think that the SRA can do anything that CILEx Regulation can't.

I don't think the public are aware of any difference now and expect all lawyers regardless to be competent and held to the same standards.

Disagree I don't think the public care either way.

Disagree I don't think the SRA is going to change anything about how law practices treat individuals on different routes of qualification. It is an inherent problem. Cilex should stick to their own brand that they have been building for who knows how long and work on developing that. And listen to its membership - all levels of it.

Disagree I have not seen any or any persuasive evidence that "consumers" are unhappy about the current system of Legal Execs regulation, which merits a change.

Disagree I have seen no evidence that regulation by the SRA will provide an increased confidence amongst consumers.

I never set out to be a Solicitor. I have never had an issue with consumer confidence in the service I provide within regulated practice. I am concerned that the SRA will ultimately destatus existing Fellows and force us to qualify as Solicitors. I liked CILEX because it offered an alternative route and an independent regulator.

Disagree

- Disagree I prefer a regulator dealing with CILEX members separately from the SRA, who I do not believe would truly recognise, support or value the status of CILEX members. As to regulation by the SRA providing an opportunity to standardise the approach to increase consumer confidence, I think this unlikely to work in practice particular in light of the recent Axiom Ince debacle where it seems the SRA may have been slow to act and appears to have failed to exercise stringent checks and controls on large firms set up on atypical business models.
- Disagree i strongly disagree with this as the SRA in my opinion are a failed regulator and seek only to undermine solicitors and i do not wish to be associated with them
- Disagree I suspect it won't be a real life consideration
- Disagree I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of cilex lawyers
- Disagree I work in a regulated firm and so I am already required to work I. Accordance with SRA rules. However a separate regulator is to my mind preferable as I prefer my distinct identity to solicitors as do some clients.
- Disagree I work in an organisation that employs solicitors, Chartered Legal Executives and barristers all carrying out similar work. The fact that three regulatory organisations will be reduced to two will make little difference. I fail to see how the SRA regulating Cilex professionals will increase public confidence - the fact that different organisations regulate different professionals would appear to do more to increase confidence than to have a single regulatory body.
- Disagree I work in an SRA regulated firm. We don't need the change
- Disagree I would again reiterate the comments made in the question above.
- Disagree If anything Legal Executives have a higher standard because we have to prove we are doing as well and know our stuff. This regulation change will not have the desired impact in my opinion.
- Disagree If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.
- Disagree If CILEx lawyers are regulated by SRA and seek to hold the title of a CILEx lawyer there will be further confusion for the consumer - they may question why an individual is regulated by the SRA but is not a solicitor and fail to deliver the confidence CILEx seeks to deliver - if CILEx lawyers are to be regulated by the SRA and deliver the same services then the title should be the same to avoid consumer confusion by dissolving CILEx all together
- Disagree If I had wanted to be regulated by SRA I would have joined as a Solicitor not a CILEX Member. I think its just plain wrong to join up with them.
- Disagree If that is the case then surely there should just be one regulator for all lawyers, rather than CILEx Regulation, the SRA and the Bar Standards Board?
- Disagree I'm not sure whether consumers will think that CILEX Lawyers and Solicitors are the same/offer the same service and not knowing the CILEX professional titles may make them go with that they know, i.e. a solicitor
- Disagree Insufficient information to know
- Disagree It makes no difference what so ever
- Disagree It will not be accepted by solicitors. Cilex fellows need supervising - that's not parity:
- Disagree It would make no change in consumer confidence. If anything being regulated by the SRA would perhaps damage consumer confidence as sadly not all members of the public perceive solicitors in a positive light. Cilex members already operate to a high standard. There is a danger once we are within the grip of the SRA that they could make the standard even higher for Cilex members as we are competitors of solicitors.
- Disagree its fine as it is no need to change

- More spin. I've said no once, you wont change my or any other Fellow I've spoken to's mind. You must have realised when the CILEX leadership started out on this route that was win (for them) or bust.
- Disagree Time to consider your positions. Please consider also putting a survey to the membership with the proposition along the lines of 'Do you think that the current leadership of CILEX has brought the membership and institution into embarrassing disrepute over its proposal to be regulated by the SRA and if yes should the Board resign'.
- Disagree Most CILEx member and graduates work in a solicitor firm that is regulated by the SRA. I don't believe that consumer really make any difference as they employ the firm. Plus even if the firm is made of CILEx lawyers only, all is covered in client care letters and trust is built by the conduct of the firm and lawyers, consumers see the regulator as an insurance conduct will be proper and tool in case something goes wrong.
- Disagree n
- Disagree No
- Disagree no
- Disagree No - we should be pushing all the great things about Cilex, what makes us special and different from solicitors - regulation by the SRA will confuse the public.
- Disagree No evidence at all of this- simply a statement and again noted the SRA will review exams run by Cilex and no doubt suggest that the college of law take over and again independence is slowly 9or maybe not slowly) eradicated.
- Disagree No far better that CILEX retains its own governing body and promotes itself rather than be consumed in the SRA who let's face it have done nothing for the Solicitor's profession other than to undermine it.
- Disagree No further comments
- Disagree No need to merge. Managed just fine being separate to date
- Disagree No see above. We currently train for longer and have more involved CPD and yet they still treat us like a poor relation
- Disagree No the SRA are far to complex and too big and too aggressive and have a bad name in the industry for being bullies
- Disagree No we should stay separate and I believe that to be regulated by the SRA for CILEX members will lead to CILEX fellows and CILEX brand disappearing altogether
- Disagree No, the SRA see us as inferior, so how will they promote us as delivering the same high standard? The SRA see us as sub-par, so they cannot deliver on this. An active and informed marketing campaign would address these issues.
- Disagree Not necessarily same as above
- Disagree Not necessarily, there has been no clear indication from the consultation so far to suggest this position
- Disagree not really
- Disagree obviously not
- Disagree Of course not
- Disagree Please see above, 19.
- Disagree Please see answer at 20 above
- Please see answers above.
- The bottom line is that the majority of consumers assume that a CILEX Lawyer (or Chartered Lawyer - it is hard to know which when the terms are used interchangeably) and Solicitor working in a regulated firm are required to operate to the same standards of conduct and practice. Changing regulation from CRL to SRA will make little to no difference in the eyes of the consumer - and if anything given the SRA's mishandling of various serious breaches, may reduce confidence.
- Disagree Please see previous comments
- Disagree Reasons as above.
- I believe that people perceive a genuine Chartered status an emblem of trust. What does the public perceive of SRA Nothing in my opinion.
- Disagree

- Disagree Regulation already has consumer confidence in Legal Executives services via CRL
Regulation by a merging of the SRA and regulatory aspect of CILEX is required. Equity and parity is key
- Disagree in this instance.
Regulation by the SRA will not change a thing. Clients already expect us to operate at high standards of conduct and practice. They see no difference. We are not going to change old school attitudes just by changing regulator - in fact it may come across as admitting we are not good enough and need the SRA to govern us.
- Disagree Repetition
- Disagree Same as above
- Disagree Same question and answer as above
- Disagree Same reasons as the answer in 18 above
- Disagree See 16 above.
- Disagree see above
- Disagree See above
- Disagree see above
- Disagree See above
- Disagree See above answer. I think our professional status would be undermined by the SRA.
- Disagree See above.
- Disagree see above. the current news involving axiom law does not show the SRA in a positive light.
- Disagree See above. It really doesn't matter. The public automatically assumes competence as it is entitled to do.
- Disagree See answer to 19 above
- Disagree See answer to question 18. I am opposed to this change being forced upon the membership.
- Disagree See answer to question 21 above. CILEX already has robust high standards of conduct and practice without SRA changing CILEX whilst the solicitors profession's conduct and practice standards remain unaltered. Surely what CILEX has already is more than sufficient. Why are solicitors standards deemed to be of a higher standard than those already operated by CILEX professionals.
- Disagree See below
- Disagree See earlier comment about consumers not knowing or caring about regulation/regulators
- Disagree See my comments above
- Disagree See my response to 20 above
- Disagree See previous answer.
- Disagree See previous answer.
- Disagree See reply to 18 above.
- Disagree See responses above.
- Disagree Should provide same service of high standard if regulated by CILEX or SRA
- Disagree Solicitors have a different set of interests. We should remain separate and be independent from Solicitors.
- Disagree Sra fails to consistently administer their rules amongst the firms and solicitors already regulated. They fail to properly regulate the firms on their panel or large business and consistently only seek to regulate the most junior solicitors and smallest firms. Their cases that have gone before the courts have almost uniformly attracted judicial criticism for the sra conduct.
- Disagree Being regulated by the sra is a truly terrible idea
- Disagree SRA will not be committed to communicating "equality"
- Disagree Stay away from SRA
- Disagree Switching to the SRA will not improve a thing for the CiLex

- Disagree That by its own statement says that we aren't operating to the same high standards be that perceived or otherwise. If you consider that the case, then I have little confidence in those who are seeking this change. Again it removes our independence and identity.
- Disagree That is my view
- Disagree The current situation does not fail to do this. Change is not needed.
- Disagree the general public will never understand this - we already follow the SRA code of conduct anyway
- Disagree The majority of CILEX Lawyers are subject to SRA regulation as they work in SRA regulated forms, so there is little to no tangible benefit.
- Disagree The opportunity is no different from that of remaining with CILEx regulation. CILEx rules are generally easier to navigate for professionals and the public. There will not be an improvement.
- Disagree The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who. Legal professionals and employers already know the standards to which Chartered Legal Executives and Solicitors are held so it makes no difference.
- Disagree The public confidence in CILEX is high and equal to solicitors.
- Disagree The public generally have little awareness of the SRA and those who do have an awareness perhaps have more of a negative opinion than positive.
- Disagree The public will pay very little attention to who regulates. My 20 years as a FILEX has shown that (i) I have never been asked by a client who regulates me (ii) members of the public do not undertake research before instructions - if they did, they would not use Will Writers.
- Disagree The SRA are proposing to maintain the Code of conduct and requirements separately from solicitors and so this is still going to be present.
- Disagree The SRA claim they will maintain separate arrangements so this will mean there remain differences. There is no evidence that consumers believe CLEs operate to lower standards and even if they did, provided those standards were sufficient to provide consumer protection then we should be crowing about that and not trying to achieve a different standard which is less attainable and therefore serves to restrict legal advice.
- Disagree The SRA hasn't been consistent or had the confidence for solicitors so why should it be any different for Cilex.
- Disagree there are distinct duties on different parts of the legal profession and different codes of conduct
- Disagree There has been no practical or objective evidence to support the transition.
- Disagree There is no evidence of the public not already having confidence in how F.CILEx are regulated.
- Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
- Disagree There will always be a difference between Solicitors and Legal Executives. The regulatory body will make no difference at all
- Disagree They don't care about the Solicitors in their care they think less of us!
- Disagree This is not necessary ⁸
- Disagree This suggests that CILEX Regulation isn't up to the standard of the SRA. In any event, how can a non-Solicitor Lawyer be regulated by an entity that starts with the word "Solicitors"? I don't have confidence that CILEX Lawyers will be treated as equal to Solicitors by the SRA. I'm happy to be proven wrong.
- Disagree This will depend, in my opinion, on the particular firm in which the individual professional is engaged
- Disagree To the general public, lawyers are lawyers and I doubt the general public know in much detail about the different types of lawyer, let alone regulator.
- Disagree We are regulated by CRL now and our standards are fine. If not, arguably better than SRA

Disagree Whilst I agree that not everyone understands the title of Chartered Legal Executive, or CILEx lawyer. I am not sure there is evidence that this is causing confusion among the public nor any belief we do not operate to the same high standards?

Disagree Whilst I don't necessarily disagree, the CILEx Code of Conduct almost mirrors that of the SRA. I would never expect that we were held to "lesser" standards of conduct and practice. The only difference with the proposal in my view is that it would bring everything under one roof.

Disagree Why is nether agree nor disagree not an option? I doubt its a major consideration.

Disagree Why would a CILEX lawyer being regulated by a solicitors regulator instill more confidence?

Disagree Yes to consistency of aporoach but Distinction between Cilex regulation and SRA regulation won't much concern the client

Disagree You appear not to be aware of the Axiom Ince saga where the SRA have clearly been asleep on the job. This has been rumbling on for a year, £60 Million pay out? Not sure how much confidence that gives consumers, or indeed Solicitors in the regulator. We can, and do operate to high standards now, so no logic in your position. In 18 years I have never been referred to either SRA or CRL only LEO, am a litigator. No complaint upheld, or compensation paid out ever. So does that suggest we dont need either SRA or CRL? One regulator (SRA) giving consistency, no as we have different training, standards so each needs to be treated according to standard.

Disagree You can establish consistency by looking at our rules with our existing regulatory body. You need not throw out the baby with the bath water.

Disagree You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here.

Disagree You're just putting questions out there in the hope that we will not see through your attempts to spin the results. WE DONT WANT TO BE REGULATED BY THE SRA. FULL STOP.

Do you agree that regulation by the SRA provides opportunity to establish a consistent

Response Please state reasons

Agree -

Agree #As above.

Agree (as above)

Agree .

Agree A consistent set of rules should give greater confidence to consumers

Agree Absolutely. The public and all legal professionals understand who SRA is. I'm often called upon to explain who my regulator is and whether I'm qualified to both consumer and other legal professionals, it's embarrassing. If FCilex were linked to SRA, I think this would increase confidence and understanding immeasurably. I would feel much more comfortable.

Agree Again, please see my answer 20.

Agree agree

Agree Agree

Agree Agree with the statement.

Agree Agreed as long as there is equality between qualifications

Agree Agreed for the same reasons as outlined at 22 above.

Agree As 20

Agree As above

Agree As above

Agree as above

Agree As above

Agree as above, the consumer will trust that the professional is conducting the matter in a thorough way, following SRA guidance, which any other lawyer would

Agree As above, the opportunity is there but practice rights need to be given to Fellows

Agree As above, the SRA is well known and highly reputable

Agree As above.

Agree As above.

Agree As above.

Agree As before.

Agree As mentioned previously it would go towards addressing the issue of perceived disparity and validate the role and position played by the CILEX lawyer.

Agree Because the public will know Cilex lawyers are held to the same standards as solicitors

Agree Because they will have the same regulator

Agree But only if the public are educated via the press, indirectly via law firms, etc.

Agree Cilex lawyers are competent in equivalence to solicitors

Agree CILEX Lawyers should have the same rights.

Agree CILEX regulation does not seem to have had any publicly visible action, I suspect the SRA will do a better job

Agree Consistency

Agree Consistency across the profession is key with one set of service standards etc but separately badged for the Law Society and CILEX.

Agree Consistency of approach will help

Agree Consistency within the profession should help with confidence inside and outside of the profession.

Agree Could not agree more with this

Agree Do the same job anyway

Agree Equity

Agree Fairer

Agree For the reasons in Q21

Agree However, if SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients.

Agree I agree only because the SRA is a more public facing organisation than the CLR.

Agree I agree with this proposal

Agree I agree, and it should not be forgotten that often Legal Practices are led by a mix of both Solicitor and CILEX led firms.

Agree I agree, as it should be the same approach by both professionals.

Agree I believe that consumers/clients feel that all lawyers should perform to the same standards. It is confusing for consumers to have to deal with multiple regulators. There is a general assumption that SRA regulates all lawyers.

Agree I cannot add any further comments as I would be repeating myself as I have answered above.

I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:

1. People see us as equals - which would be great.
2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.

Agree I repeat here my comment from question 22.

Agree I think it may promote a better understanding of the Cilex role.

Agree I think regulation by the SRA may provide an opportunity to establish a consistent approach.

Agree However, I have not seen a clear argument that it definitely will.

Agree I've long argued that we should have parity with solicitors

Agree I would hope so

Agree ibid

Agree It can only be a positive measure for our members and hopefully broaden the opportunities for our members to become partners or set up their own firms

Agree It gives the required recognition and would help the understanding of the public.

Agree It is time for CILEX to be equal.

Agree It makes the system simpler which is better for consumers.

Agree It provides opportunity, but it may not actually improve the situation with regard to recognition of the expertise of CILEX qualified professionals.

Agree It will provide the same benefits as the SRA provides to Lawyers/Solicitors that qualify through the traditional route.

Agree many CILEX members work in Solicitors' firms anyway so it would avoid dual regulation.

Agree More credible with higher membership

Agree N/A

Agree No the public won't understand the difference

Agree one umbrella

Agree Paramount is to increase confidence among consumers

Agree People know what the SRA is

Agree Please have regard to 22 and 23 above.

Agree Power standard

Agree Public will start to gain more confidence to branch out.

Agree Puts Cilex members on a par with Solicitors

Agree Same as above

Agree same as above.

Agree See above

Agree See above response

Agree see above.

Agree SRA regulation will allow consumers to see that CILEX Lawyers have to operate to the same standards as Solicitor led firms.

Agree SRA would add confidence to the CILEX lawyer.

Agree The proposed changes are welcomed.

Agree The public might be less confused

Agree The Solicitor-led or CILEX Lawyer-led, who deliver the same services, must operate to the same high standards.

Agree The SRA hasn't provided me with confidence around their qualification procedures. Their approach is vague and inconsistent especially surrounding paralegals who want to take the sqe and attain professional promotion.

Agree There are so many people nowadays who are doing the same job and work alongside each other that have taken a different route be it through CILEX or a Solicitor and have the same ability to do the job.

Agree These standards are uniform and clear.

Agree This is not a Yes or No answer. The principle of what is being suggested is correct, but fail to understand why after so long CILEX determines that CRL is not up to the job and/or why those standards have slipped or are not the same.

Agree This must be supported

Agree To an extent (see above)

Agree Very much so. This for me is the strongest argument for undertaking these changes and one which I support.

Agree Whichever provider Regulates CILEX it should always promote the confidence of high standards.

Agree Will provide clarity to consumers as to who regulates lawyers and an even playing field in the industry between solicitors and chartered lawyers regulation wise

Agree Yes

Agree Yes but ONLY if cilex are EQUALLY represented. The SRA MUST change its name and give assurances that cilex lawyers will have equal status to solicitors (to open sra regulated firms and independent practice rights etc) and perhaps then cilex will simply become another route to an equal status as lawyer. This is absolutely key.

Agree Yes the standards will be consistent.

Agree Yes, simply be HR departments will find it easier to understand.

Agree Within the large law firm I work for for example, traditionally the SQE route has been favoured as a route to qualification rather than CILEX. i.e. Whilst they recognise CILEX Chartered lawyers as being eligible for Associate positions, they do not formally CILEX sponsor as route to qualification. (Some of my CILEX qualified colleagues who work at the same firm as me have said in the past the CILEX members were viewed as 2nd class. So unfortunately there is the unfortunate conclusion that in some quarters there may still be some prejudice/snobbery against CILEX. Therefore I believe that by putting CILEX legal professionals under the same regulatory umbrella as the Solicitors it will make it easier for Firms, HR departments and senior leadership teams to comprehend that CILEX professionals qualifications are just as valid as those who have chosen the more traditional qualification routes.

Agree Yes.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

You need to explain what you mean in this question by using the phrases 'same services' and 'consistent approach' neither of which have been demonstrated to me, so far. This completely undermines and contradicts everything you have set out previously and the changes to structure that you require or, are you only referring to the minority who have obtained the further rights? Only if you get rid of advance practice rights which completely remove this ability will any kind of equal footing or standards be seen. As one member has disturbingly said, even with 25 years practice and qualification, they are having their work signed off by a NQ solicitor? Is this really your intention? How can this possibly be justified? I know so many former CILEx colleagues have now moved to CLC so that they can continue their hard work (including those at partnership) without any change whatsoever to their daily work, only an allowance of them doing this work.

Agree

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree a

Absolutely not.

The LSB are there to ensure consistency of regulation.

The absence of consistency is what sets CILEx apart and what is important.

CILEX should be spending its time on working to improve outcomes for members not in Internecine warring.

Disagree

Disagree Again same as above

Disagree Again, clients are not concerned about who regulates if you do a good job.

Disagree Again, creating any kind of monopoly, even a monopoly of regulation, is never good and never results in higher standards the way competition does.

Disagree Again, it is not required, they already operate at the same high standards, so again collaboration between CRL and the SRA to advertise this would provide the same results but at much less cost -

Disagree the move to the SRA actually raises more concerns for CILEX led firms, in that a change in legislation is required which may never come and where are the guarantees that it will be pushed for by the SRA and CILEX.

Disagree All following the same regulations.

Disagree As 19

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree as above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above 19 - 23.

Disagree As above, this risks widening the gap between solicitors and CILEX lawyers

Disagree As above, we can have consistency without the need to pass over the responsibility

Disagree As above.

Disagree as above.
Disagree As above.
Disagree As above.
Disagree As above.

As above. And it completely ignores the presence of other types of lawyer providing legal services. It doesn't make it any simpler particularly if CILEX lawyers retain their separate identity to solicitors.

Disagree How does it make it any simpler or more beneficial for the public?

Disagree As above. SRA not required to achieve this

Disagree As before

As mentioned above, I do not believe that the SRA has very high reputation among solicitors. An effective CILEX and CRL ought to be able to ensure that high standards continue to exist within its membership.

Disagree As my previous answer too institutionalized and not really a body that fits today's needs.

Disagree As per previous answer.

Disagree As stated, the SRA does not view us as equals so they cannot promote consistency of approach.

Disagree Changing to the SRA has little to do with public trust and confidence. See above.

CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree

Cilex has not demonstrated that they are unable to regulate members so why the change. The SRA however do make some very questionable decisions. I would not like to be part of a body whose members often don't recognise the qualification I worked hard for

Disagree

CILEX lawyers already deliver services to a high standard and so changing to the SRA would not have much impact on this

Disagree

Disagree Cilex Lawyers are being regulated by rules that are pretty much identical to SRA rules

CILEX lawyers are far more specialised in the areas in which they practice and are therefore probably far more knowledgeable - Solicitors tend to dabble in lots of areas of law to ensure a steady stream of income, CILEX lawyers don't!

Disagree

CILEX members already operate to a high standard and the assumption the SRA is a higher standard is quite derogatory on CILEX members.

Disagree

CILEX members are not solicitors, so should not be regulated by the SRA. I consider this would take something away from CILEX's unique status, and have a detrimental effect on the efforts made to ensure CILEX Lawyers have parity with solicitors. If lawyers that are not solicitors are regulated by the SRA, there would exist an implicit assumption that they are not the same, as they do not hold the title that is encapsulated in the S of SRA. This could lead to the public and others viewing them as subordinate to solicitors.

Disagree

CILEX members whether regulated through a traditional SRA firm or a CRL firm operate to the same levels. In fact, CILEX regulated firms operate at a higher level. CRL regulators implement changes quicker than the SRA, work proactively with their firms to ensure the highest levels of conduct and practice. No insurance claims have been made against CILEX entities for dishonesty or misappropriation of client funds unlike the SRA. CRL work with us to make us better - they do not punish and persecute.

Disagree

Disagree CILEX Regulation has those attributes.

Disagree

Disagree Consistency of approach appears not to be a feature of the SRA's performance and high standards are not necessarily achieved by putting all eggs in one basket.

Disagree

Disagree Consumer knowledge of CILEX to too low.

- Disagree Consumers don't pay attention to this kind of thing, I believe it will create a deeper division between solicitors and legal execs because the solicitors will want a tier system to separate out them and us. I feel this will create more division and animosity in the profession.
- Disagree CRL can do this as in 18 above. We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it.
- Disagree CRL should remain in place. No changes are required. Just change the title of CILEX fellows etc.
- Disagree CRL-led firms are doing this already. The change is unnecessary.
- Disagree Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent
- Disagree Donot want to be regulated by SRA look at the mess they are in with Axiom and Ince
- Disagree For reasons above
- Disagree For reasons as previously mentioned
- Disagree for the reasons outlined above
- Disagree For the reasons stated above.
- For years Solicitors viewed themselves as being above Chartered Legal Executives. This attitude has slowly been changing but I think that this move will encourage them to view themselves as more important again as we haven't been properly regulated and have had to go to the SRA for them to regulate us.
- Disagree Have you actually heard and seen online the comments solicitors make about the SRA and solicitors experiences with them - never positive. with over £100k solicitors and £7k Fellows - how can anyone believe that the needs of the Cilex lawyers will be taken into account we will be ignored and just a number.
- Disagree Have you read the articles on this?
- Disagree I
- Disagree i agree to a certain extent that regulation does lead to increased confidence, but i do not agree that it needs to be by the SRA.
- Disagree I am not aware of any issues with this. Never have I been asked who runs my firm and what are their qualifications and I have worked in firms both lead by solicitors and CILEX members.
- Disagree I believe it would be difficult to maintain customer confidence if the SRA were regulators given the recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.
- Disagree I do not believe this to be an issue, at no point in my dealings with clients have I ever been asked who my managers or partners are and how they qualified. I believe having CILEX and Solicitor's who are separate organisations and regulated separately strengthens the way a firm is run.
- Disagree I do not consider that the change will brig about increased confidence, as the view of the SRA is generally negative.
- Disagree I don't believe that the public will care who we are regulated by, whether we are CILEX or SRA the parity comes from lawyers/solicitors.
- Disagree I don't I don't believe it would make any difference to consumers but it will make a huge (and negative) difference to CILEx lawyers.
- Disagree I note there are no CRL firms in the news.
- Disagree There are no details to satisfy how the SRA will protect our distinct identity.
- Disagree I suspect it won't be a real life consideration
- Disagree I think costs need to be considered given CiLex lawyers do not often come from a monied background.

- I think i agree with that my concern is it against our brand which calls for "Diversity" speaking entirely for myself it seems to suggest of a Homogeneous Super Solicitor/Lawyer rather than a Chartered Lawyers as distinct from Solicitors or at least having the ability to water down throughout the years to such
- Disagree
- I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of cilex lawyers
- Disagree
- I work to a high standard and I am not impressed that this question appears to suggest that only CILEX lawyer or solicitors could inspire consumer confidence. I would not still be working if this was the case.
- Disagree
- I would again reiterate my comments to question 19. I need more information and evidence.
- Disagree
- If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.
- Disagree
- If I understand the question correctly, you are asking if SRA regulation of firms increases consumer confidence in those firms previously regulated by CRL. On this basis, I would say potentially. I still suspect that the average consumer does not particularly care who regulates the firm as long as it is regulated. I would think though that this may be the one area where one single regulator may increase consumer confidence - however CRL regulated firms are a tiny minority in any event, so it is arguable that the attendant upheaval from the changes is barely worthwhile
- Disagree
- If the SRA are not providing professional competency in their dealings with consumers then moving regulation to the SRA will only lower the existing standard of CILEx Regulation. This again comes back to simply providing a consistent public education message what appears to have been lost. d
- Disagree
- Insufficient information to know
- Disagree
- Is it that the current regime is not consistent.
- Disagree
- It is good as it is
- Disagree
- It makes no difference what so ever
- Disagree
- It may create the opportunity but if it fails in practice then it potentially fails for both solicitor-led and CILEX Lawyer-led firms - which certainly would not improve consumer confidence. Firms may be regulated differently but there is no reason why that should not be to broadly similar and high standards.
- Disagree
- It would not alter consumer confidence.
- Disagree
- It's a very similar question.
- Disagree
- It's not the case in my experience that regulators drive standard as they like to believe or that they impact consumer confidence. The standard of service is firm dependant and there are firms delivering poor work and engaging dubious practice on a daily basis without SRA interference. See Axiom Ince and other recent cases where the SRA was slow to intervene or address concerns which were know for months. It is the failings of the SRA themselves that are diminishing consumer confidence if anyone is.
- Disagree
- Keep going, but you wont change our minds.
- Disagree
- Likely only more segregation. Are SRA going to change their name? If not that's a clear example of our non inclusion straight away given the "S" doesn't include us!
- Disagree
- Likely to cause confusion
- Disagree
- n
- Disagree
- No

Disagree no
Disagree No - again just a statement supported by no facts, merely an assertion.

No because CILEX members' opinions will not matter to the SRA and they will also defer to solicitors and once CILEX members are regulated by SRA we will not have a voice and will be trodden down.

Disagree No evidence to support this.
Disagree No further comments
Disagree No I believe over the years CILEX members would be eroded whereas in these times we should be more predominate. I do not believe the SRA will enhance our cause.
Disagree No I do not. I do not see how this will achieve the consistency and increased confidence to which you refer.
Disagree No matter how much you spin it, the answer is still no.
No, see my comments above.

Disagree
Disagree No. See responses above.
Disagree No. It is no more enhanced than CRL
Disagree No. SRA will not pursue that path.
Disagree Once again I do not believe the SRA Will champion our membership
Disagree Please see above. 19.
Please see my above answer - I am unclear what the differentiation is exactly based on the current model/s.
Disagree Please see previous responses.
Disagree Potentially agree, but ultimately does a consumer know or care about the difference?
Disagree Regulation already has consistency of approach and high standards in CRL
Regulation by a merging of the SRA and regulatory aspect of CILEX is required. Equity and parity is key in this instance.
Disagree Repetition
Disagree Repetitive and still the same answer
Disagree Same answer at number 22
Disagree same as above
Disagree Same as above
Disagree Same as above answer.
Disagree Same as above reply
Disagree Same as above.
Disagree Same as answer to Q.23
Disagree Same question and response as above - The Institute is not performing its original remit to promote Legal Executives.
Disagree Same reasons as the answer in 18 above
Disagree See 16 above.
Disagree See 23 above
Disagree See above
Disagree See Above
Disagree see above
Disagree See above
Disagree see above
Disagree see above
Disagree See above
Disagree See above
Disagree See above answers.
Disagree see all above comments
Disagree See answer to 19 above

- See answer to 20. Same principles apply. I already operate to the same high standards as Solicitors and never get questioned on the same. I think your perception is very widely misplaced.
- Disagree See comments above
- Disagree See my response to 20 above
- Disagree See previous answer. Generally, the public are not interested in the detail of who regulates a qualified lawyer
- Disagree See previous answers
- Disagree See previous comments
- Disagree See previous comments.
- Disagree See previous reasons
- Disagree See reasons above
- Disagree See reply to 18 above.
- Disagree See responses above.
- Disagree SRA does not want to share their legal control monopolization with anybody.
- Disagree SRA would not want to regulate us judging from recent articles I have read.
- Disagree Standards should remain the change if not regulated by SRA- as this is done currently
- Disagree Stated above
- Disagree Still no
- Disagree That is my view
- Disagree The current regulation through CILEX is very robust and many of the principles are already akin to those of the SRA.
- Disagree The general public have no idea who the SRA are or what they stand for
- Disagree The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who.
- Disagree The public confidence in CILEX is high and equal to solicitors.
- Disagree The public consider clearly that all lawyers operate to the same high standard.
- Disagree The public won't care one way or another
- Disagree The question appears to suggest that CILEX Lawyer led firm are not leaving to standard
- Disagree The regulation is consistent between the two and the two regulators often communicate with one another.
- Disagree The SRA claim they will maintain separate arrangements so this will mean there remain differences. There is no evidence that consumers believe CLEs operate to lower standards and even if they did, provided those standards were sufficient to provide consumer protection then we should be crowing about that and not trying to achieve a different standard which is less attainable and therefore serves to restrict legal advice.
- Disagree The SRA didnt seem to comment when the law society said they didnt want the SRA to take over our regulation. That shows they do not see us as equals.
- Disagree The SRA will not treat CILEX lawyers the same and will be snifty and conceited about us
- Disagree There are relatively few cilex led firms. Most cilex professionals work within SRA regulated firms already. This is therefore a moot point
- Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
- Disagree This appears to suggest that currently Cilex professionals are not held to the same standards as solicitors. If this is the concern then regulation simply needs to be made more robust which could easily be achieved by the current body without changing to be regulated by the SRA instead. (Having seen some of the SRA decisions on its website these do not inspire confidence in it as a regulatory body.)

Disagree This is irrelevant. A CILEx lawyer working in a SRA regulated firm is subject to both sets of rules and regulations. Where they work in a CILEx Regulation regulated entity then there are robust rules and regulations in place.

CILEx regulation require exacting standards from professionals as it is.

Disagree This remains to be seen.

This will depend, in my opinion,, on the particular firm in which the individual professional is engaged

Disagree unsure with the bad press in relation to the SRA at the moment

Disagree We are already required to work under SRA regulation, through the firms we work for.

We are already the same standard. This is more gaslighting from CILEx to the members they should be championing and supporting.

Disagree We will end up with a mess - as with accountants, with a reduction in transparency and standards

Disagree We work harder and more consistently than Solicitors I think this is a terrible idea

What are the issues now? Where is the evidence that there is reduced confidence amongst consumers? Are you saying that CILEX lawyers now do not operate at a high enough standard and require regulation by the SRA to do so?

Disagree Who came up with this? Of course not

Disagree Why is nether agree nor disagree not an option? I doubt its a major consideration.

You appear not to be aware of the Axiom Ince saga where the SRA have clearly been asleep on the job. This has been rumbling on for a year, £60 Million pay out? Not sure how much confidence that gives consumers, or indeed Solicitors in the regulator. We can, and do operate to high standards now, so no logic in your position. In 18 years I have never been referred to either SRA or CRL only LEO, am a litigator. No complaint upheld, or compensation paid out ever. So does that suggest we dont need either SRA or CRL? One regulator (SRA) giving consistency, no as we have different training, standards so each needs to be treated according to standard.

Disagree you are asking the same questions in a different format!

Disagree You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here.

Do you agree that SRA regulation of CILEX and ACCA probate entities alongside Solicitors

Response	Please state reasons
Agree	.
Agree	.
Agree	A fair reasoning is set out in the consultation.
Agree	agree
Agree	Agree
Agree	Agree with the statement.
Agree	Agreed
Agree	All singing from the same hymn sheet
Agree	An equal and equitable merging in this instance is the ideal.
Agree	as above
Agree	As above
Agree	as above, provides consistency across the board
Agree	As above.
Agree	AS above.
Agree	As before, my view is that any simplification to the regulation of all lawyers is beneficial.
Agree	Based on what has been shared I feel that they can.
Agree	Consistency
Agree	Consumers trust the SRA
Agree	Enhanced consumer protection is necessary
Agree	Fairer
Agree	From personal experience of being SRA regulated as a firm we have experienced considerable savings in premiums and avoided issues with lenders as we are SRA regulated
Agree	Fully Agree
Agree	I agree with this proposal
Agree	I believe that SRA are better equipped to manage this.
	I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:
Agree	1. People see us as equals - which would be great.
	2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.
Agree	I have limited understanding of this matter but, on the face of it, I'm inclined to agree.
Agree	I have no knowledge of this area,
Agree	I hope so although I would be interested to hear the insurers view of this
Agree	I work for a local authority therefore I am looking at this from the outside
Agree	Inclined to agree in relation to consumer protection.
	It appears self-evident that a larger body of properly regulated professionals is better in this regard.
Agree	It makes the system simpler which is better for consumers.
Agree	It seems to argue that there will be access to a larger pot of funds of the membership increases. With it without the consent of said members
Agree	It should be able to bring more consistency.
Agree	Na
Agree	Neither agree or disagree as I am unsure how this will change/work
Agree	No comment.
Agree	No other comments
Agree	Not too sure.

Absolutely not.

If the SRA can provide "consistent levels of PII, Compensation Fund scope" why cannot CILEX?

CILEx should be working harder to ensure that a CILEx qualification opens the same pathways and opportunities to members as as Solicitor enjoys.

Not wasting our money and its time on internal squabbling.

Disagree

All of these things can be effectively managed by individual regulators. Barristers and Licenced Conveyancers do not have a problem.

Disagree

As 19 save that presumably the indemnity funds could recognise Cilex independently in any event

Disagree

Disagree

As above

Disagree

as above

Disagree

as above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above 19 - 25

Disagree

As above but also that there is enough of a level of consumer protection.

Disagree

As above, we can have consistency without the need to pass over the responsibility

Disagree

As above.

Disagree

As above.

Disagree

As per my answer above

Disagree

Axiom Ince didnt seem to work well for the SRA supervision.

CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA.

Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree

Disagree

CILEX is adequately regulated already

CILEX lawyers already have transparency obligations and many other standards and requirements that SRA enforce in to their regulations

Disagree

Disagree

CILEx Regulation already delivers enhanced consumer protection

Disagree

CILEX Regulation can achieve this enhanced consumer protection.

Disagree

Consumer protection is already consistent

Disagree

CRL are doing a good job for CILEX members and no change is necessary.

Disagree

CRL can do this as in 18 above. We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it.

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

do not believe it will

Disagree

Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Disagree

Don;t know enough about this area to comment

Disagree Donot want to be regulated by SRA

Disagree Don't know anything about this area so am certainly not going to agree

Disagree Dont understand the issue or question

Disagree for reasons set out above

Disagree For the reasons stated above.

Disagree Have you read the articles on this?

Disagree I

Disagree I am not convinced the level of consumer protection offered by SRA is significantly different from that already in place.

Disagree I am not in a position to answer this fully as I am not completed involved in the PII side of rings etc. but by trying to fit us all into one regulatory you risk everyone increasing costs for all to just try and cover all basis.

Disagree I am uncertain of this but would hope that it would.

Disagree I believe it wont, there will still be the distinction between CILEX and Solicitor and so lessening this gap is what should be concentrated on not changing regulation to SRA.

Disagree I believe it would be difficult to maintain customer confidence if the SRA were regulators given the recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.

Disagree I do not

Disagree I do not believe joining the SRA will make one jot of difference to this.

Disagree I do not know enough about probate entities to "agree".

Disagree I do not know that this means.

Disagree I do not understand the inclusion of ACCA as accounts and law are distinctly separate.

Disagree I don't believe a change in regulator will improve things

Disagree I don't see how it will.

Disagree I don't think it matters who regulates as long as we are regulated.

Disagree I don't believe it would make any difference to consumers but it will make a huge (and negative) difference to CILEx lawyers.

Disagree I don't know rather than disagree or agree

Disagree I don't see that the current regulation is ineffective or that these changes are needed. Where is the evidence of any consumer protection failing which necessitates this change?

Disagree I have found no fault with the protection provided through CLR.

Disagree I have no knowledge of this and therefore cannot comment

Disagree I have no knowledge of this area so cannot comment.

Disagree I have no way of answering that question other than, in my experience, the SRA require a lot less in terms of setting up than CILEx Regulation do. The question is suggesting that CILEx Regulation will not do its job properly in terms of auditing etc and I don't believe that will be the case. I have worked for many firms of Solicitors over the last 20 years and none of them have ever been audited by the SRA. As a CILEx regulated Practitioner, I understand that regular audits are to be expected.

Disagree I have not been convinced that this will follow from what I have read in the consultation material.

Disagree I have to say disagree as I do not have sufficient understanding or knowledge to be able to agree.

Disagree I really don't know.

Disagree I see no evidence for this.

Disagree I think a lot of CiLex members will leave and not renew their membership of SRA get to regulate

Disagree	I think SRA will always uphold solicitor members requirements first and CILEX lawyers alongside solicitors will always be seen as less qualified and as such will not be accepted for more senior management roles where there are more risks requiring higher PII etc. Therefore I think there should be separate covers
Disagree	I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of cilex lawyers
Disagree	If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.
Disagree	If the SRA were seeking to regulate the Bar, this would not even result in a consultation as the change in regulation would not be entertained by members of the Bar any more than it should be by Cilex members. They are distinct branches of the legal profession and remain so with their own regulatory bodies.
Disagree	If things are missing with CILEX Regulation this can be looked into by making changes within CILEX (and CILEX) without jumping into the SRA.
Disagree	I'm not sure I fully understand this question which is why I have to select disagree for now.
Disagree	I'm unaware of the current position of ACCA probate entities, but assume the same will apply as to CILEX led firms as noted above.
Disagree	Insufficient information to know
Disagree	It is doubtful this would make any changes to PII
Disagree	It is not always the case
Disagree	It makes no difference what so ever
Disagree	It reduces choice and mandates that CLEs and ACCA entities have to achieve higher standards which will serve to reduce consumer choice of legal services
Disagree	It seems the SRA has not had a good year with the collapse of three large firms - Axion Ince, Metamorph Group and Kingly Solicitors. This is placing considerable strain on the Compensation Fund and it seems likely all solicitors will be required to plug the considerable shortfall to compensate the clients involved. These high profile incidents involving huge sums of money do nothing to improve consumer confidence in the legal profession and it seems remarkable that CILEX is even considering this change of regulator.
Disagree	Keep going, it's not working.
Disagree	Let's refer to the Axiom Ince case which doesn't really make you very confident in the SRA and their abilities to regulate!
Disagree	n
Disagree	N/A
Disagree	N/A
Disagree	Neither agree or disagree - not my area of specialism
Disagree	No
Disagree	no
Disagree	No all lawyers are a captive market to insurers so we are stuck whoever we are regulated by.
Disagree	no comment as i don't understand the issues.
Disagree	no comment.
Disagree	No doubt the SRA will insist on the same draconian levels of run off cover as they do with solicitors practices. I would recommend all conveyancing firms in particular move the be Licenced conveyancers

Disagree No evidence of that

Disagree No experience to have an informed view

Disagree No further comments

Disagree no knowledge of this so unable to comment

Disagree No more so than could be required by CILEx Regulation - it is easier for them to implement changes in this regard than the SRA.

Disagree No more than we already have under the current settlement

Disagree No opinion or comment would answer I don't know if that was the option

Disagree No this seems a stretch

Disagree

Disagree No, consumer protection is best achieved by our professionals remaining independent.

Disagree No, I don't think so. I think SRA will be burdensome.

Disagree No, the current regulatory system adequately provides for these things and if standardisation is required then the regulatory bodies could talk to each other and decide on a consistent approach.

Disagree No, the public already enjoy protections from SRA regulating the firms we work.

Disagree

Disagree No, you, CILEx are not being open or transparent with us the Members, so why would the SRA? You closed down the branch network, yet Law soc still has theirs, no real communication/discussion with members, only you talking AT us not with us.

Disagree No. It is no more enhanced than CRL.

Disagree Not sure

Disagree Not sure what this is

Disagree Of course not

Disagree Outside my area of knowledge.

Disagree PII and compensation with the SRA is not a good thing! PII market has hardened and costs are spiraling

Disagree PII levels are not about who you are regulated by, but what work you do. I work for a Licensed Conveyancers but from what I hear the SRA do not enforce the CQS scheme that they run so I am unsure how they would enhance our regulation.

Disagree Please see above, 19.

Disagree Possibly, but surely CILEX Regulation is already on top of this.

Disagree

Disagree Proponents of such regulation may argue that it ensures a level playing field and consistent standards for all entities providing probate services, regardless of their professional background. This could potentially enhance consumer protection by reducing the risk of misconduct and ensuring that consumers have access to compensation and transparency in their dealings with probate providers.

Disagree

Disagree However, opponents may argue that the regulatory burden and requirements could be overly restrictive or burdensome for certain types of probate entities, potentially limiting competition or access to legal services.

Disagree Reasons above

Disagree Regulation already has consistent consumer protection through CRL

Disagree Same answers as above.

Disagree same as above

Disagree Same as above

Disagree Same as above.

Disagree Same reasons as the answer in 18 above

Disagree See 16 above.

Disagree see above

Disagree	See above
Disagree	See above
Disagree	See above
Disagree	See above
Disagree	See above answers.
Disagree	See above responses
Disagree	See above.
Disagree	See answer to 19 above.
Disagree	See earlier comments about how useless the SRA is!
Disagree	see earlier response
Disagree	See my comments above.
Disagree	See previous answers
Disagree	See previous comments
Disagree	See previous reasons
Disagree	See previous reasons given - I do not consider SRA regulation is in our best interests
Disagree	See reply to 18 above.
Disagree	See responses above.
Disagree	should be an i dont know option
	So far as I am aware I do not think the ACCA members have any problems with their regulators.
Disagree	It may assist their members as they are not lawyers. It may confuse the public into thinking they are. I certainly do not think CILEX needs to change to SRA regulation and I object to doing so. I cannot see that doing so in respect of CILEX probate will enhance protection. Their is sufficient protection with current regulators and if employed by a firm of solicitors then SRA regulations have to be followed.
Disagree	SRA and CILEX should be kept separate, no other institute is controlled by another department and must remain independent.
Disagree	Sra compensation fund underwater after axiom -ince, no faith this won't just be ilex bailing out sra when they loot our fund
Disagree	SRA will not want the public to see equivalency
Disagree	Still No
Disagree	That is my view
Disagree	The bureaucracy always brings high costs to the consumers.
Disagree	The LSB could simply insist that all regulators provide the same. This suggestion is literally the opposite of increasing consumer choice- it is encouraging a monopoly of regulation.
Disagree	The objectives can be achieved without such cost and change
Disagree	The profession and consumers are better off with distinct regulators
Disagree	The public confidence in CILEX is high and equal to solicitors.
Disagree	The SRA have form for failing to act in the best interests of both the profession and consumers. They seem intent of taking action against individuals whilst failing to act to protect consumers who use failing firms or who are dishonest. They enable Capsticks to claim costs for disciplinary actions which are excessive to a significant degree.
Disagree	The SRA is already over- worked with severe backlogs without taking on any more professionals. Merging the regulation will dilute the uniqueness of CILEX.
Disagree	There is no evidence that SRA regulation will deliver enhanced consumer protection. Most law firms are regulated by the SRA in any event!

Disagree There is no obstacle within CILEx Regulation to providing transparency.
Disagree The question needs to be raised is the main aim for the Compensation Fund to be available.
Disagree There is no reason why separate regulators couldn't apply consistent regulation

Disagree There is nothing in the consultation that leads me to agree with this statement. TThe
Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.
Disagree There should be a industry wide accepted insurance terms and then the fairness would follow.
Disagree There should be dispersity in regulation
Disagree These entities are not solicitors firms, so should not be regulated by the SRA.

Disagree These provisions are already in place. Most CILEX professionals work within solicitors firms
They are all three differently qualified. The consumer should be able to choose between them.
Disagree This can be achieved without changing regulators
Disagree This is ambiguous with no basis in my opinion.

This is because my options are limited to "Accept" and "Disagree". Ideally I would like a "Partially Agree" button because currently I agree however I shouldn't have to agree CILEX needs to step up and fight more "fearlessly" to promote Chartered Lawyers to PII Firms as more competent in their areas of specialism to a "jack of all trades" Solicitor

There is key advantages to the CILEx approach of requiring "specialty, specialism and specialist" practitioners that the SRA doesn't have but the PII firms are complacent and approving simply what they are used too because "you can't teach an old dog new tricks"

Disagree Well if you can't teach an old dog new tricks you get a new dog not put up with an over complacent one
Disagree This is not a Yes or No answer. This move will likely cause the death of CILEX and dissuade a number of people to join this branch of the profession. The Compensation fund has closed leaving a number of former practitioners liable / exposed. This cannot be sensibly seen as a good move.

Disagree Transparency obligations already exist, moving to the SRA will not change that. How can there be enhanced levels of protection when there appears to be insufficient funds to compensate victims of Axiom? If CILEx is actually treated as the superior body that we are, PII should then fall into line or reduce. Stop reducing and devaluing your membership, you are essentially saying that we need the SRA to validate us; we don't, you just need a marketing campaign to raise awareness of who we are, what we do to qualify, and how we are superior to solicitors because of our specialist training and ongoing training requirements.

Disagree Unless it becomes mandatory
We should stop apologising for ourselves and viewing ourselves as less than. It's okay to focus on Chartered Legal Exec led firms. We don't have to work under solicitors to have legitimacy. This whole consultation is undermining what we s a profession have worked so hard to achieve.

Disagree What's wrong with what we have now?
Disagree Why do I have to justify my thoughts on this
Disagree Why is it this required now
Disagree Why is nether agree nor disagree not an option? I doubt its a major consideration.

Disagree Why would it?
Disagree why would it?
Disagree Why would this "enhance" protection?

Disagree You are removing the possibility of CILEX led firms. Neither the SRA nor your consultation documents off the opportunity of further CILEX led firms under the SRA.
Disagree You haven't provided a cogent and detailed analysis of why this isnt the case now. I see no reason to change.

Do you consider there to be any risk or detrimental effect arising from the proposed transfer of CILEX and ACCA Probate firms to the SRA?

Response Please explain

Yes

.

Yes

.

Yes

.

Yes

.

Yes

.

Yes

a

Absolutely.

It will dilute the distinction between CILEx and the other professions.

We will be the smaller, junior, subordinate and inferior class of regulated person to the far more numerous solicitors profession.

We will over time be pressured into losing our route to qualification.

Yes

Yes

ACCA is not a natural fit into law.

Yes

An eroding of CILEX Lawyer status will lead to the demise of CILEX as a valued career path, and kill the credibility of the Institute. The key is to remain distinct but equal.

Yes

As 24

Yes

As above

Yes

As above, the public perception of CILEx will be damaged if they are seen as unable to regulate their own members. The harm this will do reputationally will far outweigh any benefit

Yes

As above, the watering down of the CILEX qualification to be seen as second class to solicitors who are regulated by the same entity. Why chose a CILEX lawyer? There will be no celebration of the difference between CILEX and solicitor.

Yes

AS above.

Yes

As above.

Yes

As above. Lack of independence. We are an organisation of our entity.

Yes

As before, I believe that the SRA has much lower standards and requirements than CILEx - it is down to CILEx and CILEx Regulation to make themselves far more well known to the public at large.

Yes

As I have said earlier the SRA will not enhance our cause in anyway and are likely to erode what has been achieved to date. When I first joined ILEX back in 1972 it was said then application was being made for a Royal Charter look how many years it took. Why throw it away now by joining an authority which for many years opposed the Royal Charter status to ILEX

Yes

As mentioned above, a significant risk of widening the gap between solicitors and CILEX lawyers leading to CILEX lawyers being seen as under solicitors in regulation. I fail to see any benefit to CILEX lawyers in the transfer

Yes

as per my previous question. I for one would not be inclined to renew my membership.

Yes

As set out above, it will lead to confusion, regulatory overreach and a blurring of the roles of the legal professionals involved

Yes

As stated in previous answers about solicitors under the SRA being unhappy so why would CILEX members want to also be under that authority as well as losing members losing a level of identity by being under the same authority. That is the reason why some of us chose this route and not the solicitors route.

Yes

As these firms are not solicitors firms, they be be implicitly seen as subordinate if regulated by an organisation with solicitor in its name.

Yes

Attacks the independence of Chartered Legal Executives.

Yes

Backlash from those already in each of the bodies needs to be carefully anticipated, managed and reviewed. Full explanation at all stages and proper consultation is required.

Yes

Can't envisage any problems.

Yes

Cause confusion.

Yes

Change is not always a good thing.

Yes

Changes to regulation will create costs for firms.

Yes

Cilex- change will have impact. Separate regulation will enhance competition

- Cilex has not demonstrated that they are unable to regulate members so why the change. The SRA however do make some very questionable decisions. I would not like to be part of a body whose members often don't recognise the qualification I worked hard for
- Yes
- Cilex is a unique model and unique route. What assurances have SRA given re retaining and accepting that uniqueness? What is the point of a CILEX route if it ends up at the same end point? The proposal risks destroying cilex
- Yes
- Cilex is in danger of becoming just another part of SRA and it is important that it stays individual
- Yes
- CILEX Lawyers abandoning CILEX altogether due to the fact they will be regulated by a regulator original intended for solicitors.
- CILEx member and graduates are separate professionals from solicitors and I believe that distinction is essential. That distinction will no longer be if the regulator is the same and I'm concerned that this will give rise to CILEx professional being officially seen as lesser than solicitors.
- Yes
- Cilex members will get lost and I don't want association with sra
- Yes
- Cilex regulation have always been very helpful with any query and clear whenever I have contacted the SRA though or for work they have been much less helpful.
- Yes
- CILEx values will not hold if the SRA move is made. CILEx should seek to avoid confusion in the public domain by seeking a stronger working relationship with CILEx Regulation
- Yes
- CILEx will become irrelevant!
- Yes
- CILEX will disappear into a legal profession considered lesser than solicitors.
- Yes
- Concerned there won't be protections for CILEX lawyers.
- Consumer confusion through lawyers with different titles being regulated under a body that doesn't appear to incorporate them. I think this has the effect of undermining trust and confidence in the competence of CILEX members.
- Yes
- Damage has already been caused in the public eye from the way in which CILEX has handled this without consultation of its members beforehand. Nothing changes apart from harsher potential outcomes for CILEX members
- Yes
- Diminished status of CILEX
- Yes
- Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent
- Yes
- Don't see benefit. Feel should leave as is
- Yes
- Don't think it's necessary to do so.
- F.CILEx being treated as if we are nothing more than paralegals. Undermining the integrity of what we have worked for. CILEx will lose a raft of people who will just do the SQE and walk away because why would anyone want to remain in a profession when our own professional body thinks we are not good enough? And that's without addressing the EDI elements that come from F.CILEx and are not as present or representative in the solicitor pathway as a whole. Stop apologising for us, CILEx, and start supporting the amazingness of our Chartered Legal Executive profession!
- Yes
- Firstly I am concerned that the SRA may in the longer term seek to introduce changes which do not fully take into account the uniquely different qualification route of CILEX.
- Secondly although the SRA state that they have provided an estimate of the costs to CILEX of transferring regulation to them, this information is not included in any of the documents produced. There is no financial plan provided. I wish to know how much this will cost & how CILEX proposes to fund it.
- Yes
- For reasons given above sra are not a credible overseer of legal probity
- Yes
- For the reasons above 19 - 26. CILEx regulated members by CRL have a strong reliable, trustworthy and compliant reputation; the SRA do not. The unstable situation created by the proposals from CILEx and the SRA have impacted upon CILEx regulated firms and the members.
- Yes
- For the reasons I have explained to above questions. Clients I have represented do not have confidence in the SRA and my professional experience of the SRA does not inspire confidence.
- Yes
- Hardworking honest Solicitors are bombarded daily by the SRA meddling in matters that neither they know about or should be regulating. Yes we need a body to weed out dishonest lawyers but this should not impact on honest lawyers both in time and financially by an organisation that likes to wave a big stick at everyone and stamp their authority. Lawyers train for years to do their profession and they are except the very small minority, very good at what they do.
- Yes
- How can we have guarantees that we will not have to fund hugely costly problems like the Axiom Ince failure? What happens to have any funds held by CRL? Does it get swallowed up by the SRA?

Yes How will Cilex function under the SRA

Yes I

Yes I believe ultimately this will not achieve parity and will on the contrary achieve a two tier profession and lessen opportunities for CILEX lawyers. Surely our point of difference is the main selling point?

Yes I consider this could indicate that we have little or no faith in ourselves but instead need to be regulated by the SRA. It seems to me to be a retrograde step.

Yes I do not believe that the SRA would act in the interests of Cilex members.

Yes I do not believe the SRA is fit for purpose. And therefore I feel giving the SRA a monopoly over this type of regulation will do harm than good in the long term.

Yes I do not consider the SRA will provide the same level of support than the current regulator

Yes I do not feel SRA will work in the interests of CILEX members in the long run. They were set up to regulate solicitors not us. Even solicitors complain about the SRA.

Yes I do not know enough about probate firms to comment "no".

Yes I don't necessarily feel the SRA will have our best interests at heart.

Yes

Why are we not fighting for our independence?

Yes I don't know

Yes I don't know.

Yes I feel CILEX would not be fully understood by the SRA.

Yes I have already highlighted my concerns above and I hope the proposals can be simplified further so that existing Chartered Legal Execs who would be precluded from referring to themselves as Chartered Lawyers are not adversely affected. Unfortunately I think this is inevitable under the proposed changes.

Yes I have heard a large amount of negativity about the SRA of recent and am slightly concerned as to whether this is the right decision but would say the advantages outweigh the disadvantages

Yes I have insufficient knowledge to comment

Yes I have no time to go into detail but again would draw attention to the view of the SRA within the profession.

Yes I hope CILEX does not lose any of its status

Yes I really believe that this will devalue the status of FCilex members and make them less likely to become Partners/Directors in law firms regulated by the SRA (as it was in my last firm).

Yes I really don't know but it is probable

Yes I think CILEX members will be overlooked as there are many more solicitors

Yes I think CILEX members will feel undervalued and will cause confusion.

Yes I think CILEX will become extinct and most new lawyers will choose the SQE for qualification. Why stick with CILEX if there is no differential?

Yes I think it makes things more complicated, is an unnecessary waste of time and money and has been extremely damaging in terms of the perception of CILEX and therefore CILEX lawyers. If CILEX lawyers want to be SRA regulated, that can already be achieved at an individual level. You should be asking the membership directly whether or not they want to be forced to be SRA regulated, you should be offering alternative choices to those in the relevant practice areas (for instance to be CLC regulated) and you should be bound by a majority decision

Yes I think it will be lengthy and costly

Yes I think present concerns should be addressed first, such as the current rules on advancement of Chartered Legal Executives, which are prejudicial on the grounds of age and experience upon those who no longer conduct advocacy in their role.

Yes I think that CILEX will lose their identity that has been built up as an alternative route to becoming a lawyer and although it would be great for people to realise that CILEX lawyers are able to do the same as solicitors this would have a massive impact

Yes I think the vast difference between membership could cause issues. Most solicitors benefitted from Uni whereas not so much with CILEX. SRA applications such as equivalent means are more like academic dissertations with literally reams of requirements. It's completely mind-boggling and some CILEX members like me, will struggle with this.

Yes If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEX and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEX Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEX would be out of a job, power and money.

Yes If the aim is to become one then no as the process will fade away other regulatory bodies

Yes If the integration is handled poorly, from the communications point of view, it may go down in public imagination as the acquisition by SRA of CILEX as something lower-grade and inferior.

Yes If the SRA do not recognise Chartered Cilex Lawyers as being of equal standing to a solicitor practising in the same area it will prove detrimental.

Yes I'm struggling to feel reassured that the SRA is going to protect the interests of the CILEX members. Our number compared to the number of their member seems negligible. Why would they look after our interests when it seems likely they will eventually absorb us?

Yes In this proposal and previous ones you speak of our independence yet you wish to sell us out to a regulator whose own members have nothing good to say about it, some of whom have chosen to be regulated by CILEX Regulation. We want to maintain our independence. We will not have parity with solicitors if the body is transferred, it will be worse than it is now; we are already treated like second class citizens compared to solicitors. We do not want to be regulated by the SRA.

Yes Increased animosity, division and snobbery around the cilex qualifications.

Yes Insufficient information

Yes It completely undermines the notion that we are already equal. The SRA have made many derogatory and undermining comments regarding our 'tiny' and 'insignificant' pool of lawyers. I do not wish to be governed by such narrow mindedness and eliteness.

Yes It does not seem to be in SRA's interest to give us equal status

Yes It is fundamentally wrong. CILEX lawyers already have a regulator. To move away from it in the way that CILEX have chosen to do has totally undermined CILEX lawyers. It is hard enough to work amongst solicitors who already believe a Fellow is less than a solicitor. This is just a nail in the coffin of CILEX lawyers.

Yes It is inevitable that either solicitors or cilex lawyers will end up subsidising the other branch. This will cause unrest between the two.

Yes It is to the detriment of Legal Executives and risks reducing public confidence in them by losing them inside the SRA.

Yes It will mean that the Cilex members will miss out on having a regulatory body that is dedicated to them and well versed in dealing with Cilex members

Yes Just fear whether CILEX which has fought for so long to make it's name and be independent is going to be swallowed up by the SRA

Yes Lack of choice

Yes Losing our unique identity and taking away consumer choice

Loss of identity

Loss of independence

Being seen by the SRA as a side line to solicitors

Yes

Yes Loss of identity for CILEX with no discernible benefit to the public.

Yes Loss of independence, loss of identity.

Yes Many firms if led by CILEX entities may chose not to agree and instead move to become for example Licenced Conveyancers. The SRA is not their chosen career path , it appears to be a CILEX decision. The cost to firms will be massive. It is wrong to simply quote one example of fee comparison (I think it was £307 to £360) as a benefit. Presumably this is a single members cost. This is misinformation as the cost to firms will be far far greater.

Yes Massive risk and detriment as detailed above. Creating a monopoly pushes down standards and undermines consumer confidence. Creating new titles and pushing them into the SRA will further confuse the public and water down the professional integrity of the FCILEX brand.

Yes May be delays in reviewing cases

Yes Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.

Yes More people to regulate, however in practice I don't think this will have huge implications

Yes My experience of the SRA in an SRA regulated firm is that they are ineffective as a regulator for both members and the consumer.

Yes n

Yes Neg financial impact and loss of common sense autonomy.

Yes No further comments

Yes No refresher course to ensure that cilex lawyers are aware of SRA expectations

Yes No risk proViding CILEX members have equality with solicitors

Not having cilex regulation and less of a voice. How is the sra planning on delivering high standards to cilex practitioners.

Yes

Only if outdated, inequitable opinions of CILEX lawyers affect the way we are treated by the SRA.

Yes

Passing the regulation over to the SRA doesn't keep us separate from the SRA. Although I believe consistency is key, the regulation of CILEx won't be a separate entity any longer.

Yes

please refer to the above

Yes

Please review all my responses above, I believe it will lessen our independence from Solicitors in the way we are regulated and have a separate organisation fighting for our own rights while increasing the divide between a Solicitor and CILEX lawyer. I am yet to be shown a genuine advantage of going to be regulated by the SRA over CILEX regulations.

Yes

Please See Above

Yes

Potential risk that cilex and acca members are marginalised.

Yes

Putting too much on the SRA's plate who don't recognise CILEXx lawyers in any event. Need to keep away from the SRA

Yes

Reduced public perception of trustworthiness

Yes

Regulation by the SRA

Regulation fees will rise. administration and compliance will rise. Solicitors are deeply unhappy with SRA.

Yes

See 20 and 22.

Yes

See above

Yes

see above

Yes

See above

See above answers. It is entirely stupid to allow the SRA to boost its income from regulating CILEX. Their interest in CILEX is not aligned to CILEX's own purpose, and I fear it is monetary interest only. CILEX should remain independent of the SRA as it represents a different way to qualify.

Yes

See above comments - we will be related further down the legal ladder then we currently are, I am so happy that I can retire in a few years

Yes

See above responses

See earlier comments about playing second fiddle - I'm a FCILEX; I don't want to be regulated by the SOLICITORS Regulation Authority.

Yes

See my comments above.

Yes

See my comments in 18 above.

Yes

See previous answer.

See previous answers. The move and name change will do little to progress our cause and only add confusion.

Yes

See responses above. The SRA is not best placed to advance the interest of CILEX practitioners. This is solely best achieved by CRL.

Yes

Set out above.

Yes

So far no potive reports for SRA.

Yes

SRA and not a trusted department and should remain separate to CILEX as it then provides a different path for people.

Yes

SRA may treat Cilex as a tier 2 qualification and not "fight" for Cilex in the same manner as CRL.

Yes

SRA will not have a sufficient level of understanding of the alternative route into law. SRA is still very pro-privileged background

Yes

SRA will seek to minimise the status of CILEX lawyers in comparison to solicitors

Yes

SRA would need to change its name to reflect the increased remit. The ability of the SRA to provide the appropriate focus on CILEX frims.

Yes

Strongly disagree Such a move will not enhance the standing of legal executives and produce conflict Standards should be consistent.

Yes

That CILEX and ACCA Probate firms will lose their individuality. I have not seen enough explanation for how the SRA would recognise the different types of firm.

Yes

That is my view

The current regulatory board are best placed to continue. I believe that there is a danger that the issues already experienced will worsen if all in the hands of the SRA. It is the "Solicitors" regulation authority. Unless there is going to be a name change to Lawyers RA I believe things will be worse for us.

Yes

Yes The diversity enjoyed by the public will be truncated

Yes The implication of such a move is that CILEX members are not of a high enough standard of conduct and practice as the solicitors profession. CILEX have battled long and hard to get CILEX members to be deemed of the same standard as a solicitor. The message of this move would be that CILEX have failed its members.

Yes The legal services will increase in fee, and the consumers will be limited to the legal offers.

Yes The membership have shown already that they do not see this change as a priority, yet CILEX are now changing the goal posts to say that it is public interest and not members interests and opinions that matter. The SRA are only interested in FCILEX members and the legal executive route will become just another route to becoming a Solicitor.

Yes The move would be giving too much authority to one entity. Diversity and competition will help maintain better standards among the professions.

Yes The new titles demean those that remain at Chartered Legal Executives and make them second class to the new Chartered Lawyers title when many CLEs have years more experience.

Yes The only risk I can envisage is that members may decide to convert to solicitor status dependent on further exams.

Yes The potential detrimental effect relates only to equality in my view. How will CILEX/ACCA be views and treated by the SRA compared with their 'own' members

Yes the profession become subsumed

Yes The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who.

Yes Legal professionals and employers are unlikely to care - other than those employers or solicitors who already look down on Chartered Legal Executives are likely to look even less favourably on the more generic sounding "Chartered Lawyer".

Yes The public may not consider there to be equal standing and these entities may be seen as lesser than, unless the SOLICITORS regulation authority actively do something to prevent that

Yes The public may well consider ACCA members are lawyers. Why should a CILEX probate firm have to be regulated by the SRA when CILEX has a regulator.

Yes The quality of regulation is going to be worse. The SRA is not set up to regulate other professions and is very slow to change. CILEx lawyers and entities will become second class citizens, drowned out by the voices of solicitor members. SRA regulation is not the panacea you believe.

Yes The recent events involving the SRA and Axiom Ince Limited pose a risk with both consumer and professional confidence.

Yes The risk is that it may at the end lead to the SRA reaffirming the discrimination against cilex lawyers as compared to solicitors

Yes The risk is that my qualification of FCILEx is going to be demeaned because I will only be allowed to specialize in one area whereas a solicitor will still be able to be a generalist. Also the public will not understand why someone regulated by the SOLICITORS' Regulation Authority is not a solicitor - it will lead to confusion and ridicule.

Yes The SRA compensation fund is currently due to be greatly diminished due to the Axiom Ince fallout and members may be asked for a one off payment. Currently, CILEX authorised firms and members will be outside the SRA's remit.

Yes The SRA do not act as a valued regulator and should be disbanded

Yes The SRA do not want us; there is no provision to stop them from discontinuing with the CILEx route once transferred. The SRA will promote solicitors as superior. I and other legacy members will be required to undertake additional qualifications whether we want it or not, despite everything we have done already. The visual is that we need mummy and daddy to come save us because we cannot make it on our own. You are thorwing away everything we have done to achieve the rights and independence we have gained. I have worked in law for 30 years and am proud of what I have achieved in the non-conventional route. You are my membership body should be equally as proud and want to maintain that independence.

- Yes The SRA does not have a good reputation within the solicitors' industry. The well publicised failure of Axiom Ince and revelations that the SRA are unable to cover the huge loss of client money are unlikely to engender client confidence in their regulation. It has also been reported in the legal press that the SRA are now considering to raise the additional millions needed to cover the losses resulting in a regulatory failure from solicitors. If this is the approach then CILEX firms (which presumably are smaller than SRA regulated firms) are likely to be disproportionately affected by the financial penalties arising from regulatory failure.
- Yes The SRA is an oppressive and failing organisation. It has never driven standards for the solicitors profession or law firms. Consumers have no idea who they are or what they do and therefore it is self indulgent to pretend that they do. By moving to the SRA there will be tensions between the Law Society and CILEX, it is likely the Law Society will lobby to the detriment of CILEX as it will be perceived as an attempt to merge the two branches not least because the public will not surprisingly see anyone regulated but the SRA as a solicitor. Expect to see CILEX members becoming victims of vindictive SRA enquiries as larger organisations (metamorphosis/ axiom) are ignored as they fail at great expense to consumers and the profession. By way of example of the irrelevance of the SRA to the general public in fact £64 million appears to have been stolen from Axiom and yet the story has no leverage outside of the legal profession.
- Yes The SRA reputation with those they already regulate is not very good. CILEX lawyers may further be deemed as "less than" solicitors.
- Yes The SRA will need to clarify how they intend to cope with the additional demand of regulating several thousands of CILEX lawyers, and whether they will be asking for anything from those CILEX lawyers above and beyond what they require of solicitors, regulation-wise
- Yes The SRA won't have the resources to manage the extra work required
- Yes The transfer could be viewed as some as an indication that CILEX, as body, is no longer capable of regulating their members
- Yes The whole reason for opening the doors for CILEX regulated and ACCA probate firms was to widen the market for consumers, to allow us to work in different. modern and dynamic ways. to provide market competition and choice which will ultimately benefit the consumer. The damage to CILEX and ACCA probate firms has already been done by CILEX not supporting our regulation and giving the impression that it is not good enough. Everyone knows that this potential merger will mean the end of the CILEX brand and position in the legal profession. It is being instigated at the behest of those who are supposed to protect our brand and act in our best interests. The destruction of our profession is neither of those things.
- Yes there are a lot of concerned cilex members
- Yes that SRA will get rid of cilex altogether or not offer parity
- Yes There has been limited work on this. Limited information to members, and no clarity on the detail. CILEX has been an independent body from other regulations and this is the way it should stay.
- Yes There is a danger over time the SRA could take small steps to disadvantage cilex lawyers, to push all "lawyers" down the SQE route, no matter what they suggest / agree at the outset.
- Yes There is a possibility CILEX Lawyers could be overlooked by the SRA, in view of the number of Solicitors they already have on their "books". I also do not feel the SRA is as fair in its dealings as CILEX Regulation. Will the SRA protect (or have the time to protect) CILEX Lawyers in the same way as CILEX Regulation?
- Yes There is a risk of Cilex professionals and ACCA being viewed as inferior/less than their solicitor counterparts.
- Yes There is a risk that Cilex could in time lose its identity as the "non professional route" by mixing regulation with the SRA, some people may feel the social mobility element will be impacted.
- Yes There is a risk that those who obtain their practice rights through CILEX, will still be looked down upon compared to those who go through the SQE if the SRA will be the delegated regulator.
- Yes There is an obvious reduction in choice of regulator for legal services providers and a loss of independent identity of CLEs
- Yes There is no clear plan of how this will work following the move with a change in legislation being required.
- Yes There is no guarantee that the SRA will have our best interest in mind, will not restrict our growth and will create the perception we are 'cheaper' or 'inferior' SRA solicitors.
- Yes There is no positives as far as I can see. This is so frustrating and cilex are going to upset many many members if this happens

Yes There is the risk that CILEX and ACCA Probate firms are considered to be less prestigious than the traditional solicitor led run firms.

Yes There will always be loss and gain, it's a matter of finding an equitable balance

Yes There will always be risk and you will not please everyone. I am not in a CILEX or ACCA Probate firm so cannot comment.

Yes There will no doubt be new/different regs that these types of firms will have to work towards, which may currently be biased towards the solicitor model. This could put them at a disadvantage in the early stages at least.

Yes This process requires a competent approach from the SRA, needing clarity and transparency. I'm not confident in their ability to provide this

Yes This question as framed in the negative effect invites a critique of the SRA, which I am not qualified to give. This should be obvious, nobody is going to want to be a CLE, they will all be solicitors. Legal executives will cease to exist in a few years time if we are absorbed into the SRA. So much for being proud of there being a third string to the legal bow that we have been told all these years.

Yes This will lead to the depreciation of the CILEX lawyers and fellows, and move the professional status from equal to solicitors to lower legal assistants.

Yes timing is not appropriate.

Yes Unable to comment as do not know enough on the topic

Yes Unnecessary, it undermines Fellows and lead to unnecessary disruption.

Yes We are different. We will be swallowed whole by the SRA. They appear to have a very heavy handed approach to regulation, whereas cilex is more holistic.

Yes We as a body will lose our identity and control and I am far from satisfied this would be a good move for us.

Yes We lose our independence and Identity.

Yes We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We have been encouraged by Government in our development specifically to be a market place challenge. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it.

Yes We should stick to our own brand for the reasons outlined already. We are distinct to solicitors; we don't need SRA/law firms telling us that any more clearly and using that as a reason to treat us differently. BUILD OUR OWN ESTABLISHED BRAND

Yes We will be lost and treated as the lowest priority

Yes We will be lost in the numbers - the name itself 'Solicitors Regulation Authority' excludes us already please do not do this.

Yes We will loose our identity. The public spat has already made me loose confidence in my own qualification let alone what it has done to the general public. For the first time ever I have considered cross qualifying to be a solicitor not to achieve better rights but to no longer be involved in this.

Yes We will lose our identity and we will not have an independent voice. There will be no impetus to promote our cause while they champion the causes of solicitors over our needs leading to a conflict of interest.

Yes We will lose our independent regulator and get swallowed up by the SRA

Yes We will share a regular with solicitors and will there no longer be independent.

Yes What would be the point of CILEX lawyers if this was the case? The SRA already has Solicitor-Apprenticeship schemes and the SQE - why would it need CILEX lawyers as well?

Yes Why would anyone in their right minds want to willingly subject themselves to the SDT?

Yes Will SRA champion cilex as equal to solicitors

Yes Without a good marketing campaign there could continue to be an overall sense that CILEX qualified professionals are 'lesser' than solicitors, particularly if there is an easy direct comparison. It could leave CILEX professionals and firms being overlooked.

Yes Without doubt and if Cilex were to transfer to the SRA without the agreement of the majority of its members then it would lose the confidence of its members

Yes X

Yes yes

Yes Yes

Yes Yes Do not want to be regulated by SRA I want us to stay independent and proud to be different look at the mess sra are in with Axiom

Yes, we are too few, and will be swallowed up by a huge body, and then largely ignored. Our voices will not be heard amongst the 200,00 solicitors, only 7,000 of us. Not even 10%

Yes. CILEX members will always be treated as second class citizens as far as the SRA is concerned.

Yes. Риски они всегда есть в любой области работы, но компании и другие организации должны иметь с сотрудником компании или других организации о сохранении тайны и подписания в письменной форме о неразглашении. Есть закон, что в случае разглашения тайны компании и клиента в том числе преследуется по уголовной статье даже в любой стране.

Do you agree that regulation by the SRA provides opportunity to better empower consumers to make informed choices as to which regulated provider (individual lawyer or firm) can best meet their need?

Response	Please state reasons
Agree	.
Agree	.
Agree	A unified consolidated register of lawyers, indicating their route to qualification and their area(s) of specialism has to be gold standard.
Agree	Access to a legal professional
Agree	Again, it should help with both consistency and confidence.
Agree	agree
Agree	Agree
Agree	Agree with the statement.
Agree	All information regarding practitioners being in one place would be helpful.
Agree	as above
Agree	As above
Agree	As above.
Agree	Avoids confusion for consumers using different legal regulators
Agree	Being part of the SRA register would help the public search for CILEX firms or lawyers and read more about the specialism.
Agree	But the public may not consider there to be equal standing and these entities may be seen as lesser than, unless the SOLICITORS regulation authority actively do something to prevent that
Agree	By definition this will enhance consumer confidence.
Agree	CILEX lawyers needs will be better met with the SRA
Agree	Common sense.
Agree	Consistency in regulation would have a marginal benefit, although the same could be achieved by the STA keeping a register of CILEx Lawyers without a regulatory change.
Agree	Consumers will be able to access paralegals for conveyancing work and potentially incur lower fees as opposed to larger firms of solicitors.
Agree	For all the reasons mentioned
Agree	Freedom of choice
Agree	Gives consumers a better oversight into all lawyers/practitioners rather than just Solicitors
Agree	Has a good website where you can check lawyers and law firms. CILEX Paralegal Register introduction.
Agree	However a database is no substitution for specialised experience.
Agree	Having a single register where individuals are listed together should help to see they need not choose a lawyer based on qualification route.
Agree	Having members listed on the SRA register is clearly better for consumers who can then check that they are dealing with a qualified lawyer
Agree	However, it remains to be seen if clients would be that concerned as long as they get professional service good service irrespective of who the regulator
Agree	I agree with this proposal
Agree	I do agree with this statement.
Agree	I guess if the regulation is consistent then that won't be considered when making a choice as to whether the consumer uses an individual lawyer or firm. The SRA is more known than CILEx regulation
Agree	I suspect it will show a general consistency of regulation and remove questions of why there are different regulatory bodies.
Agree	I think it certainly helps where there has been in the past any uncertainty.
Agree	I think it is a possibility
Agree	I think there is a greater public awareness of the SRA and it has greater credibility.
Agree	Interesting to know how the find a lawyer search function will operate and how this differentiates between Chartered Legal Execs and Chartered Lawyers.
Agree	It is important since SRA is an independent Body which has experience and expertise in Probate issues and can only increase consumer confidence.
Agree	It makes the system simpler which is better for consumers.

Agree It provides consistency through one regulator (otherwise it might become necessary to compare regulators as well as service providers)

Agree It provides opportunity, but it may not actually improve the situation with regard to recognition of the expertise of CILEx qualified professionals.

Agree It removes elements of confusion. I personally would only wish to instruct a SRA regulated firm and I say that as a Fellow.

Agree It should give a directory that the public can look at to see who is who.

Agree It will at least put CILEx lawyers "on the map".

Agree It will level the playing field

Agree It would be preferable from a consumer pov to have all legal providers under one roof.

Agree It's a one stop shop. The consumer can look in one place and be assured that they are instructing the right legal professional who has met the required standard.

knowledge is power, though it could result in increased competition for work among legal professionals for business. The issue is, that people who know they have a small case and moderate resources may quickly decide and choose to patronize and obtain quality legal advice from a specialist individual solicitor, who is a legally regulated provider, instead of choosing a regulated solicitor firm, likely to charge huge costs for the delivery of the same service.

Agree Many clients may be biased to whether or not somebody is regulated by the SRA. The bias would be removed meaning a Lawyer/Solicitor would be chosen on fair principles.

Agree neither agree or disagree

Agree Neither disagree or agree. Yet to see how this will work in practice.

Agree No for the reasons stated above.

Agree Nothing to add.

Agree Opportunity of choice from one central database

Agree People want to use minimal calories when looking for a service - they are very unlikely in my opinion to check more than one location when looking for that service.

Agree Possibly - allows the opportunity to educate consumers and also within the industry about what CILEX professionals can do.

Agree Same as above

Agree see above

Agree should provide a list of all lawyers

Agree Simpler

Agree SRA is already set up in a way which allows consumers to make informed choices and therefore as Cilex members under this umbrella we would gain benefit from this.

Agree Subject to 18 above.

Agree Subject to how the register will present the information

Agree The more diverse the regulated marketplace, the better for consumers.

Agree

Agree The price structure will still depend on experience of lawyers which will suit the public spending

Agree There is more public confidence and recognition in SRA - it provides an established credence to those of us who are qualified via Cilex.

Agree There would need to be a clear understanding that we either follow the CILEX code or the SRA code of conduct

Agree To some extent.

Agree When looking for a specific area of practice the general public are likely to only search the SRA database and if CILEX fellows and lawyers are also included in this list it will increase consumer confidence in that professional.

Agree When searching for a lawyer, often clients will use the SRA database to identify suitable representation. It is important that CILEX professionals are listed also, so that the public can make informed decisions and we are not overlooked.

Agree Yes

Agree Yes but only if all lawyers/firms are listed together in a single database

Agree Yes, for reasons already mentioned, I think for the consumer, one single regulatory is inherently easier to comprehend.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Disagree .

Disagree .
Disagree .
Disagree .
Disagree .
Disagree .
Disagree .
Disagree .

Disagree =I am not sure what is meant by the question. Obviously fewer regulatory bodies provide less 'choice' but why do consumers need a choice of regulator for providers of legal services, providing that the SRA 'has teeth' and is sufficiently broad based in lawyer/law firm disciplines?

Disagree a

A consumer will not have a clue. They will approach a firm of Solicitors and hope that the lawyer assigned to the case regardless of their status does a good job.

Disagree

CILEX need to bury the hatchet with our regulator here and support the membership who are largely opposed to these changes.

Disagree above

Disagree

Again, I don't think the consumer cares. To them, lawyers are lawyers regardless of regulator.

Disagree

Again, it is not required. What is needed is better collaboration with the current regulators to promote both CLE's and Solicitors.

Disagree

Answer is i don't know

Disagree

Any good regulator could achieve that objective.

Disagree

As 24

Disagree

As 27

Disagree

as above

Disagree

as above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above

Disagree

As above- SRA already regulate most law firms were Chartered Legal Executives work.

Disagree As above, creating a monopoly will disempower consumers. There will be no informed choice because there will be no competition. It is competition and the existence of an alternative viable independent regulator (e.g. CILEX Regulation) that enables the consumer to gain information from outside of the SRA.

Disagree

As above, we can have consistency without the need to pass over the responsibility

Disagree

As above.

Disagree

As above.

Disagree

As above.

Disagree

Cause confusion

Disagree CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree

CILEX Regulation can achieve this.

Disagree

Cilex regulation is as clear and transparent.

Disagree

Clients do not care whether their adviser is regulated by the SRA or CRL. This is a nonsense. It would be interesting to see how many clients pick their advisers with this criteria

Disagree

Clients do not contact SRA for lawyers.

Disagree

Clients do not look into who regulates a lawyer or firm when making their decision about who to instruct.

Disagree

Clients dont care. They just want to know that their work is being done correctly.

Disagree

Consumers can make informed decisions of their own whether to use a particular firm regardless of a regulator

Disagree consumers can still make informed choices as to who they wish to use

Disagree Consumers do not really check who is regulating. They just want their case to be carried out by a qualified lawyer and therefore, clarification as to what CILEX means is far more important. The public are generally unaware that we are qualified lawyers so the focus should be in educating the public and not changing from CRL to SRA. The status quo should remain.

Disagree Consumers mostly do not understand these issues. They are not shopping for legal advice based on their lawyers regulator

Disagree Consumers usually instruct Lawyers on the basis of "word of mouth" of cost, and, whilst Estate Agents are still given far too much power and leeway, I doubt that having my name on the SRA website will be any different to having it on the CILEX Regulation website.

Disagree Consumers will still not know the difference between CILEX and Solicitor, this change will make no difference. Most consumers have no more idea of who the SRA are than they do CILEX

Disagree current terms 'solicitor' and 'legal executive' better describe relationship between the consumer and legal professional. Adopting the generic term 'lawyer' whilst tasking the SRA to with regulatory oversight is very likely to lead to confusion not clarity and thus a lessening of consumer choice and confidence.

Disagree disagree

Disagree Distinction between Cilex regulation and SRA regulation won't much concern the client

Disagree Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Disagree Don't believe consumers look at who we're regulated by before appointing us

Disagree Educating the public by way of advertising would help with that, but given that most of my clients struggle to understand the concept of alternative dispute resolution, or out of court options, I don't see how CILEx being regulated by the SRA is going to help them better understand their choice of individual or firm representative. Generally, the public just want to know that the person is qualified to do the job. CILEx should be able to market its membership to make this position clear.

Disagree For the reasons stated above.

Disagree Freedom of choice will be removed

Disagree How can there be an informed choice if the choices are more limited, by using fewer bodies to regulate legal services work?

Disagree How could it possibly? This is nonsense.

Disagree How would the SRA go this?

Disagree I

Disagree I am not sure it does to be honest. In my view there is a complete lack of awareness here for members of the public which requires considerable re education and public information for them to understand the value of this. The SRA I would say are in a better position to provide this but whether they will remains to be seen

Disagree I am of the view that any consumer wishing to make an informed choice could find this information even if we remained with CLR.

Disagree I cannot see how being regulated by the SRA would do this.

Disagree I cannot see why regulation by the SRA would provide such opportunity.

Disagree I do not believe it will

Disagree I do not have enough clarity that this move is within our best interests to answer this question.

Disagree I do not know enough about how consumers make their choices to be able to answer "agree".

Disagree I do not see any persuasive evidence for the assertion contained in the question in the consultation.

Disagree I do not think it helps which is a better choice

Disagree I do not think this will matter to consumers.

Disagree I don't think it makes any difference in practice

Disagree I don't believe it would make any difference to consumers but it will make a huge (and negative) difference to CILEx lawyers.

Disagree I don't believe that there would be any change in consumer confidence at all.

Disagree I don't believe whatever regulation assists consumers to make informed choices. Their choice of lawyer or firm will be decided on other factors

Disagree I dont see how this is a natural fit for improving choice.

Disagree I don't see that it provides any better choice than there is now
I don't think it makes any difference. I think the consumer will make their decision as to which avenue meets their needs based on things other than the regulator of the firm or individual. However if the regulator is a deciding factor (and one might question the motivation behind that), then I hardly think the SRA is a shining beacon which will sway a consumer's choice.

Disagree I don't think that this automatically follows.

Disagree I don't think the consumer will care

Disagree I don't think these sort of changes will empower the consumer. I think consumers will remain confused.

Disagree I doubt many people look at the accreditations of the law firm they instruct.
I have never had a client research who I am regulated by before deciding if they want to instruct the firm I work for, in 20 years.

Disagree I just disagree with that statement.

Disagree I suspect it won't be a real life consideration

Disagree I think CILEx regulation do the same thing for Cilex members

Disagree I think consumers will be even more confused.
I think that people would not understand the distinction still between CILEX and SRA lawyer and would still be swayed by what they know

Disagree I think this will be a bad move for CILEx and the SRA will soon find ways of going back on promises. Clients do not choose a firm or individual on the basis of who regulates them. They choose on reputation, cost and who they can relate to.

Disagree I vehemently and whole heartedly disagree with the proposal for the SRA to take over regulation of cilex lawyers

Disagree I want to stay independent see above
If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.

Disagree Insufficient information to know

Disagree It generally isn't a consideration for users of legal services.

Disagree It is for CILEx to better empower consumers rather than "passing the buck" to another regulator.

Disagree It is not an immediate concern of consumers when making choices

Disagree It makes no difference what so ever

Disagree It seems unlikely that consumers base choice on the regulatory body involved rather than the service they receive, cost and or recommendation.

Disagree It should not make any difference.
It will make no difference to the empowerment of consumers at all.

Disagree Consumers (clients) do not chose their legal representation based on the regulator but the qulaity of firm or individual.
It will remove choices because it will become a "melting pot" of assimilation in terms of diversity all funnelled through the SRA

Disagree It would rather brings confusion as they will not be sure whether the person is a solicitor or a cilex law.
I've never had a client base their decision to instruct me on this basis and neither have my colleagues. Clients instruct based on price or recommendation - they don't even consider if a firm's regulated, let alone search for representation on that basis.

Disagree Less focussed and interested view of Cilex persons by SRA, which has been wholly interested in solicitors to date.

Disagree Lumps us all in together

Disagree Members of the public look at the skills and expertise of a professional and reviews of work done by such individuals before deciding who should do their work.

Disagree Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.

Disagree Monopolization from SRA.

Most consumers ask around, they dont go on trip advisor for lawyers to find one. In 18 years I have never had someone say they find me via SRA or Cilex (when we used to publish lists) It is often, by recommendation, or by chance, advertising etc. Yes we look on the net, but have never been told "I picked you off the CILEx website etc

Disagree

Most firms are SRA regulated anyway. I am yet to come across a consumer who chooses their lawyer rather than the regulated firm they wish to represent them.

Disagree

Multi regulators give better choice

Disagree

n

Disagree

N/A

Disagree

N/A

Disagree

No

no comment- consumers will tend to choose and being regulated by CILEX or SRA will have not effect their needs

Disagree

No further comments

Disagree

No- that is simply a statement- I dont believe that consumers make choices in that way but even if they did they may want the benefit of double regulators looking at an individual and the firm- twice the potential protection.

Disagree

No this will just confuse them.

Disagree

No, because it is still emphasising the myth, that only Solicitors are capable of dealing with legal work

Disagree

No, no matter how many times you spin it, the answer will always be no.

Disagree

No, this is not a consideration to an average consumer.

Disagree

No. CILEX can and does provide that without the SRA - parity and equality is the key.

Disagree

No. No more so than CRL

Disagree

No. You ask that question as though there is only one option and that is not a reasonable thing for a professional body to do.

Disagree

Not necessarily

Disagree

Not necessarily

Disagree

Not really.

Disagree

Not sure the public who the regulator is so long as we are properly regulated

Disagree

Not sure what this is

Obviously not! It is actively reducing choice by making a source of regulated providers extinct. No one can sensibly see the removal of an option as 'increasing' choice!

Disagree

On the face of it I disagree but it is hard to be definitive without understanding the inner workings of the SRA.

Disagree

People chose people and fi rm reputation. The qualification means less than you think.

Disagree

Previous answer.

Disagree

Quite the opposite - it takes away consumer choice

Disagree

Same answers as previously. I do not know in which way it is thought that consumers will be "better empowered by a change.

Disagree

Same as above

Disagree

Same reasons as the answer in 18 above

Disagree

See 16 above.

Disagree

See above

Disagree

see above

Disagree

See above

Disagree

See above 19 -28.

Disagree

See above answers

Disagree

See above answers.

Disagree

see earlier comments the public don't know the difference

Disagree

See my comments above.

Disagree

See previous

Disagree

See previous answers.

Disagree

See previous answers.

Disagree

See previous comments

Disagree

Sra are not credible

Disagree SRA are way out of touch with realty and embody an institutionalized body not fit for today climate

Disagree SRA will seek to minimise the status of CILEX lawyers in comparison to solicitors and may limit CILEX ability to communicate that

Disagree Surely any disciplinary action by the CILEx Regulator could be listed with the SRA, especially if both organisations had adopted the same standards. A central Register would achieve that.

Disagree That is my view

Disagree That suggests that we cant now. Fight our own corner not be merging with an organisation that regulates our potential direct competitors. You aren't really selling our brand at all.

Disagree The average consumer has no idea about who regulates firms and how. The proliferation of firms like Premier Property Lawyers, O'Neill Patient and Taylor Rose is a clear demonstration of this. Most consumers use these firms because they are cheap - they consider them solicitors whether they are regulated by the SRA or CLC and have little knowledge or understanding of the level of qualifications or regulation that the staff or firms have.

Disagree The consumer should be allowed to choose between the different organisations.

Disagree The identity of the regulator is not relevant to this question in practice.

Disagree The majority of consumers simply have no understanding of the regulators or the nuance or distinctions that apply. As most cilex professionals practice in SRA regulated firms, it would change very little.

Disagree The only benefit is that the SRA is a well known brand. If CILEx / CILEx Regulation become far more visible the public will understand the benefit of going to a CILEx regulated lawyer as opposed to an SRA regulated Solicitor.

Disagree The public are likely to be confused as to why the SOLICITORS regulatory authority is regulating legal professionals who are fully qualified but not solicitors. The majority of the public are not aware of the name of the SRA or any other regulatory body. The only thing that the public care about is that professionals are regulated - not by who.

Disagree In addition, almost all clients go to a local recommended firm, or shop for the best price online.

Disagree The public do not have any interest in our regulator when choosing a lawyer.

Disagree The public have little interest or knowledge of regulatory bodies.

Disagree The public make their own minds up, the name of the regulator makes no difference. The only thing the SRA makes available to the public is the opportunity to complain!

Disagree The public will not really care about the distinction.

Disagree The question is unbelievably naive. SRA regulation does not or would not empower consumers or enable informed choices. They chose their solicitors from adverts or the internet or support organisations or recommendations. It is simply not the case that a consumer would be empowered by the regulator chosen to make informed choices. Anyone who thinks as much is simply not living in the real world.

Disagree The SRA have not been clear on matters such as training providers for the sqe. I don't see any reason they would be better in regards to processes such as these.

Disagree The thrust of both the Woolf Report on Access to Justice and the Jackson Report on Civil Litigatio Costs was that litigation was too expensive and the reforms following those reports squeezed foims and was supposed to create a cheaper landscape for clients. And that is what the public wants - legal services as economically as possible. The public cares about the final bill, not who regulates the lawyer. We should not be too keen to align ourselves with solicitors as we are the market place challenge to them. We have been encouraged by Government in our development specifically to be a market place challenge. We should be establishing and enhancing our independence from the status quo, not rushing to join it. I have no problem with the SRA per se, but I disagree with the question suggestion. Let us get on with providing proper competition as the priority.

Disagree The vast majority of consumers have no idea of the oversight system within the profession and probably care still less. The question is thus misplaced.

Disagree There is a clear distinction between a solicitor and CILEX and this should be maintained

Disagree There is no evidence that consumers are unhappy or want change.

Disagree There is no evidence to suggest this would be the case. Most lay people would not know any different between CILEx and the SRA.

Disagree There is no evidence to support this.

Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Disagree There should be an industry register of lawyers. One resource fed by regulators. The SRA model won't include the other types of lawyers so it's still not comprehensive.

Disagree There will be less distinction and less options. CILEX are specialist lawyers and should have a specialist regulator.

Disagree There would be too much information and more confusion

Disagree They can check everyone out adequately enough now.

Disagree They do not make this decision now and never will, they approach a law firm they find online, they make an enquiry and speak to a member of the team who is either CILEX or Solicitor and they make an assessment of the costs they are going to incur and whether they are going to be successful in whatever they are attempting to do. They are not concerned with who we are regulated by.

Disagree They don't know the difference between solicitors and licenced conveyancers, they are simply not concerned.

Disagree They have not had much difficulty so far and some find it preferable to deal with a Cilex lawyer.

Disagree They have the choice now and many are simply unaware of the differences. Being one regulator will not change anything, it just means we are the minority in a massive group

Disagree They have this opportunity already.

Disagree This can be achieved without changing regulators

Disagree This is not necessarily true

Disagree This will confuse the public as to why SRA regulates a completely different kind of professionals. In the eyes of the public CILEX will be reduced to a fancy name for legal assistants/paralegals.

Disagree This will reduce the number of regulators not increase them so how can it provided more choice to the consumer?

Disagree We dont want to be regulated by the SRA, but keep going if you must.

Disagree Who knows what then SRA do as a member of public

Disagree Why chose a CILEX lawyer over a solicitor when the regulator will be called the SRA. There is no indication that the two will be on an equal footing under regulation by the SRA

Disagree Why is nether agree nor disagree not an option? Possibly, but I doubt it's a major consideration.

Disagree Why would it?

Disagree why would it? CILEX regulate their members presently. Consumers just want to know they have recourse - they are not bothered it is the SRA or CILEX

Disagree Why would it? Where is the evidence to suggest that consumers/clients will only have informed choice if regulated by the SRA?

Disagree Why would the SRA provide this? CILEX is and should continue to be seen as independent and a better path to the legal sector. If this happens i will be removing myself from CILEX as the SRA cannot and will not be trusted.

Disagree X

Disagree You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here.

Disagree Your own reputation from your case load and partner/other established lawyers/networks is what empowers a consumer to make such choices.

Please specify

.
. .
.

A single regulator for two branches of the legal profession reduces choice. You may as well abolish the LSB and have a single entity regulate the whole profession, including the bar.

Again as stated above, a lot of CILEX members do want to be regulated by the SRA as from my experience they can be a barrier in themselves.

All firms face the same barriers to entry if under one regulator - freedom of choice disappears completely.

Any barriers must be set aside

As above

As above

As above

As above

As above.

As above. Creating any kind of monopoly of regulation would remove competition, which would also decrease quality and innovation.

As previously set.

As stated above Solicitors, if they don't already, are likely to view their qualification as more important.

Attacks the independence of Chartered Legal Executives.

By having one regulatory body there is no incentive for innovation as there is only one "choice" for prospective lawyers.

By its very nature, a monopoly of regulations reduces competition and doesn't promote innovation by either regulator or those who are regulated

CILEX already has an independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it won't make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Cilex and solicitors would all have the same regulator. I have no doubt that the SRA would not act in the interests of Cilex members as they regulate solicitors who a) see us as competition and b) in many cases, do not see Cilex as equals either.

Cilex and the SRA have different routes into the profession. Therefore there is likely going to be barriers imposed by changing everyone to one regulator as this will, in turn, limit the routes to qualify.

CILEX members are better off being regulated by CRL and being independent from SRA and solicitors.

CILEX members are not solicitors, so should not be regulated by the SRA. I consider this would take something away from CILEX's unique status, and have a detrimental effect on the efforts made to ensure CILEX Lawyers have parity with solicitors. If lawyers that are not solicitors are regulated by the SRA, there would exist an implicit assumption that they are not the same, as they do not hold the title that is encapsulated in the S of SRA. This could lead to the public and others viewing them as subordinate to solicitors.

CILEX might as well not exist if regulation is merging competition and disagreement from solicitors who do not want cilex to join them

Competition in conveyancing is already rife due to the number of 'factory' style firms already in existence. This has not led to an increase in the quality of service.

Consolidation of the legal market to less regulators could hinder competition and result in CILEX members being in a worse position, with increased membership fees and being less independent due to sharing a regulator. The solicitor membership of the SRA could hinder progressing of CILEX Lawyers given its membership size in comparison and block reforms which would benefit CILEX Lawyers.

CRL is better placed than the SRA to fight for greater parity between CILEx lawyers and solicitors. The SRA will potentially be faced with resistance from solicitors for greater parity between the different lawyer categories.

The SRA will be very unlikely to support CILEx lawyers over solicitors.

Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Expect so .

Firms will only take up their internal trainees, so external trainees wishing to apply find it more competitive.

For the reasons stated above in 27.

Giving the SRA a monopoly on regulation will reduce freedom within the legal market. The decisions of the SRA can be questionable and controversial, as noted with the SQE changes

Having a direct easy comparison to solicitors may cause a disservice to CILEx qualified professionals, particularly when it is seen that there are more women CILEx professionals. It could potentially exacerbate the existing misogyny within the legal profession.

How could anyone possibly answer this question?

How is there increased competition if we are all being put under the same banner? As the SRA are not very effective as evidenced by Axiom, quality must surely be in question with them right now. If everyone is placed together, competition stifles and innovation dwindles. This is not a good move for your membership or the public.

I

I am concerned that CILEx qualified people will come second best against solicitors. This is a stigma that we have been trying to erase for several years. To undo this work would be prejudicial for its members.

I am not certain that giving up our professional independence will assist us in delivering a great legal service to our clients.

I do not believe it will provide increased competition, quality and innovation in legal services.

I do not have enough clarity that this move is within our best interests to answer differently at the moment.

I do not know in circumstances where I have not been given any research undertaken by CILEX.

I don't actually know but there was no option for this reply.

I don't know

I don't think regulation by the SRA will remove any of these barriers. Innovation comes from having more than one voice in the market place.

I don't think this question is worded fairly.

I have answered "Yes" only because I find the wording of the question rather odd, given that on a broad brush basis, the proposal to change to the SRA seems to be based on Legal Execs having parity with solicitors, in so far as consumers' interests are concerned, so why would there be barriers in competition, quality etc.

I have no faith in the SRA as far as CILEx is concerned and I do not feel they want us to be seen as equals to solicitors. I feel we will soon be seen as a tier below rather than one of the three types of lawyers along with barristers and solicitors. We need to stay independent.

I would rather be a general or
Commissioned Officer of a small army than a light infantry in a bigger one.

CILEx needs to improve its access for CILEx Lawyers enabling Lawyers to more easily set up firms with PII (i.e. A
Lawyers Mutual Indemnity Fund) without amalgamation with the SRA

If CILEx needs help and support from more established players go to The Bar for guidance but don't water down
your core values and principles to a bigger and badder wolf
If outdated views of CILEX lawyers remain, it could stunt the progression of CILEX lawyers and their career
paths.
If we are all under the SRA then they would be in control and there would be no competition etc.

In my gut, less people will qualify with CILEx shutting out a large number of people from the profession
Innovation will be lost.
Insofar as competition is contemplated, there is less resource available to most CILEX members
Insufficient information to know
Insurance

It completely undermines the notion that we are already equal.
It creates a deepened divide in terms of solicitors and their perception of cilex as second class lawyers. It is
inevitable there will be a tiered system of lawyer created and it will damage those who are Chartered and
studying to be chartered. Please do not do this.
It fails to acknowledge that CLEs are different.

It is not clear that the SRA has ever driven quality or innovation. It appears not to push quality but rather
operates a light touch and focuses on punishment but not avoidance of issues. The CILEX CPD requirements are
more onerous than SRA has historically required and accordingly quality seems likely to diminish.
It may end up with consumers demanding solicitors do the work rather than CILEX members
It seems likely that Cilex will lose its individual identity.
It stands to reason that an entity with few people to oversee, will have more time to attend to the needs of
those few. An entity, which already oversees a vast number, will no doubt be limited in time and capacity to
oversee yet more persons.

It will validate the current lack of effort by CILEx to look for innovation in legal services. CILEx should be finding
ways to expand the network of CILEX regulated firms.

The lack of affordable Professional Indemnity Insurance of professional business support for our members is a
disgrace to the notion of empowering choice and competition and a travesty to inclusion and diversity.

It's going to take some time
It's unclear at this stage
I've said 'Yes' because I don't know the answer to this.
lack of confidence from the consumer and CILEx members as CILEX cannot maintain its working relationship
with the current regulator (CRL delivering the same services as SRA) therefore longevity with the new regulator
is questionable
Lack of independence.
Less focussed and interested view of Cilex persons by SRA, which has been wholly interested in solicitors to
date.
Lesser equality and fairness
Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.
n
No

no competition and then it becomes a monopoly which the SRA is eager, in my view, to attain, which is not good for the public. They are already seen as monopoly, cartel and implying restrictive practice.

No further comments

Not sure I understand the question

People who have qualified through LPC route will no doubt be given preference

Potentially but low risk as long as the SRA are fair in their view of CILEX and Solicitors and treat the same equally and with fairness

Potentially yes. For CILEX lawyers to flourish we need to be able to form our own entities without the involvement of a solicitor. Until that happens we will always be de facto second class citizens. If we are subsumed into the SRA it is quite feasible that this would become more difficult to achieve

Probably. You work it out.

Regulation by the SRA is costly, very time consuming and prevents solicitors now from competing with other types of professional firms. You will be committing your members to that.

Regulation by the SRA.

Same reasons as the answer in 18 above

See above

See above answers.

See earlier comments - CILEX will be swallowed up/lose its identity if it becomes regulated by the SRA

See previous answer.

See previous answers - I believe regulation by the SRA is not appropriate it will not improve quality certainly separate regulators will make the distinction

Solicitor attitudes & prejudice in workplace

SRA is not a fair and independent department unlike CILEX. They allow money to talk.

SRA is slow

SRA will seek to minimise the status of CILEX lawyers in comparison to solicitors and may limit CILEX ability to communicate that

Surely it is obvious that if the SRA have a monopoly and start abusing that power then having a viable independent alternative is a vital check and balance for the legal industry.

The Cilex brand will die out and get lost in the SRA it will muddy the waters for the public and be harder for them to distinguish between who we are and what we do and that of a Solicitor

The great danger is that the two branches of the profession will be seen to be synonymous instead of providing different types of services.

The independence of Cilex will be watered down to simply become a sub branch of solicitors.

The legal profession still lacks true diversity and innovation generally.

The main barrier is for the public to give credence to a Legal Executive over a solicitor which will be hard if the SRA regulate both professions.

The members of the sra are much less diverse than cilex. Lack of diversity has an impact on all of these issues
The public may not consider there to be equal standing and these entities may be seen as lesser than, unless the SOLICITORS regulation authority actively do something to prevent that

The reputational and financial costs of this move

The route to qualify is complex

The same regulator will prevent any competition. CLC can compete because they are separated in status and regulation. IF SRA regulates CILEx, there will be no difference for the public. Solicitors are more known brand and will dominate.

The SRA are likely to favour Solicitors and Solicitor led entities whether they change their name or not.

The SRA has consistently implemented a system that promotes inequality in so far as legal professionals are concerned. It doesn't prioritise increased competition.

The SRA lack of ability to respond to correspondence either by phone, postal or electronic communications.

The SRA rules are excessive. They should be simplified, a job CRL is ideally situated to do. If we are regulated by SRA we will be stifled and unable to develop our own regulation. What should actually be considered is why we have so few complaints through CRL compared to SRA and build on that.

The SRA will need to ensure that CILEX lawyers are not presented in a 'lesser' way than solicitors.

the SRA's own guidelines which are vague and do not give clear guidance

The SRA's primary interest is in the regulation of solicitors and solicitor's firms. Moving CILEX members regulation to the SRA risks their being swallowed up and lost within that. I very much doubt, whatever is said, that the SRA really has any great interest in preserving the identity of CILEX members

The unique position of Cilex will be diminished as there is no real reason to maintain regulation by two separate regimes from the same regulator. I am unclear on what this means in practice.

There barriers and none appears to have been addressed

There can be no increased competition because all CILEx members in Solicitors firms cannot compete anyway and regulated law firms under the same banner, will mean that CILEx law firms as a majority will be insignificant and no competition at all. At least with the current separate regulation CILEx firms are able to compete with their specialist badge and specialist regulator who focuses on the needs of the specialist lawyer brand.

There is no alternative route into qualification. SRA do not encourage and support and nurture their regulated practices, CILEX firms are usually very small firms which do not fit the SRA model. You will prevent legal executives from having an opportunity to run their own firm independent of a solicitor. CILEX lawyers are innovative because we come from different backgrounds to traditional lawyers. How can there be competition if everyone has to do things in the same way?

There is nothing in the consultation that persuades me of the validity of this question.

there is still a difference in title and perceived status between solicitors and cilex legal executives

There will be no competition as CILEX member needs will take a back seat!

There will be one less regulator in an already small market - it will reduce competition among regulators. The SRA is constantly playing catch up with developments in the industry and the rate of change is slower than CILEx Regulation.

They are a little too stuffy and slow to support innovation and new ways of doing things.

They are not an effective regulator and don't serve consumers well.

This is inevitable if you reduce the number of regulators and with CLC challenges currently there is a risk that there will ultimately only be one. As long as that is well run then I do not see this necessarily as an issue but SRA are not exactly pro active

This is not a yes no answer.

This move will not increase competition, it restricts it. It is not clear how the SRA could effectively promote both Solicitors and CLE's in a fair way to encourage diversity in the legal sector.

This should be "I don't know" as I don't feel I can answer the question.

Those regulated by the SRA frequently publicly express that it is a heavy handed body which does not value quality

Two tier as above.

Unknown known barriers

Variety of regulation routes will enhance competition

Wasn't the whole idea of an ABS to allow the likes of CILEX lawyers the opportunity to open their own businesses? The innovation, quality and competition is already there, why is the SRA regulation of CILEX going to make things better for CILEX lawyers?

We don't want to be regulated by the SRA. Put it to a binding members vote, then resign.

We just become another part of an already big bureaucracy. Independence is difference.

We will become poor man's solicitors, easily identifiable.

We will continue to see no practical distinction between the qualifications. Despite this CILEX professionals will be forced to take additional qualifications and still be underpaid and undervalued in comparison to solicitor peers regardless of performance or experience.

What are the costs of the move? Who will burden this cost?

What will happen to regulated firms run by CILEX lawyers? Greater costs? Greater admin burden? Self-defeating in my view.

Whatever the SRA promises to us it will remain protectionist in regulating its key audience i.e., solicitors. CILEX members will be a distant and probably unheard voice if regulated by the SRA.

Where is the evidence there will be increased competition, quality and innovation in legal services by being regulated by the SRA. Your consultation fails to evidence this.

Whilst I agree that there should be a change of mindset in the legal industry, again I consider that now is not the time.

Who is their right minds would want to willingly subject themselves to the SRA?

Why do we need increased competition? Quality and innovation in legal services will not change.

X

yes

Yes

Yes - Fellows would lose their identity in the market place, we need to be different and unique to compete for a shrinking market place. We can do work better and more cost effective rather than fat cat solicitors

Yes but I don't have an answer to this because I don't have a crystal ball

Yes obviously. The stated goal of the SRA is to align regulation of CILEX etc. with their processes for solicitors.

There is an obvious (and deliberate) reduction in choice of regulators which necessarily reduces the scope for competition and innovation.

Yes possible conflict

Yes SRA stands for solicitors regulatory authority. CILEX members are not solicitors. Do we lose something by not having about that represents us as a unique form of lawyer

Yes the SRA will potentially stifle progress of CILEX.

Yes there could be if the SRA as the name implies relates only to solicitors.

Yes, All quoted within your question actually!

Yes, because historically Solicitors due to their broad areas of specialism are regarded more superior to FCILEX Lawyers

Yes, I believe that Chartered Lawyers and Paralegals will not benefit from regulation by the SRA as there is no general understanding or appreciation of these qualifications. I believe that Chartered Lawyers will find it more difficult to find in-house work, as that usually requires a generalist approach, rather than a specialised one, it will therefore create a monopoly where only SRA trained solicitors will be able to access that market. Equally, when it comes to Chartered Paralegals, it seems unlikely that they will be able to access the in-house market, as employers are more likely to contract non-CILEX paralegals who they can churn more easily, as they are passing through on their way to qualification.

Yes, the potential to further distinguish routes to professionalism and by doing this further discriminate between the CILEX route and the SRA [Solicitor] route.

Yes, we as in CILEX will disappear within 10 years if it goes ahead. As few will see any benefit in joining CILEX. You are, and have been for too long focussing on trainees, and not the qualifieds. So less choice, less innovation not more.

Yes, why would anyone choose CILEX over solicitor if both regulated by SRA. Nonsense

Если некоторые компании некачественно работают ,то клиент сам решает в какую компанию он может обратиться ,но при этом предварительно прочитает отзывы все о том компании куда клиент обратился и о других компаниях где возможно дешевле будет выполнена условия клиента и качественно.

Do you agree that regulation by the SRA will support the equal treatment and recognition of legal professionals regardless of route to qualification and provide equality of opportunity for individual practitioners and entities?

Response Please state reasons

Agree Absolutely

Agree absolutely

Absolutely. I do think you need to address the conversion of those on legacy qualifications (such as myself) very promptly. Ideally the majority would move to a Chartered Lawyer status within 12 months.

The barriers to this will be cost and time required to provide the necessary evidence. As set out before could be a creative solution by de-coupling litigation rights and rights of audience.

Agree This could be achieved without changing the proposed naming model and at speed.

Agree, but with the caveat that the SRA will need to have a full understanding of how CILEX qualifications work and the difference in the traditional solicitor qualification route v the CILEX route.

Agree as above

Agree As above.

Agree As long as the individual has the legal qualifications and/or experience, there should be equal treatment and recognition of legal qualifications.

Agree As long as there is checks and balances and are put in place, and we do not become absorbed into a large regulator with minimal support

Agree At present CILEx can still be seen as lesser and holding us to the same standard as solicitors will hopefully address this

Agree But as above as long as the SRA treat both equally and fairly and support them equally and recognise them as being equal

Agree But, there is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Agree By definition this will be so.

Agree Consistency

Agree Equality between solicitors and cilex members is long overdue

Agree Everybody would be working to the same standards.

Agree Everyone will be judged by the same criteria

Agree Except for the academic limitations for some as described above.

Agree Fairer

Agree Having the same regulator can make it more even between CILEX and solicitors

Agree Hope so

Agree hopefully if they are all under one roof

Agree Hopefully they are up on the value of diversity and life experience in good lawyers

Agree I agree that it can support equal treatment however until this has been put in place, its questionable whether this will happen in practice.

Agree I agree, but only if equal treatment by employers is mandated and reported on by the SRA, otherwise, the only route to equal treatment is via admittance of all CILEX Lawyers as solicitors.

Agree I am of the belief that SRA would not deliberately do anything to sabotage or hinder the progress and recognition of its CILEX members.

Agree I believe SRA as an established entity know how to manage this.

Agree I believe that the SRA is fair and abide by equal opportunity and diversity.

Agree I believe the SRA unlike the Law Society supports our members and is interested in providing a fair playing field across the legal profession. Parity and Equality are important to our members and I believe we have more chance of that if SRA regulated

Agree I do think there is not complete equality between Solicitors and Lawyers. I believe that if we are all regulated by the SRA it will help close this gap.

Agree I feel as though some old school solicitors look down on legal execs and it may help bridge the gap and give legal execs better recognition.

I have concerns that regulation by the Solicitors Regulation Authority could go one of two ways:

1. People see us as equals - which would be great.

Agree 2. People think we are regulated by solicitors and therefore inferior.

Agree I hope so but it shouldn't be taken for granted.

Agree I hope so but there is still an ignorance with regards to CILEX

Agree I hope that this will truly allow CILEx members to be seen alongside solicitors, and their employers having to recognise this.

I strongly believe that both my salary and my progression at a private law firm have been impeded by the attitude that CILEX lawyers are not as valuable as solicitors. I have encountered endless extremely average solicitors who progress smoothly through the ranks without the battle to prove your worth that CILEX lawyers have. I have even heard of 2 big law firms that say they don't recognise the CILEX qualification and will only pay CILEX lawyers as paralegals. If CILEX lawyers are regulated by the SRA, this type of attitude will be harder to maintain.

Agree

I suspect this would be the case - although time will tell.

Agree

I think it is the only way to support equal treatment and recognition.

Agree

I would hope so - the consultation seems to suggest that the SRA has undertaken to do so.

Agree

I would hope so.

Agree

I would hope that they would.

Agree

if they take on CILEX then yes, CILEX members should be treated equally.

Agree

I'm not so blinkered to think this would happen over night but long term I think this will close the gap on draconian attitudes that solicitors are in same way superior to CILEX's/CILEX Lawyers purely because of their route to qualification.

Agree

In theory it should do

Agree

Independent regulation and economies of scale will enhance equality of opportunities

Agree

It depends on how the SRA acknowledges CEL Lawyers. Far too early to say.

Agree

It is hoped that the provision of equality of opportunity for individual practitioners will provide CILEX members seeking judicial appointment with opportunities during their careers to develop the necessary skills, experiences, and support. It remains to be seen if they treat us equally to solicitors but on paper they should do and I am willing to give them the benefit of the doubt.

Agree

It should be an equal recognition.

Agree

It will help but not solve

Agree

It will help the two professions realise they are the same.

Agree

It will make clear that all "lawyers" no matter their route to qualification or their title are held to a single high set of standards.

Agree

It would

Agree

Long time on the business.

Agree

Negative opinions by some solicitors of legal executives needs to change. Hopefully this will go some way towards that

Agree

No other comment

Agree

No. The SRA will promote the solicitors profession not CILEX. The legal profession on the whole is very polarised and them and us still remain.

Agree

None to give

Agree

one regulator would be better.

Agree

Only if the SRA embraces what Cilex stands for.

Agree

Parity

Agree

Perhaps better to be under 1 umbrella.

Agree

Possibly

Agree

Possibly, but it will very much depend on how the SRA treats CILEX Lawyers compared to Solicitors. Provided cilex lawyers are protected in the move to the SRA. We are small in number and need to have our interests and distinct needs facilitated.

Agree

regulation will be equal for all

Agree

same as stated above.

Agree

See above

Agree

So that Solicitors and CILEX are considered equal

Agree

Solicitors still think they are better than Fellows/CILEX. I think by adding an additional qualification that fellows need to be able to be a Chartered Lawyer backs this theory up. You are essentially saying, you were right all along, they have never been as good as you.

Agree

SRA regulation will support equal treatment and recognition of all legal professionals I'm sure.

Agree

The consultation paper provides that the Cilex route is to be protected, however, it must be Cilex's responsibility to ensure that fair and equal treatment of its members alongside the existing SRA members is continued with robust plans for the unique qualification to be protected.

Agree

The move is all encompassing.

Agree

Their duty

Agree

there are more cilex BAME members so will widen diversity

Agree

There remains an elitism within the legal profession although I do believe this had diminished considerably since I qualified 25 years ago although this may be more to do with experience. Being regulated by the SRA may address some of the imbalance.

Agree

This ought to be a benefit.

Agree

This should very much assist in consistency and equality.

Agree

Time will tell

Agree we will have to wait and see. CILEX have failed to support equal treatment and recognition over the years. Not much point lauding about being able to join the judiciary if that judge is not permitted to certify a lasting power of attorney

Agree Why wouldn't we want this? It gives us a much more level playing field.

Agree Yes

Agree Yes

Agree Yes because of the SRA's expertise in this field

Agree Yes it should equalise the treatment of legal professionals. This is an historic issue. Can SRA fix this?

Agree Yes, I really do think that it would.

Agree Yes, I would hope so.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Agree You are making a car crash of it! Hand it over.

Disagree -

Disagree I would not like to be part of a body whose members often don't recognise the qualification I worked hard for

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree a

Disagree Again, I have set out my concerns in detail.

Disagree Again, there is no way to know the answer to this question. If CILEx believe that the SRA will behave in this way then so be it but that is down to the SRA to confirm before CILEx make this crucial decision that I believe will be detrimental to CILEx lawyers.

Disagree Any solicitor who has a dim view of CLEs will not change their view simply because we move to the SRA. All you have to do is read the comments from the Law Gazette to get an idea of how solicitors generally feel about CLEs. In fact, I think us moving has only made us a laughing stock within the industry.

Disagree As 24. I think separate regulation for each professional body would be more appropriate. I seriously doubt that solicitors would be content to be regulated alongside legal executives

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above

Disagree As above, SRA focus may be on solicitors.

Disagree As above.

Disagree As above.

Disagree As comments above

Disagree As discussed previously

Disagree As far as I am concerned it will make little difference. Most people are not concerned with how an individual lawyer is regulated, and as stated, the SRA regulate most firms anyway, and thus the employees within it.

Disagree As I have stated previously, I don't see how regulation by SRA is going to change the thinking of legal management which is where the problem lies.

Disagree As per answer at number 26.

Disagree As per previous answer I think it will do the opposite.

Disagree Attitudes in the profession will not change simply as a result of SRA regulation.

Disagree Becomes a monopoly

Disagree Bias towards solicitors is likely

Disagree By its name i do not.

Disagree CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree CILEx do nothing to ensure lawyers are treated equally to solicitors. They are mocked and looked down on and CILEx's public battle with its current regulator made a mockery of the progression.

Disagree CILEX has done a pretty good job of advancing the position of its members over the years and its ability has seen the establishment of its own regulatory set up. Riding on the coattails of solicitors is unlikely to advance matters.

Disagree CILEX Regulation can achieve this.

Cilex was created because the SRA qualification route was not inclusive enough and was very limited. The fact that members of the public do not understand Cilex qualification or have as much awareness about Cilex regulation as they do the SRA, is not indicative of a problem with Cilex regulation or Cilex. I think if the SRA were to absorb Cilex members, then Cilex membership would become redundant which will lead to less opportunity and equal treatment for all in the profession

Disagree

CILEX will cease to exist in a few years and there will be no CRL firms.

Disagree

Clue is in their title Solicitors regulation , not lawyers regulation, we are too few in numbers for them to bother with us, and give it five years and we will have to become solicitors to remain qualified. They will not want to spend precious resources on us.

Disagree

Currently, the SRA appears to relegate Cilex lawyers, and the proposed action will further enhance that position

Disagree

Definitely some doubt, I just don't know without hearing from them as a regulatory body.

Disagree

What assurances do we have?

Disagree

disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Disagree

Does not provide variety of entry

Disagree

Even more reason for certain branches of the profession to look down on cilex qualified professionals

Disagree

Except for some older more prejudiced solicitors, legal professionals and employers don't discriminate based on Chartered Legal Executive or solicitor qualification. A bigger problem when it comes to equality is the treatment of women and LGBTQIA+ legal professionals which neither CILEx nor the SRA do much to actively address.

Disagree

Expect solicitor will be regarded as superior.

Disagree

F.CILEx will dissappear. We are already being airbrushed away with the new 'CILEx Lawyer' brand that no one feels the need to buy into because it is odd to champion Chartered Legal Executives then one day decide not to anymore and by the way we now need to sit lore exams and do more (paid for) training because sudden we are not longer good enough. The goalposts are being needlessly shifted.

Disagree

Disagree

FCILEx will have to specialize whereas solicitors will not. Where is the equality in that?

Disagree

Firms and business will always prioritise profit over anything else. CILEx professionals are already paid less than their solicitor counterparts in many firms and being regulated by the SRA is unlikely to change this, unless the SRA specifically states CILEx professionals are to be treated and paid equally.

Disagree

Disagree

For the reaons cited - the SRA is about Solicitors and should remain so. otherwise it has to change its name entirely.

Disagree

For the reasons stated above at 27.

Disagree

History and past performance, plus personal experience of solicitors suggests that alternative routes to qualification will always be undermined and looked down upon by a large part of the profession.

Disagree

How can it possible support equal treatment - it is called the SOLICITORS regulation authority - I feel like Cilex have just given up fighting our cause and pushing for more awareness and are just handing us over to the SRA. I cannot fathom why SRA would want to regulation us, how they can take on the additional work and what happens to the £9k members who are not fellows yet - does Cilex even care about us?

Disagree

Disagree

How can it unless we all be one solicitors? Or is that what you want? So you can sell more courses??

Disagree

How can we expect the SRA to support equal treatment when CILEx is discriminating against its own members by completely disrespecting and ignoring the current Fellows who do not have practice rights but who can do the job and who have been doing it for years and even decades in a lot of cases. SRA will never see us as equals. Concentrate on pushing for CILEx as a route open to all with its own regulation and not the 'we want to be solicitors' begging that appears to be happening. Changing regulation will not change how we are seen. It is people's attitudes that need to change.

Disagree

I

Disagree

I am hopeful that it would - but would worry about the presentation of CILEX to the public by the SRA - would there be a member of CILEX on the SRA to ensure this does not happen?

Disagree

I believe that it will create a two tier system under one regulator where we won't have a voice having been drowned out by solicitor members of the SRA. It will be worse than it is now. As it stands, great strides have been made and CILEx lawyers are treated the same as solicitors by a vast majority of firms. Great strides have been made by CILEx in recent years; this approach is only going to undo that good work.

Disagree

Disagree

I believe the exact opposite will be achieved and that it will encourage members to cross quality or be disregarded.

Disagree

I believe the SRA would need to take further steps to address inequality between solicitors and CILEX lawyers and paralegals. Purely switching regulators will do nothing to change pre-existing perceptions of CILEX members.

Disagree

Disagree

I cannot see the CILEx members would be viewed any more favourably by SRA members through this move.

Disagree

Disagree

I disagree because this is a leading question and the wrong question. You really want to know, can SRA do this better than CRL? The answer is NO.

Disagree

Disagree

I do not believe the SRA will treat CILEX members equally.

Disagree I do not consider the SRA will support equal treatment of fellows

Disagree I do not see how this will support the equal treatment and recognition of CILEx members

Disagree I do not think being regulated by SRA will make any difference, in fact it may make our status worse. We have a good system in place and CRL should remain.

Disagree I do not think that being regulated by the SRA will affect the way Legal Exec's are view by other lawyers.

Disagree i do see what CILEX is trying to do here, but i do believe the old boys club mentality will be a tough nut to crack and i cannot see being regulated by the SRA changing that.

Disagree I do think there is a concern that a 2 tier system with the SRA could end up in place with Cilex members at the bottom being viewed less than capable than people who are Solicitors

Disagree I don't agree. equal treatment and recognition of legal professionals is a problem between various types of practice

Disagree I don't believe that they will act in the interests of Cilex members and will seek to protect solicitors from the competition that Cilex poses.

Disagree I don't believe the SRA sees us as an equal and so there can never be evidence of equality

Disagree I feel it will separate the qualification as a solicitor vs CILEX even more.

Disagree I have no doubt that the SRA will place Cilex professionals into the 'we will deal with them once we have dealt with our own (solicitors) first '. I have no doubt that we would be classed as second class citizens by the SRA and some but not all of its members

Disagree I hope so but I am not sure

Disagree I need this proven. How are they going to view and represent CILEX members

Disagree I still think there is a long way to go with the public recognising CLE on the same level as solicitors. Not to mention solicitors thinking this too!

Disagree I think CILEX Regulation allows CILEX lawyers to keep their separate identity. One can dual-qualify as a solicitor by doing the SQE.

Disagree I think it could be a step in the right direction but careful consideration needs to be given to how the SRA would regulate CILEX Lawyers- would we have to jump through hoops to align with what is expected of solicitors, rather than vice versa. Longer term, it should help to provide equality provided the SRA isn't biased to solicitors and using the amalgamation of solicitor / CILEX regulation to solicitors' benefit.

Disagree I think it will have the opposite effect

Disagree I think that CILEX lawyers will lose their identity even more so than now as people will still not fully understand them and if they are under the SRA will just assume they are a lawyer

Disagree I think the opposite

Disagree I think there might be an element of "discrimination" when it comes to recognising the legal professionals that didn't go down the standard route (solicitor route). It is notorious that solicitors have a certain attitude towards individuals who have not followed the same route, and I believe it will take some time to get them used to the idea (specially the older generations). There will need the need to educate and make those individuals and firms understand that there both CILEX lawyers and solicitors have equivalent training and capability despite the different routes of training.

Disagree I think they like to keep it all separate.

Disagree I want to stay independent see above

Disagree I would like to think yes, but in reality no. Most Solicitors will make more of their status than now

Disagree If anythingit will ultimately limit choices

Disagree If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.

Disagree If SRA could deliver what the question states what was the point for CILEX to establish itself

Disagree If the move goes ahead, will the SRA be renamed to ensure inclusivity for CILEX lawyers? If not then I struggle to agree with the above statement.

Disagree If the SRA were going to treat us as equals, they would have swiftly and very publicly criticised the law society for saying they disagree with this proposed step. I think that says all we need to know about whether there will be equality - there will not be.

Disagree In my experience, it is the title of Solicitor which gets the respect, being regulated by the SRA will change nothing on the ground

Disagree Insufficient information to know

Disagree It completely undermines Fellows.

Disagree It is the Solicitors' Regulation Authority. We are not solicitors.

Disagree It might and we wouldn't know unless tried but also it is like a loss of identity for CILEX members to be under one regulator.

It simply paves the way for amalgamation and doesn't address the route causes

I agree that currently in terms of cost-efficiency CILEx is right we pay more in practice fees and we may at the moment be getting less but this is an investment and we invest because we believe we will get more eventually but we won't sell out to do it

We will do with CILEx and CILEx Regulation as a Head & Body of the same "Approved Regulator" and we won't do it with a two headed SRA

I ask that CILEx compare Practice Fees for The Bar because I should think with the more limited membership they are also struggling in terms cost-efficiency save they have a levy from their members for Bar Mutual Indemnity which I would be very much willing to contribute too from my practice fees to CILEx to set-up a CILEx own "Lawyer Mutual Indemnity Fund" (CMIF)

Disagree

It will dilute the distinctiveness of CILEX.

That we have such a proud record for inclusion is not because of some impediment on the other professions.

We are diverse because of our route to qualification.

Regulation by a regulator paid for by a much much larger organisation with degree only membership will inevitably bring pressure on our route to qualification.

Disagree

It will have to be a fundamental (and appropriate) element of SRA regulation that non-solicitors make it crystal clear they are NOT solicitors. Anything else is bound to cause consumer confusion. Having to 'advertise' the difference(s) will only emphasise them. There will no incentive on the SRA to seek enhanced rights for its regulated community nor to expend resources on developing alternative routes to qualification.

Disagree

It will promote inequality because FCILEX will be viewed as second class citizens in an organisation which hold solicitors at the highest level and FCILEX as second rate.

Further inequality will be caused by creating a new raft of confusion legal and pseudo legal titles that, again, undermine FCILEX.

Disagree

It will remove equality of opportunity because I can see the costs of qualifying escalating the same way they have for solicitors and those of us who needed a cheaper route (family commitments) will be priced out of the market yet again.

Disagree

It would be helpful to have more information on how the SRA will support legal professionals who enter by a different solicitor route.

Disagree

It would have changed by now if so. Cilex should be doing more

Disagree

It's been a fiasco and has reflected badly on CILEx. This doesn't support equal treatment and recognition, as opposed to stability and building on relationships that have worked.

Disagree

I've never been disadvantaged by being a CILEX lawyer rather than a solicitor nor do I know anyone who has. Equality and diversity is already supported by the current arrangements.

Disagree

I've said 'Disagree' because I have not seen evidence that regulation by SRA will support the equal treatment and recognition of legal professionals regardless of to route to qualification and provide equality of opportunity. I think regulation by SRA may provide this but I cannot agree that it definitely will

Disagree

Less focussed and interested view of Cilex persons by SRA, which has been wholly interested in solicitors to date.

Disagree

Maybe to some degree but I feel by moving to the SRA will undermine everything CILEx has worked for over the years to be a stand alone recognised profession.

Disagree

Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.

Disagree

n

Disagree

N/A

Disagree

No

Disagree

No - they will always look at the interests of Solicitors. We will become second class group, this is what what we have had to put with for decades until deregulation.

Disagree

No because if CILEx titles are to stay it will simply add to the confusion

Disagree

No equality unless the SRA specifically changes so as to give that in all areas.

Disagree

No evidence to suggest this either way.

Disagree

No further comments

Disagree

No there still a disparity and the wider public do not think of us as the same it's a constant battle to prove yourself

Disagree

No, potential to further distinguish routes to professionalism and by doing this further discriminate between the CILEX route and the SRA [Solicitor] route.

Disagree

Disagree Not enough experience of SRA however I might be concerned that SRA generally might be more conservative.

Disagree not necessarily

Disagree Not sure. It depends on how it is handled.

Disagree Not the slightest. Any prejudice to FCILEX is enshrined by this move as we just become more junior to solicitors. Doesn't change our ability to act or status so its pointless.

Disagree Not unless present concerns are addressed first, such as the current rules on advancement of Chartered Legal Executives, which are prejudicial on the grounds of age and experience upon those who no longer conduct advocacy in their role.

Disagree On the contrary, I think over time it is likely to have the reverse effect and result in a reality where those regulated by the SRA that are not solicitors will be seen as subordinate to solicitors by the public at large.

Disagree Only if the title of SRA changes needs to reflect lawyers rather than solicitors

Disagree Please stop the EDI agenda now.

Disagree Quite the opposite for reasons given previously. I feel I am being subtly or not so subtly put in my place and I do not feel I am being treated fairly or equally by the requirement to obtain a practising certificate to prove my worth. I would have thought I have already done so.

Disagree Recognition dependant purely on type of qualification will still prevail.

Disagree Regulation by the SRA won't achieve equality in the professions. CILEX should have been working on this for the last 20 years but there's still so much confusion and lack of understanding as to what Legal Execs are qualified to do

Disagree Same as number 22 above

Disagree Same reasons as the answer in 18 above

Disagree See above

Disagree see above

Disagree See above

Disagree See above answers.

Disagree See above how many times do I have say the same thing - SRA are not interested in looking anyone other than their own

Disagree See above.

Disagree See my previous answers.

Disagree See previous answer

Disagree See previous answer.

Disagree See prior reasons. It will increase the snobbery and division significantly

Disagree Solicitors are not well served by the SRA when they are their their only "clients" so why would CILEx members expect a good service?

Disagree Solicitors do not and will not see CILEX as equal. This fallacy that it will provide parity is nonsense and a carrot to lure in members. Legal Executives should be proud of their qualifications and seek to explain the nature of the difference, not hide it under an illusion of parity.

Disagree Solicitors do not.always appreciate the value of cilex and see us as second class

Disagree Solicitors have often looked down on those that are qualified by a different route.

Disagree SRA decisions already show a disparity of treatment between trainees and partners. This is likely to become more apparent if this change takes place.

Disagree Sra will absolutely treat ilex as second class in the same way they treat partners and large firms different to junior members and small firms they already regulate

Disagree SRA will favour their own.

Disagree SRA will seek to minimise the status of CILEX lawyers in comparison to solicitors and may limit CILEX ability to communicate that

Disagree Strongly disagree! CILEX might as well stop accepting applications - tell those interested to train to become a solicitor instead! We're seen as second class citizens by a large number of solicitors as it is; being regulated by the SRA won't make us equal in their eyes.

Disagree That is my view

Disagree That is yet to be seen as it will take time and effort

Disagree That simply will not happen.

Disagree The advantage for CRL is that it understands the broad church of CILEX membership and therefore supports the profession and routes to qualification. there is no evidence to support that this is worse or lesser than the SRA say they will provide.

Disagree The current recognition and certification system is efficient.

Disagree The difference will still be apparent and only serve to undermine the existing professional standing of Fellows qualification and result in downgrading.

Disagree It does appear that the Board are demonstrating that Fellows in their current status are "just not good enough".

Disagree The following needs to be established in order to achieve the above. If SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients.

Disagree The solicitor route will be considered superior. University education is better and covers the breadth of law, whereas the cilex qualification is a less subject approach.

Disagree The SRA and members will not regard CILEX equally

Disagree The SRA has for many years favoured the interests of Solicitors and this culture will not change overnight

Disagree The SRA have little interest in equal treatment and recognition of legal professionals in my opinion but I cannot see what is wrong with having differences depending on knowledge and qualifications.

Disagree The SRA have made clear they do not consider us equals, so how can there be equal treatment and recognition? If there was equal recognition regardless of qualification route, we would not be having this consultation.

Disagree The SRA have made many derogatory and undermining comments regarding our 'tiny' and 'insignificant' pool of lawyers. I do not wish to be governed by such narrow mindedness and elitence.

The SRA have said they are committed to recognising and maintaining the separate identity and qualification route of CLEs / CILEX Lawyers -in other words carrying on as CRL are currently. Whether this turns out to be the case down the line is highly debatable, but to my mind regulation by the SRA instead of CRL will make absolutely zero difference to the equal treatment and recognition of CLEs / CILEX lawyers. Currently there are a great many firms which pay and treat CLEs / CILEX Lawyers less than equivalently qualified solicitors because they have qualified via the CILEX route and are CLEs etc. Changing the regulator does not change this. I would be extremely surprised (and if there is evidence for this it should be disclosed - as it hasn't I assume none exists) if any firm treating those who have qualified through CILEX differently is doing so because they have a different regulator.

I think, conversely, having CILEX members regulated by the SRA reinforces the need to treat CILEX members as a lower grade of lawyer, simply because the SRA have confirmed that they will be regulated distinctly from solicitors.

You have been championing the SRA's commitment to effectively preserving the difference between CILEX qualified lawyers and solicitors so there is a separation between them, but at the same time appear to consider that regulation by the SRA will remove the prejudices that currently exist. I strongly believe this course of action will cement those differences and parity will only be achieved by those CILEX members who wish to 'upgrade' their qualification status to solicitor

Disagree The SRA is always likely to promote solicitors as the main route to qualification.

Disagree The SRA is not fit for purpose.

Disagree The SRA will, in my opinion, always look after the interests of solicitors first and foremost, and CILEX members will be treated as second class citizens, especially if there is an issue between a solicitor and a CILEX member of whatever grade.

Disagree The whole move seems unnecessary and pointless, I cannot see any benefit to the consumer or the members

Disagree There is already a degree of 'snobbery' in route to qualification and this seems unlikely to change by changing the regulatory body.

Disagree There is already a gap between solicitors and Cilex lawyers and the law society do not look favourably on Cilex lawyers, if the law society are able to have a greater say over Cilex lawyers there is a risk they will diminish our rights.

Disagree There is no evidence that this is the case. CILEX professionals have worked hard to achieve their status which is recognised by other legal professionals and the courts.

Disagree There seems no reason to believe this to be true. CILEX under its present regulator has a fine record on equality. I have seen no evidence that SRA regulation would be an improvement

Disagree There will always be a gap in training and qualifications of solicitors over Legal Executives. Unless there can be one unifying structure for all legal professionals and uniform training and qualifications for all members of the profession there will always be unequal treatment and recognition of individuals.

Disagree there will always be differences

Disagree There will be no difference in treatment

Disagree There will still be different "types" of legal professionals; that will be evidenced by their titles and so of its very nature recognition will not be any different nor will it improve "equality of opportunity".

Disagree There's a risk of being treated differently due to the negative opinion of cilex in the industry

Disagree They are the SOLICITORS regulation authority. Unless they plan to adapt their name and regulatory model to work with these new entities equally with solicitors this may well be a disaster for cilex lawyers and the public and may spell the end for cilex lawyers

Disagree They will be quick to highlight the distinction between us and as we are now, CILEX members will be treated as lesser mortals as we always have done. There will be no independence.

Disagree This aim can be achieved in much better ways. To a great extent it is already a reality. I work with legal professionals of all kinds and we are all treated the same and afford the same respect.

Disagree This can be achieved without changing regulators.

Disagree This move risks creating increased inequality, considering most undertaking the CILEX route to qualification will be from less privileged backgrounds and likely be women. I interpret this as meaning CILEX no longer believes itself that CLE's are equal and need all this change in order to be deemed equal.

Disagree This only works is there is a single regulator for all branches of the law

This will worsen the experiences of bullying, intimidation, control and harassment of CILEx lawyers within solicitors firms. CILEx entities receive acknowledgement from the consumer on their services as being separate and distinctly different from solicitor firms which means that the public interest is being best served as the current regulatory system under CRL.

Disagree

Disagree Treated equally regardless

Disagree

Very much doubt it will support cilex people at all. Likely poor relations compared to priority of solicitors

Disagree

We clearly are different types of lawyers so we should build a brand around that - using the existing one which many people have worked hard to develop - not start over by transferring to the SRA

Disagree

We don't get that now without their regulation because it's not regulation that supports it. It's people.

Disagree

We don't want to be regulated by the SRA no matter how you try and spin the survey.

We need to be able to argue for this ourselves which we have done successfully over many years. The next step to this is not being encompassed under the SRA but maintaining our independence through CILEX regulations and continuing our arguments now.

Disagree

We need to keep our independence

Disagree

We won't get treated equally

Disagree

Disagree

What would be the point of CILEX lawyers if this was the case? The SRA already has Solicitor-Apprenticeship schemes and the SQE - why would it need CILEX lawyers as well?

Disagree

Wholeheartedly disagree. CILEX lawyers need their own regulator to show their independence from solicitors. You should be advocating for us not putting barriers in our way.

Disagree

Why should it?

Disagree

With CILEx members being a small minority for the SRA I worry treatment will not be equal.

Disagree

You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here. If other legal professionals look down on CILEX, being regulated by the SRA will fail to deal with this.

Do you agree that, through SRA publication of the Register of Authorised Persons for both Solicitors and CILEX Lawyers, there is opportunity to explain the equivalence and distinction of these two professions, therefore assisting consumers to better understand and compare the choice of lawyer able to service their legal need?

Response Please state reasons

Agree .

Agree .

Agree .

Agree a single register of authorised persons reduce discrimination and enhance the CILEX status in the eyes of the general public

Agree Agree

Agree Agree with the statement.

Agree Agreed with statement as this would provide easy one-stop access for individuals to seek confirmation of qualifications on a one singular register

Agree Anything that can assist the public should be welcomed.

Agree Anything to give clarity to the public must be of an advantage.

Agree as above -- currently hardly anyone who didn't qualify as a CILEx lawyer knows what this qualification means

Agree As above.

Agree As mentioned, the public trust the SRA. My experience is that the general public don't know who Cilex or Cilex Fellows are (even some legal professionals are unclear, particularly for someone like myself who works with in-house lawyers across other jurisdictions, they don't know who Cilex are). Even if I point someone to the Cilex Fellow register, the confidence isn't quite there that it's legitimate. With SRA there already is the public and legal professional confidence.

Agree But I also believe there to be that opportunity now.

Agree But I believe that any such explanation needs to be carefully worded to reflect the fact that Fellow of CILEX is equal to that of a Solicitor.

Agree But you need to ensure it is easy to find through the Law Society and Cilex websites.

Agree Centralising the database makes it simpler, yes

Agree Choice is key, in my view, to consumers finding the right solution for them.

Agree CILEx already have this kind of Register in place - they just need to make it known - this assumption that the SRA are the best organisation since sliced bread is, I think, overstating their role in the legal world.

Agree Consumers will have the opportunity to choose the legal specialist in the field of law in regards to their legal services that they would need.

Agree Currently the public have little knowledge of what CILEX is . SRA endorsement will further add to our standing

Agree Easier to understand different roles of lawyers within one regulator

Agree Equivalence is key here. Yes CILEX is an important non-traditional route but what the members want is to be recognised as equivalent to a Solicitor (in their practice area). Customers similarly want to know that they are instructing a competent legal professional. Both could be achieved by this.

Agree explaining the specialisation of lawyer, whether CILEX or solicitor, may be a useful to establish when selecting someone to deal with a matter

Agree Fully Agree

Agree Gives confidence to the public but the registers should remain independent and not under one roof of the SRA

Agree Good

Agree Having a single register where individuals are listed together should help to see they need not choose a lawyer based on qualification route.

Agree Having all professions in one place is helpful as a starting point

Agree I agree only because the SRA is a more public facing organisation than the CLR.

Agree I agree with this proposal

Agree I agree with this proposition, although this could be achieved through other means

Agree I couldn't agree more - I do the exact same job as my solicitor colleagues, have the same responsibility, pay and experience. I therefore think it makes perfect sense for us to be in a pool together when offering our services.

Agree I do agree but the benefit of this will be fairly limited and the register is not used by the majority of instructing clients.

Agree If there is one governing body, it may make it more clear.

Agree If they were to do this on a register it may be helpful to clients but this could presumably be done without cilex regulation being dispensed with.

Agree IF this takes place this may assist consumers, it depends on how it is done

Agree It might do, only time will tell.

Agree It provides opportunity, but it may not actually improve the situation with regard to recognition of the expertise of CILEx qualified professionals. The general public will likely always choose a solicitor over a CILEx professional, just as a barrister is generally favoured over a solicitor.

Agree It will provide a one stop shop for consumers and make us all seem equal in the eyes of the consumer

Agree It's a single, unified list for consumers to consult with when looking for a lawyer.

Agree More information for consumers must help them make their decisions.

Agree Most people are aware of the SRA register and how to find a "solicitor" but not perhaps to check on CILEX qualification and what that means.

Agree My be CILEX lawyers are more expert in their practice areas as oppose to solicitor who are in high street practice

Agree n/a

Agree No other comment

Agree None specific- seems obvious

Agree One register would be better

Agree Opportunity of choice from one central database providing equality of levels of experience etc.

Agree People find comparison relatable

Agree Possibly

Agree Potentially although it may lead to those comparisons giving more business to Solicitors depending on how it is structured.

Agree Previous question stated that both SRA and CILEx lawyers provide the same service so what is the point of another register making a distinction confusing the consumer - if one is regulated by the SRA then the title is that of a solicitor if one of regulated by CILEx regulatory body then the title is CILEx lawyer

Agree Probably.

Agree Regardless of qualification route, a lawyer should be chosen based on being able to service the needs of the clients without distinction.

Agree See answers above

Agree see my earlier comments

Agree should be easy for consumers to find all lawyers in one place, not across three regulators

Agree Should provide clarity of experience.

Agree Simpler

Agree Solicitors and CILEX lawyers have specific skill sets but also different training routes so it is important to retain the distinction and to provide consumers with the opportunity of choice

Agree Subject to the rider of the points that I have made above about keeping the distinction simple ie just to Chartered Lawyer. If people want subject specialists they tend to look that up and then consider the distinction.

Agree That will have to be publicised and acted upon - most people will use find a solicitor on the law society website to find a legal professional. What guarantees do we have that the Law Soc and the SRA will do this?

Agree The consumers will know that SRA Lawyers and CILEX Lawyers are professionals with high standards of capacitation.

Agree The SRA have more resources to engage with consumers and to capture and analyse data.

Agree There is an opportunity to expand equivalence, but it is key for the SRA to underline that CILEX Lawyers and solicitors have the same authorisation in the relevant practice areas.

Agree There is an opportunity yes, but it must be taken! The risk is that cilex simply becomes a footnote with the appearance of being a lesser option, 'not quite a solicitor' in the eyes of the public. The SRA must adapt and change their name, this could either be very positive or a disaster for cilex lawyers and the public.

Agree There is the opportunity but execution has to be there.

Agree There is the opportunity but I highly doubt it will be properly utilised. More likely it will be divisive.

Agree There needs to be more advertising for the public to endure they understand but in truth they want someone who is competent to get case done.

Agree There really shouldn't be a distinction. One is a general lawyer and the other is a specialist lawyer.

Agree This could be dealt with in client care information given to the client.

Agree This must be explained clearly

Agree This will be important

Agree This will need to be done carefully though, s that it is very clear to consumers that there is equivalence

Agree This would allow for greater transparency which in turn would allow for greater recognition.

Agree transparency is important to me

Agree Very important point

Agree We do the same job so same register

Agree Yes and this is essential but must be fair and just

Agree yes but only if CILEX can establish CILEX Lawyers are a widely understood title. At the moment this is lacking in London and often companies and firms are surprised to understand that CILEX Lawyers exist in parity with solicitors.

Agree Yes I agree having an easy way to make this comparison would help the public but this can be achieved without changing regulation.

Agree Yes I do believe there is an opportunity to explain the equivalence and distinction. However I do not agree it should help them compare the choice of lawyer to service their legal need. Unless scenario is where there is a choice between a CIELX specialist and a generic Solicitor.

Agree Yes I think it's important that as CILEx lawyers we are recognised as having a qualification and being able to meet consumers needs in the same way as a solicitor without having to have their supervision.

Agree Yes this should be easier for the consumer to understand

Agree Yes, assuming the changes go ahead I'm sure there will obviously be the need for the SRA to issue a publication to explain the differences between the two professions.

Agree Yes, but again in my experience most people choose a law firm to represent them, not a specific lawyer as such. In any event, I am sure that CILEx could address this in it's own capacity independently or in addition to the SRA.

Agree Yes, if the explanation would cover those areas of law not mentioned by the consultation.

Agree Yes, same register - different bodies is not an issue, you can simply clarify the roles and distinctions in one single register.

Agree Yes. The public is already familiar with the SRA.

Agree Клиент всегда сам решает в какую компанию он обратиться, но беда в том что не все адвокаты имеют определенный опыт и знания в той области на которую клиент рассчитывает.

Disagree -

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree .

Disagree a

Disagree A combined register of authorised persons can be made and agreed by the SRA and CRL for the public to use which shows the comparative levels for legal executives and solicitors. A merger does not need to happen to do this. Just a bit of common sense and joined up thinking.

Disagree Again members of the public don't check these things. They now do a google search for the service they want . No member of the public has ever asked me, for example, if we are Conveyancing Quality Scheme registered, a badge that we pay significant sums for every year.

Disagree Again, I think the reputation of Chartered Legal Executives will be damaged.
Disagree Again, it is up to CILEX to champion FCILEX. Lumping FCILEX in with solicitors and bring out the extremely opaque title of 'CILEX Lawyer' reduces understanding. CILEX need to stop this nonsense and focus on championing FCILEX as a distinct legal entity. The brand FCILEX should be something to be proud of, CILEX should remember that. By doing so, they can focus on the unique role of FCILEX professionals and actively promote them. This would help the public and profession understand the parity of FCILEX and solicitor. What undermines that parity in the public perception is our own organisation acting as if we are second rate. It would seem that CILEX are attempting to solve a problem they are contributing to.

Disagree All Chartered Legal Executives become solicitors? End of CILEX ?Is that the real plan.
Disagree All do similar work so not necessary.
Disagree All the same with common denominator to serve the public effectively
Disagree Another loaded question
Disagree answers already given to this above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above
Disagree As above.
Disagree As above. The proposals by the SRA retain the differences between CILEX Lawyers and solicitors. If anything having two separate qualifications regulated by one regulator is likely to lead to greater confusion and inevitably in some (most?) cases the view that one is 'better' or 'more qualified' than the other.
Also as previously stated, I very much doubt the majority of consumers are selecting a lawyer based on who regulates him or her. My experience is selection of lawyer is done by (i) expertise and recognition of that expertise (by directories etc), (ii) the publicised expertise and reputation of the firm, (iii) the cost of the service, (iv) personal recommendation.
I work in a SRA regulated firm. At no point have I ever had a potential client decide to go elsewhere because I am regulated by CRL. In fact I have never had a client care about my title - as long as I am qualified and have the expertise that they required (and the 4 points above feed into this too), then that is enough.
I strongly believe the notion that the consumer is interested in whether one is regulated by one regulator or another is a fallacy. Consumers of course want their lawyers and their firms to be regulated by a regulator but which regulator that is, I would suggest, of no interest to 90-95% of clients.

Disagree as before
Disagree As per previous answers.
Disagree As stated above, the general public's lack of knowledge about Cilex is not the fault of Cilex nor Cilex regulation.
Disagree Because being a Solicitor does not make one a better or worse lawyer and probably difficult for a consumer to know until after their experience
Disagree Because the SRA won't want the public to understand that LE are as good as Solicitors
Disagree Both CRL and SRA could publish these lists. There is nothing special about SRA in this respect.

Disagree Changing regulator is not needed to actually bring this idea into fruition. If both CRL and the SRA agreed to collaborate a joint register doing exactly this could be created whilst maintaining CILEX's distinct identity.

Disagree CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Disagree CILEx could do this themselves.

Disagree CILEX lawyers has its own list of lawyers that is accessible. In addition, if the goal is towards "equivalence" with solicitors, why is CILEX seeking to maintain a distinction? It's rather confusing as I am unsure whether CILEX are moving to be the same as solicitors or maintain a distinction. I think the focus should be towards promoting the services and competence of CILEX qualified professionals in their own right.

Disagree CILEx Lawyers will pale into insignificance within a mass of solicitors.

Disagree CILEx produce a register of FCILEx and those with practise rights already. There is nothing stopping the regulators from working together with the LSB to produce a central list published online, without SRA becoming the regulator. The value of the published register, and the 'Find a Solicitor' function on the Law Society site is diminished from how it used to be. Firms find clients through advertising, social media, websites, personal referrals, and ultimately by providing a good service to clients who come back for repeat business - I have never had a client instruct me or my firm because they have found me on the SRA or CILEx register.

Disagree CILEX should be proud not publicly embarrassed about their status.

Disagree Clients do not look at this when choosing who to instruct. This will serve only to highlight that cilex lawyers are in some ways lesser than solicitors.

Disagree Confuses public we need to stay independent regulated by SRA will mean we will be captured by their axiom mistake and also sees us as 2ns tier to solicitors not a different qualification

Disagree Confusion will be the outcome

Disagree Consumers do not mind about the qualification route their lawyer took. All they care about is whether their lawyer can do the job.

Disagree Consumers do not research regulators

Disagree Consumers shop on price and reputation, not on whom the firm is regulated by.

Disagree CRL should remain in place. They are doing a good job. The public need clarification that CILEX fellows are lawyers and the title should have the word "lawyer" to make this clear.

Disagree Depends how it is done.

Disagree disagree

Disagree Do not think assists.

Disagree Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent will confuse public

Disagree Don't see the difference between the 2 and in fact on the ground CILEX often have more experience at the coal face. By having a separate list, this continues to separate out the two professions

Disagree For the customers to have a better understanding you would need to address all 3 routes to qualification and include CLC.

Disagree For the reasons stated above. at 27.

Disagree Getting boring now.

Disagree how do clients choose

Disagree How does this generate an advantage over the current position

Disagree How is this any different to the register we have now? Bar us being on the sra website, again, being lost within all the sols

Disagree I

Disagree I believe that consumers will be able to distinguish CILEX lawyers, if whether or not it is published by SRA

- Disagree I cannot agree with the above statement whilst there are still so many unanswered questions, confusion and lack of clarity over whether such a move is within the best interest of the CILEX members.
- Disagree I disagree fundamentally with the introduction of the 'authorised person' concept which means I am unable to potentially continue to do the job I have already been working towards (based on CILEX's promises) and doing for many years. Why should my 15+ years of already 'specialist' practice, together with recent qualification require something further, to prove my worth and capability? It is a nonsense. Why am I not already an 'authorised person' where I am in a senior position and am trusted by and paid by my employer to do my job!? As mentioned, if this continues, it will only add to more leaving CILEX and moving to bodies that do recognise our work and the services provided over many years already, without having to provide, prove or do anything extra at all. I do, however, agree with a published list of lawyers in one place which will give an opportunity to see the equivalence (based on action as I have outlined in the rest of these comments, only), of all lawyers. Careful consideration to the explanation given will be needed.
- Disagree I do not consider the public would consider any publication to consider their choice of lawyer. The system as it is sufficient
- Disagree I do not think it will make any difference. You should be doing this already for your members but very few members of the public are aware of CILEX but that is not down to regulation or publication of a register. I do not think you have promoted your members as you should.
- Disagree I do not think there is anything wrong whatsoever with the current model. There is also no evidence to suggest this suggestion would assist consumers better.
- Disagree I do not trust sra to adequately explain the distinction
- Disagree I don't think this is necessary or welcome.
- Disagree I don't believe consumers consider which entity regulates the individual fee earner. They seem quite happy to instruct an unqualified person if they are told what they want to hear.
- Disagree I dont see how this will assist and i see no issue with the present system.
- Disagree I don't think consumers compare and choose their lawyer in this way
- Disagree I don't think consumers will care that much about the distinctions between the two professionals. They just want a good job done.
- Disagree I don't think that this can be achieved as consumers do not understand the difference.
- Disagree I don't think this really comes down to the consumer as stated above
- Disagree I doubt they would bother to look.
- Disagree I have never heard of the Register of Authorised Persons! Which probably speaks for itself. If consumers do not know what type of lawyer is best suited to service their legal need, then perhaps the SRA should make it a requirement of firms to explain this to new clients - much as they are currently required to carry out AML checks (?)
- Disagree I have no issue with a Register but again it seems that Fellow without practice rights will again be discriminated against. Will the register explain that we may not have this new part of the qualification but we have tons of experience in the job instead? I think this proposed register could cause issues for many people.
- Disagree I strongly feel that chartered legal executives who qualified before the changes to title, status etc should also appear on the authorised list.
- Disagree I suspect it won't be a real life consideration
- Disagree I think it will all be a confused mess
- Disagree I think that people would still not understand the distinction still between CILEX and SRA lawyer and would still be swayed by what they know therefore would make no difference
- Disagree I think this will lead to greater confusion, especially around the Chartered Legal Executive title.
- Disagree If anything is going to cause confusion, it will be trying to explain the difference between a solicitor and chartered legal executive. I don't think having everyone under one regulatory umbrella is going to change that.

Disagree If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.

Disagree If this is necessary then the LSB would be the better body to produce it.

Disagree If we are both regulated by the SRA, there should not be a distinction.

Disagree In practice no-one checks this and it will have no impact

Disagree It is already possible to explain the equivalence and distinction between the two professions.

Disagree It is important to note that I have not seen any canvassing or assessment of the public to reach this conclusion.
Surely it would be easy to carry out an independent survey of the public to establish which consumers using legal services do so via the SRA.
This may demonstrate depending on the type of legal service being sought by a consumer this may be found from different sources.

Disagree It obviously removes the distinction

Disagree It will do the opposite. It will blur the distinctiveness between the professions.

Disagree It will make no difference to consumers.

Disagree It will simply complicate matters further.

Disagree It will still rest with the skills and experience of any individual.

Disagree It won't happen. The SRA will look after its own.

Disagree It's Amalgamation or will become Amalgamation

Disagree keep Solicitors and CILEX separate

Disagree Less focussed and interested view of Cilex persons by SRA, which has been wholly interested in solicitors to date.

Disagree Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.

Disagree Most consumers are not normally bothered if a CILEX members, fellow or solicitor dealing with the matter, as long as you give a good service and act professionally that is what consumers want.

Disagree Most solicitors do not recognise the Colex qualification as equivalent. Sra regulation will not change that, education will

Disagree n

Disagree N/A

Disagree No - you will divide more people, create barriers and prejudice

Disagree No because people will still ask what a FCILEx is.

Disagree No further comments

Disagree No they need to be kept separate, any merging of the two will confuse the public.

Disagree No, exactly the opposite, it will widen the gap between them. Solicitors will be seen as the 'better option' for an SRA regulated individual

Disagree No. CILEx should remain independent and have their own Register of Authorised Persons.

Disagree Not all lawyers will be on the register - so pointless.

Disagree Perhaps but I think the equivalence will be hard to decipher and in many instances not be shown by the information as it discards so many specialists and real life experience

Disagree Possibly may cause more divide as public would always choose the solicitors rather than CILEX lawyer when looking at a database.

Disagree Possibly, however, both CILEx and SRA registers are not difficult for consumers to be aware of the professional they choose to instruct

Disagree Same answers as previously. The public really is not interested in any major way in these semantics.

Disagree Same as above

Disagree Same reasons as the answer in 18 above

Disagree See 16 above.

Disagree See above

Disagree See above answers. This is not a good enough reason to allow the SRA to regulate CILEX.

Disagree See earlier comment about clients not using this when deciding who to instruct.

Disagree See my previous answers plus CILEx should already be doing this.

Disagree See previous

Disagree See previous answer.

Disagree See previous responses.

Disagree Separate registers already do that

Disagree SRA I do not believe will enhance our standing

Disagree SRA will not be able to vocalise the distinction, they have no understanding of alternative routes into law

Disagree SRA will seek to minimise the status of CILEX lawyers in comparison to solicitors and while controlling communication as to the distinction may limit CILEX ability to communicate equivalence. Has SRA made a commitment to support the "Chartered Lawyer" designation.

Disagree Stay CILEx regulated

Disagree That is my view

Disagree That will not be seen as equivalent by the public. It will be seen as solicitors and their assistants from CILEx.

Disagree The choice is the same

Disagree The consumer is already properly advised via the client care letter of the status of the fee earner representing them.

Disagree The explanation is there already in black and white. Why being regulated by the SRA will this make any difference?

Disagree The new titles demean those that remain at Chartered Legal Executives and make them second class to the new Chartered Lawyers title when many CLEs have years more experience.

Disagree The public don't care about the differences in our professions, they just want to know the person doing the work is qualified and competent. By explaining the difference, the SRA is still distinguishing between us, therefore creating inequality, not equality. The SRA would simply be highlighting their view that we are not equal to solicitors, which is contrary to your objectives.

Disagree The public will not understand this concept

Disagree The SRA have made many derogatory and undermining comments regarding our 'tiny' and 'insignificant' pool of lawyers. I do not wish to be governed by such narrow mindedness and eliteness.

Disagree The two are different yet already equivalent. I am not sure how this will make things better?

Disagree The vast majority of consumers do not check the SRA website - they look on the Law Society Find a Solicitor function.

Disagree There are clear indication of the distinction between the Solicitors and Cilex lawyer

Disagree There is already provision in place to explain the difference and I have been doing this for the last 20 years

Disagree There is certainly opportunity to explain the equivalence and distinction of the two professions but at this stage, it is pure speculation as to whether this will assist consumers as described above or whether some may be confused.

Disagree There is no guarantee there will be a combined register in the first place let alone what explanations that register might offer. There is already a web site (which has cost the professions a considerable amount of money) which says it explains the differences between all the different types of lawyer. We don't a combined register to duplicate that.

Disagree There is no reason to believe this to be the case. It reveals a lack of understanding about how consumers arrive at the lawyers they instruct. The truth is that all things being equal and with a choice between solicitor and CILEX lawyer the general public will go to a solicitor because they know what a solicitor is and they don't know what a CILEX Lawyer is. They are not going to be reading about equivalence or distinction.

Disagree There is no such equivalence and distinction drawn for solicitor advocates, but the public seem to cope

Disagree There is nothing wrong with the current set-up. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Disagree There may be an "opportunity to explain" but understanding is a different matter

Disagree There should be no (barring rights of audience) distinction between a solicitor and a Chartered Legal Executive and so the difference (effectively being route to qualification) doesn't need to be explained.

Disagree They can publish this information without the need for us to merge with them.

Disagree This already exists. No one cares about CILEx Lawyer but the industry and consumers are clear about solicitors and chartered legal executives. Again, the only people who do not seem clear are, ironically, the body designed to support us!

Disagree This can be achieved without joining the SRA.

Disagree This has not been explained to us and how this will be a logical consequence.

Disagree This will make consumer more confusing. If SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients.

Disagree This will only add confusion for consumers.

Disagree Those Fellows that qualified a long time ago have not been given "grandfather" rights through years of experience so they will be lost and looked down upon as not being up to scratch.

Disagree Unnecessary

Disagree Until we can see a draft of the register how can we comment? You, as in Cilex have had certainly over 20 years to put this message across, it was working but in last 10 years we have gone backwards due to your actions.

Disagree What would be the point of CILEX lawyers if this was the case? The SRA already has Solicitor-Apprenticeship schemes and the SQE - why would it need CILEX lawyers as well? The SRA is hardly going to promote something that it doesn't take seriously because it won't need to

Disagree whilst i support the publication, im not sure the public would understand the difference.

Disagree Why do we need to explain we should be proud of our independent qualification

Disagree Why doesn't this oppose what you are trying to achieve that we are equivalent in all but name

Disagree Will just create further confusion

Disagree You already publish a list. Why is this in need of change?

Disagree You don't need the SRA for this.

Disagree You have provided no evidence whatsoever to support this and my points as above apply here. Further the LSB could propose a single register for all regulated lawyers including trade mark attorneys' etc. You do not require SRA regulation to do this.

Q - Do you consider there to be any adverse impact of our proposals on: Consumers, Vulnerable Consumers, Legal Professionals, Providers of legal Services?

A move across regulators will be the death toll of CILEX Lawyers

Additional costs

Additional costs for Legal Professionals and Providers of Legal Services as Paralegals for example will have to pay for Chartered status recognition.

adverse impact

Again, it reduces the independence, innovation & the recognition ground CILEX have fought for for decades by lumping us in with Solicitors/ SRA.

All become overcomplicated and confused. Risk that CILEX members will feel even further devalued and will leave the profession.

All responses have already been given and questions are repetitive. The choice for consumers, groups, professionals will be taken away

Already described above. 'Keep It Simple Stupid'

Am concerned that ultimately CLE will lose their usp when lumped together with solicitors and will then be seen even more as a lesser version of a solicitor

An effective merger with SRA will cause confusion and the impression that CILEx has been submitted to SRA. That will reduce CILEx to solicitors' assistants.

Any impact is unknown at this stage.

As a "legacy" FILEX with many years experience I do not agree that our titles should be different to incoming "lawyers". We should all be either Chartered Lawyers or CLE!!!!!! I feel this is a big slap in the face to those already qualified with CILEX. I really hope that this is reconsidered.

I do not believe that you can allow persons to achieve final qualification and then say well actually we've moved the goalposts so now newer FILEX will have an upgraded title when actually we have been lawyers all along but are not allowed to use the title. What a farce!

As above

As above

As above

As above: there's a risk for CILEx lawyers that they'll be seen as having submitted to the authority of the SRA

As aforementioned.

As all previous responses

As already stated in replies above

As detailed in previous answers

As explained on previous page.

As I have previously said, it will mean nothing to clients apart from them thinking that everyone is a solicitor. To FCILEx it mean mean demeaning their role to being subservient to solicitors, which we are most definitely not. This is just a ploy by the SRA to justify their own apprenticeship route when the CILEx one was perfectly adequate. What was wrong with graduates qualifying as solicitors, the rest of us qualifying via an apprenticeship called CILEx and at the end, regardless of the route we took, we were equals. Not that is equality, ie: regardless of whether you leave school with GCSEs or a degree you stand a change of being a lawyer.

As I have said before in this consultation, we should remain independent and our interests as CILEX members should be properly championed by its own regulator.

As I have stated - further complexity which may well confuse "consumers". Dilution of our qualification.

As I've said through the responses I really feel that regulation by the SRA will not be in anyone's best interests.

As mentioned, previously these plans to align with the SRA contain material obstructions for young legal professionals attempting to develop professionally within the legal sector

As per my comments above

As per previous answers. Most members are concerned that the change will create a divide between CILEx qualified people and solicitors, further adding to the stigma that the organisation carries, which is that solicitors are "better" or more qualified than CILEx members.

As previously explained, this illusion that Legal Executives should seek to be the same as solicitors rather than celebrate their differences is damaging to the future of the Legal Executive profession.

As previously explained.

As previously stated

Attacks the position Chartered Legal Executives as specialist lawyers.

Because it will limit the scope of opportunity for legal professionals. Additionally it would mean that Cilex members would be subject to higher fees and regulation by a body that is not well versed in dealing with Cilex members and is already dealing with a large group of people whom it oversees.

Because of the way we are viewed by the SRA

Because once a member is entitled to practice in a particular field it is his or her task to attract clients by quality of his legal expertise and practice

By becoming regulated by the SRA with the title of Chartered Lawyer, there seems to be no route to becoming a solicitor with general practice rights. This will impact the employability of Chartered lawyers in-house, but also will continue to contribute to a two tier system where solicitors are deemed more knowledgeable or better trained. A true alternative route should be created where Chartered Lawyers can obtain same general practice rights as solicitors. Under the proposals it seems Chartered Lawyers will only be able to practice in a specific area, making it difficult to undergo career changes or practice in-house, where a generalist approach is necessary.

by coming under one regulatory body it becomes restrictive and that was not and is not the intention of the Legal Services Act as that was to make it easier for the public to obtain legal advice by being under one roof this is then unavailable to the public and not the objective of the Act

CILEX already has a independent regulator it will not be independent if it goes to SRA. Delegation is losing CILEX's independence. The public will have no idea what is going on or what has happened or what CILEX or SRA is, there will be no public trust and confidence in whether the delegation occurs or not it wont make a difference to the public. But it will make a difference to CILEX members and other lawyers.

Cilex has handled this badly so far as Associate members are concerned. There is a risk of further alienation of those members if this is badly handled

Cilex has worked hard over many years to be distinct . Plus no significant issues with regulation. The SRA has had some high profile criticism so regulation by them is not warranted.

CILEX have not gone far enough to educate consumers on the role of CILEX Lawyers in the provision of legal services.

CILEX risk creating more confusing with the proposed career ladder. Adding more titles to the mix will not assist the general public.

CILEX lawyers are already treated as below solicitors that being regulated by the SRA which is primarily for Solicitors they will want to affirm their "superiority" above those whom haven't the title "Solicitor".

CILEX lawyers may lose their independent identity and not all organisations employ CILEX members.

CILEX members I have spoken with are of similar view they do not wish to be SRA regulated and what has worked entirely well does not need to change

CILEX qualification offers an established alternative route into the profession. This appears to be the start of a decline into watering down that route and CILEX status when so much work has been done to build CILEX qualification into an recognised professional body

CILEX will be second class.

CLEs being consider lower than Chartered titles

Concerned cilex members themselves may lose out

Confusion in the mind of consumers

confusion, are we trainee solicitors, already had this said to me. More confusion amongst legal professionals, as to why it has happened as per Nick Emmerson law society president states

Confusion. Too many types of lawyer. It may well reduce the confidence of the public in qualified solicitors.

Consumers - less choice

Vulnerable Groups - SRA have been unable to keep costs of qualifying down with SQE and I am concerned that CILEX would follow the same path if control is moved.

Legal Professionals - less access to qualifying and no one to fight our corner

Providers - costs involved in changes, reprinting stationary, barriers to entry and more restrictions.

CRL should remain as our regulator. The problem is that the public are not aware that Chartered Legal Executives are specialist lawyers and work should be done to educate them.

Diminished status and more confusion

Do not want to be regulated by SRA want to stay independent

Don't believe this is a good decision for CILEX lawyers

Expensive PI insurance

Explained in the preceding sections

Cilex could be disadvantaged if splitting us depending on qualifications

Feedback from solicitors about SRA regulation is largely negative so it seems likely that changing regulation of CLEs to the SRA would negatively impact on them

For the reasons already included in previous answers there will be a considerable adverse impact on all of the above, because the mere mention of this proposal has already created chaos and uncertainty around legal services.
for the reasons outlined before
For the reasons stated above.

Generally the Cilex membership as a whole will likely be affected, certainly by the confusing job titles (again) and no doubt by the SRA transfer. Stick to what we have and work on developing that with members who have made differences already
Greater confusion about the standing of CILEx Fellows.
Greater confusion in consumer understanding, potential undermining of the CILEX profession amongst consumers and employers and more confusing access and routes to qualification.
Greater confusion with multiple levels of qualifications

Having seen how the SRA operate, I cannot see that this would be a positive move. The SRA will never view CILEx members as equal and I believe restrictions in what we do are more likely than parity between the professions. I am also concerned by the SRAs endeavours to take over the function of the SDT by seeking greater fining powers.

I

I am a Fellow of CILEX- I qualified in 2013 and all I'm trying to understanding, but I'm having difficult finding the answer, is the impact this has on those of us who have been qualified as a Fellow for some time. I cannot help but feel that the introduction of new titles means that Fellows are being downgraded to be perceived as advanced paralegals instead of lawyers. There is a lot of confusion and stress over whether CILEX fellows now need to obtain practice rights, particularly if the SRA take over the regulation, at an additional expenses to us. I agree with some of the other comments I have seen by other CILEX members as to why CILEX introduced the new CILEX Lawyer route to qualification, rather than continuing to campaign for Chartered Legal Executives. This has caused an awful lot of confusion amongst members and which terminology to use. More worryingly, it seems to be having an impact on equal opportunities for Chartered Legal Executives and whether this will cause employers to negotiate lower salaries.

I am concerned that the introduction of several additional CILEX titles will further confuse members of the public instead of providing clarity as to our qualification.

I am concerned that the SRA will have the best interests of CILEX members in mind, particularly when we are such a small group compared to its solicitor members. Will we just become eventually absorbed. If the move is going to happen then does the SRA intend on changing its name to promote the equality between CILEX and solicitor? Will my membership and practising certificate therefore come from the SRA? Will the membership costs be increased as a result? Will our CPD requirements change to the SRA format?

There are still too many uncertainties to enable me to make an informed decision regarding whether the proposed changes are within the best interests of CILEX members.

I am concerned that fellows of CILEx will not be treated the same as CILEx lawyers under the proposed changes and I cannot see why I should have to go back to law school and pass more exams to be given equal status.
I am proud to be a member of the CILEx, and I am glad that the board puts so much effort into developing the quality of the organisation even further. Thanks.

I am unsure whether solicitors may take issue with us all being regulated by SRA as we have taken different routes. Majority of work places view solicitor status and trainee solicitors as much more superior than CILEX lawyers/trainees
I believe it would be difficult to maintain customer confidence and the confidence of CILEX members if the SRA were regulators given the recent events with Axiom Ince Limited.

I believe your proposals would have the opposite effect of what you are trying to achieve; it would create more confusion, stifle competition, hinder innovations, and increase the inequality between solicitors and Legal Executives. I think your proposals would deter people from minority backgrounds for engaging in CILEx qualifications, and there is the real risk that the SRA would look to do away with the qualification as a whole, once again making access to the legal profession only accessible by the wealthy, or by creating significant debt for those that need to take out ridiculously high loans to pay for their education. This would be a backwards move for society as a whole and bring back elitism in the legal profession, which would then have a significant detrimental impact on the legal system and the judiciary as it would once again become the playground of rich white men. This proposal has a far greater impact upon society than may in fact have been considered. I cannot see the benefit, the merger could water down CILEx's independence and role and I think this is likely to be the beginning of the end for CILEx

I didn't answer yes but was still required to enter text here in order to submit the form.

I do not consider the proposals are appropriate to maintain the status of fellows

I do not consider the SRA will promote the interests of CILEx and other providers of legal services

I do not feel that the proposals are right for any of the above categories at all.

I do not see how what is proposed in CILEx members best interests. I also do not see how this will assist consumers.

I don't think so

I don't believe the consumers are concerned.

I don't consider the proposal should proceed.

I don't have confidence that CILEx Lawyers will be protected under a larger Regulator, nor that this isn't anything more than a money making scheme.

I don't know enough to be able to confidently say yes there will be no adverse impact of the proposals. I have raised a question about the proposals which has not been answered.

I fail to see how adding in the SRA will "equalise" professional solicitors and Legal Executive. Until the Solicitors profession undergoes a transformation all that is being done is cosmetic and will make consumers even more wary of the two professions. This is not what CILEx members need or want. It will introduce more complex rules for each profession.

I have concerns about how CILEx lawyers will be treated by the SRA. Assuming we are treated equally, or at least viewed in the same way that we are now and retain our practising rights, I support the move.

I have concerns re: CILEx becoming subsumed by the SRA that, over time, there will be an erosion of the special nature of CILEx that allows those from diverse backgrounds to join the legal profession.

I have concerns that a small group of individuals will get left behind i.e. the position of CLEs will be even harder to explain and contextualise once Chartered Lawyers exist.

I have detailed this in my previous answers

I have explained why. It's detrimental on all levels.

I have provided detailed answers in the above there is in short a risk to jobs, risk to the CILEx brand, risk to vulnerable groups in the sense that bigger organisations can't move as quickly and meet vulnerable consumer demands and needs as easily without passing through more bureaucratic red tape and it removes the diversity from many providers of legal services to one super or mega regulatory model or

Society

I have set out in the previous answers the concerns I have for the impact on consumers. The main impact is going to be on CILEx professionals and CILEx regulated firms who will, despite whatever assurances the SRA might give, lose their voice and status. I am proud to be both a solicitor and FCILEx - they are distinct and each have good and bad points. In my experience, CILEx is easily the better regulator from a professional's point of view. Better the devil you know...

I strongly believe it will not improve the situation for Legal Executives.

I think CILEx lawyers would lose some of their identity and the reputation that has been built on so far. More needs to be input to raising awareness of the route to qualifying and the work that is put in to becoming a CILEx lawyer which is just as important and challenging if not more so than a lawyer

I think my previous answers suffice

i think the move right now would be detrimental to cilex lawyers.

I think the proposals create greater confusion and are a kick in the teeth for existing Chartered Legal Executives. I will give a practical example to illustrate my concerns. If I am asked at Court whether I am a solicitor, I say no. If I am asked whether I am a chartered Lawyer, I will have to say no. I will then need to explain that I am a Chartered Legal Executive and I am no longer sure I can explain to someone what that actually means. I studied for a long time to become one.

I think the proposed change of regulator will have a significant adverse impact on consumers and legal professionals. CILEx members are very proud of their distinct status and the change is only likely to confuse consumers and demotivate professionals who have worked hard to get where they are.

I think the proposed changes will be detrimental to those who have qualified via the Cilex route and will cause greater confusion around the Chartered Legal Executive title for those who retain it.

I think there is huge risk that CLE's will be continue to be treated by solicitors as if we are not as good as them. We have seen little indication of the financial position to CLE's in terms of practicing cert renewal fees.

I think this move had made CLEs look foolish within the industry. We are a strong organisation with every clever legal professionals but Cilex's dogged determination to move has made it appear that we have no faith in our own brand. Instead it appears we're jumping onto the coat-tails of solicitors to take up some of their brand, thereby confusing consumers into using a Cilex Lawyer.

I think we need more assurance from the SRA that their members will understand our position and profession better. More clarity and transparency

If assistance of the legal profession and the public was the goal, then looking to fully merge CILEx and its members into the law society would be the strategy. There really is no need for both CILEx Lawyers and Solicitors. I am qualified as both. We do the exact same job, the only difference is the route to qualification is a bit different. I appreciate that this will not be done because all of those running CILEx would be out of a job, power and money.

If feels like Legal Execs are constantly jumping through hoops

If SRA takes over as a regulatory body, then the FCILEXs (to their field of expertise) should be called as Solicitors to make this simpler to the public and the clients. Otherwise there is a chance that the consumers would be more confused about the distinctions.

If the public is educated about the titles and cikex this could help otherwise how will they know

I'm frankly astounded that you're even considering a) changing what FCILEX are called yet again and b) considering having the SRA regulate us. I didn't spend years studying to become FCILEX only to be lumped in with solicitors; I have no doubt that it will have a wholly detrimental impact on how I am viewed professionally.

In relation to consumers and vulnerable groups, I have answered yes only because I think having CILEX Lawyers and solicitors regulated by the SRA increases confusion about whether a CILEX Lawyer is a greater or lesser grade than a solicitor rather than just a different route to qualification. Otherwise the impact to consumers and vulnerable groups is neither adverse nor positive. I do not believe it makes any difference. CRL have proved that they are an effective regulator. CILEX for reasons that they clearly are not prepared to disclose are determined to move to the SRA regardless of the views of its members and the current regulator. I do not see any benefit for consumers in the move. If there are concerns in relation to current regulation, then far better to resolve those with the regulator. Over the past 15 years the CRL have done a far better job at regulation than the SRA have managed.

In relation to Legal Professionals the adverse impacts are manifest. I have explained my thoughts throughout this consultation, but to summarise:

(i) The risk of dilution of the identity of CILEX lawyers

(ii) The risk that perception of CILEX Lawyers as lesser to solicitors is further entrenched by being a separate class within the SRA's regulation

(iii) The risks associated by being regulated by the SRA which has shown itself repeatedly to be very interested in punishing the most minor of infractions by junior solicitors and paralegals in an entirely disproportionate manner while at the same time allowing extremely serious breaches to slide until it is way too late. I have not spoken to a solicitor who would recommend being regulated by the SRA.

(iv) Increased costs if the SRA persists in plans to seek additional levies from those regulated by it to cover shortfalls in its compensation fund - where those funds are needed to pay out for regulatory failings.

(v) The risk that the SRA does not champion the CILEX route to qualification as the CRL does.

The risks to providers of legal services are less but on the same lines. No details of costs have been provided by the SRA, but at the very least the increase of PII cover from £2m to £3m is a huge cost for a small business. Some clarity is needed here.

Overall, I am concerned at the tone of this consultation, which is very clearly biased toward the SRA proposal. The perception is that members' views are of little importance and that the decision is already made regardless of those views or anything else.

In the answers that I have already provided

Independent regulation means just that. I do not believe SRA membership is the best way to achieve CILEX objectives and I do not want to see CILEX lawyers subsumed into one large group with Solicitors. They are individuals that is their selling point.

Institutes such as CILEX should remain independent from other departments to provide all with other routes and specialties to the legal profession.

Insufficient information to know

Invariably, the changes affect both sides.

It creates additional division in the legal profession. It highlights more the difference between cilex and solicitors, increasing the us and them view and will drive the myth that cilex is a lesser qualification because solicitors will inevitably want to draw a significant distinction between the two, meaning clients when being forced to choose would inevitably choose the "more qualified" lawyer. This is incredibly damaging as a proposal.

It is clear that these changes only act to show how CILEX no longer believes its members are equal to solicitors. The SRA could not act impartially while regulating both CILEX's and Solicitors and the chances are CILEX's would suffer as a result, being smaller in number. The effect on women especially is great, but will be detrimental to any group who were not in a position in their life to undertake a degree or continue on with their studies to become a Solicitor. Consumers only need a collaboration to ensure they understand, this is also a responsibility on Firms and in-house departments to ensure they themselves promote the diversity of the legal profession and that all Lawyer's, no matter their route to qualification, are experienced and can be trusted to carry out the instruction.

It is impossible as it stands to draw conclusions on levels of expertise when even your own helpdesk staff don't understand it and you keep changing the goal posts. Your own members are confused, frustrated and losing faith and confidence in you as a regulatory body. I was proud of my qualification when I achieved it and since then you have given me three different job titles, no idea why, and then changed again asking for an exorbitant amount of money to prove that I can do a job that I have been doing and stay CPD'd to be able to maintain. I am just an endless money cow to you.

It is unnecessary for current CILEX members to have this change foisted upon us. Many Solicitors are unhappy with the SRA and the way they are overseen, why would we want to become part of that?! Please listen to your members here, we do not want this.

It leads to greater confusion and less confidence.

It makes no difference what so ever

It may lead to a two-tier system and all the hard work done to ensure parity.

It may not be well liked by solicitors being grouped together.

IT SEEMS TOTALLY UNFAIR THAT THE SRA FAILS TO ALLOW CPQ STUDENTS WHO SEEK TO CROSS-QUALIFY AS SOLICITORS EXEMPTIONS BY REASON OF THEIR CILEX CPQ STUDIES. UNDER THE FORMER CILEX LEVEL 6 LEGACY QUALIFICATIONS, MANY CILEX STUDENTS PROGRESSED THEIR CAREERS AND ACHIEVED SOLICITOR STATUS BY VIRTUE OF BEING GIVEN CREDIT FOR THEIR CILEX LEVEL 6 LAW QUALIFICATIONS AND THEREFORE RELIEF FROM SOME OF THE QUALIFYING SOLICITOR EXAMS.

SUCH FAILURE TO RECOGNISE CILEX CPQ LEGAL QUALIFICATIONS AS HOLDING VALUE (NOTWITHSTANDING STUDENTS WHO PROGRESS TO CILEX CPQ PROFESSIONAL STAGE WILL HAVE SECURED APPROXIMATELY 6 YEARS OF LEGAL KNOWLEDGE) AND REQUIRING CPQ STUDENTS TO UNDERTAKE BOTH PARTS OF THE SQE (AS WOULD BE THE REQUIREMENT FOR A STUDENT WHO HAD OBTAINED A NON-LAW DEGREE) WITHOUT ANY EXEMPTIONS WILL ONLY DETER CPQ STUDENTS FROM CROSS-QUALIFYING AS SOLICITORS. THIS IN TURN WILL MEAN THAT SOLICITORS BECOME MORE ELITIST. THIS IS AT ODDS WITH THE AMBIT OF THE LEGAL SERVICES BOARD WHICH SEEKS TO EMBRACE DIVERSITY AMONGST LEGAL PROFESSIONALS INCLUDING SOLICITORS.

I HEAVILY BELIEVE THIS NEEDS TO BE RECONSIDERED AND SOME RELAXATION/EXEMPTIONS GRANTED TO CPQ LAWYERS WHO SEEK TO CROSS-QUALIFY AS SOLICITORS.

It undermines the profile of Fellows, and makes it harder for them to practice. It will also have an impact on their mental health.

It would make no difference to consumers. Cilex members often have a niche group of individuals that they represent who are often vulnerable. Trust from those individuals may be destroyed by the change in regulator as not all members of the public think highly of solicitors as whereas Cilex members they do. As previously stated, I do not believe that the SRA would act in the interests of Cilex any more than they would act in the interests of members of the Bar if the Bar Council were seeking to make this change. Even some members of the solicitors' profession have no confidence in their regulator, the SRA and their ability to regulate them properly, so why would Cilex want them to regulate us?

Just those on legacy qualifications as I have set out before. People will still be qualifying under this route through to 2026 and a pathway for them to obtain the Chartered Lawyer status needs to be clear.

A more creative and pragmatic approach needs to be undertaken for experienced fellows. I myself conducted litigation on behalf of my employer in a number of cases which have been formally reported. Counsel (and Leading Counsel) were instructed to conduct the advocacy but I am more than capable of exercising litigation rights without supervision to a fairly decent standard.

Keep CILEX separate from SRA!

Lawyers will not benefit from the regulation

LE will suffer under SRA regulation see all my previous answers as to why

Leaving behind long standing Fellows.

Legal services are provided by a number of organisations such as the co-op who employ some unqualified staff to provide legal services direct to the public but I doubt the change will impact on them

Legal Services may become more regulated and those employed may have to either retrain or seek alternative employment if not meeting the criteria.

Less focussed and interested view of Cilex persons by SRA, which has been wholly interested in solicitors to date.

Long qualified Fellows will be at a disadvantage.

Looking forward to becoming a solicitor.

Meinir Phillips

Monopolisation by SRA is harmful to everyone.

Mor expense and confusion for the profession and the public leave as it is

more explanation is needed when explaining everything to vulnerable individuals