

Pre-entry exams not a solution

EDITOR: It has been reported in the media about the need to protect the legal profession by maintaining the pre-entry exams for lawyers-to-be. Whereas pre-entry exams may be a good practice majorly used to admit a manageable number of students, it does not necessarily promote integrity.

Integrity is an outcome of robust processes. I do not want to believe the best lawyers are the ones that go to the Law Development Centre (LDC). I am not saying LDC does not add value but when discussing this issue of pre-entry exams, you need to look at a bigger picture.

If the resources were available to train as many lawyers as we need, why not give opportunity to all like other professions and wait for the process and market forces to select? Subjecting an individual to a single exam and you think you have assessed them is like treating a symptom. This is exemplified by the number of failures by those who initially passed pre-entry exams. Almost every profession is advocating pre-entry exams because we are treating symptoms. We need to address the root cause of the problem.

The problem is bigger, beginning with planning and matching training with national priorities. For instance, how many lawyers do we need, how many should be admitted to universities and how should they be trained? This applies to all other courses because there is a big mismatch between training and priorities.

Edson Serve Ashabahebwa