

From: [Amy Danek](#)
To: [LSCSubmissions](#)
Subject: PLT changes in NSW Submission
Date: Thursday, 21 May 2026 10:52:42 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Dear LACC,

I appreciate that this email is outside the formal submission period; however, I was only recently informed that another round of submissions was being accepted, and I wished to express my concerns regarding the recent changes to Practical Legal Training requirements in New South Wales.

I am a recent LLB graduate who is now faced with either deferring PLT in NSW or undertaking PLT in another jurisdiction, due to the new mandatory in-person attendance requirements.

I run a large Facebook community for law student mothers, many of whom are experiencing similar difficulties. As the sole carer of a high-needs child, I am unable to leave her for three weeks without placing her wellbeing and safety at risk as recent changes to the NDIS cut access to support workers for children with autism. These changes therefore create significant and, for some, insurmountable barriers to entry into the legal profession for the diverse minority.

I am a distinction-average student who is eager to enter the profession and contribute meaningfully to the legal community. Increasingly, law firms and practitioners are willing to supervise and train graduates in flexible or remote “new-law” environments, which enables greater participation from diverse groups, including sole carers, people with disabilities, and those living regionally. The current changes appear inconsistent with these evolving professional realities and exclude highly capable candidates from the profession.

Throughout my law degree, I worked alongside barristers and solicitors and gained substantial exposure to the practical realities of legal practice. In my experience, graduates and students often learn far more through supervised, real-world engagement with practising lawyers than through extended classroom-based instruction which is often academic in nature rather than practically helpful. For this reason, the decision to increase compulsory in-person college attendance is perceived by many within the law student community as imposing additional procedural barriers and tickling check box criteria rather than meaningfully improving the transition from academic study to professional practice.

I respectfully urge reconsideration of these changes, or at minimum the introduction

of an alternative pathway whereby students may complete the required practical component under the supervision of a practising lawyer, rather than through mandatory in-person attendance at a PLT provider. Such flexibility would better accommodate sole carers, people with disabilities, and other disadvantaged groups, while still maintaining professional standards and competency outcomes required.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Yours faithfully,

Amy Danek