



LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ADMISSION BOARD

Secretary of the Legal Practitioners Admission Board
Supreme Court Registry
GPO Box 3946
DARWIN, NT, 0801

Telephone: (08) 8999 6574
Email: ntsc.efile@nt.gov.au

Ms Ella Howard
Policy Manager
Law Admissions Consultative Committee
PO Box H326
Australia Square NSW 1215

Via email: [REDACTED]

Dear Ms Howard

RE: ACCREDITATION STANDARDS FOR AUSTRALIAN LAW COURSES

I refer to the invitation by the Admission's Committee of the Law Admissions Consultative Committee to provide submissions on draft revisions to the Accreditation Standards for Australian Law Courses.

Please find attached the submission of the Northern Territory Legal Practitioners Admission Board.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Renata Blanch

Secretary, Northern Territory Legal Practitioners Admission Board
Registrar, Supreme Court of the Northern Territory

16 June 2025

Feedback Form

Proposed revisions to the Accreditation Standards for Australian Law Courses

ABOUT YOU

Name/organisation: Legal Practitioners Admission Board, Northern Territory (the Board)

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 The Board supports the proposed revisions. The new and amended definitions in clause 2.1 are an important inclusion to reflect and more clearly define current teaching practices and appear adequate for those purposes. Clause 4.1 is an important inclusion to reflect current delivery modes across teaching and appears adequate for those purposes. The revisions to Clause 4.6 are important to put law course providers on notice that: (i) as part of the accreditation process they are required to provide a breakdown of the hours required for active learning and/or direct interaction between teacher and student and the mode by which this will interaction will occur, being either in-person or through synchronous online learning; (ii) direct interaction between students and teachers is the preferred delivery mode across teaching and that Admitting Authorities will need evidence of how other modes of delivery will enable a student to acquire an adequate level of understanding and competence in each prescribed area of knowledge; and (iii) at least 18 hours of either or both active learning or direct interaction between teacher and student is required for each prescribed area of knowledge and statutory interpretation. The Board agrees with this
------------	--

	minimum number of hours, being 50% of the minimum number of teaching hours for each unit that covers a prescribed area of knowledge and statutory interpretation.
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" The Board supports the proposed revisions. The new and amended definitions in clause 2.1 are an important inclusion to reflect and more clearly define current teaching practices and appear adequate for those purposes. The revisions to Clause 4.5 are important to put the law course providers on notice that 36 teaching hours is the expected standard for each prescribed area of knowledge and that any less than 36 hours needs an explanation as to how the learning outcomes will be achieved. The Board seeks clarification in relation to the following: • In a case where the number of teaching hours is less than 36 hours for a prescribed area of knowledge, will the requirement for at 18 hours of either or both active learning or direct interaction between teacher and student remain pursuant to clause 4.6(b)(iii)? The Board is of the opinion that 18 hours should be the minimum regardless of any change to the total number of teaching hours to ensure learning outcomes are achieved.
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" The Board supports the proposed revisions. The new and amended definitions in clause 2.1 are an important inclusion to reflect and more clearly define current teaching practices and appear adequate for those purposes. The inclusion of at least 50% of assessments for each unit that covers a prescribed area of knowledge and statutory interpretation is conducted by invigilation is considered appropriate for quality assurance purposes. It is noted that this reflects the current approach taken for the law course delivered by Charles Darwin University. The Board seeks clarification in relation to supplementary assessments which are used to give students a 'supplementary pass (SP)' (otherwise referred to as a 'pass conceded'). For example, at Charles Darwin University if a student attains a final mark of 47 to 50, they are given the opportunity to undertake a supplementary assessment,

	such as resitting the final exam, which if they pass will give them a SP. Does this satisfy the requirement for a 'pass grade' as referenced in clause 4.7?
1.4	Intensives and block learning models Refer to Draft Revised Standards: Revisions to clause 4.3 (The duration of the law course) The Board supports the proposed revisions but suggests a clear statement that intensives or block delivery are considered the exception rather than the rule to deliver a unit that covers a prescribed area of knowledge and statutory interpretation and that the Admitting Authority will only approve same where it can be demonstrated that learning outcomes will not be compromised.
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 The Board supports the new and amended definitions to better reflect and more clearly define current teaching practices, and to include statutory interpretation, and they appear adequate for those purposes.

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 The Board agrees with the proposed staggered two-year implementation period to facilitate transition, with publication of the Standards one year before the commencement date.
----------	--

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 Is there a timeline for updating and publishing the LACC Suggested Protocols for Accreditation Reviews to reflect changes made to the Standards?
----------	---