concentrates on what first-year doctrine would look like if care and connectedness, in addition to justice, were viewed as individual rights. The innate psychological and biological differences in men and women are examined and students are reminded that gender differences are easy to assert but hard to prove. The course attempts to illustrate different voice feminism using case law, thereby showing that the women in the cases are different depending on whether you look at the case from a liberal feminist viewpoint or a cultural feminist outlook. Looking for the different voice in case law actually freshens the students' perspective on the common law method.

New looks at old cases occupies only a minor amount of the time in Part 2 and most readings come from the academy. To these readings a two-part writing requirement is added on a topic relating to women and law. Students choose their own topics, preferably to do with the first year curriculum and feminism. The second writing task is a one-page assessment of the readings for each class, called Reactions. Students are required to write Reactions for four out of 12 classes.

There are many courses at law schools which concern themselves with feminist jurisprudence. The Feminist Revisit is different in that it is grounded in specifics outside of feminism, thus keeping it firmly in contact with reality. There is also a shared reference point, the first year curriculum. Such a reference point is commonly lacking in a feminist jurisprudence course. However, the Revisit necessarily has to omit the history of feminism.

In planning this seminar the author surveyed the literature on the pedagogy of feminism in law schools. Courses tend inherently to escape tough scrutiny and to deflect unwelcome criticism and victim consciousness makes it easy for editors of law reviews and legal education journals to relax their criticisms. There is no consensus on curriculum, and indeed curriculum is seen by some feminist legal educators to be an evil. In addition, teaching of feminism in law schools still suffers from ethnocentrism by being dominated by whites. Change must be accommodated and instructors should be aware that the materials used to teach should encompass current developments. The concept of women as victims often arises as does the issue of whether the complaints made by feminists equate to anything more than whining. Such courses give men a chance to experience the conditions which go with the gendered minority status, such as self-consciousness about their bodies, stereotyping and scapegoating.

HISTORY

From cramming to skills — the development of solicitors' education and training since Ormrod
N Saunders
30 *Law Teacher* 2, pp 168–186

Despite being 25 years old the Ormrod report is still referred to as a seminal event in legal education in the United Kingdom. The report came at a time when legal education was changing and several new universities were created which were keen to establish departments of law which were cheap to run and attractive to quality applicants. Many solicitors were reluctant to believe that practitioners needed to have a degree in law or any other subject.

Between 1962 and 1979 the structure of solicitors' training was a compromise which reflected the growing number of entrants possessing a law degree and the increasing role of the Law Society's examinations as the point of entry for school leavers. There were four avenues by which law students could become solicitors. Law graduates were required to complete examinations in Conveyancing, Equity & Succession, Company & Partnership, Commercial, Revenue, and either Family, Local Government or Magisterial Law, as well as accounts, and complete two years of articles. Non-law graduates and mature students with equivalent qualifications had to complete Part I examinations as well as Part II Examinations and two years of articles. School leavers had to complete Part I and II examinations and do 5 years of articles.

The Ormrod Report proposed the division of legal education into academic, professional and continuing education, based mainly on practical considerations. The academic stage would normally be satisfied by a law degree containing Constitutional & Administrative Law, Law of Contract, Land Law, Criminal Law and the Law of Tort. Articles were to be abolished and replaced by a restriction on the practice of admittees for the first three years. There was an urgent need to up-date lawyer knowledge and familiarise them with other disciplines impacting on the law. The Ormrod Committee recommended an Institute to oversee the link between the profession and educational institutions.

It was only in 1979 that the Law Society's Training Regulations recognised qualifying law degrees as a prime means of completing the

academic stage of the training. By the early 80s there was little attempt by the Law Society to enforce the detailed rules for recognising law degrees and all-graduate entry was ceased in 1976. In 1979 the school leavers route was abolished. The Society did not wish to abolish articles to be replaced by a vocational course and 3 year period of restricted practice. However, at the same time it accepted that the Part II exams were a memory test, preparatory courses were crammers, articles were often difficult to obtain and variable in educational quality and clerks were pressured to earn their keep. In response all students were required to undertake a preliminary course to prepare them for the office. The course was to be provided at the College of Law and other approved institutions. The Society continued to set the examinations for this qualifier, known as the Final Course.

Between 1979 to 1993 law graduates had to complete the Final Course and two years of articles. Non-law graduates had to do the same in addition to completing the Common Professional Examination, usually of two years duration and containing the core subjects recommended by the Ormrod Report. School leavers had to endure an arduous six year combination of qualifying courses concurrent with articles.

The Benson Report did little other than to consider that the current academic arrangements were in line with the Ormrod Report and that changes to articles did not go far enough. It recommended that the Society should offer more help to students in finding articles, publish guidelines on pay and establish education committees.

Criticisms of the Final Course began to appear, suggesting that teaching had become formulaic and dominated by the demands of the examination, which had become more predictable. The Bar had already decided to introduce a more practical course in place of the Bar Examinations, to be called the Bar Vocational Course.

The Marre Committee was substantially constituted by practitioners. It recommended that the usual entry to the profession should be by way of a law degree and that academic and vocational training remain separate. Importantly, the report attempted to catalogue the intellectual and practical skills required by lawyers and when they should be taught. The impact of the Marre Report was negligible, and the Law Society decided to conduct its own review of legal education. Their review recommended that there should continue to be a variety of routes for entry to the profession and the transfer requirements for overseas lawyers should be eased. A rigorous review of the content of the Final Course to emphasise the identification of problems, advice to clients, preparation of documents and organisation of work was recommended. New assessment formats other than exams should be introduced. The report rejected a sandwich course.

The Training Tomorrow's Solicitors review recommended that the Final Course be replaced with the Legal Practice Course which included not only substantive law, practice and procedure but also practical skills, such as drafting, interviewing, negotiating, advocacy and legal research. Articles were to be replaced with a training contract during which time trainees would take the Professional Skills Course of 4 weeks duration if undertaken on a full-time basis.

As a result, entry into the profession for law graduates now requires completion of the Legal Practice Course of one year duration, and a training contract for two years during which the Professional Skills Course is to be completed. Non-law graduates have to complete the Common Professional Examinations or a Diploma in Law as well as the LPC and training contract.

The years 1991 to 1994 have seen the centre of activity moving from the Society to the course providers. During its life, different issues have confronted the LPC. Currently, as the recession eases and demand for trainees picks up, concern about the gap between the number of validated LPC places and the number of training contracts has lead to suggestions that the number of LPC places be reduced or made conditional on having an offer of a training contract.

The task facing the current inquiry by the Lord Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Legal Education and Conduct as it prepares its final report is much more difficult than that facing Ormrod. Law schools are increasingly not their own masters but are affected by changes in the structure and funding of higher education. Legal education is in a state of turmoil and the legal profession has doubled in size and greatly diversified. It remains to be seen whether the ACLEC report will achieve the seemingly impossible task of producing a comprehensive review of the training of solicitors and barristers which commands the general assent of both practitioners and teachers.