



TAB 4

Report to Convocation June 28, 2018

Paralegal Standing Committee

Committee Members

Robert Burd (Chair)
Janis Criger (Vice-Chair)
Marion Boyd
Cathy Corsetti
Michelle Haigh
Brian Lawrie
Marian Lippa
Susan McGrath
Malcolm Mercer
Barbara Murchie
Jan Richardson
Baljit Sikand
Anne Vespry

Purpose of Report: Information

**Prepared by the Policy Division
Will Morrison (416-947-3314)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

For Information

Paralegal Licensing Update: Accreditation, Audit and Licensing Examination Protocols and Outcomes..... [Tab 4.1](#)

COMMITTEE PROCESS

1. The Paralegal Standing Committee (the "Committee") met on June 13, 2018. In attendance were Robert Burd (Chair), Cathy Corsetti, Brian Lawrie, Marian Lippa (by telephone), Susan McGrath, Malcolm Mercer, Barbara Murchie (by telephone), Baljit Sikand (by telephone), and Anne Vespry.
2. Law Society staff members Cara-Marie O'Hagan, Priya Bhatia, Ken Osborne, and Will Morrison participated in the meeting.

FOR INFORMATION**PARALEGAL LICENSING UPDATE: ACCREDITATION,
AUDIT, AND LICENSING EXAMINATION PROTOCOLS
AND OUTCOMES****Issue**

3. This report provides an overview of key paralegal education and licensing topics, including college accreditation and audit processes, and licensing examination protocols and outcomes. This report includes updates on operational enhancements overseen by the Professional Development & Competence Division, and also reviews areas for potential further development.

Background

4. In October 2012, the Paralegal Standing Committee approved the incorporation of substantive areas of law into the paralegal licensing examination as a first step in the implementation of a more robust assessment system in support of entry-level competence for paralegal licensees.
5. The enhancements to the paralegal licensing examination platform reflected the recommendations contained in the Law Society's Legal Needs Analysis Report (April 2012), which were further echoed in the Morris Report (November 2012), focused on increasing the core competence of paralegals as a foundational step in supporting the maturation of the paralegal profession. These changes also aligned the paralegal licensing examination platform with the Law Society's strategic priorities related to the licensure of the professions.
6. As changes to the paralegal licensing examination platform were being adopted, consideration was being given to modifying the Law Society's paralegal education accreditation and audit process. In February 2014, Convocation approved reforms to the framework for the accreditation and auditing of paralegal education programs in order to establish more stringent standards and processes.

Paralegal Accreditation and Audit Protocol

7. The Law Society's accreditation and audit framework process provides systematic quality control over paralegal education through specification of curriculum, assessment, experiential training, and infrastructure requirements.

8. Accreditation of paralegal education programs began in the summer of 2008 and has consisted primarily of a paper-based application process, followed by an in-person audit of the program within the first three years of operation.
9. While the paper-based application process ensured initial oversight over the proposed instructional design, it did not permit the Law Society to fully gauge the college's ability to operationalize a program until an audit was conducted.
10. Since 2015, in conjunction with other process enhancements described below, program accreditation has expanded to involve a number of other validation activities in addition to the paper-based application, including documentation searches (e.g., complaints or Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) incident reports), site visits, interviews, and review of other data prior to the accreditation of a new program. Program accreditation must be renewed every five years.
11. An accredited program must offer a minimum of 830 program hours, comprised of 590 instructional hours in 18 compulsory legal courses, 120 instructional hours in additional coursework that relate to a paralegal's scope of practice or support being a well-rounded paralegal graduate, and 120 hours of field placement work experience. See [Tab 4.1.1](#) for a list of Compulsory Legal Courses that must be offered as part of an accredited paralegal education program.
12. As part of its application process, the Law Society requires a college to submit the following information to demonstrate fulfillment of the accreditation criteria:
 - a. general information regarding the college and its administrators, including the program coordinator;
 - b. information regarding each course, including the number of hours of instruction offered, the course syllabus, the competencies covered, proposed course assessments along with marking rubrics and the time allotted to instructors for the return of marked assessments, and proposed textbooks and supplementary resources;
 - c. a list of faculty members, the courses each will teach, faculty member résumés, and information related to faculty qualifications (i.e., licensing information and years of practice and teaching experience);
 - d. field placement information; and
 - e. program-specific as well as general college policies.
13. The Law Society formally implemented a revised Paralegal Education Program Accreditation Policy (Accreditation Policy) in September 2015, reflecting priority areas articulated by Convocation. The revisions implemented in the Accreditation

Policy sought to introduce more rigorous requirements and articulate more specific standards as a means of enhancing the Law Society's oversight of paralegal education programs. The enhancements included:

- a. limiting the program coordinator's instructional duties to no more than 50% of his or her time so as to ensure that a proportionate amount of time was directed towards supervising the instructional design;
 - b. requiring the program coordinator to conduct periodic classroom observations;
 - c. implementing more stringent standards for faculty qualifications (e.g., instructors were required to have at least one year of practice experience, preferably in the subject matter areas in which they would be teaching, and to have teaching experience or formal training in education best practices or to take such training within six months of being hired);
 - d. limiting the number of new cohort intakes per year and mandating a minimum cohort size of ten students;
 - e. requiring course sequencing so that introductory courses would be taught before secondary courses;
 - f. mandating more stringent standards for the use of assessments in paralegal education;
 - g. detailing colleges' obligations with respect to the oversight of field placements for students;
 - h. obligating colleges to report to the Law Society at periodic intervals through an annual declaration, cohort composition declaration, and cohort completion declaration; and
 - i. mandating reaccreditation every five years.
14. As a means of ensuring the adoption of the more rigorous standards required under the new Accreditation Policy, colleges accredited to provide paralegal education were required to seek reaccreditation with the Law Society. Under the Accreditation Policy, both the accreditation and reaccreditation processes are very similar, except that the accreditation process includes a site visit by Law Society auditors while the reaccreditation process does not require it. Reaccreditation activities commenced in 2016. Twenty-nine programs sought and received reaccreditation over a one-year period based on fulfillment of the new requirements under the Accreditation Policy.
15. Once accredited, each institution participates in a rigorous audit process in order to demonstrate that the program's curriculum, infrastructure, and systems continue to

align with the accreditation criteria set by the Law Society. The Audit Policy and Framework (Audit Framework) sets out a detailed requirements enabling a comprehensive review of an accredited paralegal education program.

16. In accordance with the parameters approved by Convocation in 2007, the Audit Framework stipulates that all programs be audited within the first three years post-accreditation and at least once every five years thereafter. Audits of accredited college paralegal programs began in November 2009.
17. Audits consist of both a documentation review and a site visit. The audit process may result in the following outcomes:
 - a. confirmation of the apparent compliance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the accredited program;
 - b. identification of deficiencies and required corrective measures necessary to ensure program compliance; or
 - c. a formal report that will support a decision by the Law Society regarding the accredited program's continuation.
18. Since 2015, accredited colleges have been required to provide, for the Law Society's review, the following documentation, as part of an audit:
 - a. up-to-date course descriptions for three courses specified by the Law Society;
 - b. a faculty list, together with résumés for any faculty added after the most recent accreditation/reaccreditation;
 - c. copies of three different students' completed examinations or assignments for at least two courses;
 - d. a comprehensive report from the field placement office that includes the contact information for field placement hosts, field placement policies, and field placement process documents; and
 - e. a copy of the program's policy for granting advanced standing.
19. Audit site visits consist of:
 - a. meetings with college administration, the program coordinator, and the field placement coordinator;
 - b. meetings with college faculty;
 - c. meetings with students; and

- d. classroom audits (generally two per campus per program).
20. As contemplated by the February 2014 Report to Convocation, the Law Society has continued to evolve the accreditation and audit protocol to support the quality of paralegal education. Recent updates to the Accreditation Policy have included providing additional detail about the roles of the program coordinator and field placement coordinator in superintending the program, specifying the obligation of providers to have an assessment plan for the paralegal education program as a whole, and setting out more clearly the consequences of program dormancy (i.e., when there has been no new cohort of students for at least 12 months and there is no cohort still in progress at the end of that 12-month period).
 21. Similarly, the Audit Framework was also updated at the same time to increase documentation requirement for audits, streamline the audit reporting process, and detail the escalation process when the audit of a program uncovers serious or grave deficiencies.
 22. In particular, the streamlined audit reporting process entails colleges being sent final audit reports within six to eight weeks of the audit, rather than draft reports for colleges' review and comment, which was a process that in some cases could delay implementation of required improvements. Colleges are generally afforded approximately two to three months by which to cure deficiencies. As of March 2018, the documentation that colleges may receive as part of an audit of a paralegal program includes one of the following:
 - a. **Audit Completion Notice** – this notice indicates that an audit is completed and that no compliance issues were noted. An audit completion notice may include recommendations for the general improvement of a paralegal program;
 - b. **Compliance Notice** – this notice indicates that compliance issues that must be remediated within a specified period of time were observed. A compliance notice may include a request for clarification of information provided by the college in addition to recommendations for the general improvement of a paralegal program; or
 - c. **Formal Report** – this report is used to document material breaches of the Accreditation Policy that may result in the need to make a recommendation to the Paralegal Standing Committee that a college's accreditation be suspended or revoked.

Course Sequencing and the Remote Delivery of Paralegal Education

23. In accordance with the framework for the delivery of paralegal education set by the Law Society in the Accreditation Policy, colleges must deliver an accredited program in a format that allows students to study legal principles in context. This includes the

following foundational requirements:

- Curriculum must be covered in logical order in light of the subject matter of each course, with foundational courses as prerequisites and with more advanced courses sequenced towards the latter portion of the program. See [Tab 4.1.2](#) for the Law Society's recommended course sequence.
- The field placement should normally be scheduled with advanced courses or after the completion of the compulsory legal courses in the program.
- Accredited programs must be delivered at a college campus using traditional instructional methodologies. Instructional methods employed by instructors in paralegal education commonly include interactive lectures, guided discussions, case studies, behavior modelling, field trips, peer learning, problem-based learning, and performance-based activities (e.g., mock trials and advocacy exercises).
- Online or remote delivery of an accredited program is not permitted under the Accreditation Policy.

24. The use of distance learning methodologies within paralegal education was addressed by the Paralegal Standing Committee at the time that graduation from paralegal education was instituted as a threshold requirement for admission into the paralegal licensing process. Since the inception of paralegal regulation in Ontario, the Law Society has not permitted remote delivery methodologies for paralegal education on the basis that in-person training that involves direct and real time interaction with instructors and peers facilitates the most rigorous inculcation of legal knowledge, procedural concepts, and professionalism principles.
25. Similarly, this policy position was adopted to reflect the instructional methodologies used by law schools to educate and train lawyers. Currently, the Federation of Law Societies of Canada's National Requirement requires "primarily in person" instruction in Canadian law schools and in the assessment of the qualifications of internationally trained applicants. "Primarily in person" has been defined as two thirds, or two of the three years, of instruction that must be delivered in person.
26. While the issue of technology-enabled learning platforms has been identified as a potential matter for future consideration by the Federation of Law Societies, neither the recent NCA Program Review Report (May 2017) nor the National Requirement Review Committee Final Report (June 2017) has made this item a priority or adopted concrete recommendations to change the distance learning policy for law school education.
27. To date, requests by colleges and others for the Law Society to reconsider its position on the use of distance learning methodologies have been rare.

Accreditation and Audit Outcomes

28. The Law Society has accredited 33 programs at 48 campuses over the course of the past 10 years. As of June 2018, there are 26 colleges delivering 30 accredited paralegal education programs across 39 campuses. See [Tab 4.1.3](#) for a detailed list of accredited paralegal education programs.

29. Colleges accredited to deliver paralegal education programs in Ontario may offer programs as:

- a. Certificate programs (1 year program);
- b. Diploma programs (1 to 2 year program);
- c. Degree programs (4 year program); or
- d. Graduate certificate programs (1 year program).

The majority of paralegal education programs offered in Ontario are diploma programs (19), followed by graduate certificate programs (7) and certificate programs (2). Only one college currently offers a four year paralegal education degree program (Humber College - Lakeshore Campus).

30. To date 10 campus location have become inactive and have lost accreditation.

These campuses have lost accreditation for the following reasons:

- a. two programs lost accreditation as a result of the college ceasing operations altogether;
- b. one program was unable to commence a program within six months of its accreditation; and
- c. seven programs lost accreditation as a result of program dormancy due to the lack of sufficient enrolment or failure to seek accreditation.

31. Since 2015, the Law Society has audited 24 programs at 36 campus locations. With the exception of two colleges newly accredited in 2017, accredited college programs have been generally audited within the first year of program operation. In regards to some colleges, audit revisits have been undertaken to address areas of non-compliance that were encountered during an audit activity (e.g., the failure to abide by minimum faculty requirements, lack of proper oversight by the Program Coordinator, etc.). Revisits are initiated in order to ensure program deficiencies are corrected to the satisfaction of the Law Society.

32. Changes to Law Society processes regarding paralegal education have been communicated to colleges in writing, with more significant changes communicated

through multiple platforms (telephone calls, emails, letters, updates to the Law Society website, posting of FAQs, etc.). Where appropriate, the MAESD is also notified of changes.

33. Overall, Professional Development and Competence staff have observed that elevated accreditation and audit protocols have resulted in an increase in the quality of paralegal education programs. The most notable improvements have been in the following areas:
- a. **Assessment planning, marking, and the provision of timely feedback to students.** Most examinations used in paralegal education are now tied to specific learning outcomes and utilize more robust assessment strategies. It is not uncommon for marking rubrics that are designed by instructors to be approved by the Program Coordinator along with the overall assessment plan. Most programs have implemented policies that require instructors to provide students with feedback on an assessment within two weeks following the assessment.
 - b. **The level of program oversight by Program Coordinators.** Effective program coordination and administration continues to be a central feature of paralegal education. Reduction in the amount of time that can be spent instructing now means that Program Coordinators are placing greater emphasis on superintending requirements, facilitating program developments, and monitoring faculty.
 - c. **Reinforcement of the learning process through logical course sequencing.** With more emphasis being placed on the proper sequencing of instruction, programming progresses more logically, fosters student interest and alertness, and serves to better reinforce the learning process.
 - d. **Cohort System.** With cohort intakes limited to two per year and a requirement that a minimum of 10 students be registered before a program commences, programs are experiencing more of a critical mass of learners. This in turn is translating into more peer networking and interactivity in the classroom. A greater appreciation of the impact of student attrition on cohorts also means that some colleges are electing not to offer programs if only the minimum number of students are registered. The result is better program management for students and colleges.
34. Overall, colleges have been quite receptive to changes to paralegal education. During its audit activities, the Law Society has received positive feedback from both colleges and paralegal students regarding the significant changes made to the Accreditation Policy in 2015. While some colleges experienced some initial challenges with implementation, both colleges and students have indicated that these changes have enhanced the educational experience for students. Some

students have commented that they expect the benefits of these changes to continue to be felt well into their careers as a result of the camaraderie established through the cohort system.

Opportunities for Potential Improvement in Accredited Paralegal Education

35. Notwithstanding the enhancements that have been made to the underlying accreditation and audit protocol to support quality education and the positive outcomes that have resulted, the Law Society, through its oversight activities, continues to observe opportunities for continuous improvement for paralegal education providers.
36. The Law Society carefully considers feedback received from college administration, students, paralegal instructors, field placement hosts, and other stakeholders on an ongoing basis. Staff then identify and develop potential opportunities for improvement for the Committee's consideration. Continued monitoring of topics such as faculty instructional techniques, coverage of required competencies, student preparedness to commence paralegal education, graduate readiness, and field placement activities will contribute to continuous improvement of the standards of accredited paralegal education.

Paralegal Licensing Examination

37. Prior to the expansion of the paralegal licensing examination to include substantive and procedural content, the examination tested 106 entry-level competencies in ethics, professional responsibility, and practice management. Candidates were provided with self-study materials consisting of 14 chapters (153 operational pages, plus appendices). The licensing examination was administered over a 3.5 hour time frame, in a multiple choice, open book format.
38. As of August 2015, the paralegal licensing examination tests a total of 179 entry-level competencies, including substantive law competencies in Canadian jurisdiction and law fundamentals, civil litigation, criminal and quasi-criminal law and procedure, administrative law, alternative dispute resolution, as well as ethics, professional responsibility and practice management. Study materials are now comprised of 63 chapters (469 operational pages, plus appendices). The paralegal licensing examination is 7 hours long, the same length as each of the barrister and solicitor licensing examinations, and remains multiple choice and open book.

Paralegal Licensing Examination Outcomes

39. Recent outcomes of the paralegal licensing examination are provided at [Tab 4.1.4](#). Results have been tabulated by the Law Society's examination development service provider, Performance Assessment Group, Inc.
40. **Table 1** provides first attempt success rates across three administrations in 2016

and 2017. First attempt examination results are provided as an indicator of readiness to provide legal services following completion of an accredited paralegal education program. Paralegal candidates are generally permitted up to three attempts on the licensing examinations, as are lawyer candidates. As **Table 2** indicates, some candidates who are unsuccessful on their first attempt at the examination will achieve success on subsequent attempts. Both Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that, when considered as two distinct groups, candidates who have attended community college are able to pass the licensing examinations at higher rates than those who have attended private career colleges, on both first attempts and repeat attempts. However, it should be noted that there are some private career colleges whose student success rates exceed those of some community colleges.

41. The overall licensing outcomes for the first cohort of candidates who have been subject to the substantive licensing examination protocols are provided below. Approximately 70% of candidates have successfully completed the licensing process and are licensed, with approximately 30% having been withdrawn from the licensing process due to failure to meet the licensing requirements. This represents a 10% decrease in successful completion of the licensing process as compared to the period prior to the introduction of the substantive licensing examination protocols, when approximately 80% of candidates successfully completed the licensing process and were licensed. Note that candidates have three years from when they register for the licensing process to pass the licensing examinations and fulfill the good character requirements for licensure. Only candidates in the 2014/2015 cohort have completed their three-year licensing term (as of May 31, 2018). The 2015/2016 and 2016/2017 cohorts have one and two years, respectively, remaining to complete the licensing requirements. Overall licensing outcomes must be considered in that context.

Overall Licensing Outcomes by Cohort as at June 4, 2018

Cohort	Licensed	Still Active in the Licensing Process	Withdrawn*
2014/2015 (1533)	68.56% (1051)	3.85% (59)	27.40% (420)
2015/2016 (1497)	66.00% (988)	26.72% (400)	7.15% (107)
2016/2017 (1453)	60.50% (879)	36.27% (527)	3.23% (47)

*Reasons for withdrawal include exceeding the three year licensing term, failure to successfully complete the licensing examination, and candidate request for withdrawal due to career changes or personal circumstances.

Compulsory Legal Courses

Compulsory Legal Course	Instructional Hours
Administrative Law	30
ADR	30
Advocacy	30
Communication/writing	20
Criminal/Summary Conviction Procedure	30
Employment Law	30
Ethics and Professional Responsibility	30
Evidence and the Litigation Process	40
Introduction to the Legal System	40
Legal Accounting	30
Legal Computer Applications	30
Legal Research/Writing	30
Practice Management/Operating a Small Business	40
Provincial Offences/Motor Vehicle Offences	40
Residential Landlord and Tenant Law	30
Small Claims Court	40
Torts and Contracts	30
Tribunal Practice and Procedure	40
TOTAL	590 hours

Course Sequencing

The curriculum must be covered in a logical order in light of the subject matter of each course, with foundational courses as prerequisites and with more advanced courses being scheduled towards the latter portion of the Accredited Program. The field placement should normally be scheduled with advanced courses or after completion of the [Compulsory Legal Courses](#). A recommended sequence is as follows:

Primary

- Introduction to the Legal System
- Legal Computer Applications
- Communication/Writing
- Legal Research and Writing

Secondary

- Torts & Contracts
- Criminal/Summary Conviction Procedure
- Provincial Offences/Motor Vehicle Offences
- Administrative Law
- Employment Law
- Residential Landlord and Tenant Law
- Small Claims Court
- Tribunal Practice and Procedure
- Legal Accounting
- Ethics and Professional Responsibility
- Practice Management/Owning and Operating a Small Business

Advanced

- ADR – Alternative Dispute Resolution
- Advocacy
- Evidence and the Litigation Process

The courses may be provided in any order within these sections; however, the primary courses should be considered prerequisites and offered first in the Accredited Program. The advanced courses should be offered at the end of the Accredited Program, to build on learning from previous courses. One or two courses from the secondary category may be moved to the schedule of a primary or an advanced semester/module grouping, if the Institution has a valid pedagogical reason to sequence the courses in this way.

Accredited Paralegal Education Programs as of May 31, 2018

	College	Campus Location	Community College	Private Career College	Credential	Date of Accreditation	Length of Program
1	Academy of Learning	Toronto		X	Diploma	September 12, 2012	49 weeks
2	Algonquin Careers Academy	Mississauga		X	Diploma	September 10, 2008	50 weeks
		Ottawa		X	Diploma	September 10, 2008	50 weeks
3	Algonquin College (Grad Cert)	Ottawa	X		Grad Cert	September 1, 2015	45 weeks
4	Canadian Business College	Toronto		X	Diploma	April 20, 2011	1 year
		Mississauga		X	Diploma	April 20, 2011	1 year
5	Canadian College of Business Science & Technology	Brampton		X	Diploma	February 9, 2011	51 weeks
		North York		X	Diploma	October 26, 2017	51 weeks
6	CDI College of Business, Technology and Health Care	Toronto (Downtown)		X	Diploma	April 15, 2013	48 weeks
		Toronto (North York)		X	Diploma	April 15, 2013	48 weeks
7	Centennial College (Grad Cert)	Scarborough	X		Grad Cert	August 16, 2011	3 semesters/1 year

Convocation - Paralegal Standing Committee Report

	College	Campus Location	Community College	Private Career College	Credential	Date of Accreditation	Length of Program
8	Cestar College of Business, Health and Technology	Toronto		X	Diploma	May 28, 2013	55 weeks
9	CIMT College (Canadian Institute of Management and Technology)	Brampton		X	Diploma	May 4, 2018	42 weeks
10	Conestoga College (Grad Cert)	Kitchener	X		Grad Cert	September 7, 2011	36 weeks
11	CTS Canadian Career College	Barrie		X	Diploma	June 4, 2010	1 year
		Sudbury		X	Diploma	June 4, 2010	1 year
12	Durham College (Grad Cert)	Oshawa	X		Grad Cert	July 11, 2008	2 semesters/1 year
13	Durham College	Oshawa	X		Diploma	July 11, 2008	4 semesters/2 years
14	Fanshawe College (Grad Cert)	London	X		Grad Cert	September 7, 2011	45 weeks
15	Fleming College	Peterborough	X		Diploma	March 18, 2010	4 semesters/2 years

	College	Campus Location	Community College	Private Career College	Credential	Date of Accreditation	Length of Program
16	George Brown College	Toronto	X		Certificate	June 29, 2010	6 modules, taken consecutively, as part of continuing education/up to 4 years
17	Georgian College	Barrie	X		Grad Cert	November 14, 2016	3 semesters/1 year
18	Herzing College	Ottawa		X	Diploma	February 25, 2010	1 year
		Toronto		X	Diploma	December 15, 2009	1 year
19	Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning	Toronto - North Campus	X		Diploma	July 11, 2008	4 semesters/2 years
20	Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (Degree)	Toronto - Lakeshore Campus	X		Degree (BAA)	August 29, 2008	8 semesters/4 years
21	Humber Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning	Toronto – North Campus	X		Grad Cert	June 16, 2017	3 semesters/1 year
22	La Cité collégiale	Ottawa	X		Diploma	July 30, 2010	4 semesters/2 years
23	Loyalist College	Belleville	X		Diploma	June 7, 2010	4 semesters/2 years

Convocation - Paralegal Standing Committee Report

	College	Campus Location	Community College	Private Career College	Credential	Date of Accreditation	Length of Program
24	Mohawk College	Hamilton	X		Diploma	April 26, 2013	2 years (can be completed in 16 months)
25	Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology	Toronto	X		Diploma	June 4, 2008	4 semesters/2 years or 3 semesters/13 months
26	Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology (College Cert/Evening)	Toronto	X		Certificate	September 1, 2015	2 years plus 3 months, year-round
27	Sheridan College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning	Oakville	X		Diploma	June 24, 2008	4 semesters/2 years
28	St. Clair College of Applied Arts & Technology	Windsor	X		Diploma	July 10, 2009	4 semesters/2 years or 15 months accelerated
29	triOS College Business Technology Healthcare	Brampton		X	Diploma	August 22, 2013	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
		Hamilton		X	Diploma	September 13, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
		Kitchener		X	Diploma	June 22, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
		London		X	Diploma	June 22, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)

	College	Campus Location	Community College	Private Career College	Credential	Date of Accreditation	Length of Program
		Mississauga		X	Diploma	June 22, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
		Toronto		X	Diploma	June 22, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
		Windsor		X	Diploma	June 22, 2010	1 year (48 to 52 weeks)
30	Westervelt College	London		X	Diploma	July 11, 2008	1 year

Table 1

First Attempts by Educational Path for 2017 and 2016 Administration Years

Private Career College	2017 PAR Licensure Examination				2016 PAR Licensure Examination			
	Feb	Aug	Oct	2017	Feb	Aug	Oct	2016
Total Candidates	120	107	70	297	143	85	103	331
Number Passing	70	59	34	163	97	57	49	203
Percent Passing	58.33%	55.14%	48.57%	54.88%	67.83%	67.06%	47.57%	61.33%
Community College	Feb	Aug	Oct	2017	Feb	Aug	Oct	2016
Total Candidates	293	369	317	979	228	389	277	894
Number Passing	220	305	267	792	182	309	205	696
Percent Passing	75.09%	82.66%	84.23%	80.90%	79.82%	79.43%	74.01%	77.85%

Table 1 indicates that, on their first attempts, candidates who graduated from community college paralegal education programs exhibited higher pass rates than candidates from private career colleges in both 2017 and 2016. This was true across each administration (February, August, and October) as well as overall. Overall, first attempt writers from the community college educational path appear to have had higher overall pass rates in 2017 (80.90%) compared with 2016 (77.85%); by contrast, first attempt private career college candidates had somewhat lower pass rates in 2017 (54.88%) compared to 2016 (61.33%). First attempt candidates from private career colleges exhibited notably lower pass rates during the October administrations in both 2017 and 2016 (48.57% and 47.57%, respectively).

Table 2

Repeat Attempts by Educational Path for 2017 and 2016 Administration Years

Private Career College	2017 PAR Licensure Examination				2016 PAR Licensure Examination			
	Feb	Aug	Oct	2017	Feb	Aug	Oct	2016
Total Candidates	49	19	39	107	29	17	22	68
Number Passing	18	8	11	37	9	5	4	18
Percent Passing	36.73%	42.11%	28.21%	34.58%	31.03%	29.41%	18.18%	26.47%
Community College	Feb	Aug	Oct	2017	Feb	Aug	Oct	2016
Total Candidates	70	34	48	152	35	18	34	87
Number Passing	36	13	21	70	15	7	12	34
Percent Passing	51.43%	38.24%	43.75%	46.05%	42.86%	38.89%	35.29%	39.08%

Table 2 results show that, on repeat attempts, candidates who graduated from community college paralegal education programs exhibited higher overall pass rates than candidates from private career colleges. This was true across two of the three administrations in 2017 (February and October) and across every administration in 2016. Repeat candidates from private career colleges exhibited notably lower pass rates during both October administrations (28.21% passing in 2017 and 18.18% passing in 2016).