

Subject: Responsibility and examination quality

Purpose: To determine the effect of assigning senior examiners with responsibility for quality of junior examiners' work. I.e., to determine the effect of removing any "rubber stamping" or giving of unwavering support or cursory review by SPEs and primary examiners with respect to the quality of examination by examiners that report to SPEs and/or primary examiners.

Nature: Select multiple discreet examination parameters that are quantifiable and generally related to poor examination quality. Common errors such as (1) improper restriction; (2) over-restriction; (3) unnecessary or forced RCEs; (4) improper rejections (e.g., improper anticipation or obviousness rejections, missed limitations, use of art that is not prior art, incorrect citation of art, etc.) are suggested parameter for analysis. Investigate how these poor examination practices change with respect to a change in responsibility for senior reviewing examiners. For example, divide examiners in technology center into 2 groups. For group 1, do not change how senior examiners such as SPEs and primary examiners are evaluated. For group 2, add a component of examination quality of junior examiners reporting to senior examiners to the performance reviews of SPEs and primary examiners. Graphical representation of how the above-described poor examination practices change with respect to adding a junior examiner quality component to SPE and primary examiner performance reviews is suggested.

*The views expressed herein are those of the respondent alone and do not represent the views of the respondent's organization, Dynamics Inc.

Elizabeth Capan
Assistant Chief Patent Counsel
Dynamics Inc.