

Feedback Form: Review of practical legal training

Respondent details

Name: Professor Alpana Roy

Organisation (if applicable): School of Law, University of New England (UNE)

Contact details: [REDACTED]

Are you responding as (select one):

- ☐ Individual
- ☒ Organisation
- ☐ Peak body / Representative group
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Jurisdiction (select one)

- ☐ National
- ☐ Australian Capital Territory
- ☒ New South Wales
- ☐ Northern Territory
- ☐ Queensland
- ☐ South Australia
- ☐ Tasmania
- ☐ Victoria
- ☐ Western Australia
- ☐ Multiple
- ☐ Other. Please specify:

Your submission will be shared with the Admissions Committee and the Law Admissions Consultative Committee and may also be shared with the Legal Services Council.

Unless stakeholders advise us otherwise, submissions may be published on the Council's website.

May we publish your response on the Legal Services Council's website (select one)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Responses to consultation questions

Law courses	
1.1	Do you support the proposal for the LACC to amend the Accreditation Standards for Australian Law Courses to require law courses to demonstrate how they have included practical teaching and training of the practical skills identified at Appendix F, with appropriate assessment? UNE Law School is supportive in principle for LACC to amend the Accreditation Standards for Australian Law Courses to require law courses to demonstrate how they have included practical teaching and training of practical skills. However, we are not supportive of requiring this in relation to the practical skills identified in Appendix F. Our view is that the practical skills set out in Appendix F are far too prescriptive and should be expressed at a much higher level of generality.
1.2	Do you suggest any amendments to the proposed skills schedule (Appendix F) in respect of the knowledge areas and skills to be included in the delivery of law courses, as identified in column three of the table? As indicated above, our view is that the practical skills set out in Appendix F are far too prescriptive and should be expressed at a much higher level of generality. We have serious concerns in relation to the equity implications of the proposal for institutions and students in regional, rural and remote areas such as UNE – particularly the face-to-face requirements. Please refer to our feedback on the skills schedule provided to the LPAB (which has been annexed to the <i>Interim Report on PLT Reform</i>, 13 March 2026) for further details.
1.3	Would law schools be able to implement these changes by the beginning of the 2028 academic year, as proposed? No. As indicated in our feedback to the LPAB, it normally takes our University a <i>minimum</i> of two years to implement any change to units and course rules for a range of reasons, including staffing and budgetary constraints and internal UNE policies/ requirements. In particular, we hold significant concerns in relation to the transitional complexities these changes may pose for our current students.
Reform of PLT – Practical knowledge and skills	
2.1	Do you support the proposal to amend the PLT Competency Standards to reflect the categories and skills set out in the skills schedule at Appendix F as the practical knowledge and skills required at the time of admission? As indicated above, our view is that the practical skills set out in Appendix F are far too prescriptive and should be expressed at a much higher level of

	generality. As we do not operate in the PLT sector, we will leave it to PLT providers to offer further commentary on these matters.
2.2	Do you suggest any amendments to the categories or skills set out in the skills schedule at Appendix F? Please refer to our feedback on the skills schedule provided to the LPAB (which has been annexed to the Interim Report on PLT Reform, 13 March 2026) for further information.
2.3	Do you think that the following areas need to be specifically included in the skills schedule, either as categories or identified knowledge and skills: i. Working with clients from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds? ii. Preventing and addressing sexual harassment? iii. Awareness of obligations under anti-money laundering/counter-terrorism financing regulations? iv. Awareness of ADR options, or specific skills relating to ADR? v. Negotiation skills in a wider range of settings, or other specific settings? vi. Drafting any other types of legal documents? If so, what types of documents? In relation to all of the above, our firm view is that the current curriculum is already very dense, leaving limited scope for additional content. Please refer to our feedback on the skills schedule provided to the LPAB (which has been annexed to the Interim Report on PLT Reform, 13 March 2026) for further information.
2.4	Should the option for graduates to undertake Supervised Workplace Training as a way of completing PLT be retained? As we do not operate in the PLT sector, we will leave it to PLT providers to offer commentary on these matters.
2.5	If the option of Supervised Workplace Training is to be retained, what aspects of the skills schedule should be delivered by an approved provider or as approved programmed training? Please see 2.4.
2.6	Should there be any other amendments to Supervised Workplace Training? Please see 2.4.

Reform of PLT – Delivery of PLT	
3.1	Do you support the proposal for the LACC to amend the PLT Standards to reduce PLT courses to be a minimum of four weeks in length, together with up to one week of pre-reading and viewing of preparatory materials? Please see 2.4.
3.2	Do you think that a four-week period is too short or too long for a PLT course, taking into account the other proposals in relation to law courses and post admission training? Please see 2.4.
4.1	Do you support the proposal for the LACC to amend the PLT Standards to provide that a PLT course may be, but does not have to be, delivered at a graduate diploma level or equivalent? Please see 2.4.
4.2	If you support this proposal, would any additional safeguards be required for PLT providers (given they would not necessarily be regulated by TEQSA)? For example, should new quality assurance measures be required in the LACC framework documents? What should those additional measures be? Please see 2.4.
5.1	Do you support the proposal that the LACC amends the PLT Standards to require that PLT coursework is to be delivered in person or, in exceptional cases (as determined by the PLT provider), by synchronous online delivery? Please see 2.4.
6.1	Do you support a review of the PLT Standards to ensure that assessments are rigorous in measuring whether students have developed the required knowledge and skills? If so, do you have any suggestions on how the Standards should be set to ensure rigorous and effective assessment? Please see 2.4.
6.2	Do you think that there is a need for the LACC to amend the PLT Standards to provide guidance on how incidents of academic misconduct should be recorded and reported to the admitting authorities in student conduct reports? Please see 2.4.

Workplace experience	
7.1	Do you support the LACC retaining the requirement for a minimum of 15 days of workplace experience prior to admission? We are not able to express a concluded view on this matter at this time. The question of whether a minimum of 15 days of workplace experience should be retained cannot, in our view, be properly addressed in isolation. It should be considered within the broader framework of the proposed changes, which has yet to be settled.
8.1	Do you support the LACC updating the Standards on PLT Workplace Experience to provide more information on the types of tasks and hours allocated to the development of specific skills for students completing their workplace experience, with regard to the skills schedule at Appendix F? Do you have any suggestions on what this guidance should include? Please see 2.4.
9.1	Do you support the LACC working with stakeholders to prepare guidance for supervisors on the supervision of workplace experience that addresses the purpose and requirements of workplace experience, the type of tasks to be undertaken and time allocated to them and the ethical standards and expectation of supervisors? Please see 2.4.
10.1	Do you think that legal profession regulators should review the training that is offered to lawyers who wish to improve their supervisory skills? We will leave it to the legal profession regulators to comment on this issue.
10.2	Do you think that there is a need for additional training for lawyers who wish to improve their supervisory skills? What do you think that training should include? How could it be delivered? Please see 10.1.
11.1	Do you support the LACC amending the Standards and the Standards for PLT Workplace Experience to allow a PLT provider to approve workplace experience being undertaken while the student is studying a law course? If so, should any additional safeguards or requirements be imposed on such work experience? Should PLT providers play the role of certifying that appropriate work experience has been undertaken? Please see 2.4.

12.1	Do you support the LACC amending the PLT Standards to set out the obligations of PLT providers to assist students in sourcing workplace experience opportunities? Please see 2.4.
Post Admission Legal Training (PALT)	
13.1	Do you support a new requirement being imposed for early career lawyers to undertake 15 hours of PALT in each of the first two years of practice? Is the amount of time proposed for PALT too long or too short? We are not able to express a concluded view on this matter at this stage. This issue cannot be properly addressed in isolation, and should be considered within the broader framework of the proposed changes which are yet to be settled.
13.2	Do you think it is appropriate for this requirement be implemented as a condition on practising certificates? If not, please outline what you consider to be the preferable mechanism to impose the new requirement. Please see 13.1.
14.1	Do you support the proposal for lawyers who practise exclusively as barristers to be exempt from the requirement to undertake PALT? Would this pose any issues in your jurisdiction? Please see 13.1.
15.1	Do you support the proposal that PALT should be delivered in areas identified and developed by PALT providers, subject to the approval mechanisms set out separately below? Please see 13.1.
15.2	Do you support the idea that lawyers can choose to undertake PALT in one practice area, or up to four different practice areas? Please see 13.1.
16.1	Do you support the proposal that lawyers who are undertaking PALT should have further restrictions on their ability to practise? If so, what additional restrictions should apply? We will leave it to the legal profession regulators to comment on this issue.

Delivery of PALT	
17.1	Do you support the proposal that PALT should be delivered in person or, in exceptional circumstances (as determined by the PALT provider), by synchronous online delivery? We strongly support the proposal that PALT should be delivered by synchronous online delivery (and also asynchronous online delivery when required) as this would maximise equitable access to PALT - including for those in regional, remote and rural areas (such as UNE).
18.1	Do you support the proposal that the content and providers of PALT should be approved by the regulator that issues practising certificates to solicitors? We will leave it to the legal profession regulators to comment on this issue.
19.1	Do you support the proposal that PALT should incorporate rigorous assessment? Do you have any views on the parameters for this requirement? Please see 18.1.
Clinical legal education	
20.1	Do you support the Committees considering options for the inclusion of clinical legal education as a component of PLT? We are not able to express a concluded view on this matter at this stage. This issue cannot be properly addressed in isolation, and should be considered within the broader framework of the proposed changes which are yet to be settled.
20.2	If introduced, should clinical legal education be a mandatory component of PLT or an optional extra for students to undertake? If clinical legal education is a mandatory component of PLT, should students be entitled to credit for clinical legal education undertaken as part of a law degree Please see 20.1
20.3	If clinical legal education is optional, should completion of clinical legal education satisfy the requirements for PALT? Please see 20.1
20.4	Who should be responsible for delivering and supervising clinical legal education? Please see 20.1

20.5	Do you support the Committees inviting a working group comprising suitably qualified educators/experts to explore how clinical models of legal education could be employed as part of PLT? Yes.
Supervision of early career lawyers	
21.1	Do you think there is a need for additional guidance to supervisors of early career lawyers, to improve supervision? We will leave it to the legal profession regulators to comment on this issue.
21.2	Do you support legal profession regulators establishing a working group to develop additional guidance and resources for supervisors of lawyers as part of their supervised legal practice and consider potential regulatory reforms? Please see 21.1.
Implementation timing	
22.1	Do you support the proposed transitional arrangements and implementation timeframe set out at Proposal 22? No. Please refer to our response in 1.3.