



Analysis of Feedback to EQE Discussion Paper

Number of feedback posts so far (June 14, 2021, 11 p.m.):

Forum on epi-learning: 51 individual posts

E-Mail (or otherwise): 7 comments

June 14, 2021

1

1



I. Feedback related to „Motivation for Change“

- Adequate testing of core competencies should be starting point of all changes
- Reduction of costs appears to be a major driving force for the proposal
- Improvement of training and support of candidates could be done by providing training courses not increasing number of exams (e.g. EPO academy)
- Knowing the “trick” is currently not sufficient for passing, so do not overrate methodology courses; these courses also help to improve the practical skills of the candidates
- Correlation between mentioned motivation (“fit-to-practice”) and proposed changes in setup (modular, MCQ-questions) not stringent

2

2



II. Feedback related to „Content of EQE“

- **Making exam more real-life / less predictable / extend syllabus:**
 - enlarging syllabus may be detrimental for candidates with less practical experience, e.g. from **smaller countries** with less variability in work practice
 - way of marking should change when questions go in direction of legal opinion; accept **alternative solutions**
 - discuss constraints and options with the **examination committees**
 - change of syllabus does not require a change of the entire format
 - real-life questions **increase complexity** – this is in contrast with time reduction
-

3

3



II. Feedback related to „Content of EQE“

- New format would enable **passing without sitting each of A/B/C parts** (due to random selection)
 - can lead to reduction of quality; candidates might just prepare for some part and resit long enough
 - all candidates should demonstrate in EQE that they have all “core competences” required for practice
 - **Technical level** required for EQE should be clearly defined
 - **Define core competences** and after that choose the suitable format for testing
-

4

4



III. Feedback related to „Format of EQE“

- **Electronic form of exam**
 - overall very positive feedback so far
 - candidates managed very well this year
- **Venue of exam** – at examination centres or at home?
 - organizational burden fully on candidates when at home
 - cheating possible when at home
 - supervision by AI is uncomfortable for candidates at home
- **Overall timeline of exam** – should it be possible to start the exam after 1 year and finish the exam already after 2 years?
 - starting after 1 year may be too early
 - can the quality be maintained? Is 2 years sufficient to be “fit-to-practice”?
 - what is the motivation for the proposed change?

5

5



III. Feedback related to „Format of EQE“

- **Modular set-up** – shall the exam be split into different modules distributed over 1 year?
 - increase of workload for candidates and supervisors
 - diminished performance in every-day work
 - increase of workload for markers and drafters, decrease of quality
 - increase of workload for examination board and appeal board due to increased number of appeals
 - clash with preparation for national exams
- **Duration of final exam** – shall the parts of the final exam do not exceed 2 hours?
 - complexity / quality of exam will be reduced
 - will not allow making the exam more “real-life”
 - detrimental for non-native speakers of EN/DE/FR
 - seems to be dictated by technical reasons -> instead improve the used technology

6

6



III. Feedback related to „Format of EQE“

- **Multiple choice questions (MCQ)**
 - how can the creative skills still be tested?
 - How can the quality be maintained in MCQ exams?
 - can the workload for drafting/organization be actually reduced by MCQ?
 - what can we learn from the experiences with the pre-exam?
 - MCQ could be more suitable in training than in examination
 - MCQ is not a suitable replacement for the D1 part; add free-text exam “L3” with D1-style questions (e.g. 1.5 hours)

- **AI correction** of parts of free-text exam
 - may not lead to a fair marking of answers which are not 100 % correct or deviate from defined terminology

7

7



III. Feedback related to „Format of EQE“

- **Provide several dates for each exam part within one year**
 - overall welcomed
 - how to manage increased workload for drafting/markings?

- **Sitting some of exams at any time**
 - who will generate the required pool of questions?
 - enormous effort for drafting MCQs in three languages
 - who will invigilate the candidates when sitting is allowed at any time?
 - methodology courses will even get more important

- **Raising pass rate for re-sitters**
 - could be unfair

8

8



III. Further suggestions / comments

- **Do not conduct hasty changes**
 - quality should have absolute priority
 - good MCQ questions are difficult to design
 - mock exams for all parts should be available to the candidates well before the real exams
 - **Improve the pre-exam** to test exam-readiness
 - expand benchmarking of MCQs to increase quality
 - **Consult drafters/markers** for changing content and way of marking of EQE
 - Add comment section to MCQ to allow a candidate give explanations
 - **Limit number of resits** (2 to 3 resits)
 - **Abolish compensation scheme** to reduce time for marking and increase quality (only one threshold to be observed)
-

9

9



III. Further suggestions / comments

- Enable access to automatic translators and enable candidates to give answers in their native language
 - Enable access to all material in digital format / enable uploading pdf material or provide pdf version of required legal basis
 - Provide a reference to IP 5 aspects
-

10

10



III. Further suggestions / comments

- supervise training period, e.g. show number of specific cases handled by candidate
- allow sitting papers A/B earlier
- Start slowly with only 1 final exam per year to test the new setup
- Test P1/L1 not any time but at multiple fixed times, e.g. every second month
- add patent-related articles of the TRIPs agreement to the syllabus (TRIPs Part II.5, Patents: Art. 27-29 & 34; Part III.2 Civil and Administrative Procedures and Remedies: Art. 44-47; and Part. III.3 Provisional Measures: Art. 50), to have appropriate legal basis for the rights conferred, infringement and enforcement
- Increase support for Examination Secretariat -> IT division!