

EDUCATING FUTURE LAWYERS FOR CO-INTELLIGENCE: A PROPOSAL FOR A THIRD PILLAR IN LEGAL EDUCATION BASED ON A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE U.S. AND AUSTRALIAN APPROACHES

DR. YING CHEN^{*} & DR. BENEDICT SHEEHY^{**}

ABSTRACT

This Article examines the transformative implications of artificial intelligence (AI) on legal education, focusing on recent developments in the United States and Australia. Through a critical analysis of AI's current role in legal practice and its integration into legal curricula, the Article identifies key challenges and opportunities for legal educators and students. It makes a bold case for fundamentally restructuring legal education by introducing a third pillar—AI proficiency—alongside the two traditional pillars of substantive legal knowledge and skills training. Specifically, it advocates for embedding AI across both doctrinal and skills-based courses to develop practical competencies, foster critical thinking, and raise ethical awareness about its use. It further calls for the development of specialized AI courses and domain-specific AI tutors to better equip future lawyers for an AI-enhanced legal landscape. Ultimately, the Article urges law schools to take proactive steps in preparing co-intelligent lawyers capable of working ethically and effectively alongside AI in a rapidly evolving profession.

^{*}Dr. Ying Chen, Associate Professor, Bond University Faculty of Law, Gold Coast, Australia. Email: yinchen@bond.edu.au.

^{**}Dr. Benedict Sheehy, Professor of Law, Canberra Law School, University of Canberra, Bruce, Australia. Email: benedict.sheehy@canberra.edu.au

Abstract.....	243
Introduction.....	245
I. The Role of AI in Legal Practice and Legal Education.....	252
A. An AI Law Firm and Tasks Already Performed by AI in Legal Practice	252
1. AI in Legal Research and E-Discovery (AI as a Search and Discovery Tool).....	253
2. Document Automation (AI as a Document Drafting and Management Tool)	254
3. Predictive Legal Analysis (AI as a Predictive Analytical Tool)	255
4. Legal Review (AI as a Reading and Summarizing Tool).....	257
5. Case Management (AI as a Scheduling and Filing Tool).....	257
6. Legal Advice and Expertise Automation (AI as a Client Communication and Support Tool).....	258
7. Information and Marketing (AI as a Learning and Marketing Tool)	258
8. Summary	258
B. AI in Legal Education	259
C. Bridging the Gap Between Legal Education and Practice: Myths and Realities of Teaching and Learning Law in the Age of AI	264
1. Students' Perspectives	265
2. Legal Educators' Perspectives	266
3. The Three Pillars of Legal Education in the Age of AI ..	267
II. AI-enhanced Delivery of Substantive Legal Knowledge.....	268
A. Introducing AI-related Topics into the Doctrinal Courses..	269
B. Personalized AI Tutors to Maximize Individual Learning Outcomes	271
1. The Benefits.....	271
2. The Concerns	273
3. The Actions.....	275
III. AI-enhanced Approaches to Skills Training in Legal Education...	277
A. Critical Skills and Competences Beyond the Reach of AI...	278
B. Technical Analytical Skills	282
C. Ethical Judgment and Professional Responsibility.....	288
D. Human-centric Soft Skills	293
IV. Specialized AI Courses.....	295

V. Conclusion 297

INTRODUCTION

Driven by the rapid rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI),¹ the legal profession is undergoing a profound digital transformation worldwide.² As the popular computer magazine WIRED puts it:

The hype cycle for chatbots—software that can generate convincing strings of words from a simple prompt—is in full swing. Few industries are more panicked than lawyers, who have been investing in tools to generate and process legal documents for years. After all, you might joke, what are lawyers but primitive human chatbots, generating convincing strings of words from simple prompts?³

AI refers to a vast array of technologies.⁴ One important subset is generative AI (GenAI), which includes large language models (LLMs).⁵ LLMs are often used to power chatbots and other text-based systems. These LLMs are capable of performing many types of legal tasks from legal research to document review to contract drafting and analysis.⁶ Other AI tools, such as virtual assistants, can automate routine administrative tasks including answering emails, taking phone calls, booking

¹ See generally, Scott J. Shackelford & Rachel Dockery, *Governing AI*, 30 CORNELL J.L. & PUB. POL’Y 279, 279-333 (2020) (discussing AI and its regulation).

² Jake Karr & Jason Schultz, *The Legal Imitation Game: Generative AI’s Incompatibility with Clinical Legal Education*, 92 FORDHAM L. REV. 1867, 1867 (2024); Francisco J. García-Peñalvo, Faraón Llorens-Largo, & Javier Vidal, *The New Reality of Education in the Face of Advances in Generative Artificial Intelligence*, 27 REV. IBEROAMERICANA DE EDUCACIÓN A DISTANCIA 9, 31 (2024) (Spain).

³ Keith Porcaro, *Robot Lawyers Are About to Flood the Courts*, WIRED (Apr. 13, 2023, at 7:00 AM), <https://www.wired.com/story/generative-ai-courts-law-justice/> [<https://perma.cc/2ZFY-N6JG>].

⁴ Benedict Sheehy & Yee-Fui Ng, *The Challenges of AI Decision-Making in Government and Administrative Law: A Proposal for Regulatory Design*, 57 IND. L. REV. 665, 668 (2024).

⁵ Orly Mazur & Adam Thimmesch, *Beyond ChatGPT: Transforming Government with Augmented LLMs*, 92 TENN. L. REV. 87, 88 (2024).

⁶ See generally Aileen Nielsen, Stavroula Skylaki, Milda Norkute, & Alexander Stremitzer, *Building A Better Lawyer: Experimental Evidence that Artificial Intelligence can Increase Legal Work Efficiency*, 21 J. EMPIRICAL L. STUD. 979 (2024) (analyzing an experiment with law students on a variety of AI-tasks which reduced completion time without reducing quality of work).

appointments, and handling billing.⁷ Thus, among other impacts, AI is reshaping the way legal work is performed and delivered.⁸

Indeed, AI shows significant potential to free up lawyers from mundane tasks, allowing them to focus on more complex, high-value legal work.⁹ Crucially, AI is not reserved for tech-savvy lawyers; its implications reach every corner of legal practice. From critical debates, such as whether there is a human right to a decision made by a human (as opposed to a right to a well-calibrated machine decision),¹⁰ to nationwide implementation of harmful AI-driven decisions,¹¹ these issues are far from abstract. They are directly relevant to the everyday challenges faced by lawyers in professional practice. As such, legal education must be reformed to keep pace with technological advances to best ensure future lawyers are equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively navigate the rapidly evolving legal landscape.¹²

Scholars and legal educators have started exploring ways to address the pedagogical and professional challenges posed by AI.¹³ While there has been valuable work in this area, much of the existing literature remains focused on specific aspects of legal education and practice and often lacks a systematic approach. In light of this, we begin our investigation by examining the question: “how is AI transforming the learning experience of law students and reshaping the legal practice?” For

⁷ See generally Akshaj Chandwani, Kartikey Shrivastava, Siddharth Sadashiv, Ishani Saha, & Payal Mishra, *Virtual Assistant for Appointment Booking*, in 2023 IEEE 8TH INT’L CONF. FOR CONVERGENCE IN TECH. (IC2CT), at 1–5 (2023) (discussing potential applications for appointment-booking chatbots).

⁸ See generally AURELIA TAMO-LARRIEUX, CLEMENT GUITTON & SIMON MAYER, *AI AND LAW: HOW AUTOMATION IS CHANGING THE LAW* (1st ed. 2025) (discussing how AI is changing legal practice).

⁹ Carol M. Bast, *Artificial Intelligence and Ethics*, 50 RUTGERS COMPUT. & TECH. L.J. 283, 295–96 (2024); *How AI is Transforming the Legal Profession*, THOMSON REUTERS, (Jan. 16, 2025), <https://web.archive.org/web/20250306113813/https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/blog/how-ai-is-transforming-the-legal-profession/> [https://perma.cc/JEH5-GCTX] (suggesting that “AI could save lawyers 4 hours per week while generating \$100,000 in new billable time per lawyer annually.”).

¹⁰ See generally Aziz Z. Huq, *A Right to A Human Decision*, 106 VA. L. REV. 611 (2020) (discussing the debates pertaining to a right to human decision and a right to a well-calibrated machine decision).

¹¹ Sheehy & Ng, *supra* note 4, at 683.

¹² Julie L. Kimbrough, *Developing Lawyering Skills in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: A Framework for Legal Education*, 29 J. TECH. L. & POL’Y 31, 52 (2025).

¹³ See, e.g., *id.* at 35 (discussing how to develop lawyering skills in legal education); Nachman N. Gutowski & Jeremy W. Hurley, *Forging Ahead or Proceeding with Caution: Developing Policy for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education*, 63 U. LOUISVILLE L. REV. 581, 587 (2025) (discussing developing policy for GenAI in legal education).

purposes of the discussion as well as illustration, we include the following response generated by a GenAI tool, ChatGPT 5:

AI is fundamentally transforming legal education by providing law students with personalized, interactive, and practice-oriented learning experiences. Through AI-powered tutors, research assistants, and simulation tools, students can quickly analyze complex cases, draft legal documents, and test arguments in realistic scenarios, accelerating their understanding of substantive law and procedural strategy. This hands-on, adaptive approach bridges the traditional gap between theoretical study and practical skills, preparing students for a legal environment increasingly reliant on technology. Simultaneously, AI is reshaping legal practice by automating routine tasks such as document review, contract analysis, and legal research, allowing lawyers to focus on strategic decision-making, client counseling, and high-level problem-solving, ultimately creating a more efficient, data-driven, and accessible legal system.¹⁴

Scholars concur with the foregoing synthetic knowledge generated by ChatGPT on many aspects. For example, Professors Aswathy Prakash G and Vishnu Nair observe that AI is reshaping the student experience in higher education, influencing how students learn, communicate, and work.¹⁵ They further explain that AI has significantly impacted the legal profession, transforming multiple aspects of legal practice.¹⁶ Today, AI-powered tools are widely used for tasks such as legal research, contract drafting, and case management.¹⁷

In the US, a 2024 survey conducted by the American Bar Association and its Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence supports the views of Prakash, Nair, and ChatGPT.¹⁸ The survey notes that legal education has already begun adapting to the new technology.¹⁹ The survey predicts this trend will continue and will result in continuing changes in legal education.²⁰ As a result, it is no surprise that some American law schools are integrating AI literacy into their curriculums, including legal

¹⁴ Ying Chen & Benedict Sheehy, ChatGPT 5, “How is AI transforming the learning experience of law students and reshaping the legal practice?” (Feb. 26, 2026) [<https://perma.cc/G6KX-JMW6>]

¹⁵ Aswathy Prakash G & Vishnu Nair, *Integrating Generative AI into Legal Education: From Casebooks to Code, Opportunities and Challenges*, 6 L., TECH. & HUMS. 60, 61 (2024).

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *ABA Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence Releases Survey on AI and Legal Education*, A.B.A. (Jun. 24, 2024) [hereinafter ABA Task Force 2024 Survey], <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2024/06/aba-task-force-law-and-ai-survey/> [<https://perma.cc/8FXJ-P5YQ>].

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

writing and criminal practice.²¹ Other American law schools even offer AI-focused courses²² to better prepare students for the challenges and opportunities AI brings to legal practice.²³

Furthermore, the survey elaborates on the benefits of AI integration in legal practice, noting that it enhances client engagement, boosts conversion rates, and streamlines operations. These benefits help law firms align with modern consumer expectations for personalized, efficient, and responsive services.²⁴ As for the judiciary, the American Bar Association observes that AI is increasingly used in US court administration and the criminal justice system.²⁵ Judges acknowledge, however, that they often encounter legal issues involving AI, such as the authentication and use of AI-generated evidence in courts.²⁶

The US is not the only jurisdiction increasingly integrating AI into the teaching and practice of law. A basic premise of comparative law is the utility of looking across jurisdictional boundaries to analyze, critique, and evaluate both the strengths and challenges encountered in one's home jurisdiction.²⁷ Accordingly, this Article includes an element of comparison with another advanced Anglo-American jurisdiction, Australia. In Australia, law schools and legal institutions are embracing the technology, but broadly, in contrast to the US, they have adopted a relatively conservative approach.

As legal educators in Australia, we have noticed that while Australian law schools have been actively engaging in discussions around the use of AI in legal education and practice, as of November 2025, only a small number have incorporated AI into teaching or introduced AI-

²¹ *Id.*

²² Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68–69 (noting that Yale Law School and Georgetown Law School offer these courses).

²³ ABA Task Force 2024 Survey, *supra* note 18.

²⁴ *Leveraging AI to Grow Your Legal Practice*, A.B.A. (Nov. 13, 2024), https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_practice/resources/law-technology-today/2024/leveraging-ai-to-grow-your-legal-practice/ [https://perma.cc/CVR8-K2EC].

²⁵ *Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence: Addressing the Legal Challenges of AI*, A.B.A., https://www.americanbar.org/groups/centers_commissions/center-for-innovation/artificial-intelligence/ai-courts/ [https://perma.cc/G8BA-MEV6] (last visited Jul. 12, 2025) (“[S]everal courts have issued opinions raising concerns or imposing constraints on lawyers’ use of AI. Deepfakes and AI are creating daunting challenges for the authentication and use of evidence in court, such as to establish the reliability and integrity of evidence.”).

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ See generally UWE KISCHEL, *COMPARATIVE LAW* 45–86 (Oxford University Press, 2019) (discussing the aims of comparative law).

focused courses into their curricula.²⁸ Additionally, Australian scholars have conducted research on AI in legal education and practice, the volume and depth of scholarship remains modest compared to in the US.

In Australian legal practice, the adoption of AI is cautiously progressing. Some jurisdictions are more proactive while others remain conservative in adopting this technology. For example, the Queensland Law Society, a state-level professional body comparable to a US state bar association, is taking a proactive approach in embracing these technologies.²⁹ The Queensland's approach focuses on guiding the legal profession in the use of AI emphasizing the importance of ethical considerations.³⁰ Queensland Law Society states that it "does not seek to discourage use of AI tools in legal practice, nor does [it] view such use as incompatible with ethical duties."³¹ It further acknowledges that the use of AI could enhance access to justice and reduce the burden of routine work; however, "such use must be carefully considered and undertaken within appropriate guardrails."³² By contrast, in New South Wales, the Law Society takes a more cautious approach, placing particular emphasis on maintaining strong ethical standards and, most importantly, prioritizing consumer protection.³³

As for the judiciary, while the Queensland courts acknowledge concerns pertaining to the use of AI, they have yet to take strong action related thereto. For example, the Queensland courts could have imposed an outright ban, or even established clear guidelines on how AI should be used in court proceedings. Instead, the courts have only encouraged the

²⁸ See, e.g., *Artificial Intelligence, Law & Society*, AUSTL. NAT'L UNIV., <https://programsandcourses.anu.edu.au/2022/course/laws8405> [<https://perma.cc/7VX6-HWYT>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025); *Artificial Intelligence and the Law*, UNIV. OF MELBOURNE, <https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/subjects/laws90145> [<https://perma.cc/EZ58-F5CP>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025).

²⁹ *AI Companion Guide*, QUEENSL. L. SOC'Y, <https://www.qls.com.au/resource-centre/technology-and-innovation/artificial-intelligence/ai-companion-guide> [<https://perma.cc/FRN4-Z2QQ>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025) ("The Queensland Law Society does not seek to discourage use of AI tools in legal practice, nor does QLS view such use as incompatible with ethical duties. AI – used properly – has the potential to significantly enhance access to justice... and lessen the burden of routine work on solicitors and support staff.").

³⁰ *No.37 Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice*, QUEENSL. L. SOC'Y, <https://www.qls.com.au/practising-law-in-qld/ethics/guidance-statements/no-37-artificial-intelligence-in-legal-practice> [<https://perma.cc/3WFM-ANTU>] (last visited Jul. 12, 2025).

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ *AI Guidance to Safeguard Consumers of Legal Services*, L. SOC'Y NEW S. WALES, <https://www.lawsociety.com.au/publications-and-resources/news-media-releases/ai-guidance-safeguard-consumers-legal-services> [<https://perma.cc/3NTU-4YZK>] (last visited Jul. 12, 2025).

responsible adoption of AI tools and offered a range of advice focusing on non-lawyers, such as self-represented litigants, to attempt to ensure accurate legal guidance and to protect privacy.³⁴

In contrast to Queensland's more proactive approach, Chief Justice Andrew Bell first banned the use of AI in New South Wales courts in November 2024 due to "a wide range of concerns about how AI could undermine the justice system."³⁵ In February 2025,³⁶ Bell relaxed the ban but issued a directive stating that AI must "not be used in generating the content of affidavits, witness statements, character references or other material that is intended to reflect the deponent or witness' evidence and/or opinion, or other material tendered in evidence or used in cross examination[.]"³⁷ This was a smart ban because it restricts AI involvement in the personal, nontechnical aspects of document generation.

Despite the obvious variation in approaches to AI adoption across jurisdictions and legal institutions, it is undeniable that AI is playing an increasingly important role in both the present and future of legal education and practice. It is therefore imperative that law schools ensure law students are adequately prepared to work with AI.

We argue that this goal would be best achieved through focused legal education reform, specifically by incorporating AI tools across the curriculum. This proposal would reform legal education to rest on three key pillars rather than the traditional two. Thus, beyond the traditional pillars of substantive legal knowledge and critical lawyering skills, a third pillar—AI proficiency—should be added to the law school curriculum.

The first two pillars have long been integral to legal education and remain essential for law students. A solid foundation in these areas continues to provide the bedrock for professional legal practice. Since AI can assist lawyers with a wide range of legal tasks (and in some cases, raise novel legal issues), the proposed new pillar—AI proficiency—ought to focus on equipping law students with essential AI knowledge and skills,

³⁴ *Using Generative AI*, QUEENSL. CTS., [https://www.courts.qld.gov.au/going-to-court/using-generative-ai?utm_source=\[https://perma.cc/FY57-YRDH\]](https://www.courts.qld.gov.au/going-to-court/using-generative-ai?utm_source=[https://perma.cc/FY57-YRDH]) (last updated Sep. 26, 2025).

³⁵ Dan Holmes, *Chief Justice Relaxes AI Ban in NSW Courts*, THE MANDARIN (Feb. 5, 2025), <https://www.themandarin.com.au/285933-chief-justice-relaxes-ai-ban-in-nsw-courts/> [https://perma.cc/JNF3-L34D] (noting that other states, such as Victoria and Western Australia followed suit in December 2024).

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ Supreme Court of New South Wales, *Practice Note SC Gen 23: Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI)*, 28 January 2025, https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Practice-and-Procedure/Practice-Notes/general/current/PN_SC_Gen_23.pdf [https://perma.cc/5LJX-B4L5] (Bell, CJ).

thereby enabling them to effectively utilize AI and deal with AI-related issues.

One important caveat is that AI is expected to expand in both capabilities and applications over time. The legal education reform proposed in this Article, while based on the current state of technology and reasonable projections, is not limited to these conditions. It is a proposal designed to remain relevant in the future. Another caveat is to consider the strategy taken towards AI technology: is the strategy to shield the profession from competition, or is it to harness AI's capabilities to their fullest, so as to use the AI as a team of experts supporting the lawyers—one referred to by Dessislav Dobrev as the intertwined approach of the “AI lawyer” plus the “human lawyer”?³⁸ Between these strategies, we advocate for the latter.

The Article is divided into five parts. Following this introduction, Part I discusses the tasks AI is currently performing in the legal practice. It then reviews steps taken by law schools to respond to these technological developments. This review aims to identify gaps in existing curricula, providing valuable insights on how to better prepare students for the future of legal practice in an AI-saturated environment. Part I highlights the importance of adopting the three pillars in legal education, suggesting that the third pillar—AI proficiency—should be embedded throughout doctrinal and skills development courses, and be further complemented by separate, specialized AI-focused courses.

Part II examines the first pillar of legal education: substantive legal knowledge. While AI is powerful, it cannot replace the nuanced understanding and application of legal principles as creatively developed by law professors and lawyers. Substantive legal knowledge remains and always must be a core component of legal education. In the Age of AI, however, law schools cannot ignore the technology and should be actively exploring ways to integrate AI into the delivery of doctrinal courses. This strategy would ensure that law students develop not only traditional legal expertise but also the skills to do so with the help of the latest AI tools. To this end, Part II proposes two strategies: (1) integrating AI-related topics into doctrinal courses, and (2) encouraging law students to use AI, particularly domain-specific AI systems, as personalized tutors to maximize their individual learning outcomes.

³⁸ Dessislav Dobrev, *The Human Lawyer in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Doomed for Extinction or in Need of a Survival Manual?*, 18 J. INT'L BUS. & L. 39, 66 (2018).

Part III further contends that critical skills training remains a vital pillar of legal education. It particularly underscores the importance of technical analytical skills, ethical judgment, professional responsibility, and human-centric soft skills—skills that AI has yet to perform effectively at this stage of technological development and that remain indispensable in legal education and practice.

Part IV proceeds to examine the rationale and approaches that law schools should adopt when introducing specialized AI courses and seminars into the curriculum. Finally, Part V concludes the Article by emphasizing that legal education should encompass three key pillars—substantive legal knowledge, skills training, and AI proficiency—to prepare the next generation of lawyers effectively using the co-intelligence of AI.

I. THE ROLE OF AI IN LEGAL PRACTICE AND LEGAL EDUCATION

This section reviews AI's current role in legal practice and law schools' responses. It identifies gaps in existing curricula and proposes a three-pillar framework—traditional doctrinal knowledge, practical skills development, and the new pillar of AI proficiency—to better prepare students for an AI-saturated legal environment.

A. AN AI LAW FIRM AND TASKS ALREADY PERFORMED BY AI IN LEGAL PRACTICE

In May 2025, the UK's regulatory body for lawyers, the Solicitors Regulation Authority, authorized the first AI law firm. In making the announcement, it stated:

We have authorised the first law firm providing legal services through artificial intelligence (AI). While many firms are already using AI to support and deliver a range of back-office and public-facing services, Garfield.Law Ltd is the first purely AI-based firm we have authorised to provide regulated legal services in England and Wales.³⁹

The firm itself claims:

The firm itself represents that it is able to take care of all documents and correspondence, including drafts a Claim Form and Particulars of Claim. When approved, it will submit them to the Court and calculate

³⁹ *News Release: SRA Approves First AI-Driven Law Firm*, SOLICITORS' REGULATORY AUTHORITY (May 6, 2025), <https://www.sra.org.uk/sra/news/press/garfield-ai-authorised/> [https://perma.cc/9J3Y-HT77].

interest under either the relevant statute or the contract and prosecute through default judgment, admission or help you respond to the Defence and help you through the subsequent stages of taking a small claim to trial.⁴⁰

This list of services is quite a formidable array for an AI law firm. It is therefore unsurprising that many areas of the legal practice have already had legal professionals integrate AI into their jobs. This integration is possible simply because, as Professor Joe Regalia observes, AI can perform as well as and even outperform human lawyers in many traditional tasks.⁴¹

The British Institute of International and Comparative Law has identified seven key areas in which AI is increasingly being used to assist lawyers (though certainly not limited to these tasks as the technology continues to advance at a rapid rate).⁴² They are: legal research and e-discovery (AI as a search and discovery tool), document automation (AI as a document drafting and management tool), predictive legal analysis (AI as a predictive analytical tool), legal review (AI as a reading and summarizing tool), case management (AI as a scheduling and filing tool), legal advice and expertise automation (AI as a client communication and support tool), and information and marketing (AI as a learning and marketing tool).⁴³

1. AI in Legal Research and E-Discovery (AI as a Search and Discovery Tool)

AI has been used in e-discovery and legal research for a long time, functioning as a powerful search and discovery tool.⁴⁴ It transforms e-

⁴⁰ *The Journey Through the Court System*, GARFIELD AI, <https://www.garfield.law/#about> [https://perma.cc/ZQ4E-92GB] (last visited Feb. 28, 2026).

⁴¹ Joseph Regalia, *Generative AI and the Future of Legal Education*, NEV. LAW., Oct. 2023, at 8, 8, <https://scholars.law.unlv.edu/facpub/1411> [https://perma.cc/TRX3-LPRR] (“The result is technology that can understand text, parse it for insights, and apply those insights with striking competence. Just like we lawyers do.”).

⁴² Irene Pietropaoli, Iris Anastasiadou, Jean-Pierre Gauci, & Holly MacAlpine, *Use of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Practice*, BRITISH INST. OF INT’L & COMPAR. L., at 2 (Oct. 17, 2023), https://www.biicl.org/documents/170_use_of_artificial_intelligence_in_legal_practice_final.pdf [https://perma.cc/9SKN-LK5W].

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.*; Hon. John G. Browning, *Real World Ethics in an Artificial Intelligence World*, 49 N. KY. L. REV. 155, 157 (2022); Michael Mills, *Artificial Intelligence in Law: The State of Play 2016*, THOMSON REUTERS (2016), <https://britishlegalitforum.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Keynote-Mills-AI-in-Law-State-of-Play-2016.pdf> [https://perma.cc/EWW8-Q848].

discovery from a labor-intensive task into a strategic, tech-assisted process.⁴⁵ By automating the review and analysis of documents, AI makes e-discovery faster, more accurate, and cost-effective compared to traditional manual methods.⁴⁶ As for legal research, AI helps lawyers do legal research by quickly retrieving relevant legal materials and supports them in developing strong, up-to-date legal arguments.⁴⁷ Up to this point, however, many lawyers do not completely trust the work produced by AI.⁴⁸ Instead, most lawyers only use AI as a starting point for their research.⁴⁹

2. Document Automation (AI as a Document Drafting and Management Tool)

To some extent, document automation is akin to the old precedent model. In this model, templates were provided and then modified to address the specific circumstances of the case. AI shows promise in doing so with fewer errors and greater speed across the whole range of documents required for legal work, whether transactional or litigation.⁵⁰

A recent example from the US demonstrates what AI can achieve in document drafting and preparation.⁵¹ Doucet Co., LPA, a law firm based in Ohio, claims to have filed what the firm believes to be the first federal lawsuit drafted entirely by AI. The lawsuit alleges violations of federal and state laws resulting from their attempts to collect on a paid debt.⁵² The firm notes that ai.law's software recognized niche legal components, including the need for proper jurisdiction as well as specific elements of claims. The software was also able to draft the complaint in a persuasive style, even including an introductory statement designed to

⁴⁵ Bast, *supra* note 9, at 295 (noting that AI “produces better results with fewer errors when asked to use a formula to analyze data, such as that necessary for reviewing discovery documents”); Joe Regalia, *Lex Ex Machina: Forging A New Ethical Framework for AI and Technology in the Law*, 55 CUMB. L. REV. 53, 60 (2025).

⁴⁶ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42; Anthony E. Davis, *The Future of Law Firms (and Lawyers) in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, 16 REV. DIREITO GV 1, 4 (2020).

⁴⁷ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 2.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 3.

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.* at 2; Davis, *supra* note 46, at 4; Harry Surden, *Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview*, 35 GA. STATE U.L. REV. 1305, 1329–32 (2019) (discussing the benefits of AI in legal practice).

⁵¹ *First AI Lawsuit Filed in Federal Court*, AI LAW, <https://www.ai.law/blog/ai-lawsuit/> [<https://perma.cc/2LW2-8GHT>] (last visited Jul. 12, 2025).

⁵² *Id.*

persuasively and concisely tell the client's story.⁵³ Troy Doucet, the firm's principal attorney, explains how the AI-generated draft is what he would expect from an experienced associate. He claims that he is confident in filing the lawsuit in court after he validates the allegations.⁵⁴ While not quite at the level of the UK's Garfield in terms of the scale of document automation that its AI reportedly handles, Doucet Co., LPA's use of AI is still an impressive accomplishment.

3. Predictive Legal Analysis (AI as a Predictive Analytical Tool)

According to the British Institute of International and Comparative Law report, AI is also applied in legal practice through information assimilation and predictive legal analysis.⁵⁵ In this regard, AI algorithms examine historical data and patterns, predict case outcomes and litigation trends, and identify potential concerns for lawyers.⁵⁶ An increasing number of AI providers offer toolkits allowing law firms to develop analytics programs customized to their specific needs.⁵⁷

One of the major challenges lawyers often face is predicting the outcome of litigation with a reasonable degree of certainty. No less a figure than Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.—jurist and former US Supreme Court Associate Justice—famously commented on this challenge.⁵⁸ Holmes said the law is “[t]he prophecies of what the courts will do in fact, and nothing more pretentious.”⁵⁹ A study of 481 lawyers' predictions on cases also suggests that “lawyers were overconfident in their predictions, and

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ See Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 5; Gizem Halis Kasap, *Can Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) Replace Human Arbitrators? Technological Concerns and Legal Implications*, 2021 J. DISP. RESOL. 209, 210 (2021); K. Gandall, C. Haley, J. Chhouk, L. Knight, A. Wang, & B. DeMarco, *Predicting Precedent: A Psycholinguistic Artificial Intelligence in the Supreme Court*, 14 J.L. TECH. & INTERNET 218, 222 (2023).

⁵⁶ See Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 5; Gizem Halis Kasap, *Can Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) Replace Human Arbitrators? Technological Concerns and Legal Implications*, 2021 J. DISP. RESOL. 209, 210 (2021); K. Gandall, C. Haley, J. Chhouk, L. Knight, A. Wang, & B. DeMarco, *Predicting Precedent: A Psycholinguistic Artificial Intelligence in the Supreme Court*, 14 J.L. TECH. & INTERNET 218, 222 (2023).

⁵⁷ See Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 5; Gizem Halis Kasap, *Can Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) Replace Human Arbitrators? Technological Concerns and Legal Implications*, 2021 J. DISP. RESOL. 209, 210 (2021); K. Gandall, C. Haley, J. Chhouk, L. Knight, A. Wang, & B. DeMarco, *Predicting Precedent: A Psycholinguistic Artificial Intelligence in the Supreme Court*, 14 J.L. TECH. & INTERNET 218, 222 (2023).

⁵⁸ Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., *The Path of the Law*, 10 HARV. L. REV. 475, 478 (1897).

⁵⁹ *Id.*

calibration did not increase with years of legal experience.”⁶⁰ A recent study of an AI developed to predict SCOTUS, named SCOTUS_AI, has successful prediction rate of well over 70% and exceeds human predictions as it can “measure complicated trends more accurately than traditional statistical analysis, but also transcends the abilities of human researchers to notice, detect, and understand patterns in the data...[and unlike humans is not] distracted by irrelevant information or offer overly simplistic explanations to fit the maximum amount of data” as they are neither subjected to repeated iterations of institutionalist theory nor subject to psychological priming.⁶¹

If as it appears, that lawyers can be outperformed by AI in this task, then it may well be the case that there ought to be greater reliance on AI in such predictions. Indeed, the general public appears to have a strong interest in seeing this type of development. A recent Google search for “autonomous ai legal reasoning judgment prediction” limited to publications since 2024, for example, returned 17,400 results.⁶² This type of tool has been in use in areas such as tax law for close to a decade.⁶³

New studies by computer scientists have usefully identified new approaches to this challenging application. Haoxi Zhong and colleagues note two different AI models that produce distinctive results.⁶⁴ They describe one model that uses symbol-based methods to apply interpretable hand-crafted symbols to legal tasks.⁶⁵ These models focus more on applying interpretable legal knowledge to reason.⁶⁶ The second model they describe as using embedding-based methods. The goal of this model is to design efficient neural models to improve performance.⁶⁷ However, they note that interpretable symbolic models are not effective, and embedding-methods cannot be interpreted.⁶⁸

⁶⁰ Jane Goodman-Delahunty, Par Anders Granhag, Maria Hartwig, & Elizabeth Loftus, *Insightful or Wishful: Lawyers' Ability to Predict Case Outcomes*, 16 PSYCH., PUB. POL'Y, & L. 133, 133 (2010).

⁶¹ Gandall et al., *supra* note 55, at 234.

⁶² GOOGLE, “autonomous ai legal reasoning judgment prediction”, 17,400 results (Jun. 13. 2025) [<https://perma.cc/B5L7-7RNX>].

⁶³ Benjamin Alarie, Anothony Niblett, & Albert H. Yoon, *Using Machine Learning to Predict Outcomes in Tax Law*, 58 CAN. BUS. L.J. 231, 232 (2016).

⁶⁴ Haoxi Zhong, Chaojun Xiao, Cunchao Tu, Tianyang Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun, *How Does NLP Benefit Legal System: A Summary of Legal Artificial Intelligence*, ARXIV (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.12158> [<https://perma.cc/W5ML-N7SQ>].

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ *Id.*

Thus, despite predictive AI legal analysis being a rapidly developing technology, fundamental challenges not well understood by the legal profession remain. Again, Zhong and colleagues note that reliable legal AI is founded on knowledge modeling, legal reasoning, and interpretability. Although some existing methods try to solve these problems, computer science researchers still have a long way to go.⁶⁹ As a result, even more work is left for legal scholars and professionals.

4. *Legal Review (AI as a Reading and Summarizing Tool)*

Document review is a particularly useful function given the large volume of documents in contemporary legal practice. Overwhelming the opposing side with voluminous amounts of documents, particularly in discovery, is a well-known litigation strategy.⁷⁰ Using AI for document summaries and identifying salient issues is both an established practice⁷¹ and is growing as the technology continues to develop.⁷² Improvements can be expected; however, this particular activity is often a task on which junior lawyers develop experiences that are particularly valuable over time.⁷³

5. *Case Management (AI as a Scheduling and Filing Tool)*

Case management software has been used in the court system for decades.⁷⁴ Like other areas of the law, it too is evolving as new AI capabilities emerge.⁷⁵ In legal practice, AI-powered virtual assistants are used in managing routine administrative tasks for lawyers, including file

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ See, e.g., William Hopwood, Carl Pacini, and George Young, *Fighting Discovery Abuse in Litigation*, 6 J. FORENSIC & INVESTIGATIVE ACCT. 52, 53 (2014).

⁷¹ See, e.g., Antonio Mastropaolo, Francesco Pallante, & Daniele Paolo Radicioni, *Legal Documents Categorization by Compression*, PROC. 14TH INT'L CONF. ARTIFICIAL INTEL. & L. 92 (2013).

⁷² Milda Norkute, Nadja Herger, Leszek Michalak, Andrew Mulder, & Sally Gao, *Towards Explainable AI: Assessing the Usefulness and Impact of Added Explainability Features in Legal Document Summarization*, in EXTENDED ABSTRACTS OF THE 2021 CHI CONF. ON HUM. FACTORS IN COMPUTING SYS. 53, 1–7 (2021).

⁷³ Davis, *supra* note 46, at 2, 4.

⁷⁴ J. Michael Greenwood & John Brinkema, *E-Filing Case Management Services in the US Federal Courts: The Next Generation: A Case Study*, 7 INT'L J. CT. ADMIN. 3, 3 (2015).

⁷⁵ Marco Fabri, *From Court Automation to E-Justice and Beyond in Europe*, 15 INT'L J. CT. ADMIN. 1, 10 (2024).

organization, case management, timekeeping, and scheduling client meetings and court hearings.⁷⁶

6. *Legal Advice and Expertise Automation (AI as a Client Communication and Support Tool)*

Legal advice and expertise automation represent two distinct applications of AI in law. Although the British Institute of International and Comparative Law report grouped the two together as a single application, in fact, they differ markedly. In its discussion of the two, it seems to conflate client communications and basic legal inquiries along with standardized tasks which are little more than completion of pro formas, such as wills and other forms. The current AI technologies readily perform basic client communication via a chat bot and/or some customer relationship management software. In this use, AI, as a legal advice and support tool, is used to engage with website visitors and respond to frequently asked questions.⁷⁷ Expertise, as the UK firm, Garfield, noted above aimed at simple, straightforward debt collection cases, can be reasonably well executed by AI. Where greater complexity is involved, however, human lawyers are still necessary and will be for the foreseeable future.⁷⁸

7. *Information and Marketing (AI as a Learning and Marketing Tool)*

AI has also become a powerful marketing tool for some law firms. With the ability to identify potential clients and generate tailored content—down to details including the tone a potential client will prefer in an email.⁷⁹

8. *Summary*

Lawyers have been using AI tools to assist with not only basic administrative functions but also a variety of legal tasks. They actively

⁷⁶ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 3–5; Ashley Robinson & Anne M. Golson, *Navigating the Legal Implications of Artificial Intelligence*, 85 ALA. LAW. 184, 185–186 (2024).

⁷⁷ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 3–5.

⁷⁸ *Id.*; Michael Legg & Felicity Bell, *Artificial Intelligence and the Legal Profession: Becoming the AI-Enhanced Lawyer*, 38 U. TAS. L. REV. 34, 35 (2019).

⁷⁹ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 3–5; *see generally* Ed Finkel, *Boon or Bust*, 111 ILL. B.J. 18, 18–45 (2023) (discussing lawyers and law firms using AI to generate marketing materials).

pilot approaches to co-intelligence—working alongside AI to enhance the efficiency of legal work.⁸⁰ Yet, lawyers remain cautious about AI tools handling the entire legal process without significant checks and balances.⁸¹ Lawyers view AI as a valuable aid rather than a replacement for legal services. In the future, it is expected that AI will be able to perform an even broader range of legal tasks.⁸² As Dessislav Dobrev, a leading expert on AI and the law, observes, “AI is viable in any area with sufficient digitized data that can be labeled and mapped in ‘input-output’ processes through predictive or other cognitive methods.”⁸³ While AI is not yet capable of replacing humans in legal decision-making and other complex tasks, it could potentially assist with other high-level functions. For example, facilitating adjudicative proceedings,⁸⁴ detecting potential violations of law,⁸⁵ and filing and reviewing applications as part of administrative processes.⁸⁶ In light of this, the importance of helping future lawyers work in tandem with AI cannot be understated.

B. AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION

The fundamental purpose of legal education has long been a matter of debate involving some of the law’s great educators such as Professor Karl Nickerson Llewellyn⁸⁷ and Professor Harold Dwight Lasswell.⁸⁸ The debate stems from the basic observation that law school curriculum diverges from professional practice.⁸⁹ The foundational

⁸⁰ Nielsen et al., *supra* note 6, at 980; Legg & Bell, *supra* note 78, at 35; Patrick Parsons, *AI in 2024: A Year of Crossroads and Decisions*, 40 GA. ST. U.L. REV., at ix, xii (2024).

⁸¹ Pietropaoli et al., *supra* note 42, at 4.

⁸² Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 55–56 (noting that the potential applications of AI in legal practice are “likely to be wide-ranging”).

⁸³ *Id.*

⁸⁴ *Id.* at 56.

⁸⁵ *Id.* (noting that “AI can be trained to scan patents and text in order to track violations of patent and copyright laws.”).

⁸⁶ *Id.* (noting that “AI can enable individuals to apply for change in immigration, employment, or other status. The relevant agency or other regulators on the receiving end can, too, utilize AI in processing such applications.”).

⁸⁷ Karl Nickerson Llewellyn, *On What is Wrong with So-Called Legal Education*, 35 COLUM. L. REV. 651, 678 (1935).

⁸⁸ Harold D. Lasswell & Myres S. McDougal, *Legal Education and Public Policy: Professional Training in the Public Interest*, 52 YALE L. J. 203, 203 (1943).

⁸⁹ See, e.g., Harry T. Edwards, *The Growing Disjunction Between Legal Education and the Legal Profession*, 91 MICH. L. REV. 34, 34 (1992); George L. Priest, *The Increasing Division between Legal Practice and Legal Education*, 37 BUFF. L. REV. 681, 681 (1988); Neil Joel Dilloff, *Law School Training: Bridging the Gap between Legal Education and the Practice of Law*, 24 STAN. L. & POL’Y REV. 425, 455 (2013).

question is whether law schools prepare students for the private practice of the profession⁹⁰ or for participation in public life. In other words, is legal education training for jobs or for educating students to be able to engage in civic duties, including supporting society's public institutions,⁹¹ advancing disciplinary knowledge, and promoting personal development through improved reasoning, citizenship, and cognitive growth.⁹² Helpfully, UK Professor Otto Kahn-Freund notes that this is a false dichotomy.⁹³ Law schools may emphasize one objective or the other, but a satisfactory legal education serves both.

From this debate, it is clear that because legal education evolves in tandem with the legal practice and society, it must take account of AI. Thus, in the Age of AI, aligning the legal curriculum with the realities of a technology-driven profession as well as changes in society helps ensure law graduates are prepared to meet the demands of life beyond academia.⁹⁴ Our review of existing initiatives in both American and Australian law schools reveals several promising efforts of adapting to an AI driven legal practice, with American institutions at the forefront. This forward-leaning posture of American law schools is evident through curriculum reform, including the introduction of specialized courses on AI in law and the incorporation of AI innovations in doctrinal teaching.

For example, Yale Law School recognizes that AI affects “not only individual subject matters, but also the legal system and the work of lawyering itself.”⁹⁵ In response, it has proactively expanded its course offerings related to AI.⁹⁶ As early as Spring 2017, Yale offered *Artificial Intelligence, Robots, and the Law*,⁹⁷ examining the impact of AI (and robotics) on law and society, particularly through the lens of ethics,

⁹⁰ Jay Conison, *Success, Status, and the Goals of a Law School*, 37 U. TOL. L. REV. 23, 29 (2005) (arguing that law schools should “prepare their graduates to be competent and responsible lawyers.”).

⁹¹ Otto Kahn-Freund, *Reflections on Legal Education*, 29 MOD. L. REV. 121, 121–22 (1966).

⁹² Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity in Legal Education*, 70 U. CHI. L. REV. 265, 269–70 (2003).

⁹³ Kahn-Freund, *supra* note 91, at 129.

⁹⁴ Parsons, *supra* note 80, at xxi (noting that law firms are investing in AI technology, and therefore, “law schools have an obligation to prepare students for the realities they will face in practice.”).

⁹⁵ *Charting New Courses in Artificial Intelligence*, YALE L. SCH. (Apr. 22, 2025) [hereinafter Yale Charting New Courses in AI], <https://law.yale.edu/yls-today/news/charting-new-courses-artificial-intelligence> [<https://perma.cc/LX4V-3HD7>].

⁹⁶ *Id.*

⁹⁷ *Teaching*, YALE L. SCH., <https://law.yale.edu/isp/teaching#heading-32278178> [<https://perma.cc/GN9Y-S44H>] (last visited July 12, 2025); Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68.

regulation, and liability.⁹⁸ In Spring 2018, Yale added a course on *Law and Artificial Intelligence* to its curriculum. This course focuses on how machine learning systems, algorithms, and other AI technologies are reshaping critical areas of the economy and society; it also examines the ways these technologies interact with, challenge, and influence law and society in the future.⁹⁹ Since Spring 2018, Yale has offered a wide range of AI and law courses, such as *Liability and Regulation at the Frontier of AI Development* (2023),¹⁰⁰ *Artificial Intelligence, the Legal Profession, and Procedure: Seminar* (2023),¹⁰¹ *Practical Artificial Intelligence* (2024),¹⁰² *Global Law and Policy of Artificial Intelligence* (2024),¹⁰³ *Law's Artificial Intelligence Future* (Fall 2024),¹⁰⁴ and *Artificial Intelligence Law and Policy* (Spring 2025).¹⁰⁵

Yale has actively engaged in pedagogical innovation by embedding AI-related topics into existing courses. For example, in *Torts and Regulation*, students explore tort liability for injuries caused by LLMs and other forms of AI.¹⁰⁶ Yale has also developed novel approaches to

⁹⁸ *Teaching*, *supra* note 97; Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68.

⁹⁹ *Teaching*, *supra* note 97; Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68.

¹⁰⁰ *Liability and Regulation at the Frontier of AI Development*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202303&CRN=23104> [<https://perma.cc/86PP-AQCC>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹⁰¹ *Artificial Intelligence, the Legal Profession, and Procedure: Seminar*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202301&CRN=22151> [<https://perma.cc/KM8F-Y6YJ>] (last visited July 12, 2025) (“This seminar will consider whether the trajectory of artificial intelligence systems is on course to automate legal argument or procedure. To this end, the course will consider theoretical and doctrinal writings relating to all three topics. The course will also consider AI use cases in modern litigation and the ethical regimes that govern lawyers’ use of these technologies.”).

¹⁰² *Practical Artificial Intelligence*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202403&CRN=15560> [<https://perma.cc/K9WB-SHU7>] (last visited July 12, 2025) (this course explores “the transformative power of artificial intelligence in the field of legal research.”).

¹⁰³ *Global Law and Policy of Artificial Intelligence*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202401&CRN=31484> [<https://perma.cc/2WVQ-DUZA>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹⁰⁴ *Law's Artificial Intelligence Future*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202403&CRN=14453> [<https://perma.cc/44M5-RBAR>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹⁰⁵ *Artificial Intelligence Law and Policy*, YLS: COURSES, <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202501&CRN=21893> [<https://perma.cc/D3R8-KEV6>] (last visited July 12, 2025) (this course examines “current legal and policy issues regarding artificial intelligence, robotics, and related technologies.” It also looks at both American and European regulatory frameworks and policy debates on related issues).

¹⁰⁶ *Torts and Regulation*, YLS: COURSES [hereinafter Yale Torts and Regulations], <https://courses.law.yale.edu/CourseDetailPage?TermCode=202401&CRN=28273> [<https://perma.cc/7SKC-P5JF>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

train students in building AI models for legal applications. For example, with the DocProject, Professor Scott Shapiro required students to work with AI tools and develop AI models in media law.¹⁰⁷

Georgetown Law School has also shone through as a leader in incorporating AI into its curriculum. Georgetown offers more than seventy tech-related law courses,¹⁰⁸ including at least seventeen courses specifically teaching various aspects of AI.¹⁰⁹ Faculty members at Georgetown are involved in integrating AI tools into their teaching.¹¹⁰ Some create exercises for students to work directly with language models; others develop upper-level classes integrating AI into legal writing.¹¹¹ Indeed, as Georgetown Law Professor Frances DeLaurentis notes, “the future is hybrid work produced by humans working with gen-AI.”¹¹² There is a growing need to prepare law students to work effectively with the assistance of AI.¹¹³

While less advanced in AI as compared to Yale and Georgetown, most other American law schools are integrating AI into their curricula, particularly by introducing AI-focused courses.¹¹⁴ However, as Patrick Parsons observes, many of these law schools have not taken a systematic approach to integrating AI.¹¹⁵ He further notes, “Most course offerings are fragmented with little coordination regarding agreed-upon skills, outputs, or curriculum. Courses sounding the same will vary dramatically from institution to institution.”¹¹⁶

In Australia, practical steps toward implementation remain limited in comparison to those taken by their American counterparts. Australian universities have established special task forces or working groups to

¹⁰⁷ *Yale Law School Shapes the Future of Artificial Intelligence*, YALE L. SCH. (Apr. 10, 2024), <https://law.yale.edu/yls-today/news/yale-law-school-shapes-future-artificial-intelligence> [<https://perma.cc/U37H-88LD>] (noting that DocProject is “a program of the Media Freedom and Information Access (MFIA) clinic that provides pro bono legal representation for documentary filmmakers.”); Yale Charting New Courses in AI, *supra* note 95.

¹⁰⁸ *Master of Law and Technology*, GEO. L., https://curriculum.law.georgetown.edu/lm/lm-programs-non-lawyers/masters-law-technology/?utm_source [<https://perma.cc/96KM-JEX8>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025).

¹⁰⁹ Vince Beiser, *AI & the Law... & What It Means for Legal Education & Lawyers*, GEO. L. (Jan. 2, 2024), <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/news/ai-the-law-what-it-means-for-legal-education-lawyers/> [<https://perma.cc/FUP7-UXUV>]; Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68.

¹¹⁰ Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 68.

¹¹¹ *Id.*

¹¹² Beiser, *supra* note 109.

¹¹³ Prakash G & Nair, *supra* note 15, at 61.

¹¹⁴ Parsons, *supra* note 80, at xx.

¹¹⁵ *Id.*

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

investigate the use of AI generally; however, discussions on AI are largely conceptual, focusing primarily on each institution's stance on its use and the challenges associated therewith.¹¹⁷ Some Australian institutions have begun exploring ways to embed AI into teaching, though progress in integrating AI into the curriculum remain far less comprehensive than in the US, particularly when compared with Yale and Georgetown.¹¹⁸

Since 2022, a few top-tier law schools have begun offering specialized courses on AI and the law, though usually limited to a single course.¹¹⁹ For example, Australian National University Law School offers *Artificial Intelligence, Law & Society*;¹²⁰ the University of Melbourne Law School offers *Artificial Intelligence and the Law*;¹²¹ the University of New South Wales offers *Big Tech, AI and the Law*;¹²² and Monash University offers *AI, Technology and the Law*.¹²³ Bond University offers a short course—*The Breakthrough Lawyer: GenAI and Productivity*—teaching lawyers how to integrate generative AI into their daily legal practice.¹²⁴ Despite these examples, our research shows that, as of November 2025, only 7 out of 38 accredited Australian law schools have introduced a single AI-related subject into their curricula.¹²⁵ There remains a lack of a

¹¹⁷ See, e.g., *University of Melbourne AI Principles*, THE UNIV. OF MELB., <https://www.unimelb.edu.au/ai/university-of-melbourne-ai-principles> [<https://perma.cc/RBW9-749B>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹¹⁸ See, e.g., *Generative AI Governance*, THE UNIV. OF MELB., <https://www.unimelb.edu.au/ai/home/governance-and-ai-principles> [<https://perma.cc/KQ3D-ETGJ>] (last visited July 12, 2025); *Submission to the Senate Inquiry on Adopting Artificial Intelligence*, UNIV. AUSTL. (July 14, 2023), <https://universitiesaustralia.edu.au/submission-to-the-inquiry-into-the-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-in-the-australian-education-system/> [<https://perma.cc/B3AL-JWVY>] (Universities Australia is the peak body in the higher education sector. It “has established two working groups focusing on AI in teaching and AI in research, bringing together senior leaders and experts in the sector to lead and advise on constructive and ethical use of AI.”).

¹¹⁹ See e.g., *Artificial Intelligence, Law & Society*, *supra* note 28 (Australian National University Law School was among the first in Australia to offer AI-related subject, beginning in 2022).

¹²⁰ *Id.*

¹²¹ *Artificial Intelligence and the Law*, *supra* note 28.

¹²² *Big Tech, AI and the Law*, THE UNIV. OF N.S.W., <https://www.handbook.unsw.edu.au/undergraduate/courses/2025/LAWS3533?year=2025> [<https://perma.cc/K9F8-32BU>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹²³ *AI, Technology and the Law*, MONASH UNIV., <https://handbook.monash.edu/2025/units/law4542?year=2025> [<https://perma.cc/E4AK-TNTQJ>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹²⁴ *The Breakthrough Lawyer: GenAI and Productivity*, BOND UNIV., <https://bond.edu.au/microcredential/breakthrough-lawyer-genai-and-productivity> [<https://perma.cc/ADH7-9HVM>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

¹²⁵ Our research shows that, as of November 2025, only the following Australian law schools offer AI-related law subjects: Australian National University, University of New South Wales, Monash University, the University of Wollongong, the University of Adelaide, Queensland University of

comprehensive or systematic approach to integrating AI into legal education in Australia.

C. BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN LEGAL EDUCATION AND PRACTICE: MYTHS AND REALITIES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING LAW IN THE AGE OF AI

There is growing recognition among law schools regarding the expanding role of AI in legal practice, prompting curricular reform initiatives.¹²⁶ Despite American law schools taking a more proactive approach than their Australian counterparts, both have failed to adopt a systematic approach ensuring their curricula effectively aligns with technological developments in legal practice.¹²⁷ As Professors Larry Bridgesmith and Adel Elmessiry observe, “legal academics are slow to adapt to the changing technology.”¹²⁸ As a result, a new gap has emerged between legal education and legal practice.

To bridge this gap, we now examine students’ and educators’ perspectives on how legal education should be adapted in response to the rise of AI. Both students’ growing expectations as well as educators’

Technology, and the University of New England. See *Artificial Intelligence, Law & Society*, *supra* note 28;

Big Tech, AI and the Law, *supra* note 122; *AI, Tech and the Law*, *supra* note 123; *LLB3373 - Artificial Intelligence and the Law*, UNIV. OF WOLLONGONG, <https://courses.uow.edu.au/subjects/2026/llb3373?year=2026> [https://perma.cc/N8JR-MQ2U] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025); *LAW 7042 - AI and Technology: Legal and Security Issues*, UNIV. OF ADELAIDE., <https://www.adelaide.edu.au/course-outlines/001806/1/tri-3/> [https://perma.cc/AY6S-6CRK] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025); *LLB353 Governing Artificial Intelligence*, QUEENSL. UNIV. OF TECH., <https://www.qut.edu.au/study/unit?unitCode=LLB353> [https://perma.cc/38NM-QWWG] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025); *Special Studies in Law (C) (LAW395)*, UNIV. NEW ENG., <https://www.une.edu.au/study/units/special-studies-in-law-c-law395#:~:text=The%20unit%20will%20provide%20an,the%20Law%20of%20Space%20Operations> [https://perma.cc/E3ZN-X86V] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025); *AI and the Law (LAWS5105)*, UNIV. OF QUEENSL., https://programs-courses.uq.edu.au/course.html?course_code=LAWS5105 [https://perma.cc/3XR3-LKW2] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025).

¹²⁶ Steven R. Smith, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution and Legal Education*, 39 GA. ST. U. L. REV. 337 (2023) (noting that “[L]aw schools will have to adjust students’ education and focus the curriculum on ensuring new competencies.”).

¹²⁷ See Parsons, *supra* note 80, at xx (discussing the American law schools’ approaches and the issues).

¹²⁸ Larry Bridgesmith & Adel Elmessiry, *The Digital Transformation of Law: Are We Prepared for Artificially Intelligent Legal Practice?*, 54 AKRON L. REV. 815, 823 (2020); see also Smith, *supra* note 126 (noting that “Changing law school curriculum is generally more evolutionary than dramatic, but there is not enough time to slowly begin to prepare students for their professional lives in the 4th industrial revolution.”).

willingness to engage with AI play a key role in shaping how legal education adapts.

I. Students' Perspectives

In 2023, for the first time in history, a non-human—ChatGPT 4—passed the Uniform Bar Exam.¹²⁹ According to Pablo Arredondo, ChatGPT 4 did not merely pass the bar exam,¹³⁰ it scored in the 90th percentile, exceeding the average score of human exam takers.¹³¹ ChatGPT performed particularly better on multiple-choice questions when compared to the written sections.¹³² The increasing capabilities and accessibility of AI have led some students to believe that they no longer need to acquire foundational legal knowledge and skills.¹³³ Professor Ethan Mollick describes this phenomenon as the “paradox of knowledge acquisition in the Age of AI.”¹³⁴ Mollick further contends that, with the rise of AI, acquiring foundational knowledge and skills is not optional; rather, it is, more important than ever, as society requires a continuous supply of human experts to oversee AI work.¹³⁵ This will remain the case unless and until humans are able to obtain the expertise in AI without traditional learning techniques such as memorization and purposeful practice.

A sample of Australian law students revealed that the majority held a positive view of AI and generally supported its integration into doctrinal courses and skills-based training.¹³⁶ In qualitative results, one student expressed a high level of appreciation for AI’s ability to succinctly and accurately identify key legal concepts and relevant information, even

¹²⁹ Pablo Arredondo, *GPT-4 Passes the Bar Exam: What That Means for Artificial Intelligence Tools in the Legal Profession*, STAN. L. SCH. BLOGS (Apr. 19, 2023), <https://law.stanford.edu/2023/04/19/gpt-4-passes-the-bar-exam-what-that-means-for-artificial-intelligence-tools-in-the-legal-industry/> [https://perma.cc/C7P7-L3XU]; Jonathan Choi & Daniel Schwarcz, *AI Assistance in Legal Analysis: An Empirical Study*, 73 J. LEGAL EDUC. 384, 385 (2025).

¹³⁰ Arredondo, *supra* note 129.

¹³¹ *Id.*

¹³² John Bliss, *Teaching Law in the Age of Generative AI*, 64 JURIMETRICS J. 111, 136–37 (2024).

¹³³ Katrina Robinson, *Thinking About Co-Intelligence*, 21 LEGAL COMM. & RHETORIC 171, 176 (2024) (reviewing CO-INTELLIGENCE: LIVING AND WORKING WITH AI by Ethan Mollick); ETHAN MOLLICK, CO-INTELLIGENCE: LIVING AND WORKING WITH AI 181 (2024).

¹³⁴ MOLLICK, *supra* 133, at 181.

¹³⁵ Robinson, *supra* note 133.

¹³⁶ See Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 114.

when given limited context.¹³⁷ Interestingly, the students understood the importance of understanding the foundational legal principles themselves in order to use AI effectively.¹³⁸

2. Legal Educators' Perspectives

We have found that legal educators are torn between competing approaches to teaching given the current state of AI development. While educators agree that educating students through substantive knowledge and critical skills remains essential,¹³⁹ they are under increasing pressure to incorporate AI into their teaching in order to prepare students for an evolving job market.¹⁴⁰ In this regard, Professor John Bliss notes, legal educators fall across all points on the AI-integration spectrum.¹⁴¹ They range from those favoring an immersive approach throughout the curriculum to those favoring all-out bans on student use of AI.¹⁴² In reality, the majority of legal educators recognize the potential of AI-integrated teaching, but levels of engagement vary: proactive curricular integration¹⁴³ coexists with skepticism about AI's long-term implications.¹⁴⁴

There have also been pedagogical debates about when to introduce AI into legal education, specifically whether it is appropriate to incorporate it into the first-year curriculum as opposed to later on.¹⁴⁵ While

¹³⁷ Benedict Sheehy & Juan Diaz-Granados, A Theoretical Framework for AI in Law Assessment: The Imperative of Strategic Adaptation (Nov. 14, 2024), <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5020506> [<https://perma.cc/SPK2-VXXX>].

¹³⁸ See *id.*

¹³⁹ Amanda Head & Sonya Willis, *Assessing Law Students in a GenAI World to Create Knowledgeable Future Lawyers*, 31 INT'L J. LEGAL PROF. 293, 295 (2024).

¹⁴⁰ See, e.g., Jennifer Tran, *LSU Law Professors Release 'The Law Prof's AI Sandbox' to Help Colleagues Explore, Enhance Artificial Intelligence in the Classroom*, LSU LAW (Feb. 21, 2025) (statement of Tracy Norton) ("There's a lot of pressure right now for law professors to commit to using AI."), <https://law.lsu.edu/news/2025/02/21/lsu-law-professors-release-the-law-profs-ai-sandbox-to-help-colleagues-explore-enhance-artificial-intelligence-in-the-classroom> [<https://perma.cc/EL8W-7DV7>].

¹⁴¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 115.

¹⁴² *Id.* at 114–15.

¹⁴³ See Erica Friesen, *The Artificial Researcher: Information Literacy and Ai in the Legal Research Classroom*, 26 LEGAL WRITING 241 (2022) (noting the need to incorporate the competent use of AI into the law school curriculum).

¹⁴⁴ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 115, 130 ("Although most of the surveyed faculty agreed that legal education should incorporate generative AI, many of these respondents also raised concerns that AI might "hinder" the teaching of law and "compromise the learning process." Some worried that students would become "heavily reliant on AI" rather than developing their own skills of legal writing, research, and analysis.").

¹⁴⁵ *Id.* at 115, 133–34.

some educators argue students should be learning law without AI during their 1L year,¹⁴⁶ others posit that incorporating AI from the outset sends a clear message to students about the growing importance of this technology in the legal profession.¹⁴⁷ According to Bliss's survey of 149 law faculty members, despite their interest in AI-integrated teaching, the major concern is that they feel uninformed about AI technology and are uncertain about how to structure AI-integrated exercises and assignments.¹⁴⁸ This challenge will likely persist, as law professors face growing pressure to teach more, publish more, and keep up with rapidly advancing technology.¹⁴⁹ Simply put, few law professors have enough time to explore and experiment sufficiently with AI technology to be able to learn its capabilities and drawbacks.

3. *The Three Pillars of Legal Education in the Age of AI*

Regardless of the foregoing debates, AI technology in its various forms has long been an important part of legal education. Some legal educators view the integration of AI into legal education as analogous to past shifts in legal research methods. Most notably, this evolution mirrors the transition from flipping through paper books to teaching students how to navigate digital resources.¹⁵⁰ Initially, this meant CDs, and later, electronic databases such as LexisNexis and Westlaw.¹⁵¹ As doctors Amanda Head and Sonya Willis observe, although it is arguably no longer a viable stance, historically, engaging with electronic technology held a secondary role in legal education.¹⁵² In the Age of AI, it can be argued that the role of technology has only become more prominent.

As such, we argue that to prepare graduates to be ready to practice law and contribute knowledgeably to society, technological proficiency

¹⁴⁶ *Id.*

¹⁴⁷ *Id.*

¹⁴⁸ *Id.* at 127, 130 ("Many acknowledged that they are just beginning to consider AI-integrated teaching and 'are not informed enough about the technology' and 'need to have a better understanding' before changing their approach to teaching.").

¹⁴⁹ See generally, Angela Melville & Amy Barrow, "Permanent" but Pressured: Junior Academics within Australian Law Schools, 29 INT'L J. LEGAL PRO. 125, 125–41 (2021) (discussing the pressure junior academics are facing in Australian law schools); see also Marina Nehme, *The Nexus Between Teaching and Research: Easier Said Than Done*, 22 LEGAL EDUC. REV. 241, 241 (2012) ("[T]here was a gradual shift towards universities not only promoting the transmission of knowledge but also encouraging the search for and discovery of new knowledge.").

¹⁵⁰ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 129.

¹⁵¹ *Id.*

¹⁵² Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 295–96.

should be considered as important as substantive legal knowledge and practical skills training. For that to occur, AI integration must be implemented across the curriculum to prepare students for their future careers in law and beyond. This approach advocates that legal education should now be structured around three key pillars: First, substantive legal knowledge, as human lawyers must be able to navigate the law in order to work alongside AI. Second, critical skills training, given the limitations of AI in performing certain tasks that require human judgement. And third, AI proficiency, as it is increasingly regarded as a key professional skill needed for competent legal practice.

II. AI-ENHANCED DELIVERY OF SUBSTANTIVE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE

In the US, while there is some variation across institutions, Juris Doctor programs generally follow a regulated standard curriculum in the first year. A list of compulsory courses, such as contracts, torts, property, criminal law, civil procedure, constitutional law, and legal research and writing can be found at most institutions.¹⁵³ These foundational courses are intended to help students build a solid grounding in legal doctrine and skills.¹⁵⁴ In the second and third years, Juris Doctor programs often include additional compulsory components, including professional responsibility, experiential learning (e.g., law clinics, simulations, and externships), and writing requirements.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ See, e.g., *First Year Courses*, U. CHI. L. SCH. <https://www.law.uchicago.edu/prospective/1LCourses> [<https://perma.cc/YA68-R3SV>] (last visited July 12, 2025); *JD Program: The First Year*, HARV. L. SCH., <https://hls.harvard.edu/academics/degree-programs/jd-program> [<https://perma.cc/S6KU-63DE>] (last visited July 12, 2025) (noting that first-year law students are required to take the following courses: civil procedure, constitutional law, contracts, criminal law, legislation and regulation, property, and torts); *Student Handbook, Part I: Academic Rules & Requirements*, IU ROBERT H. MCKINNEY SCH. OF LAW, (updated on Aug. 3, 2025), <https://mckinneylaw.iu.edu/students/student-handbook/index.html> [<https://perma.cc/D2MX-88TD>] (noting that compulsory courses include civil procedure, contracts and sales, criminal law, legal communications and analysis I and II, Property, torts, legal research, constitutional law, responsible lawyering, professional responsibility, evidence, and administrative law).

¹⁵⁴ See Daniel Goldworthy, *The Future of Legal Education in the 21st Century*, 41 ADEL. L. REV. 243, 245–46 (2020) (noting that the purpose of legal education includes “the acquisition of legal knowledge” and “learning skills relevant to legal practice”); Eduardo M. Peñalver, *The Role of Skills Instruction in Legal Education*, 13 FIU L. REV. 229, 229 (2018).

¹⁵⁵ A.B.A., STANDARDS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS 2018-2019: CHAPTER 3 PROGRAM OF LEGAL EDUCATION 16 https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/misc/legal_education/Standards/2018-2019ABASStandardsforApprovalofLawSchools/2018-2019-aba-standards-chapter3.pdf [<https://perma.cc/QRB3-2QH6>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

Legal education is also highly regulated in Australia.¹⁵⁶ Following a nationally consistent framework, admission to the legal practice requires studying in prescribed areas.¹⁵⁷ All Australian jurisdictions require minimum academic knowledge to practice law.¹⁵⁸ These requirements, commonly referred to as the “Priestley 11,” consist of contracts, torts, criminal law and procedure, constitutional law, administrative law, property law, equity and trusts, company law, evidence, civil procedure, and professional conduct.¹⁵⁹ The Priestley 11 courses form the core of legal education in Australia and all accredited law programs must cover them to ensure that graduates have the requisite substantive legal knowledge for admission to legal practice.¹⁶⁰

In teaching these compulsory subjects, it is important to consider how AI skills building can be effectively incorporated into their delivery. While other approaches may be available, we focus on two key strategies: First, introducing AI-related topics into doctrinal courses; and second, using AI tools as learning aids to provide students with personalized learning.

A. INTRODUCING AI-RELATED TOPICS INTO THE DOCTRINAL COURSES

Incorporating AI into teaching doctrinal courses is crucial, but the specific content to be integrated into the curriculum varies across different subject matters. In torts, legal educators may consider including discussions about AI’s impact on tortious liability. This can include discussing autonomous vehicle cases, AI-driven decisions causing physical injuries, and psychological harm arising from interactions with AI. Indeed, AI’s tortious liability is an emerging area of scholarly debate.¹⁶¹ Yale Law School’s *Torts and Regulation* course has already

¹⁵⁶ See Yale Torts and Regulation, *supra* note 106.

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *Id.*

¹⁵⁹ *How to Become A Lawyer in Australia*, COLL. OF L. (July 16, 2024), <https://www.collaw.edu.au/community/resources/how-to-become-a-lawyer-in-australia/> [<https://perma.cc/FGF5-JDLG>].

¹⁶⁰ Reid Mortensen, *Becoming A Lawyer: From Admission to Practice Under the Legal Profession Act 2004 (Qld)*, 23 U. QUEENSL. L.J. 319, 329 (2004).

¹⁶¹ See, e.g., Anat Lior, *Addressing AI-Related Harms Through Existing Tort Doctrines*, OXFORD BUS. L. BLOG (July 3, 2024), <https://blogs.law.ox.ac.uk/oblb/blog-post/2024/07/addressing-ai-related-harms-through-existing-tort-doctrines> [<https://perma.cc/R9EA-429Q>]; see also Anat Lior, *The AI Accident Network: Artificial Intelligence Liability Meets Network Theory*, 95 TUL. L. REV. 1103 (2021); see also Iria Giuffrida, *Liability for Ai Decision-Making: Some Legal and Ethical Considerations*, 88 FORDHAM L. REV. 439 (2019).

introduced a module addressing tortious liability inflicted by AI. This approach offers a model for others to follow when integrating such topics into the curriculum.¹⁶²

Similarly, there is growing evidence that AI is being used to facilitate various criminal activities,¹⁶³ including creating deepfakes for fraud¹⁶⁴ and AI-powered cyberattacks and scams.¹⁶⁵ Deepfake content, such as AI-generated documents, audio recordings, photos, and videos, has been introduced as evidence in criminal proceedings.¹⁶⁶ AI-powered predictive policing¹⁶⁷ and predictive algorithm use in sentencing decisions¹⁶⁸ are also increasingly being used in the criminal justice system and are therefore important topics for study. Legal educators may consider including these topics and other emerging issues in criminal law curriculum, as doing so allows students to engage with how criminal law responds to and interacts with developments in AI.

In both torts and criminal law, AI introduces novel complexities, particularly in cases where the entities giving rise to liability are AI

¹⁶² See Yale Torts and Regulation, *supra* note 106.

¹⁶³ Tais Fernanda Blauth, Oskar Josef Gstrein & Andrej Zwitter, *Artificial Intelligence Crime: An Overview of Malicious Use and Abuse of AI*, 10 IEEE ACCESS 77110, 77110–112 (2022).

¹⁶⁴ See generally Leo S.F. Lin, *Examining the Role of Deepfake Technology in Organized Fraud: Legal, Security, and Governance Challenges*, 4 FRONTIERS LAW 6 (2025); see generally Li Lin, *GAI-Enabled Real Estate Fraud Schemes: Risks, Prevention and Regulations*, 29 J. TECH. L. & POL'Y 97 (2025).

¹⁶⁵ See generally *The New Frontier of Cybercrime: Understanding AI-Driven Threats and Their Impact on Australian Organisations*, VIRTUAL IT GROUP: RESOURCES (Feb. 2025), <https://vitg.com.au/the-new-frontier-of-cybercrime-understanding-ai-driven-threats-and-their-impact-on-australian-organisations/> [<https://perma.cc/K3J8-UGXQ>]; see also Spencer Overton, *Overcoming Racial Harms to Democracy from Artificial Intelligence*, 110 IOWA L. REV. 805, 848 (2025) (“Local election offices that serve large populations of color are particularly vulnerable to AI-powered cyberattacks....”).

¹⁶⁶ See generally Benjamin Perrin, *AI and Criminal Justice: How AI Can Support — Not Undermine — Justice* (Nov. 19, 2024, at 12:06 ET), THE CONVERSATION, <https://theconversation.com.ai-and-criminal-justice-how-ai-can-support-not-undermine-justice> [<https://perma.cc/JD5L-FPCP>]; Anuragini Shirish & Shobana Komal, *A Socio-Legal Inquiry on Deepfakes*, 54 CAL. W. INT'L L.J. 517, 547 (2024).

¹⁶⁷ Willem Gravett, *The Dark Side of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges for the Legal System*, JUD. COMM'N OF N.S.W. 1088, 1090, 1093 (Oct. 2021), https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/judicial_officers/dark_side_of_artificial_intelligence.html#fn.id-1.5.10.2.1.4.1.1 [<https://perma.cc/4Q6P-87C5>]; see generally Laura Myers, Allen Parrish & Alexis Williams, *Big Data and the Fourth Amendment: Reducing Overreliance on the Objectivity of Predictive Policing*, 8 FED. CTS. L. REV. 231 (2015).

¹⁶⁸ See generally John Villasenor & Virginia Foggo, *Artificial Intelligence, Due Process, and Criminal Sentencing*, 2020 MICH. ST. L. REV. 295 (2020); see also Mirko Bagaric, Dan Hunter & Nigel Stobbs, *Erasing the Bias Against Using Artificial Intelligence to Predict Future Criminality: Algorithms Are Color Blind and Never Tire*, 88 U. CIN. L. REV. 1037 (2020); see also Keith Swisher, *Algorithmic Judicial Ethics*, 2024 WIS. L. REV. 1289 (2024).

systems themselves. As AI increasingly permeates all facets of life and society, it inevitably reshapes and challenges most—if not all—domains of law.¹⁶⁹ Indeed, technological advancements in AI test the limits of existing legal and judicial frameworks and underscore the importance of thoughtfully incorporating AI-related topics into doctrinal course curricula. This pedagogical approach can better prepare students by equipping them with the necessary tools to navigate the evolving legal landscape.

B. PERSONALIZED AI TUTORS TO MAXIMIZE INDIVIDUAL LEARNING OUTCOMES

This section explains how personalized AI tutors can optimize individual learning outcomes. It highlights their key benefits, addresses potential challenges, and proposes practical strategies to enhance their effectiveness in supporting student learning.

1. *The Benefits*

Many students already utilize AI tools as their personal tutors, though often unsupervised and primarily through open-domain systems including ChatGPT.¹⁷⁰ There is certainly a role for AI in legal education, particularly as a personalized tutoring tool to support students learning substantive legal knowledge. In this sense, AI addresses a problem with traditional classrooms. Whether lecture-based or centered on the Socratic method, law classes are typically characterized by large cohorts of students unable to ask sufficient questions to ensure clarity.¹⁷¹ This size problem is particularly the case for subjects in the core curriculum.¹⁷² While traditional classroom teaching supports doctrinal understanding, it limits

¹⁶⁹ *How AI Is Changing the Legal Sector*, UNIV. OF TECH. SYD.: NEWSROOM (June 19, 2024), <https://www.uts.edu.au/news/2024/06/how-ai-changing-legal-sector> [<https://perma.cc/9URL-AP6P>]; see Nestor Maslej et al., *Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2025*, STAN. UNIV. HUMAN-CENTERED A.I. 3–5 (Apr. 2025), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.07139> [<https://perma.cc/PE3K-VELK>].

¹⁷⁰ Ashley Mowreader, *Students and Instructors Say AI Tool Helps With Understanding, Confidence in Course Materials*, INSIDE HIGHER ED: NEWS, 1, 2 (Jan. 22, 2025), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/academic-life/2025/01/22/survey-college-students-enjoy-using-generative-ai> [<https://perma.cc/E24E-6JNE>] (“Students have been early adopters of generative AI tools for their coursework, turning to chat bots for help with essay writing or answering tough homework questions.”).

¹⁷¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 133.

¹⁷² See *id.* at 150 (discussing the potential of using AI as a personalized tutor in legal writing).

instructors' capacity to provide students with individualized feedback and attention.¹⁷³ In contrast, AI tools like ChatGPT provide student a more personalized, self-paced, and self-directed learning experience that is capable of tailoring feedback to individual learning styles. As Bliss notes, by asking their own questions and delving deeper into topics piquing their interest, students engaging with AI tools can manage their learning experience and clear up aspects they find confusing.¹⁷⁴ AI functions as a private tutor by adapting to each student's pace, needs, and level of understanding.¹⁷⁵

Research also shows that interacting with a chatbot promotes active learning, in contrast to the passive experience students often encounter in traditional classroom settings.¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, AI tools help create a low-pressure learning environment where students feel more comfortable and confident asking questions—and asking repeatedly until they are satisfied with their own understanding.¹⁷⁷ A recent case study conducted by a group of Swiss researchers shows that students actively engaged with the AI tutor outperformed their peers, with average grades improving by up to fifteen percentage points when compared to a parallel course without the AI tutor.¹⁷⁸ This use of technology contrasts with traditional classrooms, where some students fear asking naive questions.¹⁷⁹ By providing a private, judgment-free space for academic inquiry, AI enables students to seek clarification without embarrassment.

¹⁷³ See *id.* at 133.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

¹⁷⁵ Yu Chen, Scott Jensen, Leslie J. Albert, Sambhav Gupta, & Terri Lee, *Artificial Intelligence (AI) Assistants in the Classroom: Designing Chatbots to Support Student Success*, 25 INFO. SYS. FRONTIER 161, 161–62, 168, 174 (2022).

¹⁷⁶ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 133.

¹⁷⁷ Kyoungwon Seo, Joice Tang, Ido Roll, Sidney Fels & Dongwook Yoon, *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Learner–Instructor Interaction in Online Learning*, 18 INT'L J. EDUC. TECH. HIGHER EDUC. 1, 2 (2021) (“AI teaching assistants help instructors save time answering students’ simple, repetitive questions in online discussion forums, and instead instructors can dedicate their saved time to higher-value work.”).

¹⁷⁸ Ambroise Baillifard, Maxime Gabella, Pamela Banta Lavenex & Corinna S. Martarelli, *Effective Learning with a Personal AI Tutor: A Case Study*, 30 EDUC. & INFO. TECH. 297, 297–99 (2025).

¹⁷⁹ See Sacha Bergsma, *There Are No Stupid Questions, but Not Asking Any Questions is Stupid*, DUB (Sept. 22, 2025), <https://dub.uu.nl/en/depth/there-are-no-stupid-questions-not-asking-any-questions-stupid> [https://perma.cc/4Y3M-Y3NU] (“It’s quite common to be afraid of asking stupid questions.”); see, e.g., Ryan Fan, *How Asking Stupid Questions Transformed My Learning: Taking Risks and Being in the Arena*, MEDIUM (Oct. 27, 2025), <https://ryanfan.medium.com/how-asking-stupid-questions-transformed-my-learning-d845f703d83b> [https://perma.cc/GJS7-CRTD] (discussing “asking stupid questions” from a student perspective).

This in turn can encourage deeper engagement with learning materials and support more inclusive learning.¹⁸⁰

2. The Concerns

While greater accessibility to additional assistance is beneficial, it also gives rise to significant concerns. First, adopting AI tutors at a greater scale imposes new obligations on law schools. This can include ensuring data security, protecting student privacy, and providing meaningful faculty oversight.¹⁸¹ In fact, these obligations are not confined to AI tutors; they extend to the broader integration of AI in legal education. Law schools will vary in their capacity to meet these obligations for varying reasons. Well-resourced institutions may readily adapt, while others may face significant financial and practical constraints.

The environmental impact of AI also warrants attention. Although law schools do not operate large data centers themselves, the AI systems on which they rely draw upon energy-intensive infrastructure, raising serious environmental concerns.¹⁸² AI-integrated legal education is therefore not merely a technical upgrade; it is a governance challenge that requires sustained institutional commitment and foresight. While we acknowledge these broader challenges, they fall outside the scope of this Article.

AI tools used by students are powered by LLMs.¹⁸³ These models are often trained on open-domain data and are consequently subject to a range of constraints, both generally and within the specific context of law.¹⁸⁴ In a broader context, there is no guarantee of the accuracy or

¹⁸⁰ Mowreader, *supra* note 170, at 3 (“AI tutors can assist in student learning and skill-building, as well as increase learner confidence to ask questions and dig deeper into materials.”).

¹⁸¹ Islam Asim Ismail & Jihan Ma’rouf Alosi, *Data Privacy in AI-Driven Education: An In-Depth Exploration Into the Data Privacy Concerns and Potential Solutions*, in AI APPLICATIONS AND STRATEGIES IN TEACHER EDUCATION 223, 231, 235–41 (Krista LaRue Keeley ed. 2025); Islam Asim Ismail, *Protecting Privacy in AI-Enhanced Education: A Comprehensive Examination of Data Privacy Concerns and Solutions in AI-Based Learning*, in IMPACTS OF GENERATIVE AI ON THE FUTURE OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION 117, 127–29, 131 (Abdullah Mutawa ed. 2024).

¹⁸² See Nina-Simone Edwards, *Unveiling the Environmental Impact of Large Language Models on Indigenous Communities: A Call for Action and Liability*, 28 TUL. ENV’T L.J. 1, 7–8 (2025); *AI Has an Environmental Problem. Here’s What the World Can Do About That*, UN ENV’T PROGRAMME, (Nov. 13, 2025), <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/ai-has-environmental-problem-heres-what-world-can-do-about> [<https://perma.cc/33WD-WGK8>].

¹⁸³ Silvia García-Méndez, Francisco de Arriba-Pérez & María del Carmen Somoza-López, *A Review on the Use of Large Language Models as Virtual Tutors*, 34 SCI. & EDUC. 877, 877–79 (2025).

¹⁸⁴ See, e.g., Yulin Chen, Ning Ding, Haitao Zheng, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun & Bowen Zhou, *Empowering Private Tutoring by Chaining Large Language Models*, CIKM ‘24: PROCS. OF THE

reliability of the responses produced by open-domain systems. This is because such models often generate plausible-sounding but fabricated information. A worrying example is the term “vegetative electron microscopy,” a term found in the LLMs but refers to a non-existent phenomenon.¹⁸⁵ The term originated from an AI system’s optical character reading function misreading a scientific paper. Despite its widely acknowledged falsity, the term has been embedded in the scientific literature and has been considered virtually irremovable.¹⁸⁶ It is impossible to identify all the locations and instances of its existence, and hence, lurks widely across the systems and databases making up the AI ecosystem. This error is emblematic of a deep-rooted problem with AI: rather than being developed to generate accurate information, AI systems often produce plausible-sounding statements, persuasive, novel recombination of words, and “synthetic knowledge” that lacks scientific grounding and empirical verification.¹⁸⁷ Further, models such as ChatGPT 4 are sycophantic, resulting in the model not correcting errors—a problem arising from efforts to improve the human-AI interface.¹⁸⁸

The general concern outlined above applies to the legal context as well. AI models trained on open data generate responses from diverse sources varying widely in credibility and accuracy, since these systems rely on probabilistic patterns rather than verified facts. Additionally, non-commercial AI-generated outputs are not jurisdictionally specific—a fact

33RD ACM INT’L CONF. ON INFO. AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT, 354, 355–56, 361 (Oct. 21, 2024), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3627673.3679665> [<https://perma.cc/LS3T-ATDV>].

¹⁸⁵ Prateek Tripathi, *AI, Error, and Academia: The Case of “Vegetative Electron Microscopy,”* OBSERVER RSCH. FOUND.: EXPERT SPEAK (July 15, 2025), <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/ai-error-and-academia-the-case-of-vegetative-electron-microscopy> [<https://perma.cc/2BYW-HVA2>].

¹⁸⁶ Aaron J. Snoswell, Kevin Witzemberger & Rayane El Masri, *A Weird Phrase is Plaguing Scientific Papers – and We Traced It Back to a Glitch in AI Training Data*, THE CONVERSATION (Apr. 15, 2025), <https://theconversation.com/a-weird-phrase-is-plaguing-scientific-papers-and-we-traced-it-back-to-a-glitch-in-ai-training-data-254463> [<https://perma.cc/6GER-43YE>].

¹⁸⁷ Jeppe Klitgaard Stricker, *The Synthetic Knowledge Crisis: How AI is Reshaping Knowledge, and Not for the Better*, THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUC. (Feb. 25, 2025), <https://jeppestricker.substack.com/p/the-synthetic-knowledge-crisis> [<https://perma.cc/55BF-3B24>]; Kincaid C. Brown, *Generative Artificial Intelligence: Basic Terminology and Concepts*, 103 MICH. BAR J. 32, 33 (2024).

¹⁸⁸ See Seed Ahmed & Tahir Javaid, *Sycophancy in AI: Challenges in Large Language Models and Argumentation Graphs* (Mar. 2025), <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14094.06723> [<https://perma.cc/9K4M-MPV9>]; See generally Mrinank Sharma et al., *Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models*, INT’L CONF. ON LEARNING REPRESENTATIONS (2024), <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.13548> [<https://perma.cc/9TY9-BX8D>].

likely to cause errors in terms of misalignment with course content and/or individual instructor's expectations.¹⁸⁹

3. The Actions

To begin with, educators need to identify reliable AI tutoring tools. These tools should operate within AI systems that draw on trustworthy, jurisdictionally specific, course-relevant information. Where such AI systems are available, legal educators should encourage students to use them to support their learning; however, legal educators need to provide guidance on how to use them. Such instruction is particularly important for first-year law students who may be unfamiliar, not only with these new technologies, but with the basics of law, including jurisdictional issues. Effective use of AI tools can deepen students' understanding of legal issues and concepts—especially complex ones¹⁹⁰—while also motivating them to “take ownership of their learning.”¹⁹¹

In the absence of a ready-made tool, educators may consider training their own AI with customized content and developing tailored AI-based resources within a domain-specific system that aligns with their own curriculum and pedagogical goals. As Professor Ethan Mollick and Lilach Mollick observe, “Generative AI, if fed deliberately designed and structured prompts, has the potential to give every student a personalized tutoring experience on any topic.”¹⁹² Thus, they propose that educators create carefully crafted tutoring prompts to maximize the chances of successful use of AI.¹⁹³

Such prompts, Mollick and Mollick argue, should meet the following seven requirements.¹⁹⁴ First, the prompts should instruct the AI to adopt the role of “an expert, encouraging, and upbeat tutor,” whose mission is to support student learning by clearly explaining concepts and actively engaging students through thoughtful questioning.¹⁹⁵ Second, the

¹⁸⁹ See Ethan Mollick & Lilach Mollick, *Student Use Cases for AI Part 2: AI as Personal Tutor* (Sept. 25, 2023), <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/ai-as-personal-tutor> [<https://perma.cc/EDQ8-XPQS>].

¹⁹⁰ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 133–34; Radha Firaina & Dwi Sulisworo, *Exploring the Usage of ChatGPT in Higher Education: Frequency and Impact on Productivity*, 2 BULETIN EDUKASI INDON. 39, 45 (2023).

¹⁹¹ Mollick & Mollick, *supra* note 189.

¹⁹² *Id.*

¹⁹³ *Id.*

¹⁹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁹⁵ *Id.*

prompts should instruct the AI to meet students at their current level of understanding by asking about “their learning level, the topic they would like to learn about, and what they already know about the topic.”¹⁹⁶ Third, the prompts need to provide students with explanations, examples, and analogies to help clarify concepts since students learn best through individualized explanations and examples.¹⁹⁷ Fourth, the prompts should ensure the AI guides students’ learning in an open-ended manner and asks leading questions to force students to explain their thinking.¹⁹⁸ Fifth, Mollick and Mollick believe it is important to prompt the AI to adapt to individual students’ performance and provide customized support when the students are struggling to understand.¹⁹⁹ Sixth, the AI should encourage students to actively construct knowledge, for example, by ending responses with questions prompting students to keep generating ideas.²⁰⁰ Seventh, Mollick and Mollick advise that the AI should prompt students to explain concepts in their own words.²⁰¹ This latter practice reinforces students’ understanding, as the ability to explain an idea is a key indicator of comprehension.²⁰²

Indeed, Mollick and Mollick offer valuable insights into the development of AI. Legal educators should consider creating their own AI prompts based on these recommendations to optimize educational outcomes. The potential of properly trained AI tutors is enormous. While the development of domain-specific AI tutors requires a significant investment of time and expertise, this effort holds the promise of substantial educational benefits.

Expanding on this latter model, Bliss argues AI tutors also hold great potential for enhancing flipped classroom pedagogy²⁰³—a view we share. In this pedagogical model, legal educators encourage or even require students to engage with AI-driven resources and acquire a strong command of the course materials through that process, as opposed to

¹⁹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰⁰ *Id.*

²⁰¹ *Id.*

²⁰² *Id.*

²⁰³ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 155–56; *see generally*, Suvendu Ray & Deb Prasad Sikdar, *AI-Driven Flipped Classroom: Revolutionizing Education Through Digital Pedagogy*, 7 BRIT. J. OF EDUC., LEARNING & DEV. PSYCH. 169, 169–76 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.52589/BJELDP-LTDJFLIH> [<https://perma.cc/EY9U-8N6U>] (discussing “the effects, advantages, difficulties, and efficacy” of using AI, including AI tutors, in flipped classrooms).

relying exclusively on reading before class.²⁰⁴ Such preparation allows valuable in-class time to be used more effectively.²⁰⁵ For example, legal educators can guide students to engage with more advanced topics in class, modeling and supporting the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills.²⁰⁶

The benefits of using a personalized AI tutor are substantial. Legal educators should explore ways to integrate AI into their teaching practice. It complements traditional approaches to teaching substantive legal knowledge, enhances learning outcomes by providing personalized feedback, and fosters deeper engagement with course material.

It is critical to recall, however, that open-access tutoring tools have significant risks. They may present misinformation, outdated information, or fail to align with course content and instructors' expectations.²⁰⁷ As such, it is strongly recommended that legal educators carefully choose appropriate AI tools. Ideally, law schools or consortia of law schools could invest in developing their own customized AI tutoring tools to ensure accuracy, credibility, and alignment with the substantive learning objectives of specific subjects. Further, as students collaborate with AI, it will be important to teach them how to use these tools ethically and responsibly, including upholding academic integrity.²⁰⁸

III. AI-ENHANCED APPROACHES TO SKILLS TRAINING IN LEGAL EDUCATION

While substantive legal knowledge forms the first pillar of legal education, critical skills and competences form the second pillar.²⁰⁹ This

²⁰⁴ See Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 157.

²⁰⁵ *Id.*; see generally David López-Villanueva, Raúl Santiago & Ramon Palau, *Flipped Learning and Artificial Intelligence*, 13 ELECTRONICS, Sept. 2024, at 1–19 <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13173424> [<https://perma.cc/3WJ6-RWJ5>].

²⁰⁶ Bliss, *supra* note 132 at 141; see Mikko Hyttinen & Ville Isomöttönen, *Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Support Students' Independent Learning in Flipped Law Courses*, 8 INT'L J. TECH. EDUC. 698, 710–11 (2025).

²⁰⁷ Mollick & Mollick, *supra* note 189; Hassan Elsayed, *The Impact of Hallucinated Information in Large Language Models on Student Learning Outcomes: A Critical Examination of Misinformation Risks in AI-Assisted Education*, 9 N. REVS. ON ALGORITHMIC RSCH. THEORETICAL COMPUTATION AND COMPLEXITY 11, 12–13, 19 (2024).

²⁰⁸ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 115, 132; see generally Andrea Aler Tubella, Marçal Mora-Cantalops & Juan Carlos Nieves, *How to Teach Responsible AI in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities*, 26 ETHICS & INF. TECHNOL. 1 (2023) (discussing how to teach responsible AI in higher education).

²⁰⁹ Smith, *supra* note 126, at 378 (“Law school courses were traditionally expected to provide at least three kinds of instruction: analytical skills, communication skills, and substantive legal

section maps a clear path for skills development in legal education. It first identifies core competencies that AI cannot yet replicate—technical analytical skills, ethical judgment, and human-centric soft skills—and examines each in some detail. While traditional pedagogy remains essential, we argue that AI-integrated teaching can not only achieve the goal of skills development but also strengthen the skills through deliberate design, particularly by encouraging students to engage with AI as a learning partner and a future work colleague.

A. CRITICAL SKILLS AND COMPETENCES BEYOND THE REACH OF AI

Professor Steven R. Smith identifies a set of key skills and competencies that law students should acquire before they enter the legal profession.²¹⁰ His list is as follows: analytical skills;²¹¹ written and verbal communication skills;²¹² problem-solving skills;²¹³ self-management skills;²¹⁴ dispute resolution skills;²¹⁵ skills to construct and maintain close professional relationships with clients, lawyers, and stakeholders;²¹⁶ judgment;²¹⁷ leadership;²¹⁸ ethical responsibility;²¹⁹ professionalism;²²⁰

knowledge.”); Okechukwu Oko, *Legal Education Reform in Africa: Time to Revisit the Two-Tier Legal Education System*, 29 UNIV. MIA. INT’L & COMP. L. REV. 130, 178 (2021) (noting that legal knowledge and skills are the two key components of legal education).

²¹⁰ Smith, *supra* note 126, at 361.

²¹¹ *Id.*; ROY STUCKEY ET AL., BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION 20–21 (Clinical Legal Educ. Ass’n 2007).

²¹² Smith, *supra* note 126, at 362.

²¹³ *Id.* at 362 (statement of David Barnhizer) (“Law schools should develop ‘holistic’ skills such as ‘diagnosis, conceptualization, synthesis, problem definition, and problem-solving.’”).

²¹⁴ *See id.* at 368 (discussing wellness).

²¹⁵ *Id.* at 363.

²¹⁶ *Id.* at 367 (“In an age of AI, the human qualities of relationships become essential and serve to separate good lawyers from machines.”).

²¹⁷ *Id.* at 361 (“Excellent judgment begins with analytical skills and a clear understanding of a client’s goals and the context in which issues may arise. It includes assessing the future consequences of various courses of action based on a client’s business and culture. As such, judgment often involves counseling clients.”).

²¹⁸ *Id.* at 366.

²¹⁹ *Id.* at 362 (noting that it includes “the compliance with codes of professional responsibility” as well as “a commitment to professionalism, professional identity, the legal profession’s ideals, justice, and the rule of law.”).

²²⁰ *Id.* at 368–69 (describing emotional intelligence, including honesty, compassion, and empathy, and versatility and flexibility, including the ability to adapt to rapid change).

technology competence;²²¹ interdisciplinary;²²² global²²³ and cultural competence,²²⁴ as well as commitments to diversity and inclusion²²⁵ and to the public good.²²⁶

The age of AI does not alter these essential skills and competencies; they continue to hold relevance for law graduates. Given the rapid rise and widespread use of AI in legal practice,²²⁷ it is crucial to reassess the areas of skill development. Ensuring the proper skills are prioritized in legal education and refining those skills to complement the work generated by AI, can help to develop the necessary collaborative AI skills.²²⁸

William J. Connell and Megan Hamlin-Black note that creativity and empathy (at least to this point)²²⁹ remain areas in which humans outperform machines.²³⁰ They argue that law students with a solid understanding of AI, forward-thinking creativity, and a strong sense of

²²¹ *Id.* at 369 (describing technological competence as essential to modern legal practice, requiring attorneys to adapt to ongoing technological innovation to deliver legal services more efficiently, and noting that only a minority of law schools currently offer courses in artificial intelligence); Brendan Johnson & Francis X. Shen, *Teaching Law and Artificial Intelligence*, 22 MINN. J.L. SCI. & TECH. 23, 31–34 (2021).

²²² Smith, *supra* note 126, at 363.

²²³ *Id.* at 364 (“[G]lobalization is one of the legal profession’s significant changes. Almost all law school graduates will deal with international services and issues in the future.”).

²²⁴ *Id.* at 364 (emphasizing that law graduates learn how to interact with cultural differences in the U.S. and abroad); Samuel Vincent Jones, *Law Schools, Cultural Competency, and Anti-Black Racism: The Liberty of Discrimination*, 21 BERKELEY J. AFR.-AM. L. & POL’Y 84, 96–97 (2021).

²²⁵ Smith, *supra* note 126, at 365 (“lawyers should be competent to promote diversity within the legal system... and among clients....”); see also Donald J. Polden & Leah Jackson Teague, *More Diversity Requires More Inclusive Leaders Leading by Example in Law Organizations*, 48 HOFSTRA L. REV. 681, 683 (2020); Julie Ashdown, *Shaping Diversity and Inclusion Policy with Research*, 83 FORDHAM L. REV. 2249, 2264 (2015).

²²⁶ Smith, *supra* note 126, at 365; Harry T. Edwards, *Remarks: A Lawyer’s Duty to Serve the Public Good*, 65 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1148, 1148 (1990).

²²⁷ Jeffrey M. Hirsch, *Future Work*, 2020 U. ILL. L. REV. 889, 900 (2020); see, e.g., Gary Marcus, *Artificial Intelligence Is Stuck. Here’s How to Move It Forward*, N.Y. TIMES (July 29, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/29/opinion/sunday/artificial-intelligence-is-stuck-heres-how-to-move-it-forward.html> [<https://perma.cc/V26W-3SXG>].

²²⁸ See generally Aleksandra Przegalinska, Tamilla Triantoro, Anna Kovbasiuk, Leon Ciechanowski, Richard B. Freeman & Konrad Sowa, *Collaborative AI in the Workplace: Enhancing Organizational Performance through Resource-based and Task-technology Fit Perspectives*, 81 INT’L J. INFO. MGMT. 1 (2025) (discussing “AI’s strengths and weaknesses” and “the strategic implementation of AI systems” in the workplace).

²²⁹ See, e.g., Jian Zhao, Mengqing Wu, Liyun Zhou, Xuezhu Wang & Jian Jia, *Cognitive Psychology-Based Artificial Intelligence Review*, 16 FRONT. NEUROSCI. 1, 1–9 (2022) (discussing that some artificial-intelligence systems are designed to generate empathic-sounding speech, which is the focus of much research).

²³⁰ William J. Connell & Megan Hamlin-Black, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Education*, 67 R.I. B.J. 5, 7 (2019).

human empathy will be better equipped to navigate the future of legal practice.²³¹ Similarly, to improve student success in this era of AI, Professor Christian B. Sundquist contends that law schools will need to ensure students are prepared to participate in high-level analysis,²³² craft innovative solutions to complicated legal problems,²³³ engage in complex oral and written advocacy,²³⁴ and provide personalized, client-focused representation.²³⁵ Bliss also suggests that, as AI tools take on more of the technical aspects of legal research and writing,²³⁶ legal educators should help students develop more advanced skills, with a particular focus on “higher-level strategic and interpersonal aspects of legal practice.”²³⁷ That focus includes, for example, “negotiation, strategy, ethics, judgment, client collaboration, leadership, interaction, cultural competence, problem solving, and dispute resolution.”²³⁸ Dobrev also recommends that law schools prioritize the development of “a specific set of skills where human lawyers will likely continue to hold an edge over AI.”²³⁹ These include creativity, ethical judgment and adaptability requiring complex normative assessment, social context understanding and strategic thinking, client management and interpersonal skills, and robust mastery of legal technological innovations.²⁴⁰

Despite the differing views on which specific skills and competencies should be prioritized, there is a broad consensus that legal education should place greater emphasis on nurturing human-centric skills

²³¹ See *id.* at 5-6.

²³² Christian B. Sundquist, *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Knowledge and the Future of Law Schools*, BEST PRAC. LEGAL EDUC.: BLOG (Apr. 19, 2018), <https://bestpracticeslegaled.com/2018/04/09/artificial-intelligence-algorithmic-knowledge-and-the-future-of-law-schools/> [<https://perma.cc/49ZZ-W59R>].

²³³ *Id.* (describing creative solutions to complicated legal problems such as “providing individualized advice to clients and engaging in interdisciplinary group problem-solving activities”).

²³⁴ *Id.* (describing that law students must be prepared to engage in complex oral and written advocacy).

²³⁵ *Id.* (emphasizing that law students must be prepared to provide emotive client-focused representation such as “by further developing professionalism and negotiation skills and enabling students to interact with a diverse range of persons”).

²³⁶ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 139 (“[L]egal educators should help students ‘move up the skills ladder,’ focusing on higher-level strategic and interpersonal aspects of legal practice, while generative AI increasingly assists in the technical aspects of legal research and writing.”); see also Mimi Zou, *The AI Revolution Demands Radical Change to Law Curricula*, TIMES HIGHER EDUC.: OPINION (Dec. 23, 2022), <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/ai-revolution-demands-radical-change-law-curricula> [<https://perma.cc/WJT2-YAUA>].

²³⁷ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 139.

²³⁸ *Id.*

²³⁹ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 41.

²⁴⁰ *Id.*

and attributes. For the time being, these skills remain beyond the effective reach of AI.²⁴¹ In this regard, we draw particular attention to three key domains of legal skill development—all of which involve forms of human judgment, interpersonal engagement, and other human capabilities that AI struggles to replicate. These skills and competences are beyond the current and foreseeable reach of AI;²⁴² they are also foundational to the practice, responsibilities, and professional integrity of the legal profession. The three key areas are (1) technical analytical skills, with a particular focus on critical thinking and legal reasoning skills; (2) ethical judgment and professional responsibility; and (3) human-centric soft skills, such as empathy, dispute resolution, advocacy, collaboration, and communication skills. In addition, we argue that some of these skills and competencies can be effectively enhanced through AI-integrated teaching. Others require a more deliberate pedagogical focus to prepare future lawyers for the evolving demands of legal practice.

While we acknowledge the value of cultivating skills beyond AI's reach, law schools should approach this task carefully given how quickly the technology is advancing. For example, some AI systems allow users to control the level of "creativity" through settings such as "temperature," which adjusts the degree of randomness in the responses.²⁴³ Understanding these tools and their outputs, particularly when evaluating their outputs—from individual word choices to paragraph construction and even full sections—requires very high-level skills.²⁴⁴ Indeed, there is a good reason to consider a much closer examination and deeper understanding of the challenges AI presents in dealing with complex law problems. Those able to master that chasm, or at least grasp the interface between AI systems

²⁴¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 139.

²⁴² Brian Eastwood, *These Human Capabilities Complement AI's Shortcomings*, MIT SLOAN SCH.: IDEAS MADE TO MATTER (Jun. 10, 2025), <https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/these-human-capabilities-complement-ais-shortcomings> [<https://perma.cc/U4UV-AVLB>].

²⁴³ Max Peeperkorn, Tom Kouwenhoven, Dan Brown & Anna Jordanous, *Is Temperature the Creativity Parameter of Large Language Models?*, *ARXIV PREPRINT ARXIV:2405.00492* (2024), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2405.00492> [<https://perma.cc/58W9-9CCN>].

²⁴⁴ Mandy Chessell, *AI Is Not Magic but It Is Complex*, 80 *INGENIA* (Sept. 2019), <https://www.ingenia.org.uk/articles/ai-is-not-magic-but-it-is-complex> [<https://perma.cc/7A5V-RJWQ>]; Qian Yang, Aaron Steinfeld, Carolyn Penstein Rosé & John Zimmerman, *Re-examining Whether, Why, and How Human-AI Interaction Is Uniquely Difficult to Design*, CHI'20: PROCS OF THE 2020 CHI CONF. ON HUMAN FACTORS IN COMPUTING SYS. (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376301> [<https://perma.cc/3MJC-DGNR>] (noting that AI, as a technology, is highly complex).

and legal problems, will stand head and shoulders above their colleagues.²⁴⁵

B. TECHNICAL ANALYTICAL SKILLS

Although AI can process vast amounts of data and generate responses based on patterns, it remains limited in its ability to engage in high-order cognitive tasks.²⁴⁶ It lacks the capacity for advanced critical thinking, reasoning, and analysis.²⁴⁷ While AI has the capacity to generate creativity, it is hard to determine its effectiveness in this regard with respect to devising effective solutions to complex legal problems.²⁴⁸ That means AI has limitations with respect to correctly dissecting and categorizing complex fact scenarios to achieve client-desired outcomes. AI also experiences difficulty in terms of effectively creating and weighing out reasonable alternative strategies in the manner of a seasoned lawyer. Among other reasons that AI is unable to achieve these outputs is its lack of intentionality and direct connection to the social world.

In the educational context, the basic challenge is that AI misses what forms a critical foundation of legal education. Traditionally, legal education has relied on the Socratic Method to foster critical thinking.²⁴⁹ This approach encourages law students to engage with complex legal ideas and their social contexts by responding to questions designed to challenge their reasoning as well as deepen their understanding of legal principles.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁵ Zhong et al., *supra* note 64; See Jean O’Grady, *CaseText CoCounsel Event—Professor Stephen Gillers[’s] Keynote Declares “The end of legal services as we know it,”* DEWEY B STRATEGIC (Mar. 23, 2023), <https://www.deweybstrategic.com/2023/03/casetext-cocounsel-event-professor-stephen-gillers-keynote-declares-the-end-of-legal-services-as-we-know-it.html> [<https://perma.cc/EYK3-5F5X>] (“AI will not replace lawyers, but lawyers who use AI will replace lawyers who don’t.”).

²⁴⁶ Peter Gärdenfors, *Why AI Lacks Judgment*, PSYCH. TODAY (June 5, 2023), <https://www.psychologytoday.com/au/blog/what-is-a-human/202306/why-ai-lacks-judgment> [<https://perma.cc/B4QZ-K2KM>] (noting that “human involvement is necessary for decision-making”); Sir Andrew Likierman, *Good News for Humans: AI Doesn’t Do Judgement*, AIRPORT TECH. (Dec. 4, 2024), <https://www.airport-technology.com/sponsored/good-news-for-humans-ai-doesnt-do-judgement/> [<https://perma.cc/8JBF-TJN3>].

²⁴⁷ Sundquist, *supra* note 232.

²⁴⁸ *Id.* (describing creative problem-solving as “providing individualized advice to clients and engaging in interdisciplinary group problem-solving activities”).

²⁴⁹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 136–37 (noting that in doctrinal courses, law students “read cases, attend large classes, participate in Socratic cold calling, and are assessed largely by scenario-based essay exams.”); Jamie R. Abrams, *Reframing the Socratic Method*, 64 J. LEGAL EDUC. 562, 563 (2015).

²⁵⁰ See generally Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 136 (noting that “Legal education in the U.S. is highly distinctive in its focus and methodology, aiming to instill professional training, identity formation, and a particular form of reasoning, that is, learning to think like a lawyer.”); Prakash G & Nair,

This task is not developed in a single session or even within a single subject. Rather, these are practices—developed over the course of a law degree—that, with repetition, become second nature.

Legal educators must now reconsider how law schools should integrate and balance technological proficiency with the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills.²⁵¹ On the one hand, AI cannot engage in critical thinking in the same way humans do.²⁵² It is unable to understand social, economic, or political contexts, or intent in general; it is unable to evaluate competing interests and priorities, or exercise independent judgment.²⁵³ On the other hand, legal educators rightly worry that increasing the integration of AI into legal education may inadvertently undermine the development of critical thinking skills in students, who may look for an easy solution to a difficult problem, like relying on AI to simplify obtaining answers..²⁵⁴ Students should be taught to extract and develop scenarios more richly to uncover client intentions and learn to reflect on their own intentions, enabling them to use AI correctly and to its greatest advantage. This type of analytical thinking is engaged in by the best lawyers, and teaching it to students early and continuously throughout law school becomes increasingly important in the context of burgeoning AI.

Transitioning now to legal reasoning, it is worth noting that this is an area of legal education with a long history of work that predates the advent of AI and²⁵⁵ even extends back to the classics of Rome²⁵⁶ and Greece.²⁵⁷ In the contemporary context of AI, Dobrev demarcates such reasoning as the articulation of a clear and logical connection between two

supra note 15, at 60–61; *see also* David T. ButleRitchie, *Situating “Thinking Like A Lawyer” Within Legal Pedagogy*, 50 CLEV. ST. L. REV. 29 (2002).

²⁵¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 128–29; Alexandria Serra, *AI Lawyering Skills Trainers: Transforming Legal Education with Generative AI*, 16 CASE W. RES. J.L. TECH. & INTERNET 74, 77 (2025); *see also* Carol M. Bast, *Artificial Intelligence and Ethics*, 50 RUTGERS COMPUT. & TECH. L.J. 283 (2024) (discussing the importance of embedding AI into continuing legal education for lawyers).

²⁵² Gärdenfors, *supra* note 246; Likierman, *supra* note 246.

²⁵³ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 41, 64.

²⁵⁴ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 141–42.

²⁵⁵ *See generally* Neil MacCormick, *Legal Reasoning and Legal Theory*, 93 HARV. L. REV. 817 (1994); EDWARD H. LEVI, *AN INTRODUCTION TO LEGAL REASONING* (U. CHI. PRESS, 9th ed. 1992); Louis Kaplow, *Rules Versus Standards: An Economic Analysis*, 42 DUKE L. J. 557 (1992).

²⁵⁶ *See generally* Anthony M. Honoré, *Legal Reasoning in Rome and Today*, 4 CAMBRIAN L. REV. 58 (1973); Peter Stein, *Interpretation and Legal Reasoning in Roman Law*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 1539 (1995).

²⁵⁷ *See* David C. Mirhady, *Aristotle on the Rhetoric of Law*, 31 GREEK, ROMAN, AND BYZANTINE STUDIES 393, 396 (1990); John Finnis, *Natural Law and Legal Reasoning*, in *LAW AND MORALITY* 3–15 (Kenneth Einar Himma ed., 2017).

premises including fact and legal stipulations, and the conclusion or recommendation that emerges from those premises.²⁵⁸ While AI is capable of generating responses based on patterns in data, it is not a “sentient AI”—that is, it lacks self-awareness, as well as the ability to “set objectives” and to “self-rationalize actions.”²⁵⁹ AI operates within the confines of its algorithmic logic; it struggles to replicate the reasoning process humans can provide, particularly in situations involving high-level competing elements or interests must be weighed.²⁶⁰ Further, to humans, AI reasoning is a black-box: something inscrutable and unknowable.²⁶¹ Interestingly, AI is unable to explain its actual reasoning, however, it can generate a plausible reason, but this plausible reason is a problem in itself for interpreting the law and may require clear and explicit reasons.²⁶² For this reason, some scholars argue that the practice of removing structure from legal problems in pedagogy is an approach that develops important lawyering skills not easily replicated or replaced by AI.²⁶³

Furthermore, AI is bereft of both context and intentionality.²⁶⁴ This means it is severely limited when dealing with the real world and specific human and organizational actors—the source of legal problems and associated professional work. This limitation will, in all likelihood, continue into the foreseeable future.²⁶⁵ Nevertheless, AI is an active area of research, and it is premature to dismiss it as a useful tool in contributing to legal reasoning²⁶⁶ and even in understanding the various types of legal reasoning at play.²⁶⁷

To address these constraints of AI, legal education must continue to prioritize the development of analytical skills while integrating AI into

²⁵⁸ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 58.

²⁵⁹ *Id.* (noting that AI’s algorithmic “logic” is programmatic rather than “explanatory”).

²⁶⁰ *Id.*

²⁶¹ Vikas Hassija et al., *Interpreting Black-Box Models: A Review on Explainable Artificial Intelligence*, 16 COGNITIVE COMPUTATION 45, 46 (2024).

²⁶² This is an emerging area of research: explainable AI. See, e.g., Amina Adadi & Mohammed Berrada, *Peeking Inside the Black-Box: A Survey on Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)*, 6 IEEE ACCESS 52138, 52140 (2018).

²⁶³ Audrey Fried, *Unstructuring for Insight: The Legal Profession in An Age of AI and Social Change*, 58 THE LAW TEACHER 74, 79–80, 83 (2024).

²⁶⁴ See Yavar Bathaee, *The Artificial Intelligence Black Box and the Failure of Intent and Causation*, 31 HARV. J. L. & TECH. 890, 890–91 (2018).

²⁶⁵ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 58.

²⁶⁶ See generally Joaquín Arias, Mar Moreno-Rebato, Jose A. Rodríguez-García & Sascha Ossowski, *Automated Legal Reasoning with Discretion to Act Using s(LAW)*, 32 A.I. & L. 1141 (2024).

²⁶⁷ Karen McGregor Richmond, Satya M. Muddamsetty, Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen, Henrik Palmer Olsen & Thomas B. Moeslund, *Explainable AI and Law: An Evidential Survey*, 3 DIGIT. SOC’Y 1, 4 (2024).

learning where appropriate. Law students rely on these skills to assess the relevance, reliability, application, and implications of legal principles.²⁶⁸ They must also be able to apply these skills when evaluating AI-generated outputs. Legal reasoning skills empower law students to develop persuasive arguments and interpret and apply the law effectively. Students must learn to develop legal strategies on their own, and when appropriate, use AI tools as part of a legal team, generating and critiquing creative approaches to legal problems. Additionally, creativity and its critique should be considered critical skills in an AI-driven society. These analytical skills are crucial for ensuring effective legal problem-solving and for preparing future lawyers to co-create and critique AI-generated outputs. Students must learn how to work with AI during their time in law school.

While traditional pedagogical approaches have long sought to foster critical thinking and legal reasoning skills in students,²⁶⁹ AI-integrated teaching offers the potential not only to achieve these goals, but to strengthen them through deliberate design. This is done by encouraging students to engage with AI as a learning partner and a future work colleague.²⁷⁰ While there are various approaches to enhancing critical thinking and legal reasoning skills through AI integration in skills development, four examples are provided below.

First, as previously discussed, the personalized nature of AI chatbot interactions, where AI acts as a personalized tutor, can be an effective tool for fostering analytical skills in students.²⁷¹ For example, students may ask the chatbot a question. Instead of simply providing an answer, the chatbot could follow up with questions that encourage students to think critically and develop their legal reasoning skills. The chatbot may be prompted to ask, for example, what other legal principles could be applied here, what are the implications if you apply this principle, can you think of any counterarguments to this approach, or what is the reasoning

²⁶⁸ See generally Nick James & Kelley Burton, *Measuring the Critical Thinking Skills of Law Students Using a Whole-of-Curriculum Approach*, 27 LEGAL EDUC. REV. 1 (2017) (discussing the importance of critical thinking skills for law students).

²⁶⁹ Larry O. Natt Gantt, II, *Deconstructing Thinking Like A Lawyer: Analyzing the Cognitive Components of the Analytical Mind*, 29 CAMPBELL L. REV. 413, 416–17 (2007); see also Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 136–37.

²⁷⁰ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 132; see also Stephen Atlas, *ChatGPT for Higher Education and Professional Development: A Guide to Conversational AI*, UNIV. OF R.I. (2023) https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cba_facpubs/548 [<https://perma.cc/79MQ-RQJ8>].

²⁷¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 132; see generally Hoda Fakour & Moslem Imani, *Socratic Wisdom in the Age of AI: A Comparative Study of ChatGPT and Human Tutors in Enhancing Critical Thinking Skills*, 10 FRONTIERS EDUCATION 1 (2025).

behind your position, and how would you structure it to persuade the court? Over time, this continuous, reflective engagement encourages students to critically assess their thought process, challenge their own assumptions, and refine their thinking and reasoning skills.²⁷²

Second, legal instructors may consider introducing “critical AI literacy” instruction in doctrinal courses. This approach fosters analytical skills by training students to “scrutinize the validity and quality of AI outputs.”²⁷³ For example, instructors may give students a legal problem along with a set of AI-generated legal briefs in response to the problem.²⁷⁴ Students would then be tasked with critically evaluating the strengths, weaknesses, omissions, potential biases, and inaccuracies in the AI’s analysis.²⁷⁵ That critique would include, for example, whether AI identifies all the potential issues and applicable rules, whether AI effectively applies relevant rules to the facts and develops strong arguments, whether AI addresses and responds to all potential counterarguments, or whether AI draws sound conclusions.

A third approach is to have students use “AI-generated writing as a first draft,” critically assess its reasoning, analysis, and persuasiveness, and revise it to align with their desired outcome.²⁷⁶ This process could be iterative, with students engaging AI tools to review numerous drafts and refine their work through critical engagement with the feedback.²⁷⁷

Indeed, these “critical AI literacy” exercises ensure that students can effectively navigate and apply AI in legal contexts while also strengthening their critical thinking and legal reasoning skills.²⁷⁸ Bliss asserts that the workflow, as outlined in the second approach, is poised to become a standard application of AI in legal practice, where lawyers collaborate with AI to validate and refine its responses.²⁷⁹

²⁷² Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 132.

²⁷³ *Id.* at 135.

²⁷⁴ *Id.* at 153 (“Some legal educators have taken an early step toward AI-integrated teaching by having students evaluate AI-generated legal writing.”).

²⁷⁵ Bridgesmith & Elmessiry, *supra* note 128, at 824 (noting that in legal practice, lawyers play an important role “in determining, protecting from, and establishing the limits of AI to create pernicious outcomes for humans”); Melanie Reid, *A Call to Arms: Why and How Lawyers and Law Schools Should Embrace Artificial Intelligence*, 50 U. TOL. L. REV. 477, 484 (2019).

²⁷⁶ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 154.

²⁷⁷ *Id.* at 153–54.

²⁷⁸ Michael Guihot, *Reimagining Legal Education Through Purpose-Built GPTs: A Suite of AI Tutors for Critical Thinking and Authentic Practice* (Oct. 8, 2025), https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5577310 [<https://perma.cc/BJ9E-C9FJ>].

²⁷⁹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 154.

Fourth, to improve legal reasoning skills, law schools may place deliberate pedagogical emphasis on teaching students “legal methodologies for reasoning and rationalization.”²⁸⁰ This emphasis aligns with what Dobrev describes as “the [future] human lawyer’s value-add training” in response to the growing role of AI in legal practice.²⁸¹

Undoubtedly, AI holds great potential for enhancing doctrinal legal education when educators integrate it effectively and innovatively. This integration would allow educators to shift focus towards higher-order learning objectives—such as fostering critical thinking, developing persuasive arguments, and the all-important skill of creatively applying law to novel fact patterns—rather than teaching students the mechanics of writing, like grammar and citation in legal writing.²⁸² This pedagogical shift, in Bliss’s view, is analogous to earlier changes to the mathematics curriculum where the introduction of calculators allowed educators to redirect the focus of study from arithmetic to more complex mathematical and scientific concepts.²⁸³

Furthermore, many scholars argue that the cultivation of creativity in law students should be another key objective in response to the rise of AI.²⁸⁴ Particularly, the ability to develop deeply innovative solutions to legal problems is a skill setting legal professionals apart—one that also distinguishes human lawyers from AI.²⁸⁵ In this regard, Dobrev provides a list of historical examples demonstrating how truly creative thinking has enabled significant breakthroughs in legal practice and jurisprudence, and ultimately better justice for society.²⁸⁶ He notes that in *Roe v. Wade* (1973), the US Supreme Court interpreted the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to “protect a woman’s decision to have an abortion,” despite

²⁸⁰ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 59.

²⁸¹ *Id.* (“AI would be able to summarize, draft, identify specific issues and predict specific outcomes. However, AI would probably not inherently internalize the methodology essential to bridge the analytical gap between substantive findings and legal determinations.”).

²⁸² Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 134–35; see generally Lusía Maryani Silitonga, Wiyaka, Sri Suciati & Entika Fani Prastikawati, *The Impact of Integrating AI Chatbots and Microlearning into Flipped Classrooms: Enhancing Students’ Motivation and Higher-Order Thinking Skills*, in INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND LEARNING 184-193 (Elisa Bertino, Wen Gao, Bernhard Steffen, and Moti Yung, 2024).

²⁸³ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 134–35.

²⁸⁴ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 61–62; Mateus de Oliveira Fornasier, *Legal Education in the 21st Century and the Artificial Intelligence*, 19 REV. OPINIÃO JURÍDICA 1, 2 (2020).

²⁸⁵ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 61–62; Hilary G. Escajeda, *The Vitruvian Lawyer: How to Thrive in an Era of Ai and Quantum Technologies*, 29 KAN. J.L. & PUB. POL’Y 421, 476-77 (2020).

²⁸⁶ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 61–62.

the right to privacy not being explicitly stated in the Constitution.²⁸⁷ Although this case was overturned by the same court in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* in 2022—a significant setback for women's rights—it does not diminish the nearly half-century of freedom secured by its creative reasoning.²⁸⁸ Dobrev suggests that to foster creativity in law students, law schools ought to expand their approach to AI integration.²⁸⁹ He writes that law school should “structure curricula, coursework, teaching[,] and grading methods to boost creative thinking.”²⁹⁰

C. ETHICAL JUDGMENT AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The importance and challenges of ethics when integrating AI into the curriculum are not limited to law.²⁹¹ The ability to exercise ethical judgment and fulfill professional responsibility obligations, however, is a core competency for legal practitioners. It is a key distinction between humans and AI—at least at this stage of technological development.²⁹² This advantage exists for a variety of reasons.

First of all, AI is unable to “develop its own ethical compass and metrics.”²⁹³ To some degree, this is an obvious extrapolation from the lack of context and intentionality of AI itself. Human lawyers, by way of contrast, are capable of engaging with nuanced moral and ethical considerations and arguments as well as addressing the value-laden decisions inherent in everyday legal practice.²⁹⁴ Lawyers interpret and apply the law within complex social, ethical, and professional contexts. This undertaking involves direct engagement with those contexts and draws on human judgment, empathy, adaptability, and a strong sense of

²⁸⁷ *Id.*

²⁸⁸ *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022); Caroline Wakefield, Note, *[Ordered] Liberty and Justice for All? The Elusive “Right to Privacy” and A Comparison of American and Canadian Women's Rights Schemes*, 20 S.C.J. INT'L L. & BUS. 189, 191 (2024) (discussing the violations of women's rights).

²⁸⁹ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 62.

²⁹⁰ *Id.*

²⁹¹ See Sheikh Abdulaziz Fahad, Said A. Salloum, & Khaled Shaalan, *The Role of ChatGPT in Knowledge Sharing and Collaboration Within Digital Workplaces: A Systematic Review*, 144 STUD. IN BIG DATA 259-82 (2024).

²⁹² Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 62–63 (“[I]n the currently foreseeable time horizon this area will continue to be a source of human lawyer advantage”).

²⁹³ *Id.*

²⁹⁴ *Id.*

accountability.²⁹⁵ As such, we argue there is an increased need for law schools to refine and advance their approaches to teaching ethics and judgment, focusing on the strengths, weaknesses, utility, and related politics of teleological, deontological, and pragmatic ethical approaches. Further, students need to understand and develop skills in the application of these approaches both in the practice of law as well as in the arguments put forth before the courts.

One way to achieve this deeper integration is by integrating professional ethics across the entire curriculum, while still including a dedicated ethics course to reinforce its importance. Thus, discussion and analysis of ethics and professional responsibility can occur in doctrinal teaching as well as in various skills subjects. Instructors in doctrinal courses, for example, may consider implementing simulation exercises replicating real-life situations. These simulations provide students with opportunities to exercise judgment in response to ethical dilemmas. In doing so, students must consider how to balance competing moral and ethical interests in legal practice.²⁹⁶

As an example of such ethical dilemmas in practice, criminal law students could be assigned the task of role-playing as defense lawyers representing a client accused of murder. The scenario could have the client confessing to the crime but also insisting on hiding the body and pleading not guilty. The client may also admit to having murdered several other individuals and having hidden their bodies, with no one else being aware of these crimes. The lawyers then face an ethical dilemma, at least under Australian law: While bound by obligations of client confidentiality, they must decide whether to uphold their client's instructions or prioritize public safety and justice by potentially disclosing the information to authorities.²⁹⁷ Similar simulations could also be incorporated into other compulsory courses such as corporations, contracts, and torts. For example, they could address scenarios including wage theft or pension funding. In these cases, a trusted lawyer must advise a corporate client on the legality and ethics of siphoning funds or asset stripping to avoid paying obligations.²⁹⁸ This approach reflects a deliberate pedagogical focus on

²⁹⁵ *Id.*

²⁹⁶ *Id.* at 63.

²⁹⁷ Lillian Corbin, *Australian Lawyers as Public Citizens*, 16 *LEGAL ETHICS* 57 (2013); Nigel Stobbs, *Duty to the Court and the Administration of Justice*, *PRECEDENT*, July/Aug. 2014, at 17-20.

²⁹⁸ In this case, students would be expected to recognize the fraud- crime exception to attorney-client privilege. "A party may not invoke the attorney-client privilege where 'it involves client communications that may have been in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme, an alleged breach of

ethics across the entire curriculum, ensuring that professional ethics is integrated into the study of substantive law.

In doctrinal courses, instructors could use AI to create challenging scenarios. Students could engage with AI to test different approaches to ethical problems and dilemmas. AI could also take on the roles of a client, opposing counsel, or even a judge, responding dynamically to students' decisions and prompting reflection on ethical considerations.

Second, as lawyers increasingly rely on AI tools to perform various legal tasks, concerns about their ethical use are arising more frequently and across a wider variety of issues.²⁹⁹ While there are no universal, comprehensive laws specifically regulating lawyers' use of AI, these ethical questions fall within the scope of professional conduct rules.³⁰⁰ Under current frameworks, ethical use of AI is particularly relevant to lawyers' duty of competence and diligence, as well as the obligation to maintain technological competence.³⁰¹

Australian professional conduct rules do not explicitly reference technological competence.³⁰² This has led to debates about whether the duty of competence and diligence extends to a lawyer's ability to navigate technology in general and specifically with respect to AI.³⁰³ Many states, such as Victoria, New South Wales, and Western Australia, have issued a joint statement on lawyers' use of AI in legal practice.³⁰⁴ While acknowledging AI's benefits, the statement places particular attention on concerns relating to the duty to maintain client confidentiality, and the duty of competence and diligence.³⁰⁵ It also recommends that lawyers

fiduciary duty or an accusation of some other wrongful conduct." *E.g.*, *Art Capital Group LLC v Rose*, 54 A.D. 276, 277 (2008).

²⁹⁹ See Justine Rogers & Felicity Bell, *The Ethical AI Lawyer: What Is Required of Lawyers When They Use Automated Systems?*, 1 LAW, TECH. & HUM. 80 (2019); Andrew Arruda, *An Ethical Obligation to Use Artificial Intelligence: An Examination of the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Law and the Model Rules of Professional Responsibility*, 40 AM. J. TRIAL ADVOC. 443 (2017).

³⁰⁰ Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297-98; Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 120.

³⁰¹ Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297-98; Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 120 ("Some commentators suggest that the legal profession is approaching a point when lawyers will need to use generative AI to satisfy their duties of competence and diligence, as these tools will make lawyers more effective and efficient.").

³⁰² Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297-98.

³⁰³ *Id.*

³⁰⁴ *Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Australian Legal Practice*, VICTORIAN LEGAL SERVS. BD. + COMM'R. (Mar. 26, 2025), <https://www.lsbcc.vic.gov.au/news-updates/news/statement-use-artificial-intelligence-australian-legal-practice> [https://perma.cc/23EF-DZ9V].

³⁰⁵ *Id.*

using AI in their practice consider implementing risk assessment policies and limiting the use of AI to low-risk tasks.³⁰⁶

Other countries have taken it a step further by incorporating technological competence requirements into their professional conduct rules,³⁰⁷ although these requirements may not explicitly address the use of AI.³⁰⁸ These rules emphasize the obligation that lawyers have to maintaining an understanding of relevant technologies, ensuring competent representation of their clients and uphold ethical standards.³⁰⁹ For example, in the US, Comment 8 to the Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1 on Competence states: “To maintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology, engage in continuing study and education and comply with all continuing legal education requirements to which the lawyer is subject.”³¹⁰

Given that professional conduct rules require ethical use of AI in legal practice—whether under the duty of competence and diligence, or through the obligation of technological competence—legal education must recognize and respond to this requirement.³¹¹ In fact, legal educators are concerned that students may not fully understand the limitations and risks associated with the use of AI, with some noting that improper use may result in substandard work and potential risks of professional discipline.³¹² Therefore, there is a clear need to educate students on the ethical and responsible use of AI.³¹³ As previously discussed, this can be achieved by integrating AI into teaching, where students engage with AI tools and supervise AI work throughout their legal studies. In light of this, Bliss notes that students should learn what AI is good and not good at, and steer, confirm, and develop AI outputs, rather than cutting and pasting without understanding.³¹⁴ Head and Willis describe this process as

³⁰⁶ *Id.*

³⁰⁷ Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297-98.

³⁰⁸ *Id.*

³⁰⁹ Mark L. Shope, *Lawyer and Judicial Competency in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Ethical Requirements for Documenting Datasets and Machine Learning Models*, 34 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 191, 192 (2021).

³¹⁰ Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297-98.

³¹¹ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 120.

³¹² *Id.* at 129-30.

³¹³ *Id.*; David King, *How to Retain Being a Human Lawyer While Using Generative AI*, 61 CAL. W. L. REV. 331, 347-48 (2025).

³¹⁴ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 130.

analogous to supervising a junior lawyer.³¹⁵ Similarly, Melanie Reid observes that the role of the junior lawyer is shifting to more of a supervisory roles—that is, supervising AI.³¹⁶

Furthermore, when AI is used in clinical legal education, it raises the same ethical and practical considerations faced in law firms. Students must handle clients' personal information with the same care and confidentiality required in professional practice. AI tools should be used in ways that safeguard client privacy, comply with relevant data protection laws, and uphold professional ethical standards. Failure to do so could expose both the institution and students to significant legal and ethical risks. Meaningful faulty oversight and clear protocols for AI use can help mitigate these risks while allowing students to benefit from AI-supported learning in clinical settings.

Lastly, it is our view that, with the continued development and integration of AI technology in legal practice, professional bodies are likely to issue more detailed guidance and rules clarifying lawyers' responsibilities in using AI. These may include, ethical and responsible AI use guides, privacy protection measures, and risk management strategies. Over time, these guidance's and rules may help shape statutory or regulatory frameworks, creating a more structured legal environment for the ethical and responsible use of AI in legal practice. For example, the world's first comprehensive AI law—the EU Artificial Intelligence Act—was adopted in 2024 and will take full effect in August 2026.³¹⁷ While this Act does not directly regulate lawyers' use of AI, it signals a broader shift towards formalizing ethical and responsible AI use, which could shape the evolution of legal ethics in the profession.

³¹⁵ Head & Willis, *supra* note 139, at 297–98.

³¹⁶ Reid, *supra* note 275, at 484.

³¹⁷ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence and Amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act), 2024 O.J. (L 1689) 1; *AI Act*, EUR. COMM'N (Jan. 27, 2026), <https://digital-strategy.cc.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai#:~:text=The%20AI%20Act%20entered%20into,application%20from%202%20February%202025> [<https://perma.cc/7WXB-Z3D6>]; *EU AI Act: First Regulation on Artificial Intelligence*, EUR. PARLIAMENT (Feb. 19, 2025, 17:46 CST), <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence> [<https://perma.cc/KNR7-XLQC>].

D. HUMAN-CENTRIC SOFT SKILLS

Although AI is increasingly taking over a wide range of legal tasks,³¹⁸ it may still lack the human-centric soft skills required to navigate complex interpersonal situations and provide emotive client-focused representation.³¹⁹ This underscores the need for law schools to strengthen skills training in these areas. As Professor Melanie Reid notes, “there are [...] emotional aspects to being human and interacting with humans”³²⁰ and these are the skills critical to getting the facts out and the stories assembled to be put before a judge. Human-centric soft skills, such as empathy, negotiation, dispute resolution, communication, and advocacy, enable effective client interaction, persuasive advocacy, and the clear articulation of legal reasoning—capacities leading to effective legal representation cannot be wholly delegated to machines.³²¹ Soft skills can be developed through deliberate course and assessment design.

Legal educators may, in the first instance, consider adopting the medical school models.³²² These models emphasize using simulations to teach students the value of doctor-patient relationships.³²³ In law schools, this means teaching students the importance of lawyer-client relationships, particularly through experiential learning that develops empathy, communication, and interpersonal skills rather than mere fact determination.³²⁴ For example, legal instructors may create scenarios simulating sensitive and difficult client issues, or typical client crises situations—and they may use AI to do so.³²⁵

³¹⁸ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 65 (“[T]he technical processing of specific legal matters will reside more prominently within AI’s competency.”).

³¹⁹ Sundquist, *supra* note 232. The hot research agenda of AI, however, targets precisely these skills. See Zhao et al., *supra* note 229, at 1. In a medical context it appears that AI is superior to humans in terms of ability to express empathy, Alistair Howcroft et al., *AI Chatbots Versus Human Healthcare Professionals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Empathy in Patient Care*, BRIT. MED. BULL., 20 August 2025, at 1, 11, and there is no reason to believe the same will not happen in law practice.

³²⁰ Reid, *supra* note 275, at 485.

³²¹ See *id.* (“[S]tudents need to be prepared to tackle the tough give-and-take client meetings, negotiations with opposing counsel, and court appearances before the jury and judge.”).

³²² *Id.*

³²³ See generally Vanessa Britz et al., *Impact of Simulated Patient-Based Communication Training vs. Real Patient-Based Communication Training on Empathetic Behaviour in Undergraduate Students – a Prospective Evaluation Study*, BMC MED. EDUC., 2024, at 1 (emphasizing the value of simulated patient communication on training empathetic behavior in undergraduate medical students).

³²⁴ Reid, *supra* note 275, at 485.

³²⁵ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 65.

Students would then be tasked with responding to the scenarios, followed by a structured debriefing led by instructors. During this process, students would reflect on their own actions and receive constructive feedback from instructors or even their peers. This type of exercise helps students identify the strengths and areas for improvement in terms of their own communication skills, conflict resolution skills, and empathy. Particular emphasis should be placed on developing students' "interpersonal skills such as being able to relate to and interact with clients and other recipients of legal output, as well as being able to generate trust."³²⁶ Additionally, wellness and resilience training should also be provided to help students prepare for the challenges that may arise from managing difficult clients or situations.

Soft skills can also be developed through "offering negotiation, mediation, and client interview classes with an emphasis on developing students' interpersonal skills."³²⁷ Indeed, this is an approach that Bond University Faculty of Law (Australia) adopted well before the advent of AI, and one continuing to set it apart from other institutions.³²⁸ At Bond, communication, collaboration, negotiation, client interviewing, advocacy, dispute resolution, and other essential skills are seamlessly integrated not only into doctrinal teaching but also into assessments.

For example, in one of the first-year legal foundations courses, instructors go beyond teaching foundational legal knowledge; they incorporate skills training into the curriculum.³²⁹ Students are taught how to collaborate effectively as a team, communicate, negotiate, and resolve disputes with opposing counsel, while also advocating for their clients.³³⁰ Although the final exam is a written piece, the mid-term assessment is skills-based: Students are put into teams of three, and are required to negotiate with another team of three to resolve a legal dispute, thereby demonstrating the skills they have learned in this course.³³¹

Bond's skills-based teaching and assessments are scaffolded and integrated throughout the entire law curriculum. For example, Contract

³²⁶ *Id.*

³²⁷ Reid, *supra* note 275, at 485.

³²⁸ See Nick James, *A Message from the Executive Dean*, BOND UNIV., <https://bond.edu.au/our-university/our-faculties-and-academic-units/faculty-of-law> [<https://perma.cc/X8TB-ZB8C>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025).

³²⁹ *LAWS11-106: Legal Foundations B*, BOND UNIV., <https://bond.edu.au/subject/laws11-106-legal-foundations-b> [<https://perma.cc/3GHU-QBSY>] (last visited Nov. 21, 2025).

³³⁰ See *id.*

³³¹ *LAWS11-106: Legal Foundations B*, BOND UNIV., https://bond.edu.au/subject-outline/LAWS11-106_2026_JAN_STD_01 [<https://perma.cc/A2TK-2FYB>] (last visited Mar. 2, 2026).

Law enhances negotiation skills by assessing students through a transactional negotiation exercise.³³² Criminal Law strengthens advocacy and communication skills by assessing students through a sentencing exercise.³³³ Bond graduates tend to be more practice ready as a result of these practical, hands-on skills trainings embedded throughout their law studies.³³⁴ As skills training has become increasingly relevant in the Age of AI, law schools may consider adopting similar teaching and assessment models to better prepare their students for the evolving legal landscape.³³⁵ Bond's success is supported by a small-class teaching model, with a student-to-teaching-staff ratio of eleven-to-one.³³⁶ This approach may not be feasible for all law schools.

IV. SPECIALIZED AI COURSES

To truly implement AI as a third pillar, AI-integrated teaching will need to be incorporated across the entire curriculum, including both doctrinal courses and skills training subjects. This approach ensures that students develop not only a solid understanding of substantive law and skills, but also how AI can be used in an ethical and responsible way in legal practice.³³⁷ In addition, for two key reasons, specialized AI courses are becoming imperative.³³⁸ First, such courses help students develop advanced AI proficiency.³³⁹ Second, they help foster an innovative, effective AI mindset—a mindset that plays a critical role in the successful

³³² *LAWS11-201: Contract Law A*, BOND UNIV., https://bond.edu.au/subject-outline/LAWS11-201_2025_SEP_STD_01 [<https://perma.cc/RYSZ-V2NQ>] (last visited Feb. 25, 2026).

³³³ *LAWS11-203: Criminal Law*, BOND UNIV., https://bond.edu.au/subject-outline/LAWS11-203_2026_JAN_STD_01 [<https://perma.cc/ZUD5-3BPY>] (last visited Mar. 2, 2026).

³³⁴ See, e.g., *Free Legal Clinic Gives Law Students Real-World Experience*, EDUCATIONDAILY (Sept. 29, 2023), <https://educationdaily.au/general/free-legal-clinic-gives-law-students-real-world-experience-6667/> [<https://perma.cc/T3UX-6KB6>].

³³⁵ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 138 (“This notion that legal educators should teach AI literacy as a core professional competency may align with the trend toward experiential learning and calls for a more practical legal education.”); see also Margaret E. Reuter & Joanne Ingham, *The Practice Value of Experiential Legal Education: An Examination of Enrollment Patterns, Course Intensity, and Career Relevance*, 22 CLINICAL L. REV. 181, 183–84 (2015).

³³⁶ *Rankings and Ratings*, BOND UNIV., <https://bond.edu.au/our-university/bond-difference/rankings-and-ratings> [<https://perma.cc/623L-KH92>] (last visited July 12, 2025).

³³⁷ See Friesen, *supra* note 143, at 243.

³³⁸ Connell & Hamlin-Black, *supra* note 230, at 5, 7–8 (suggesting law schools should “provide more formal instruction in AI technologies by developing specific courses addressing the use of and access to Artificial Intelligence”); Johnson & Shen, *supra* note 221, at 23.

³³⁹ Parineeta Goswami, *Revolutionizing Legal Education: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Shaping the Future of Law Teaching and Learning*, SSRN (Feb. 4, 2025), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5123719> [<https://perma.cc/4X3L-WRKN>].

application of the technology.³⁴⁰ Rather than merely considering AI a tool for menial or repetitive tasks, the most effective users treat it as a strategic partner—one that can emulate the insights of a team of experts.³⁴¹ Taking a broad view and a proactive approach enables students to engage with and address emerging challenges, exploring novel ways to apply and work with AI in legal contexts. This approach, known as the augmentation approach, strategically positions AI as a valuable member of a legal team.³⁴² Several areas warrant attention when designing these courses and seminars.

First, there has been a growing demand for lawyers to build competence in adapting or tailoring existing AI tools.³⁴³ To better prepare students for these challenges, law schools may offer specialized courses on AI technology. These courses can equip students with a thorough understanding of its underlying algorithms, the processes generating AI outputs,³⁴⁴ and prompt engineering.³⁴⁵ Such understanding enables students not only to use AI tools competently but also to critically engage with the technology, for example, by learning how AI tools can be custom-designed for specific legal applications.³⁴⁶ Law schools may also introduce modules strengthening students' ability to effectively manage AI-driven legal systems. This includes customized ones, ensuring that these AI

³⁴⁰ See Molly Sands, AI Collaboration Report: "Using" AI is Not Enough – Here's What Your Organization is Missing, ATLASSIAN (Nov. 19, 2024), <https://www.atlassian.com/blog/productivity/ai-collaboration-report> [https://perma.cc/Q7PE-3U7X]; see generally ERIK SEVERSEN ET AL., THE AI MINDSET: THRIVING WITHIN CIVILIZATION'S NEXT BIG DISRUPTION (2024) (discussing the importance of developing an "AI Mindset").

³⁴¹ Sands, *supra* note 340; see Anja Hornikel et al., *The Need to Collaborate: Opportunities for Human and AI Co-Workers*, in CHIRA 2021 - 5TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COMPUTER-HUMAN INTERACTION RESEARCH AND APPLICATIONS 139–43 (2021); VIOLETTA KHOREVA & KATJA EINOLA, *Chapter 16: Artificial Intelligence as a Colleague: Towards the Workplace Coexistence of People and Artificial Intelligence*, in RESEARCH HANDBOOK ON HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND DISRUPTIVE TECHNOLOGIES 224–37 (Tanya Bondarouk & Jeroen Meijerink eds., 2024).

³⁴² See, e.g., Hossein Hassani et al., *Artificial Intelligence (AI) or Intelligence Augmentation (IA): What Is the Future?*, 1 AI 143, 150 (2020) ("Augmented intelligence is a substitute formulation of artificial intelligence that focuses on AI's role in aiding and promoting human capabilities.").

³⁴³ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 66.

³⁴⁴ *Id.*

³⁴⁵ Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 151–52 (discussing the benefits of AI-focused courses and noting that "students who learn effective prompt engineering techniques may be able to enhance the efficiency and quality of their legal work.").

³⁴⁶ Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 66.

driven legal systems deliver reliable, high-quality results aligning with the professional standards of legal practice.³⁴⁷

AI is advancing at a rapid pace. AI-focused courses, as Connell and Hamlin-Black observe, are not a one-and-done effort but rather an ongoing process, with the content and teaching methods regularly refined and updated.³⁴⁸ A basic challenge is that most legal educators have yet to receive adequate resources for training in AI-integrated teaching, let alone understanding its underlying technology.³⁴⁹ Addressing this gap may require interdisciplinary collaboration with AI experts or targeted training for legal educators interested in developing this expertise.

Furthermore, it is essential that law schools not only educate students about the current use of AI, but also ensure they stay informed about emerging developments in this field.³⁵⁰ In addition to AI-focused courses, law schools should organize regular seminars and workshops updating students on the latest AI advancements and their applications in legal practice.³⁵¹ These initiatives support knowledge transfer, and foster adaptability and continuous learning—key attributes for students' future success in the legal profession.

V. CONCLUSION

In this Article, we have reviewed the two traditional pillars of legal education—substantive knowledge and lawyering skills—and proposed adding a third: AI proficiency. AI is already playing a significant role in legal work, both by reshaping legal practice and by serving as a helpful tool for lawyers. In response, we advocate for a strategic posture that embraces AI as a valuable co-intelligent member of a legal team, in contrast to a defensive stance rooted in insecurity. Ultimately, a defensive approach puts human lawyers on the back foot, making it harder for them to harness this technology to its fullest. As such, we endorse Dobrev's "AI lawyer" plus "human lawyer" model,³⁵² as it is well-suited to the evolving paradigm of co-intelligent legal systems in the Age of AI.

³⁴⁷ *Id.*

³⁴⁸ Connell & Hamlin-Black, *supra* note 230, at 7.

³⁴⁹ See Bliss, *supra* note 132, at 151.

³⁵⁰ Tammy Pettinato Oltz, *Educating Robot-Proof Attorneys*, 97 N.D. L. REV. 185, 186 (2022).

³⁵¹ See, e.g., Nick Hafen, *From Competence to Excellence: How Utah's Law Schools Are Training Tomorrow's AI-Savvy Lawyers*, UTAH BAR J., Jul/Aug 2024, at 50, 51 (discussing a Utah law school's approach).

³⁵² Dobrev, *supra* note 38, at 66.

The rise of such integrated legal practices creates an imperative for law schools to reform legal education. Such reform, we argue, should focus on embedding AI into the curriculum as part of the foundational legal knowledge and skills development of the degree, thereby preparing the next generation of co-intelligent legal professionals. Noting that lawyers have two roles, they will need to learn to do both with AI: as legal practitioners, they will need to learn to collaborate with AI in their professional lives; and as members of the broader community, they will need to harness the power of AI to influence policy reform and contribute to positive societal change.

A proactive posture, supported by a solid educational foundation, makes it easier for a person to open their mind to the potential of AI rather than fear it. A pragmatic technological approach recognizes that AI itself is not the threat; rather, the threat is a matter of perception. As Zhong and colleagues caution, “We must note that the goal of Legal AI is not replacing the legal professionals but helping their work. As a result, we should regard the results of the models only as a reference. Otherwise, the legal system will no longer be reliable.”³⁵³ By “reliable” Zhong means only that the legal system will not be worthy of the trust it has developed over the years to deliver lawful, just outcomes. That task and evaluation is ultimately something only human lawyers can deliver.

³⁵³ Zhong et al., *supra* note 64.