



# **Changes to the regulations for the Higher Rights of Audience qualification**

## **Consultation responses**

---

May 2025

**These are the responses from respondents who asked us to publish their responses anonymously.**

## 2. About you

How should we publish your response?

Please select an option below.

Publish the response anonymously

## 1. Consultation questions

**1) Do you have any comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards and Regulations for Higher Rights of Audience assessments in Annex 1?**

I am concerned about the assessment procedure . Will there be sufficient attention paid to consistent assessment? What training will be given to assessors ? I am concerned that those delivering the training will not know what is in the assessment. How on earth can they then ensure that relevant training is given? Will assessors be barristers ? I hope not as many will have a vested interest in actually not allowing solicitors to practise in what they consider to be their domain. Ensuring that's the assessments are consistent and transparent is extremely difficult, and I have yet to see the detail of how this will be managed by the University of Law.

**2) Do you have any further comments on the potential impacts, either positive or negative, of our proposed regulatory changes?**

Please see my previous comments. I have recently undertaken the civil higher rights training. I spent a great deal of time in preparation. I took time off work to do so. I failed the assessment on first sitting and succeeded on the second sitting. I passed the advocacy element but not the written assessment. The reason I failed the written assessment was because two of the five questions asked were not covered at all on the course, so they arose completely unexpectedly. The instruction not to access digital materials made it impossible to consult available materials in the time available as I had no non digital access to the white book. What measures will be taken to ensure that all assessed topics will be covered by the training provider? Despite what is said about how other training providers will not be disadvantaged in future, it remains obvious that the University of Law will be every candidates first choice as they are conducting the assessment! Other training providers will suffer and the candidate will have to use the University of Law, no matter what the quality of the training provision might be.

Response ID:6 Data

### 3. About you

**How should we publish your response?**

**Please select an option below.**

Publish the response anonymously

### 1. Consultation questions

**1) Do you have any comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards and Regulations for Higher Rights of Audience assessments in Annex 1?**

Students should have choice when it comes to providers. Personally, I have found ULaw and BPP extremely poor with being willing to implement reasonable adjustments, thus I took my LPC elsewhere. The HRA needs this also or disabled students like myself will be stuck furthering our careers.

**2) Do you have any further comments on the potential impacts, either positive or negative, of our proposed regulatory changes?**

Have more than one course provider - don't monopolise it. It only benefits the provider and not the students.

Response ID:7 Data

#### 4. About you

**How should we publish your response?**

**Please select an option below.**

Publish the response anonymously

#### 2. Consultation questions

**1) Do you have any comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards and Regulations for Higher Rights of Audience assessments in Annex 1?**

Please allow students/solicitors to continue to have a choice. I am currently doing my LLB with the University of Law and have experienced nothing but problems with assessments (wrong exam papers, forgetting to mark amongst other issues). When it comes to the SQE I will not choose them as a provider due to this. I want to obtain my HRA in time but my experiences with this establishment are putting me off. Please allow people to have a choice.

**2) Do you have any further comments on the potential impacts, either positive or negative, of our proposed regulatory changes?**

See previous comments. Allowing only one provider will be disastrous. It will take away choice from students and only benefit the provider.

Response ID:9 Data

## 5. About you

**How should we publish your response?**

**Please select an option below.**

Publish the response anonymously

## 2. Consultation questions

**1) Do you have any comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards and Regulations for Higher Rights of Audience assessments in Annex 1?**

I note that you are to allow the University of Law to be the sole provider for HRA. Please reconsider this. Solicitors require choice. I am thankfully coming to the end of my LPC with the University of Law. It has been a dreadful experience. Their assessment team has forgotten to list me for exams on campus more than once meaning I have had to wait for a resit. Because of this and as I haven't completed the course within the agreed time, my training contract offer has now been rescinded. If I had choice, I would have gone elsewhere. I certainly would not want to continue my HRA journey with them.

**2) Do you have any further comments on the potential impacts, either positive or negative, of our proposed regulatory changes?**

Response ID:10 Data

## 2. About you

---

How should we publish your response?

Please select an option below.

Publish the response anonymously

## 3. Consultation questions

---

1) Do you have any comments on the proposed amendments to the Standards and Regulations for Higher Rights of Audience assessments in Annex 1?

---

2) Do you have any further comments on the potential impacts, either positive or negative, of our proposed regulatory changes?

There should be atleast 2 providers, altior barbri is good they should be on the list