

Feedback Form

Proposed revisions to the Accreditation Standards for Australian Law Courses

ABOUT YOU

Name/organisation: **Bond University**

YOUR FEEDBACK

Consultation Question 1: Do you support the drafting of the proposed revisions set out in the Draft Revised Standards? We are interested in the reasons for your view and suggestions for improved drafting.

Please provide your feedback below:

1.1	Online delivery of law courses Refer to Draft Revised Standards: • New clause 4.1 (The delivery of the law course) • Ancillary adjustments to clause 4.6 (Teaching of the law course and active learning) for synchronous online learning • Clause 2.1 adjusted and new definitions for “online”, “delivery mode”, “in-person” and “synchronous online learning” • Clause 2.1 deletion of the “face-to-face” definition Clause 2.1 <u>Definitions</u>: • <i>Active learning</i>: we suggest replacing the word ‘producing’ with the phrase ‘production of’. • <i>Direct interaction</i>: we suggest replacing the word ‘available’ with ‘possible’. To avoid conflation of the two concepts ‘synchronous’ and ‘direct’, and to ensure that directness refer to the relationship or interaction between student and educator, rather than synchronicity of interaction, we suggest deleting the words ‘in real time’. Communication can be ‘direct’ but not be synchronous, for example interaction via email, feedback platforms, or discussion boards. • <i>Synchronous online learning</i>: clarification may be needed in respect of the requirements regarding live-stream lectures. Many institutions record their live-stream lecture outputs. Students may therefore access recordings of a live-stream lecture, not a pre-recorded lecture, but the student is not interacting with others in real time. We also suggest that definitions for the concepts ‘intensive’ and ‘block teaching’ be included.
1.2	Teaching hours, active learning and student engagement Refer to Draft Revised Standards: • Revisions to clauses 4.5 (Content of the law course) and 4.6 (Teaching the law course) • Clause 2.1 new definitions for “delivery mode” and “teaching method”, as well as for “active learning” and “direct interaction” We support measuring volume of learning by teaching hours rather than weeks (clause 4.5(b)(iii)) and support that 36 hours be the recommended number of hours for undergraduate units. However, provided that the law school satisfies the Admitting Authority that the requisite

	learning is assured and that it is appropriate in all the circumstances, the total teaching hours in units offered at JD or graduate level should be a minimum of 24 hours.
1.3	Invigilated assessments Refer to Draft Revised Standards: • Revisions to clause 4.7 (Assessing understanding and competence), • Clause 2.1 new definitions for “assessment method” and “invigilation” We suggest that clarification is needed in Clause 4.7(b), specifically relative to the meaning of the phrase ‘provide evidence that at least 50% of assessments...’. The wording of this clause suggests that 50% of the assessment of statutory interpretation needs to be carried out under invigilation. It is unclear whether there needs to be a stand-alone body of assessment - and by implication a separate subject - dealing exclusively with statutory interpretation, in which 50% of the assessment should be invigilated, or whether statutory interpretation should be assessed as part of content delivery and assessment of the prescribed areas of knowledge (i.e. be embedded in other subjects). In reality, the skill of statutory interpretation is often assessed as part of broader assessments in subjects covering specific prescribed areas of knowledge.
1.4	Intensives and block learning models Refer to Draft Revised Standards: • Revisions to clause 4.3 (The duration of the law course) It would be helpful if an explanation can be included as to why block or intensive teaching should be restricted to non-prescribed areas of knowledge (i.e. non-Priestley subjects). For example, there may be pedagogical advantages in block teaching in typical first-year subjects. Alternatively, it would be helpful if some indication could be provided of which circumstances would justify teaching of prescribed areas of knowledge in block or intensive mode to assist law schools seeking approval from their Admitting Authority for teaching in that format.
1.5	Other minor revisions Refer to Draft Revised Standards: • Clause 2.1 new definitions for “law course” and “unit” and accompanying revisions • Updates to the definition of “prescribed areas of knowledge” at clause 2.1 and elsewhere to include statutory interpretation We recognise that statutory interpretation was not initially included as a prescribed area of knowledge as set out in Schedule 1 of the Admission Rules, but instead is outlined through the LACC Statement on Statutory Interpretation, both of which are referenced in the definitions. We suggest that these two documents be added to the proposed standards as appendices. Further, Clause 4.7(b) of the proposed revisions is in our view open to the interpretation that statutory interpretation is assessed separately from the prescribed areas of knowledge. Such an interpretation may be inconsistent with the approach indicated under the definition of <i>Prescribed area of knowledge</i>, namely that statutory interpretation <i>may</i> be included in the teaching of the prescribed areas.

Consultation Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed transitional period for the final Revised Standards? If not, why not?

Please provide your feedback below:

2	Transitional period
	We agree that a transitional period is critical. We propose that the final revised standards be published two years before the date of commencement to allow for university processes that involve committees at faculty and university level. These may take more than 12 calendar months to conclude.

Consultation Question 3: Do you have any other comments in relation to this work that you would like to provide to the Committees?

Please provide your feedback below:

3	Other comments
	We have no other comments or feedback, but thank you for the opportunity to be consulted and provide feedback.