

The relationship between peer review outcomes and accreditation profiles of providers

Purpose

The QWG have agreed to look into the relationship between peer review outcomes and accreditation profiles of providers, to establish if possible how they can work together to provide a comprehensive picture of competence without unnecessary burden on providers. If a link between accreditation and good peer review outcomes is established– this will be considered by the members of the future QWG and may be incorporated into a future quality framework,

Structure of Research

A pilot will be conducted in one category of law to establish whether there is a relationship between peer review and accreditation, if so what that relationship is. The QWG agreed that initial analysis should be conducted in the Family category of law, largely due to the fact that there will be sufficient peer review outcomes (over the last 12 months) to use as a benchmark to compare accreditation against.

Additional information will be sought from providers or other parties, to establish per supplier, the following:

- Accreditation profile (how many staff Accredited/not accredited)
- Accreditation type (Resolution/Family Panel or Advanced Family Panel).
- Experience of Non-Accredited Staff (presumably Post Qualification?)

It was agreed that family lawyers (from TLS/LSC etc) are approached for their input into what other information may be relevant to ask, before a final set of questions are agreed.

The research will be based on a hypothesis drafted by Avrom Sherr and agreed by the QWG. This will take into account the specific issues that members feel need to be considered as part of this research.

What do we do with the findings of the research?

It is not known what the findings of the research will show. However, if a linkage is proven between peer review outcomes and the accreditation profile of the supplier – it is possible that in the future quality framework, accreditation can be actively utilised as a quality assurance tool along with other tools that provide levels of quality assurance such as the SQM, LEXEL or Peer Review – and visa versa. An example was explored during the meeting – where if the accreditation profile of a supplier is at a level that gives quality confidence then a peer review may not be necessary every 3 years, but say every 5 years instead. Alternatively, SRA could accept a peer review rating of a supplier as assurance rather than an individual accreditation ‘test’ or portfolio test. Therefore, this research could lead to real benefits to the

provider and those responsible for quality assurance – it would also support the objectives of the quality framework to avoid duplication and reduce bureaucracy. Other benefits of research may become apparent – for example – what type of accreditation works better (portfolio route or test).

Following this research, if a linkage is proven - it is anticipated that research into all other accredited categories will need to be conducted.

Next Steps

- Research hypothesis agreed End October
- Required information for collection agreed Mid November
- Data collection methodology agreed Mid November
- Research team and costs agreed Mid November

It is likely that the initial research will take approximately 3 months (from mid-November). This would be reported as part of the continuing work of the QWP.