Application and Challenge of Artificial Intelligence in Law Education

Liu Feng

School of Law and Public Administration, Yibin University, Yibin, Sichuan 644000, China

Abstract: The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence technology is fundamentally transforming the legal education ecosystem, driving a shift from the traditional "teacher–student" binary structure to a tripartite collaborative framework of "teacher–student–machine." This evolution empowers case–based teaching to enhance experiential learning, personalized instruction, and advanced skill development, while expanding educational content into digital jurisprudence. These changes challenge conventional knowledge transmission paradigms, revealing issues such as weakened critical thinking due to technological dependence, teaching quality risks caused by algorithmic biases and "illusions," academic integrity crises, and imbalanced access to educational resources. To address these challenges, legal education reform should adopt student–centered and learning–centered approaches grounded in constructivism and contextual cognition theories. This requires redefining pedagogical concepts, innovating teaching methods, reforming instructional designs, upgrading evaluation systems, and strengthening academic standards and professional ethics education. The ultimate goal is to cultivate interdisciplinary legal professionals who combine solid legal expertise, digital literacy, critical thinking, and noble professional ethics in the "AI + Law" era.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; legal education; teaching reform; digital law

0. Introduction

With the explosive growth and widespread application of generative AI technologies represented by DeepSeek in China, the nation is accelerating into the intelligent era. This technological wave has not only profoundly transformed social production methods and lifestyles, but also presented unprecedented opportunities and challenges for China´s legal system and legal talent cultivation. As the primary platform for producing legal professionals, legal education faces a "broken window" transformation driven by technology, challenging its inherent knowledge systems, teaching models, and training objectives. The traditional education paradigm centered on one–way knowledge transmission and memorization of legal statutes has become increasingly limited in the face of AI´s capabilities to efficiently complete knowledge retrieval, text generation, and even pass judicial examinations. Meanwhile, AI provides new tools and scenarios for enhancing legal education, such as virtual simulation practices, personalized learning support, and massive case analysis, opening new pathways to improve teaching efficiency, strengthen practicality, and cultivate advanced legal thinking skills. However, technological empowerment comes with risks. The application of AI in legal education has also sparked widespread concerns. Students may become overly reliant on technical tools, weakening their independent thinking and critical reasoning abilities. The inherent "black box" nature of algorithms, data biases, and the "illusion" of fabricated cases may mislead learners and compromise the accuracy of teaching content. Students using AI for homework plagiarism or thesis ghostwriting severely undermines academic integrity. Therefore, how to find the balance between embracing technological innovation and adhering to the essence of education, and how to transform artificial intelligence from a potential "disruptor" into an effective "defender" have become the questions of the times in the current reform of legal education.

1. Empowerment and Reconstruction: Multi-dimensional Application of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education

1.1 Transformation of Teaching Mode: From Dual Structure to Triple Synergy Interaction

Traditional legal education classrooms predominantly follow a "teacher-student" binary structure, where instructors serve as authoritative knowledge transmitters while students remain passive recipients. Although this model demonstrates efficiency in knowledge delivery, its limitations have become increasingly apparent: one-way teaching interactions, superficial student engagement, and insufficient personalized guidance fail to meet the demands of legal practice requiring comprehensive competencies and innovative thinking. The deep integration of artificial intelligence (AI) is driving this model toward a tripartite collaborative framework of "teacher-student-machine," redefining subject relationships, task allocation, and interactive mechanisms in the teaching process. AI first reassigns cognitive loads by taking over standardized, repetitive teaching tasks. For instance, in legal text retrieval, basic concept analysis, historical case review, initial assignment evaluation, and format checking, AI exhibits advantages of efficiency, accuracy, and time-space independence. Taking intelligent legal search systems as an example, they can quickly locate relevant statutes, judicial interpretations, and similar cases based on natural language queries, generating summaries and correlation analyses that significantly enhance knowledge acquisition efficiency. This allows teachers to shift from tedious information delivery and basic Q&A to focusing on instructional design, cognitive guidance, value cultivation, and deep interaction. Consequently, the teacher's role evolves from "knowledge transmitter" to "learning facilitator," "methodological guide," and "ethical educator," with greater emphasis on developing students' judgment, reasoning abilities, and professional ethics when facing complex legal scenarios.

For students, artificial intelligence empowers their true return to learning agency. They are no longer passive recipients of knowledge but active explorers, collaborators, and creators. With AI tools, students can engage in self-directed inquiry-based learning, customizing study paths according to their knowledge base, cognitive rhythm, and interests. For instance, through adaptive learning platforms, students can receive targeted reinforcement for weak knowledge points or generate in-depth reading materials and discussion questions on cutting-edge legal topics of interest. Simultaneously, they can interact with virtual AI agents for case-based discussions, engaging in multiple rounds of Q&A, debates, and even simulated negotiations to hone legal argumentation and on-the-spot adaptability. This AI-driven personalized and interactive learning experience effectively stimulates students' intrinsic motivation and creativity.

In this innovative model, artificial intelligence has transcended its traditional role as a "supportive tool" to become an indispensable participant in the educational process. This transformation manifests in three key aspects: Firstly, as a "virtual teaching assistant," it provides round-the-clock online Q&A support, learning progress tracking, and personalized feedback, effectively alleviating the pressures of faculty shortages and imbalanced student-to-teacher ratios—particularly evident in large-scale online courses and blended learning environments. Secondly, functioning as a "case repository and think tank," it integrates vast resources of legal statutes, judicial precedents, and academic literature. Leveraging generative capabilities, it dynamically creates virtual cases, simulates legal scenarios, and predicts judicial opinion trends, delivering dynamic, realistic research materials for instruction. Thirdly, as a "collaborative partner," it assists students in drafting legal documents, analyzing evidence chains, and predicting opposing arguments during group projects and mock trial preparations, thereby enhancing the efficiency and depth of team collaboration.

1.2 Innovation of Teaching Methods: Enhancing Experience, Individuality and Higher-order Competence Cultivation

First, artificial intelligence has significantly enhanced the immersion, practicality, and complexity

of case-based teaching. Traditional case teaching often relies on textual descriptions, leaving students limited in comprehending the full scope of cases, evidence details, and courtroom dynamics. Today, through virtual reality, augmented reality, and 3D modeling technologies, highly realistic legal practice scenarios can be constructed. In criminal law education, crime scenes can be reconstructed for immersive investigative simulations; in contract law teaching, business negotiation scenarios can be simulated with dynamically generated terms and risk points. These technologies effectively overcome traditional mock trials´ constraints regarding time allocation, venue limitations, number of participants, and diversity of case types, enabling more students to receive high-frequency, low-cost, and high-quality legal practice training. Additionally, generative AI can rapidly create "virtual cases" based on real legal logic. These cases can be set with varying difficulty levels and involve novel legal disputes for students to analyze and adjudicate, effectively expanding the boundaries of case-based teaching.

Secondly, artificial intelligence enables the organic integration of large-scale education and personalized cultivation. Traditional large-class teaching struggles to accommodate individual cognitive differences and learning progress. Through big data analysis, learning behavior tracking, and intelligent algorithms, AI systems can create precise "learner profiles" for each student, identifying knowledge gaps, cognitive preferences, interest hotspots, and skill deficiencies in real time. Based on this, the system automatically delivers customized learning packages including targeted reading materials, exercises with differentiated difficulty levels, and related extension cases or micro-courses. This "tailored instruction" approach not only enhances learning efficiency but also preserves students´ interest and confidence, paving new paths to resolve the long-standing contradiction between "uniform pace" and "personalization" in legal education.

Thirdly, artificial intelligence is driving a strategic shift in legal education, transitioning its focus from rote memorization of knowledge to cultivating higher-order cognitive skills. AI has become highly efficient at performing low-level cognitive tasks such as memorizing legal knowledge, rapidly retrieving statutes, and drafting standardized legal documents. This compels educators to reconsider: What irreplaceable core competencies should legal professionals possess in the AI era? The answer undoubtedly lies in advanced cognitive abilities like analysis, evaluation, and creation, along with professional ethics. Consequently, teaching methodologies must evolve. Classrooms should prioritize in-depth debates on complex legal principles, multi-perspective deconstructions of challenging cases, critical reflections on judicial decisions, and cutting-edge explorations of legal-technological interactions. Educators can design more open-ended questions, project-based learning tasks, and interdisciplinary challenges, encouraging students to use AI tools for preliminary information gathering and analysis before focusing on higher-order intellectual activities such as legal interpretation, value assessments, strategy formulation, and innovative solution development. AI serves as a "primary assistant" handling foundational tasks, while students and faculty concentrate on the core components requiring human intuition, ethical judgment, and creative thinking.

1.3 Expansion of Teaching Content: Digital Law and Cultivation of New Quality Legal Talents

First, the dynamic development and organic integration of digital law curricula. The widespread adoption of technologies like artificial intelligence, big data, blockchain, and the Internet of Things has given rise to new legal challenges, including data ownership disputes, algorithmic discrimination, platform monopolies, digital asset inheritance, autonomous driving liability, and legal consequences of deep fakes. To address these evolving demands, leading law schools worldwide have prioritized "digital law" or "law and technology" as key academic fields. Specific initiatives include: introducing cutting-edge courses such as "Artificial Intelligence and Law," "Data Law and Privacy Protection," "Cyberspace Governance," and "Introduction to Computational Law"; incorporating digital society-related modules into core subjects like constitutional law, civil law, criminal law, administrative law, and procedural law—such as "Digital Human Rights in Constitutional Law," "AI Liability in Tort Law," "Cybercrime from

a Criminal Law Perspective," and "Automated Decision–Making in Administrative Litigation"; and establishing specialized research centers or laboratories focused on frontier topics in digital governance. These educational approaches enable students to understand the fundamental logic of technological operations and the legal challenges they present, while equipping them with the legal tools to regulate technological development.

Secondly, the explicit definition and capability development of "new–type legal professionals". In the context of "new–type productive forces" driven by technological innovation, the nation urgently requires legal professionals capable of serving strategic emerging industries and future–oriented sectors – namely "new–type legal professionals". These professionals exhibit a "law+" interdisciplinary profile: they possess both solid traditional legal foundations and socialist rule–of–law concepts, while also demonstrating foundational understanding of key technologies like artificial intelligence and big data. They master legal statutes and litigation techniques, while being adept at utilizing digital tools for legal research, evidence analysis, risk prediction, and compliance management. Equipped with profound expertise, they demonstrate interdisciplinary knowledge integration awareness and global perspective. Their mission involves addressing complex issues in technological innovation, including intellectual property layout, cross–border data flow compliance, algorithmic ethics review, and legal frameworks for technology project financing, thereby providing legal safeguards for national strategic deployments in critical areas such as technological competition and digital economy governance. Consequently, legal education must adjust its training programs to strengthen the cultivation of technological literacy and interdisciplinary capabilities through curriculum design, practical teaching, and degree programs.

Third, the deep integration of interdisciplinary research methodologies and teaching models. Legal studies in the context of artificial intelligence increasingly require drawing on knowledge and methods from computer science, statistics, economics, ethics, and other disciplines. This is reflected in teaching content and methods, demonstrating a distinct trend of interdisciplinary convergence. In terms of content, basic programming thinking, data visualization, and statistical inference knowledge are being introduced to help students understand the legal implications of algorithmic decision–making and big data analysis reports. Methodologically, students are encouraged to use empirical research, quantitative analysis, network analysis, and computational simulation tools to study legal phenomena. For example, natural language processing technology is applied to analyze judicial document biases, big data is utilized to track the socio–economic effects of specific legislation, and modeling simulations are employed to examine the impact of different regulatory strategies on platform economies. This interdisciplinary training aims to cultivate students´ ability to explore and solve complex legal problems with scientific rigor and diverse approaches, transforming them into "bridge–type" professionals who are proficient in both law and technology.

2. Risks and Challenges: The Multidimensional Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Legal Education Ecosystem

2.1 Impact on Educational Philosophy and Objectives

Traditional legal education is rooted in a solid cognitive foundation—the "stability commitment of legal knowledge." This commitment posits the existence of a systematic, logically coherent, and relatively stable body of substantive law and legal principles. The core mission of education is for teachers, as authoritative interpreters and transmitters, to efficiently and accurately convey this systematic knowledge to students. Through methods like case study and legal text annotation, students are trained to apply abstract rules to specific cases. However, the rise of artificial intelligence—particularly its near–infinite memory capacity, millisecond–level retrieval speed, and powerful knowledge generation capabilities—is eroding the very foundation of this traditional concept.

First, the pedagogical value of memorization-based knowledge has been fundamentally diminished. When students can instantly access precise summaries of legal statutes, judicial interpretations, academic perspectives, and even global case law through natural language queries, the relative value of traditional teaching methods—such as extensive memorization of legal texts, recitation of case law, and literature review—has plummeted. Knowledge acquisition has shifted from a long-term accumulation of "professional skills" to a near-zero-threshold "generalized operation." This compels educators to confront a critical question: In the age of artificial intelligence, what constitutes the core value of law school classrooms?

Secondly, the competency landscape of the legal profession is undergoing structural transformation. AI-powered legal tools now proficiently handle routine tasks like contract review, initial compliance screening, document drafting, and evidence categorization—functions that once served as the foundation for junior legal professionals to establish careers and accumulate experience. The core demands of the legal profession are rapidly shifting toward domains where AI cannot replace human expertise: addressing novel complex cases involving unprecedented value conflicts; conducting client communication and dispute resolution requiring deep empathy, strategic negotiation, and cross-cultural understanding; critically evaluating AI-generated legal analyses and predictive judgments; and innovating institutional frameworks and rule design at the intersection of law, technology, business, and ethics. In short, the job market no longer requires "knowledge repository specialists," but rather "complex problem solvers," "value balancers," and "rule innovators."

Therefore, the traditional legal education philosophy centered on knowledge transmission has become outdated and narrow-minded. It faces a "paradigm crisis" and urgently needs to transition to a broader and deeper "new liberal arts" training model. The new educational objectives must transcend knowledge delivery and focus on: 1. Cultivating higher-order thinking skills: including critical thinking, systematic thinking, and innovative thinking; 2. Developing human-machine collaboration literacy: enabling students to master efficient and critical use of AI tools, clarify the boundaries of human-machine division of labor, and become "commanders" rather than "subordinates" in collaborative workflows; 3. Shaping solid professional ethics and values: in an environment where technological omnipotence prevails, emphasizing adherence to core legal values such as fairness, justice, human rights, and procedural legitimacy, as well as ethical reflection and responsibility when applying technology. This conceptual transformation requires comprehensive restructuring of curriculum systems, teaching methods, and evaluation standards, with its complexity and challenges constituting a fundamental challenge.

2.2 Risk of Technological Dependence and Weakening of Subjectivity

While technological progress empowers the subject, it is always accompanied by the risk of "alienation". When artificial intelligence is deeply embedded in the entire process of teaching and learning, a profound crisis of "subjective weakening" begins to emerge, threatening the essence of legal education as "human education".

First, the potential "atrophy" of students' critical thinking and innovative spirit. The convenience of generative AI is a double-edged sword. When students become accustomed to asking AI questions and receiving structurally complete, well-formulated answers, draft documents, or even thesis frameworks, their motivation for independent, in-depth cognitive work may weaken. This could lead to mental inertia, where students settle for the "optimal solution" path provided by AI, abandoning efforts to engage in multi-perspective, disruptive thinking about the problem itself. This further results in the deterioration of argumentation skills and a lack of critical reflection. AI answers often present themselves with confident, authoritative tones, making it easy for beginners to accept them uncritically, thereby weakening their habits of questioning authority and examining the premises and implicit biases of arguments. When technology can provide the illusion of "standard answers," the drive to explore diverse, even contradictory legal interpretation

paths diminishes. Yet the vitality of law lies precisely in this diversity and debate.

Secondly, the "alienation" of educational subject relationships and the erosion of humanistic values. In traditional legal education, teachers serve not only as knowledge transmitters but also as shapers of students' thinking patterns, guides for professional ethics, and mentors for character development. The interactions between teachers and students during classroom debates, after-class tutoring, and clinical education are filled with emotional exchanges, value guidance, and personal influence. However, when artificial intelligence demonstrates powerful and even more efficient capabilities in knowledge, assignment feedback, and resource recommendations—functions traditionally associated with "teaching" and "resolving doubts" —the traditional authoritative status of teachers is challenged. More alarmingly, if technological applications become extreme, leading to direct, in-depth, and non-utilitarian intellectual exchanges between teachers and students being largely replaced by human-computer interactions, the most precious dimension of education— "nurturing character" —may face the risk of erosion. Legal education could degenerate into a purely technical process of knowledge and skill transmission, rather than a humanistic process that fosters wisdom, values, and character development through teacher-student collaboration.

2.3 Teaching Quality and Ethical Crisis Caused by Technical Inherent Defects

The imperfection of artificial intelligence technology itself directly translates into specific risks in teaching application scenarios, which may compromise teaching quality, distort legal cognition, and undermine academic ethics.

First, the risk of knowledge distortion caused by algorithmic bias and data limitations. AI models derive their knowledge and judgments from training data. If the training data inherently contains systemic biases related to race, gender, or socioeconomic status, or if the data distribution is severely imbalanced, the AI may unconsciously replicate or even amplify these biases when interpreting legal concepts, analyzing cases, or predicting verdicts. For instance, in criminal sentencing simulation algorithms, historical data might reveal discriminatory tendencies toward certain groups. This could severely mislead students' understanding of legal fairness and objectivity, contradicting the fundamental goal of legal education to promote justice and equity.

Second, the impact of "model hallucinations" on legal rigor. Generative AI exhibits a phenomenon known as "hallucinations" —content that appears logical and professional but actually contains fabricated legal provisions, non-existent case citations, flawed reasoning, or fabricated academic viewpoints. In the legal field, which demands precision and authority, such hallucinations pose significant risks. If students uncritically accept AI-generated content without rigorous training or teacher review, they may not only acquire incorrect knowledge but also develop a distorted understanding of legal uncertainty and ambiguity, eroding their fundamental respect for the rigor of legal texts and the authority of judicial decisions.

Third, the severe challenges confronting academic integrity systems. AI-generated assignments, papers, and even exam answers have made academic misconduct remarkably convenient, concealed, and resistant to detection through traditional plagiarism detection methods. This has triggered a profound ethical crisis in academia. It blurs the boundaries of originality, undermines the fairness of academic evaluation, and complicates the assessment of students' genuine learning outcomes and capabilities. If left unchecked, this trend will fundamentally erode the integrity foundation upon which academic communities rely, while also undermining the credibility of the competence commitments embodied in degree certificates.

Fourth, the "information cocoon" effect and the narrowing of cognitive horizons. While algorithms designed to enhance learning efficiency through personalized recommendations aim to improve efficiency, they may inadvertently confine students to their established knowledge interests and viewpoints. These systems tend to consistently recommend literature from theoretical

schools they endorse and case analyses aligned with their preconceived positions, while filtering out information that challenges their perspectives. Such algorithmic "tailoring to preferences" may unintentionally limit students' exposure to diverse viewpoints, interdisciplinary knowledge, and critical opposing opinions. This hinders the development of open, inclusive, and comprehensive thinking horizons, which contradicts the spirit of legal education that seeks truth through debate.

3. Paradigm Innovation and Path Exploration: Reform Strategies for Legal Education in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

3.1 Fundamental Conceptual Transformation: Establishing a Learning–Centered and Student–Centered Approach

The traditional teacher–centered, textbook–centered, and classroom–centered indoctrination model must give way to a constructivist paradigm that prioritizes 'learning' and 'students'. This shift is rooted in the philosophy that knowledge is not a static, passively received entity, but rather a dynamic construct actively shaped by learners through interactions with their environment, peers, teachers, and tools.

Under this new paradigm, the core focus of instructional design has shifted from "what to teach" to "how to facilitate learning." Teachers 'roles have evolved from being "authoritative knowledge transmitters" to becoming "designers of learning processes," "catalysts for cognitive development," and "collaborators in deep inquiry." Classroom instruction now prioritizes creating thought–provoking tasks and scenarios that stimulate students' active exploration, collaborative discussions, and reflective iterations, rather than merely covering textbook content. Artificial intelligence should strictly adhere to the principle of "empowering human potential" —functioning as a powerful cognitive enhancer, personalized learning companion, and infinitely expandable resource environment. Its fundamental purpose is to liberate teachers and students, enabling them to focus on higher–order activities that require unique human wisdom, emotions, and judgment. We must remain vigilant against the pitfalls of technology becoming a "teacher substitute" or "mind–set fixer," while steadfastly upholding teachers' leading role, guiding influence, and irreplaceable humanistic values in education. This conceptual transformation serves as the "master switch" and value anchor for all subsequent concrete reform measures.

3.2 Reconstruction of Teaching Content and Methods

The design of teaching content requires structural adjustments. While ensuring solid foundational knowledge in core disciplines such as jurisprudence, constitutional law, civil law, and criminal law, substantial reductions should be made to purely memorization–based content. Instead, systematic emphasis should be placed on training modules that enhance key competencies, including legal hermeneutics, legal reasoning and argumentation, complex evidence analysis, legal negotiation and drafting, critical thinking, and innovative approaches to solving intricate legal issues. Furthermore, the curriculum must maintain dynamic openness by organically integrating cutting–edge legal topics of the digital era—such as AI governance, data property rights, algorithmic compliance, digital platform liability, and bioethics—into the teaching system through thematic modules or cross–course thematic threads.

The first step is to proactively incorporate generative AI outputs as teaching materials. Educators can design specific tasks where students pose legal questions to AI systems, then evaluate the AI–generated case analyses, legal opinions, or draft judgments through three key assessments: authenticity verification (checking if legal provisions and case citations are authentic), logical scrutiny (assessing the coherence of reasoning chains and identifying any leaps or contradictions), and bias detection (analyzing whether conclusions reflect specific value biases or data distortions). This process transforms AI from a "answer provider" into a "targeted resource for critical thinking training," effectively cultivating students' ability to discern information, maintain logical rigor, and develop value judgment awareness.

Secondly, we should vigorously develop and promote the application of virtual reality, augmented reality, and high-fidelity simulation technologies. It is essential to establish immersive virtual simulation projects that cover multiple domains and levels, including civil trials, criminal investigations, administrative hearings, intellectual property arbitration, internet court proceedings, and cross-border M&A negotiations. In these highly realistic environments, students can repeatedly engage in role-playing, procedural drills, and on-the-spot decision-making, gaining near-realistic practical immersion and skill muscle memory. This approach significantly compensates for the limitations of traditional internships in terms of opportunities, costs, and risk control.

This methodology implements project-based learning through complex real-world or simulated legal scenarios. Students collaborate in teams, assuming diverse roles within the project. They must plan and execute human-machine collaboration, utilizing AI tools to efficiently complete tasks including legal research, literature review, preliminary data analysis, and draft document generation. Simultaneously, the team must pool human expertise to formulate strategies, construct core arguments, evaluate value trade-offs, negotiate, and ultimately integrate and refine the final solution. Throughout the process, instructors provide continuous guidance, and the final assessment evaluates both the quality of project outcomes and the effectiveness of human-machine collaboration strategies. This approach systematically cultivates students' comprehensive abilities in teamwork, project management, and human-machine collaboration for solving complex practical problems.

3.3 Reform of Teaching Design and Management Model

On one hand, we implement data-driven precision teaching management. By leveraging learning analytics technology, we integrate multimodal data generated from students' interactions on online learning platforms, virtual simulation systems, and interactive Q&A sessions to create dynamic, comprehensive "digital learning portfolios" for each student. These portfolios not only reflect knowledge mastery but also capture students' thinking patterns, learning habits, and interest trajectories. Based on this, the system can provide personalized learning resource recommendations, adaptive learning path planning, and early warnings for potential knowledge gaps or learning difficulties. This enables teachers to offer timely and precise academic support and tutoring, achieving an organic integration of large-scale education and personalized cultivation.

On the other hand, we should strengthen the design of deep interactive teaching based on dialogue. Drawing from the experiential learning circle theory, instructional design should systematically enhance and optimize dialogue and interaction components both inside and outside the classroom. This includes but is not limited to: Socratic-style Q&A based on case studies, structured debates around contentious issues, collaborative problem-solving in groups, and peer review. In these activities, teachers' core responsibilities involve designing high-quality problem scenarios, guiding conversations to deeper levels, encouraging idea collisions, and promoting reflective integration. Artificial intelligence can serve as an "interactive enhancer" in this context— for example, by providing real-time data or case studies to support discussions, generating opposing viewpoints to spark debates, or recording discussion processes to create visual maps that help teachers and students review thought processes. Data-driven precision management provides the foundation and starting point for deep interaction, while such interaction generates new, richer learning data. This creates a virtuous cycle that collectively transforms teaching structures from one-way, static transmission to two-way, dynamic co-creation.

3.4 Teaching Evaluation and Academic Ethics System Innovation

On one hand, the evaluation system must transition toward a "diversified, process-oriented, and competency-based" framework. The weight of standardized test scores in overall assessments should be substantially reduced, establishing a composite evaluation system that better reflects students' comprehensive competencies and developmental progress. This system should

incorporate classroom participation and debate performance, operational records and reports of virtual simulation experiments, process logs and final outcomes of human-computer collaborative projects, research-based learning reports, peer review results, oral defenses, and personal learning reflection journals. By leveraging technological tools to comprehensively document and analyze students' learning trajectories, evaluations can be truly embedded throughout the learning process, enabling fairer and more holistic measurement of students' efforts, progress, and advanced competency development.

The other party must concurrently establish clear and actionable academic standards and ethical education systems for AI usage. Law schools and departments should promptly develop and issue the "Guidelines for the Use of Generative AI in Learning and Research," explicitly informing students: which scenarios permit AI usage, and which scenarios restrict or prohibit it. All AI-assisted assignments and reports must clearly specify the scope of AI application, specific tools used, and generated content, with students bearing ultimate responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, and academic integrity of final outputs. This regulatory education should be integrated into freshman orientation, academic writing courses, and all curriculum syllabi. Concurrently, legal professional ethics education must be strengthened unprecedentedly. Through case-based teaching, clinical training, and mock trials, in-depth discussions should be embedded regarding new ethical issues in the AI era—such as lawyers 'confidentiality obligations, judges' neutrality, evidence authenticity, and algorithmic bias. This approach will guide students to critically reflect on how to uphold the eternal core values of fairness, justice, and conscience in the technological tide.

4. epilogue

The impact of artificial intelligence on legal education is revolutionary—it is neither a mere flood of beasts nor a panacea for all ills. At its core, it represents a profound "mutual empowerment": legal education must leverage artificial intelligence to modernize teaching paradigms and cultivate talents capable of navigating the complex legal landscape of the future. Simultaneously, legal education must also, with its profound humanistic spirit, rigorous normative system, and deep ethical reflection, delineate boundaries and provide value guidance for the development and application of artificial intelligence technologies, ensuring that technology serves good purposes. The success of future legal education will depend on whether we can uphold the wisdom of "a gentleman's nature is not different; he skillfully utilizes things," and under the guidance of human value, ingeniously integrate the power of artificial intelligence as a "thing" into the entire process of legal talent cultivation. This is a path of reform that requires continuous exploration and dynamic adjustment, with the ultimate goal of building a new-era legal education system that is intelligent, personalized, practical, and committed to its original educational mission, laying a solid talent foundation for the construction of a rule-of-law China.

Project Details:

Yibin University's Teaching Reform Project: Applications and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education.

References:

[1] Yu Wenguang. Innovation and Reform of Case Teaching Paradigm in the Era of Artificial Intelligence [J]. Research on Legal Education, 2024(49):293-313.

[2] Wu Fubo. The Transformation, Challenges and Responses of Legal Education in the Era of Artificial Intelligence [J]. Research on Legal Education, 2024(49):269-292.

[3] Deng H, Chen C. The impact of ChatGPT, the new generation of artificial intelligence, on legal education: challenges, opportunities, and future [J]. Research on Legal Education, 2023(47):65-79.

[4]Zhang Li, Xu Chenxin. Cultivating new-generation legal professionals: New responsibilities in the digital transformation of legal education [J]. Research on Legal Education, 2024(49):245-268.

[5] Liu Xieci, Yang Haibo. The Value, Risks, and Countermeasures of Generative AI in Legal Education: A Case Study of ChatGPT [J]. Research on Legal Education, 2023(47):80-100.

About the Author:

Liu Feng (b. April 1991), male, Han ethnicity, native of Huangshi, Hubei Province, holds a Master's degree in Law.