

Integrating the Knowing, the Doing and the Practise: An Early Australian Case Study of Curriculum Renewal

Imperatives for new curriculum approaches in the education of lawyers

In the late 1990s when my Faculty at the Queensland University of Technology (QUT), Australia, looked to its next cycle of undergraduate law curriculum review, we identified a confluence of imperatives (both legal and non-legal) that demanded a quite radical rethink of our (then) fundamental pedagogical approaches. In the legal context, the urgency was most clearly articulated by the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) over the course of its four-year inquiry into the federal civil justice system, which culminated in the publication of the *Managing Justice* Report (ALRC 89).¹ The ALRC reiterated the 1971 UK Ormrod Committee's call for a "desirable mix of university and apprenticeship elements in legal education"² and the US MacCrate Report's emphasis on providing law graduates with the high level professional skills and values needed operate in dynamic work environments,³ and urged an Australian curriculum re-orientation away from the traditional content focus towards skills and values acquisition and training – towards "what lawyers need to be able to do [rather than] anchored around outmoded notions of what lawyers need to know".⁴

For us, this call resonated with what we could also see happening in the environments around us. The closing decades of the 20th century were a time of unparalleled and dynamic change for higher education and the legal services industry. In both sectors, change had been instigated by a range of (remarkably comparable) external drivers, including globalisation, competitiveness and competition reform, information and communications technology, shifting knowledge and practice bases, and significant structural change.⁵ In the Australian higher education context in particular, we had witnessed extraordinary shifts – in the patterns of student engagement, in the massification of higher education participation and consequent diversity in preparedness of entering cohorts, and in institutional and governmental expectations around an enhanced professionalism in higher education learning and teaching. As regards the latter, a more professional approach was demanded of all university teachers: alongside their colleagues in other disciplines, legal educators were expected to enact deeper understandings about the nature of student learning and facilitate active learning (the shift from "teacher-centred" teaching to "student-focussed" and "independent" learning), while also responding to demands for a greater emphasis on assessment for (of) learning.⁶

In approaching curriculum redevelopment at that time, we were also cognisant of the modern reality that, on graduation, students would now routinely go through several changes of career over their working lives, while research was consistently showing that only 50%-60% of law graduates remained in longer term legal practice.⁷ For our graduates to be "globally portable" and to engage effectively in knowledge generation in the new economies,

¹ Australian Law Reform Commission, *Managing Justice: A Review of the Federal Civil Justice System* (Report No 89), AGPS, Canberra, 2000. Retrieved February 5, 2008 from <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/alrc/publications/reports/89/>. See also Australian Law Reform Commission *Review of the adversarial system of litigation: Rethinking legal education and training* (Issues Paper 21) 1997; see also Australian Law Reform Commission, *Review of the Federal Civil Justice System* (Discussion Paper 62), AGPS, Canberra, 1999.

² Committee on Legal Education, *Report of the Committee on Legal Education*. Cmnd 4595 (HMSO, London, 1971)

³ American Bar Association, Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, *Legal Education and Professional Development – An Educational Continuum*, Report of the Task Force on Law Schools and the Profession: Narrowing the Gap, ABA, Chicago, 1992.

⁴ ALRC Report NO 89, Recommendation 2 and at para 2.21. At para 2.80: "In order to assess progress in this area, law schools should make explicit the nature and extent of their skills development programs (whether as separate units, as modules within substantive units, or in clinical programs), and how they examine these skills".

⁵ See for example, S. Kift, "A Tale of Two Sectors: Dynamic Curriculum Change for a Dynamically Changing Profession". In *Proceedings 13th Commonwealth Law Conference 2003*, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. Retrieved July 1 2007 from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00007468/>.

⁶ P Coaldrake and L Stedman, *Academic Work in the Twenty-first Century Changing Roles and Policies*, DEST Occasional Paper Series 99-H, 1999, at 13. Retrieved February 21, 2003 from <http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/occpaper.htm>.

⁷ See, for example, *Scottish Legal Education in the Twenty-first Century: A Report to the Joint Standing Committee on Legal Education in Scotland* (April 2000), at para 4 cited in The Steering Committee on the Review of Legal Education and Training in Hong Kong, *Legal Education and Training in Hong Kong: Preliminary Review*, Report of the Consultants, August 2001, (the "Hong Kong Report"), at 27. Retrieved February 21, 2003 from <http://www.hklawsoc.org.hk>; M Karras and C Roper, *The Career Destination of Australian Law Graduates*, Centre for Legal Education, Newcastle, 2000: 58% of those who completed their legal education in 1997 in Australia were still working in private legal practice three years later.

we considered that Law School had an obligation to equip its students with a profile of knowledge, skills and attitudes that included, but went beyond, the disciplinary expertise or technical knowledge that traditionally formed the core of most programs. We saw a need to reconceptualise the Law School's role in legal education as part of the broader educational continuum of lifelong learning to assure our students of their readiness to take their places as productive professionals and citizens in challenging and diverse globalised work environments.⁸ Relevantly in the Australian legal context, in 1998, Vignaendra⁹ had identified that the most frequently used skills by law graduates in any type of law-related employment were those of communication (both oral and written), time management, document management and computer skills. Legally specific skills, while important to private professional practice, were not the most frequently used.

A final impetus for our curriculum reorientation along the path suggested by the ALRC was the inexorable push, coming variously from government, employers, professional associations, students and, in Australia, from universities themselves, to equip students with "graduate attributes". Graduate attributes have been defined as "the qualities, skills and understandings a university community expects its students to develop during their time at the institution and, consequently, shape the contribution they are able to make to their profession and as a citizen".¹⁰ In the decade since the 1998 *West Review* in Australia,¹¹ almost every Australian university has defined these attributes and sought to integrate them in core curriculum in various ways.¹² It has recently been observed in Australia that –

An analysis of graduate attributes from a significant number of universities shows that employability skills...may reasonably be seen as a subset of graduate attributes. Therefore graduate attributes provide an appropriate starting point from which to further explore any future work on employability skills... Some employers believe that universities are providing students with a strong knowledge base but without the ability to intelligently apply that knowledge in the work setting. This is backed up by international research.¹³

The push for higher education institutions to play their part in developing students' employability skills is not only relentless, as the recent *Leitch Review of Skills*¹⁴ makes clear in the UK, but is also indisputably valid in terms of defensible pedagogy (embracing active versus passive learning, harnessing authenticity, and the accommodation of diverse learning styles). Integrating these attributes and skills into learning and teaching design delivers higher quality learning outcomes for students (by equipping them to use their technical knowledge to do what the modern workplace demands of them) and secures them a robust foundation for careers in the knowledge economy where they will be continually challenged to learn and engage with new ideas that extend beyond the content of their university course.

One of the striking aspects of this discourse has been the degree of consensus expressed, and similarity of language used, to identify present and future skill requirements. While the UK *Leitch Review of Skills* chose not to settle on a specific skill set, there are many conceptualisations available from which to choose: for example, the US *Partnership for 21st Century Skills* asserts that workers need "critical thinking, problem solving, team work and decision-making skills";¹⁵ in 2002 the *Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry* and the

⁸ See, for example, S. Kift, "For Better or For Worse?: 21st Century Legal Education". In *LAWASIA Downunder 2005*, Gold Coast Convention Centre, March 2005, retrieved July 1 2007 from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00007439/>.

⁹ S.Vignaendra, *Australian Law Graduates Career Destinations*, Centre for Legal Education, Sydney, May 1998 at 39.

¹⁰ J Bowden, G Hart, B King, K Trigwell and O Watts, *Generic Capabilities of ATN University Graduates*, ATN, 2000. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from http://www.clt.uts.edu.au/ATN_grad_cap_project_index.html

¹¹ DETYA 1998, *Learning for life: review of higher education financing and policy*, Higher Education Financing and Policy Reviewing Committee, (the "West Review"), Department of Education, Science, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra.

¹² My own university's statement of graduate attributes may be found at http://www.mopp.qut.edu.au/C/C_01_04.jsp (retrieved November 24, 2007)

¹³ Precision Consultancy, *Graduate Employability Skills*, prepared for the Business, Industry and Higher Education Collaboration Council, 2007, at 2. Retrieved September 20 2007 from <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rduonlyres/E58EFDBE-BA83-430E-A541-2E91BCB59DF1/18858/GraduateEmployabilitySkillsFINALREPORT.pdf>.

¹⁴ Leitch Review of Skills, *Prosperity for all in the global economy - world class skill*, 2006. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/6/4/leitch_finalreport051206.pdf

¹⁵ US Partnership for 21st Century Skills, *Learning for the 21st Century- A Report and Mile Guide for 21st Century Skills*, 2002 at 12. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=29&Itemid=42

Business Council of Australia developed an “Employability Skills Framework”, identifying eight employability skills – communication, teamwork, problem solving, self-management, planning and organising, technology, life-long learning, and initiative and enterprise.¹⁶ As mentioned above, most Australian universities have adopted statements of graduate attributes that largely replicate these lists with conspicuous conformity.¹⁷ Indeed there is little substantial discrepancy between these articulations and the more generic of the 10 fundamental lawyering skills and the four ‘fundamental values of the profession’ identified by the MacCrate Report in 1992,¹⁸ albeit there rendered in the discipline-specifics of the legal context.

Major Curriculum Renewal at QUT

It was against this background that we embarked on major curriculum renewal at QUT, with a first offering of the new program in 2000. We were concerned not only to address generic issues of first year transition and the student experience (given the massification and diversity issues referred to above), but were also committed to delivering a whole-of-course approach to the intentional integration and incremental sequencing of knowledge, skills and attitudes (include professionalism) for progressive development and acquisition over the course of the undergraduate degree. We wanted to create authentic learning and assessment environments for our students, through the adoption of “appropriate learning objectives, teaching and learning approaches and assessment methods taking into account the global workplace, social and ethical values and the development of life long learning skills”.¹⁹ In this way, we sought, as the 2007 Carnegie Report has now exhorted, to “pay attention to the overall purposes and effects of [our] school's educational efforts”,²⁰ and to do so on a genuinely systematic and comprehensive basis:

Efforts to improve legal education have been more piecemeal than comprehensive. Few schools have made the overall practices and effects of their educational effort a subject for serious study. Too few have attempted to address these inadequacies on a systemic basis.²¹

Early identification of attributes and skills and development of a skills taxonomy

Being an early mover in this area, the first step for us was to identify the attributes and the generic and discipline-specific skills required by and of our law graduates. This was done utilising a variety of sources; including feedback from employers and graduates, studies conducted by professional bodies, the university's own generic list of graduate attributes, and various international studies. Many of these sources have been referred to above. It is of note that a plethora of discipline reports exists internationally, now totaling more than 20, addressing desirable law curriculum transformation.²² Of these, at the time we were working

¹⁶ See Precision Consultancy, above n 13, at 2. See also C Ryan and L Watson, *Skills at Work: Lifelong Learning and Changes in the Labour Market*, EIP 03/14, 2003. Retrieved March 1 2005 from <http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/eippubs.htm>; and Evaluation and Investigations Programme, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (EIP DETYA), *Employer Satisfaction with Graduate Skills: Research Report*, 99-7, Canberra, February 2000. Retrieved March 1, 2005 from <http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/eippubs1999.htm>.

¹⁷ In the UK, this skill set is also largely replicated in the *Benchmark Statement for Law*, the current consultation draft of which refers to “subject-specific abilities” (of knowledge, application and problem solving, and sources and research), “general transferable intellectual skills” (of analysis, synthesis, critical judgement and evaluation, and autonomy and ability to learn), and “key skills” (of communication and literacy, numeracy, information technology and teamwork). See Subject benchmark statements: Law Draft for Consultation August 2006. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/statements/drafts/lawdraft06.asp#p1>. The UK *Law's Student Employability Profile Template* further extrapolates these generic employability competencies: see *The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, Student Employability Profile Template – Law Generic Employability Competencies*. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/York/documents/ourwork/tla/employability_enterprise/web0356_employability_profile_template_law.doc

¹⁸ MacCrate Report, above n 3, at 139-40 identifying the 10 fundamental lawyering skills of problem solving, legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, factual investigation, communication (oral and written), counselling clients, negotiation, understanding litigation and alternative dispute resolution processes and consequences, organisation and management of legal work, and recognising and resolving ethical dilemmas; and the four ‘fundamental values’ of the provision of competent representation, striving to promote justice, fairness and morality, striving to improve the profession, and professional self development.

¹⁹ S Christensen and N Cuffe, *Graduate Capabilities In Law: QUT Teaching and Learning Development Large Grant Project Report*. Faculty of Law, QUT, 2002 (Internal document) at 7.

²⁰ W Sullivan, A Colby, J Wegner, L Bond, L Shulman, *Educating Lawyers: Preparation of the Profession of Law*, Jossey Bass, 2007 at 89.

²¹ *Ibid* at 190.

²² For a collection of these discipline reviews and reports, including reference to current inquiries see S Kift, “Curriculum Design Challenges for 21st Century Legal Education.” Keynote address. In *Learning in the Law Annual Conference 2008*, UKCLE. Retrieved January 31, 2007 from <http://www.ukcle.ac.uk/newsevents/lilac2008.html>.

in the late 1990s, MacCrate and the seminal work by Bell and Johnstone in the UK were available and most influential.²³ The methodology we adopted in this regard was subsequently described by national program evaluators as a “staged, holistic and consultative approach...to develop the project and ensure its embedding.”²⁴ A major Project outcome was the development of a *Table of Core Skills*, while the Project, its methodology, processes and products were subject to wide-ranging evaluation and dissemination strategies.²⁵ We always intended for the process be iterative and, for example, are again revisiting and refining our approaches in cyclical review this academic year.

The six desirable attributes of a law graduate, designed to encapsulate broad descriptors of graduate quality and expressed in terms of the abilities students would be expected to possess upon graduation, were determined to be: Discipline Knowledge; Ethical Attitude; Communication; Problem Solving and Reasoning; Information Literacy; and Interpersonal Focus.²⁶

The next stage in the process was to deconstruct these six broad attributes to identify the various skills that would desirably combine to assure student development and acquisition of them. A “program objective” descriptor was formulated for each identified skill (as a statement of graduate achievement) and three progressive levels of achievement were then defined for each skill as a guide to their staged acquisition across the program for both students and staff.²⁷ It was important for us ultimately to emphasise that many of the identified skills interrelate: very few generic or discipline specific skills exist in a vacuum and many skills (for example, problem solving) draw upon others to demonstrate their effective acquisition, while some skills are so fundamental that they permeate the application of nearly every other skill (reflective practice is a good example). We found that generic and discipline specific skills interrelate with each other *and* also overlap *and* underpin effective (holistic) skills development and the ultimate attainment of the desirable graduate attribute package.

The list of generic and legally specific skills for incorporation within the law degree were categorised broadly as: attitudinal, cognitive, communication and relational skills.²⁸ The taxonomy for skills acquisition that was developed is briefly described as follows –

- the broad **skill category**: from the four categories referred to above;
- the **specific skill** within those categories;
- the **program objective** for the skill: that is, the level of competency expected of a graduate by the end of his/her program regarding the specific skill; and
- the **demonstrated ability** of the graduate for each skill: that is, a statement that to meet the (final) program objective for the specific skill, the graduate will have demonstrated certain abilities. For the purposes of incremental assessment and reporting, we further identified three broad levels of progression or development (notionally levels one, two and three, correlating roughly to the first, second and third years of the degree). Fundamental to nominating these levels of progression were the dual imperatives of making explicit for students the incremental path of the skilling process (and thus also providing the opportunity for student reflection on their own learning development); and of providing staff with the platform on which they could implement particular learning, teaching and assessment strategies in their individual subject areas (“subjects”). This articulation of

²³ MacCrate Report, above n 3; J Bell, “General Transferable Skills in the Law Curriculum” (1996) II *Contemporary Issues in Law* 1; J Bell and J Johnstone, “General Transferable Skills in the Law Curriculum”, Report for the Department for Education and Employment, 1998. Retrieved January 31, 2007 from <http://www.ukcle.ac.uk/resources/ldn/index.html>.

²⁴ J McKenzie, S Alexander, C Harper and S Anderson, *Dissemination, Adoption and Adaptation of Project Innovations in Higher Education: A Report for the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. 2005 at 60-66. Retrieved January 31, 2007 from http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/webdav/site/carricksite/users/siteadmin/public/dissemination_dissemination_adoptionandadaptation_report_2005.pdf

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ A more detailed description of these attributes may be found in S. Christensen and S Kift, “Graduate Attributes and Legal Skills: Integration or Disintegration?” (2000) 11(2) *Legal Ed Rev* 207-237; see also S Kift, “Harnessing assessment and feedback to assure quality outcomes for graduate capability development: A legal education case study”. In AARE Conference, Brisbane, December 2002. Retrieved March 13, 2004 from <http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap/kif02151.htm>.

²⁷ Adapting the “scoping, enabling, training, and relational” levels of skills acquisition described in the ATN Report, above n 10.

²⁸ For a further elaboration of these skills see Christensen and Kift, above n 26; Kift, above n 26.

staged skills progression and development has now also provided the framework for a reflecting and reporting procedure via the student ePortfolio.²⁹

Curriculum mapping

The next stage in the process required a complete review of the existing law degree and a careful mapping of desired knowledge, skills and attitude development within and across appropriate subjects and years of the core curriculum. “Appropriate” in this context required both a considered, sequential placement of the skill (as traditionally effected for content) to build in spiralling complexity over the degree, together with a thoughtful alignment of skill with the subject content in which the teaching, learning and assessment of the skill was to be embedded (for example, advocacy in criminal law, negotiation in contract law, client interviewing in torts law, etc). Once embarked on this exercise, we quickly discovered the need for an initial and fundamental reconceptualisation of the first year curriculum given, first, the diversity in preparedness of our entering cohort and, secondly, the necessity to attend to the foundational role of the first year in the developmental sense – the first year program bore the heavy burden of providing a solid curriculum foundation on which to build the whole-of-program profile. A valuable additional benefit of this reconceptualisation was a considerable enhancement to the first year experience of our commencing cohorts through the explicit and intentional curriculum design embraced.

This whole-of-program mapping is now a process upon which almost every law school in Australia (and certainly most disciplines in the sector) has either embarked or is currently implementing. Broadly, as introduced above, mapping starts with a whole program matrix onto which the discipline’s desirable knowledge, skills and attitudes are carefully plotted for multiple learning opportunities and contexts, increasing in complexity over the course of the degree program. Then, each subject within the program is assessed for its contribution to the holistic curriculum development, having particular regard to –

- whether the learning objective is taught, practised and/or assessed in the subject, and if so, whether constructive alignment in the Biggs sense³⁰ is assured between what is taught, how it is taught and how that learning is assessed;
- the level of skills progression or intellectual development to be achieved in the subject (e.g. Levels 1, 2, or 3; novice, intermediate, advanced);³¹
- how the subject builds on relevant existing expertise and prior learning;
- how the subject complements concurrent subjects;
- how the subject prepared students for higher order outcomes as they progress through the degree;
- ensuring that career relevance is explicitly communicated; and
- the gradual formation of professional identity.

Once the whole program exercise has been initially completed, the result is reviewed to look for gaps and/or over-emphases. The process also is an iterative one and subject to ongoing monitoring, evaluation and renewal over time. Relevantly in this last regard, in 2003 my Faculty decided to revisit the validity of our assessment and feedback approaches as a particular area that required further attention and curriculum refinement. In 2007, the assessment framework consequently developed and the revised assessment strategies adopted were awarded a *Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* national teaching award in recognition of excellence in program design.

In 2005, national program evaluators who subsequently reviewed our efforts found – Law curricula in other universities have been influenced by the QUT developments...The project was perceived to be currently influencing their thinking about graduate attributes development.³²

²⁹ QUT’s Student ePortfolio at www.studentportfolio.qut.edu.au is an electronic tool for students to record, catalogue, reflect on, retrieve & present activities and experiences regarding skills acquisition for ultimate release to employers. See further UKCLE, *Using e-portfolios in legal education: Evaluation Report - October 2007*. Retrieved January 15, 2007 from <http://www.ukcle.ac.uk/research/projects/eportfoliosupdate2.html>.

³⁰ J Biggs, “Assessing for learning quality” (Chapter 8), in *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*, SRHE/OUP, Buckingham, 1999.

³¹ See, for example, HL Dreyfus and SE Dreyfus. *Mind over Machine: the power of human intuition and expertise in the era of the computer* (1986), New York, Free Press, referring to development of expertise over time within discernable stages: from novice, to advanced beginner, then competent, proficient and finally expert. Bowden *et al*, above n 10, in the ATN Graduate Attributes Project identified four inclusive, hierarchical levels of attribute attainment: the scoping level; the enabling level; the training level; and the relating level.

Reflection on QUT's law curriculum renewal

Ultimately, it seems to me that our curriculum reformulation was not unlike the three part model now suggested by Carnegie; that of the three professional apprenticeships, whose parts interact with and influence the others³³ – integrating the “cognitive apprenticeship” (for us the knowledge), the “practical apprenticeship” (the skills) and the “ethical-social/formative apprenticeship” (the attitudes).

In describing our work above, I do not mean to suggest that it was at all a simple undertaking or one that was achieved by the application of some mechanistic formula. Curriculum renewal of this magnitude is not unproblematic and is a big culture shift for staff and students alike. It takes time, dedicated resourcing and a commitment to transformative practice and to the use of integrating devices across the LLB. Those devices include, for example: teaching teams working together across years to ensure incremental development of increasing complexity; the provision of multiple opportunities and contexts for students to develop and enhance their acquisition of the learning objectives across the program; the harnessing of teaching, learning and assessment approaches for integration;³⁴ and the engagement of relevant stakeholders in the process, including the profession, part-time teaching staff, graduates and students. Particularly, to be clear about the revised curriculum intention and for quality assurance purposes also, these changes must be explicitly embedded in robust program and subject documentation. As has been mentioned, valid and reliable assessment, particularly in the affective domains of ethical values and embedding Indigenous and intercultural perspectives, has proven to be a continuing challenge for us. We also continue to strive to refine our articulations of assessment criteria and standards for the expected learning outcomes and need to remain constantly vigilant about assuring timely feedback to large multi-modal cohorts in aid of their learning.

Reflecting on my School's experience now over several years, it is possible to extrapolate some “lessons learnt”, which I set out briefly. If we were to embark on this process afresh, I think we could be even more explicit than we were in our communications with students about the rationale for change (as set out in the first part above) and should also present them with a clear (and constantly reiterated) roadmap of their degree progression. Leveraging the criticism that “the traditional legal education model has been preoccupied with the study of narrow legal rules...[and] taught the same thing – analysis of legal rules – repeatedly, with little evident recognition of students' intellectual development”,³⁵ we could have tried for more “cross-integration” at the higher levels and made greater use the opportunity to “refresh” teaching delivery; the latter especially to deliver more sophisticated and efficiently blended learning environments and to scaffold the student experience of the degree purposefully from the first year to a capstone experience and out to the next stage of legal education (in Australia, Legal Practice Courses) or the world of work. The trap of over-assessing is one easily fallen into, even with the best intentions of striving to assure validity in assessment practices – this was what partly led to our revisiting the assessment aspects of the new curriculum in 2003. With the benefit of hindsight also, I think we were overly ambitious in our program objectives: it would have been preferable not to try to embed everything and make (better) informed decisions about what to omit, at least for the first iteration. Having said this however, some underdeveloped curriculum areas now present quite glaringly: specifically, the articulation and enactment of the teaching/research nexus; how we nurture the development of desirable creative dispositions and cognitive habits in our students; greater curriculum attention to early (first year) development of students “tertiary literacies” (in law especially the academic literacies of skills in reading, referencing, critical analysis, listening, writing and

³² McKenzie *et al*, above n 24, at 66.

³³ Sullivan *et al*, above n 20, at 194. See also R Johnstone and S Vignaendra, *Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Development in Law*, AUTC, 2003, Canberra, at 134-161, identifying the four models developed in Australia for skills integration into curriculum, noting that most Australian Law Schools at that time (2003) were within the first two models: (1) Minimalist (largely ad hoc, general, implicit); (2) More explicit (more systematic and structured – some stand alone units, some clinical, some electives); (3) Integrated (where skills are built up incrementally and in a co-ordinated manner); (4) Integrated Legal Practice Course into the LLB.. Retrieved December 12, 2007 from <http://admin.carrickinstitute.edu.au/dspace/handle/10096/3492>.

³⁴ See, for example, the work of the Scottish Higher Education Enhancement Committee's (SHEEC) Enhancement Theme around Integrative Assessment. Retrieved November 24, 2007 from <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/themes/IntegrativeAssessment/>

³⁵ M Keyes and R Johnstone, “Changing Legal Education: Rhetoric, Reality, and Prospects for the Future” (2004) 26 *Sydney Law Review* 537 at 558.

presenting orally in the discipline),³⁶ and the desirability of building in more opportunities for both peer-to-peer interaction and the harnessing of the ePortfolio.³⁷

On balance however, there are always things that can be improved. What we have done in the interim is to have made considerable inroads into comprehensive improvement of our students' legal education and, in the process, attended to the better education of lawyers.

³⁶ See, for example, University of Wollongong, *Tertiary Literacy Policy and Procedures* (2003). Retrieved November 24, 2007 from http://www.uow.edu.au/about/policy/tertiary_literacy_policy.pdf.

³⁷ See for example, QUT's Student ePortfolio, above n 29.