

Gordana Ignjatović, BA*

ESP/LE Lecturer,

Faculty of Law, University of Niš,

Republic of Serbia

DOI:10.5937/zrpfni-56986

AI TECHNOLOGIES IN LEGAL EDUCATION: Milestones and Signposts for AI Integration

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence (AI) has prompted change in many walks of life but also generated ample concerns. The application of AI technologies in legal education and practice is still a contentious issue due to the lack of a comprehensive normative framework and structured approach to AI integration. In this context, this paper explores the use of AI technologies in legal education at the international and national levels. After the introductory overview of diverse approaches to AI integration worldwide, the paper first explores the integration practices in developed countries and the current circumstances in Serbia in order to identify good practices which may serve as guidelines in the process of integrating AI technologies in Serbian legal education. Relying on the research results, the second part analyzes how the major AI integration issues have been addressed by law schools in developed countries, particularly in view of instituting viable frameworks for structured, responsible and flexible applications in their legal contexts. Reviewing the key findings, the author discusses the implications, opportunities and considerations for AI integration in Serbian legal education, based on the blended learning and integrated curriculum frameworks aligned with the principles of human-centered, competency-based and pedagogy-driven instructional design.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), AI technologies, legal education, good practices, AI integration.

* goga@prafak.ni.ac.rs; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6393-4933>

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has had a transformative impact in many sectors but also raised various technical, social, legal and ethical issues. In response, international, regional and national institutions adopted regulatory frameworks on AI in general¹ or in particular sectors, such as education.² Relying on the OECD AI principles (2019), competent institutions outlined the observed benefits and risks, identified the requisite technical, procedural and educational tools³, mapped the AI integration stages, and thus enabled individual states to embark on developing national policies, strategies, guidelines and resources. In that process, countries took different governance approaches to AI integration.

Some countries opted for the *systemic approach* by enacting AI-specific documents (Brazil AI Bill, 2020; Bill, Canada's draft AI & Data Act 2022; EU AI Act 2024) as a general framework for regulating AI use across all sectors; they provided the key infrastructure (governance bodies, data centers, research hubs, AI regulatory "sandboxes" for policy development, AI observatories) and established multi-stakeholder expert groups for developing general policies, strategies, guidelines (OECD AI Observatory, 2023).⁴ For example, the EU enacted several general normative acts on AI;⁵ Council of Europe (CoE) adopted general acts in high-risk legal contexts,⁶ and some states adopted general AI policies

1 See: OECD AI Observatory (2025a). National AI policies & strategies, <https://oecd.ai/en/dashboards/overview>; (accessed 10.1.2025)

2 For more on the international, regional and national regulatory frameworks, see: Ignjatović, 2024a: 239-248.

3 The essential AI integration tools are: a) *technical tools* (tech toolkits, standards. documentation ensuring performance, safety, transparency, bias detection); b) *procedural tools* (codes of conduct, procedures. risk management); and c) *educational tools* (for capacity building, integrating AI tools, material design, training programs) (OECD AI Observatory, 2025b).

4 OECD AI Observatory (2023). How countries are implementing the OECD Principles for Trustworthy AI, 31.10.2023.

5 The EU enacted the *EU AI Act* (2024), the *EC Ethics Guidelines on Trustworthy AI* (2019), and proposed the *EC AI Liability Directive* (2022) which envisages tort liability in AI-related cases. For more, see: Ignjatović, 2024a: 242-245.

6 The CoE adopted documents regulating ethical AI use in the administration of justice and human rights: a) the *CEPEJ European Ethical Charter on the use of AI in judicial systems* (2018); and b) the *CoE Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law* (2024). For more, see: COE/CEPEJ (2019), and CoE (2024).

(Poland)⁷, strategies (Australia, Canada, UK⁸), ethical guidelines (Malta⁹) and general guidelines in specific sectors, such as education (EU¹⁰, USA¹¹).

Some states pursued the *sector-specific approach*, regulating AI use in a specific public sector.¹² In the field of education, the UNESCO adopted various documents on AI use in education and research,¹³ while individual states developed recommendations and guidelines for schools/teachers/students (Chile, Estonia, Germany, Norway, USA). Competent institutions, such as the EC European Digital Education Hub on AI (EC/EDEH, 2023), mapped the key stages in AI integration activities: a) education *about* AI (basic AI literacy/skills); b) education *for* AI (competency-based training programs); and c) education *with* AI (pedagogy-driven design, teaching/learning, assessment). In addition, some states (Australia, Canada/Quebec¹⁴, UK) developed specific documents on higher education, while some states established national AI centers (UK)¹⁵,

7 See: OECD AI Observatory (2021). Poland AI Policy 2020 (in 6 areas: society, public sector, business, science, education, cooperation). https://wp.oecd.ai/app/uploads/2021/12/Poland_Policy_for_Artificial_Intelligence_Development_in_Poland_from_2020_2020.pdf

8 See: HM Government UK (2021). National AI Strategy, UK Government, 2021 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/614db4d1e90e077a2cbdf3c4/National_AI_Strategy_-_PDF_version.pdf

9 See: MDIA/Malta Digital Innovation Authority (2019). Malta's National AI Strategy, <https://www.mdia.gov.mt/malta-ai-strategy/>; (also see: Ethical AI Framework, Ultimate AI Launchpad 2030 Strategic Enablers: Education & Workforce) (accessed 15.1.2025)

10 The EC *Ethical Guidelines on the use of AI and data for educators* (2022) were followed by *AI Skills Strategy for Europe* (ARISA, 2023) and updated DigCompEdu framework with AI skills (AI Pioneers, 2024). For more, see: Ignjatović, 2024a:242-243.

11 See: US Department of Education (2023). AI and the Future of Teaching and Learning, Educational Technology Office, US Department of Education, Washington, DC, May 2023, <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf>

12 See: OECD AI Observatory (2025a). National AI policies & strategies, <https://oecd.ai/en/dashboards/overview>; see documents on the public sector (governance, public services, employment, health) adopted in Ireland, Australia, Canada, UK, USA.

13 The UNESCO resources include: *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (2021); *Readiness Assessment Methodology* (2023); *Guidance for Generative AI in education and research* (2023); the *AI Competency Framework for Teachers and Students* (2024); and the *Guide for using GenAI in higher education* (2023). For more, see: Ignjatović, 2024a:239-241.

14 See: CSE/CEST (2024). Generative AI in Higher Education: Pedagogical and Ethical Issues, Conseil supérieur de l'éducation et Commission de l'éthique en science et en technologie, Gouvernement du Québec, Le Conseil, La Commission, 2024; <https://www.cse.gouv.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/50-0566-SU-IA-generative-enseignement-superieur-enjeux-ethiques.pdf>

15 See: UK/National Centre for AI (2024). Navigating the Future: Higher Education policies and guidance on GenAI, (C.Barker), 31 July 2024, National centre for AI/Jisc Involve, UK

AI ecosystem (Finland)¹⁶, HE hubs (Australia)¹⁷ or observatories (Canada)¹⁸ for sharing AI policies, guidelines, good practices and resources, and assisting HE institutions in AI integration (OECD Report, 2024:142-144).

Some states resorted to the *subject-specific approach* by developing documents on diverse topics. We may refer to some documents and resources developed in the HE sector for the purposes of the administration, tech support, library services, research, staff/student training, curriculum design, instruction, assessment. While some universities have general AI policies (St Andrew's, UHI, Scotland),¹⁹ others offer subject-specific guidelines for the administration, researchers, instructors and students (Cape Town Uni, South Africa; Yale, USA).²⁰ University libraries provide guides on AI tools (Eaton, 2023)²¹ and pedagogical resources on AI literacy/skills, tutorials, workshops, webinars (Arizona Uni Libraries, 2025).²² Many universities offer various learning opportunities: degree programs, research projects, professional training, open online courses (FCAI,

(agency hosting UK national AI community platform); <https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2024/07/31/navigating-the-future-higher-education-policies-and-guidance-on-generative-ai/>

16 See: FCAI (2025). Finish AI ecosystem, Finnish Center for AI, Aalto University, University of Helsinki and VTT Technical research Center of Finland, <https://fcai.fi/ai-ecosystem-in-finland> (accessed 15.1.2025)

17 See: TEQSA (2023). Higher education good practice hub, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, Australian Government, <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/higher-education-good-practice-hub/artificial-intelligence>

18 See: HESA (2023). AI in Canadian Higher Education, Higher Education Strategy Associates, Toronto, Canada, 18 Oct. 2023; <https://higherstrategy.com/ai-in-canadian-higher-education-an-update/>; AI Observatory, <https://higherstrategy.com/ai-observatory-home>

19 See: St. Andrews University (2024). Use of personal data with GenAI, St. Andrews University, Scotland, <https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/policy/information-governance-and-management-information-security/use-of-generative-ai-llm.pdf>; UHI (2024). GenAI Policy, University of the Highlands and Islands, Inverness, Scotland, UK, <https://www.uhi.ac.uk/en/t4-media/one-web/university/about-uhi/governance/policies-and-regulations/policies/generative-ai/generative-ai-policy.pdf>

20 See: Cape Town Uni (2024). AI for Teaching/Learning, Center for Innovation in Learning & Teaching, Cape Town University, South Africa, <https://cilt.uct.ac.za/teaching-resources/artificial-intelligence-teaching-learning>; Yale Uni (2025). GenAI and Learning, <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/AIguidance>; (resources for teachers, students, researchers on AI literacy, tools, academic integrity, assessment, etc).

21 See: Eaton, L. (2023). Syllabi Policies for GenAI Tools (collaborative Google doc, created 16.1.2023, updated 3.1.2025), https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RMVwzjc10oMi8Blw_JUTcXvo2b2WRH86vw7mi16W3U/edit?tab=t.o

22 See: Arizona University Libraries (2025). AI Literacy in the Age of ChatGPT, UA Libraries, Tucson, Arizona, USA, <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/ai-literacy-instructors/intro>; Pedagogy, <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/ai-literacy-instructors/teaching>

2023; Helsinki Uni, 2025).²³ The Harvard AI Pedagogy Project (2023) provides valuable resources, tutorials and material for creative and critical pedagogy-driven AI use in different contexts (Harvard Uni AI, 2025).²⁴ Experts also identified the major AI integration risks in higher education: a) *AI for admissions* (administration, valuation, ranking); b) *AI for evaluation* (learning goals, outcomes, values, conduct); c) *AI for assessment* (performance, competencies, proficiency levels); and d) *AI for proctoring* (monitoring conduct, detecting abuse in tests/exams) (DEC/Digital Education Council, 2024). To address the assessment issues, British and Australian researchers devised the *AI Assessment Scale* (2024)²⁵, a flexible tool for selecting the relevant assessment approach in line with academic integrity policies, pedagogical goals and permissible/impermissible AI use (Perkins, Furze, Roe, MacVaugh, 2024: 2, 6), which may be used in devising course-specific policies.²⁶ By making such resources publically available, universities build a shared body of knowledge on AI use which may serve as examples of good practices for other institutions.

Despite ample benefits of using AI in education, there are still numerous dilemmas, based on ethical concerns and observed risks.²⁷ The dilemmas are even more prominent in legal education, which is traditionally conservative and rigid in changing conventional ways of handling data, environments and interactions. As the regulatory framework keeps lagging behind the prolific AI advances, there is a need to explore the current situation and practices at the

23 See: FCAI Education (2023). Learning about AI: continuing education, online and degree programs, Helsinki Uni, Finland, <https://fcai.fi/news/2023/5/30/many-paths-to-learning-about-ai-continuing-education-online-and-degree-programs>; Helsinki Uni (2025). AI Courses, <https://www.helsinki.fi/en/admissions-and-education/open-university/multidisciplinary-themed-modules/artificial-intelligence-collection>

24 Harvard Uni (2025). AI Pedagogy Project: Creative and critical engagement with AI in education, Harvard metaLAB,

25 The *AI Assessment Scale* (AIAS) includes a five-point scale for integrating GenAI tools by assessing permissible/impermissible AI use: 1) strictly prohibited AI use (admissions, tests, exams); 2) allowed use for AI-assisted research (to explore resources, brainstorm/generate/structure ideas, summarize texts; collaborative writing, feedback, data analysis, visualization); 3) AI-assisted editing without using AI-generated content (to revise grammar, spelling, citation, word choice, sentence structure); 4) limited AI use (for comparison, interpretation, critical evaluation) with referencing AI-generated content; 5) fully allowed AI use without referencing AI content (to enhance creativity, exploration, feedback; to assess GenAI performance, create products/artifacts for non-commercial purposes) (Perkins, *et al.* 2024: 6-10; University of Maine, 2024).

26 See: Northern Illinois Uni (2025). Class Policies for AI tools, Center for Innovative Teaching/Learning, Northern Illinois Uni, <https://www.niu.edu/citl/resources/guides/class-policies-for-ai-tools.shtml>;

27 For more on the observed benefits and risks, see: Ignjatović, 2024a:248-250.

global level in order to examine the capacities in local contexts and prepare for a sustainable AI integration in legal education and practice.

2. AI in Legal Education: Current situation in developed countries and in Serbia

Legal education has the crucial role in preparing future professionals to handle different legal issues in real-world contexts. The traditional legal education was largely based on *ex cathedra* teaching and hierarchical teacher-student roles. In the 20th century, law schools recognized the relevance of experiential learning (legal clinics, moot courts, internships) in promoting lawyer skills (legal reasoning, analysis, critical thinking, problem-solving) and practical soft skills (communication, management, leadership, digital skills) in real-life contexts (Fornasier, 2021: 5, 7). Digital technologies brought new learning opportunities and generated significant changes in instructional design, practices and teacher-student roles.²⁸ In the 21st century, the growing use of AI technologies in different legal contexts (education, research, professional training, project management, practice, judiciary) has brought new challenges. In legal education, it entails tackling not only complex technical issues (legal technology, infrastructure, support) and educational issues (AI literacy/competencies, pedagogy) but also many social and legal issues (ethics, equity, regulation, governance, supervision) (Balan, 2024: 324-325). There are opinions that sustainable AI integration may bring new personalized learning opportunities and equip legal professionals with requisite AI skills which are highly desirable in the competitive legal market (Balan, 2024: 325,327,328). On the other hand, there are doubts about the transformative impact of AI technologies and their viability in high-risk contexts (legal writing, document drafting, assessment, legal clinics, judicial practice) (Dorf, 2023; Karr, Schultz, 2024).

Given that current circumstances and practices significantly vary, both in terms of disproportionate availability of AI tools and diverse attitudes to AI integration, we first focus on the use of AI technologies in legal education and practice in developed counties (worldwide) and at the national level (Serbia).

2.1. AI in Legal Education and practice in developed countries worldwide

Given that legal education and practice are closely correlated, the extensive research focused on AI use and related issues in legal technology, legal education, professional development/training, legal practice and judiciary. For the purposes of this paper, we will focus on several topics: a) the attitudes of legal scholars, practitioners and law students to AI use for legal purposes;

²⁸ For more on Digital Learning in legal education, see: Ignjatović, 2024b.

b) the actual application of AI tools in legal education, research, practice and judicial contexts; and c) developments in legal technology and AI tools used in legal contexts. As the results contain common issues and cross-references, the research findings on these topics will be presented summatively, per legal sector and interest group.

Generally, the reports by national law societies, bar associations and judicial authorities in the UK, US, Canada and Australia show that legal professionals increasingly use AI tools for different purposes: a) legal operations management (time-tracking, billing, accounting, data analytics, data-driven decisions); b) client management (intake/triage of requests, calls, appointments, legal services); c) legal research, case management, legal analytics; d) document/case management (summarizing, generating transcripts of client interviews, drafting statements, deposition questions, contracts, legal briefs, reports); e) e-discovery (fact-finding, analysis, predicting risks/performance/outcomes); f) risk assessment, predictive analytics, law compliance; g) administrative tasks and transactional writing (legal correspondence, newsletters, press releases); h) AI legal chatbots for basic legal advice/consultation and legal assistants for complex interactions and specialized department tasks (customer service, IT support, HR management, marketing, payments) (Stanford LS, 2024²⁹; ABA, 2024³⁰; UK Law Society, 2024³¹; CBA, 2025³²; NWS Law Society, 2024³³); and i) court administration (automated e-filing, triage/allocation of cases, legal research on legislation and case law, judgments, books, articles), case management, predictive justice (risk assessment, outcomes, sentencing),

29 Stanford Law School (2024). Use AI in Legal Practice, Juelsgaard Clinic, Stanford Law School, Stanford, CA, USA.

30 ABA/American Bar Association (2024). ABA Task Force on Law&AI: Report on the Impact of AI on the Practice of Law, 2024

31 UK Law Society (2024). How AI is reshaping the future of legal practice, The Law Society, UK, 20 Nov. 2024.

32 CBA/Canadian Bar Association (2025). Use of AI in Legal Practice: an overview, CBA. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

33 NSW Law Society (2024). AI for Legal Professionals, Law Society of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.

support in decision-making, and online dispute resolution (AIJA, 2022³⁴; UK Judiciary, 2023³⁵; US NCSC, 2024³⁶; CJC, 2024³⁷).

In terms of *legal professionals*, the Bloomberg survey (2024) reports that 46% of legal practitioners use AI for legal research, e-discovery, reviewing legal document, drafting communications, contracts, case pleadings (Bloomberg Law, 2024).³⁸ The Thompson Reuters survey (2024) shows different attitudes of legal practitioners to AI integration: positive (44%), hesitant (35%), concerned (18%). GenAI tools are used by 12% of respondents, while 45% do not intend to use them (ThRI, 2024:3).³⁹ Education *about* AI is low (21%) and most law firms (62%) have no AI policies; respondents urge for investments and staff training for sector-specific purposes (ThRI, 2024:18, 28). In the USA alone, a survey (Ironclad, 2024) reveals that 71% of practitioners trust AI tools, 74% use them, and 92% report improved performance in legal research, administrative tasks, contract review, but they underscore concerns about policy, inaccuracy, data privacy, security, unethical use/abuse, over-reliance on AI, etc.(U-Arizona Law Library, 2025b).⁴⁰

In *judicial contexts*, GenAI tools are used in legal research, predictive justice, drafting documents, but many US courts prohibit their use for drafting court submissions or require disclosure of used AI tools. Despite many benefits in terms of efficiency and productivity (time-management, data analytics, automating repetitive tasks), judges professional are still skeptical or reluctant to use AI in adjudication due to identified risks and possible abuses (U-Arizona LawLib, 2025c).⁴¹ Judicial professionals warn about risks and limitations (data privacy, security, inaccuracies, bias, discrimination, misleading, outdated or

34 AIJA/Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration (2022). AI Decision-Making and Courts, AIJA, Sydney, NS Wales.

35 UK Judiciary (2023). AI Guidance for Judicial Office Holders, UK Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, 12. 12.2023,

36 NCSC/National Center for State Courts (2024). Guidance for use of AI and GenAI in Courts, AI Rapid Response Team, NCSC.

37 CJC/Canadian Judicial Council (2024).Guidelines for the Use of AI in Canadian Courts, 2024, CJC, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

38 Bloomberg Law (2024). Legal Workers use AI for Research (S.Pacheco), Bloomberg Law, 4.4.2024.

39 The survey (Jan.2024) included 1,128 legal professionals from the US, UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (ThRI, 2024).

40 See: Arizona Uni Law Library (2025b). ChatGPT and GenAI Legal Research Guide: Surveys of Lawyers' ChatGPT use, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9997098>; <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9655948>

41 See: Arizona Uni. LawLib (2025c). ChatGPT and GenAI Legal Research Guide: Judicial policies about GenAI use, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9805733>; <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9671724>

AI-fabricated data, intellectual property infringements, deepfake technology abuses) and stress the need for constant human supervision, robust safeguards and training to mitigate risks. They underscore the users' responsibility to preserve professional independence, accountability, procedural fairness, validity of presented evidence, data confidentiality and security (AIJA, 2022:5; UK Judiciary, 2013:3-5; CJC, 2024:2; US NCSC, 2024:2).

In terms of *legal technologies* (platforms, software and tools),⁴² AI tools are already integrated in proprietary legal AI tools (Lexis, Westlaw). A report on legal trends in the US reveals that legal AI tools may automate 74% of legal work; they are used by 79% of legal professionals (8% fully, 17% widely, 21% partially, 34% minimally) while 21% do not use them (Clio, 2024).⁴³ Stanford researchers' comparative assessment of two legal AI tools and a ChatGPT (2024)⁴⁴ shows that GenAI models misinterpret facts, make reasoning errors, fail to identify false prompts, generate incomplete answers and incorrect citations, and "hallucinate" (fabricate non-existent data) (Magesh, Surani, Dahl, Suzgun, Manning, Ho, 2024: 8,15). Yet, in a research experiment, OpenAI ChatGPT-4 managed to pass the simulated US Uniform Bar Exam (July 2022),⁴⁵ scoring 74% on average,

42 AI-based legal technologies include: a) *legal research softwares* [Bloomberg Law, Lexis, Westlaw] and platforms [Law ChatGPT, Harvey] (Legal Practice, 2025); b) *legal practice and project management softwares* [Clio, CloudLex] (Project Manager, 2024); c) *AI chatbots* [LawDruid, Harvey]; *AI legal assistants* [CoCounsel] and drafting assistants [CoDraft]; *legal AI agents* [Teneo, Claude]; and d) other tools: *legal e-discovery tools* [Everlaw], *legal analytics* [LexMachina, Factcase], *legal AI-powered receptionists and voice assistants* [Smith, Streamline] (Checkbox AI, 2024). See: Checkbox AI (2024). Legal AI Tools: A Guide for Lawyers and Legal Professionals, Checkbox Technology, Sidney/New York/Singapore, 29 Nov. 2024; <https://www.checkbox.ai/blog/legal-ai-tools-a-guide-for-lawyers-and-legal-professionals>; Project Manager (2024). Best Legal Project Management Software, (B.Schwartz), 11.12.2024, <https://www.projectmanager.com/blog/best-legal-project-management-software>; Legal Practice (2025). Best Law Firm Software on the Market 2025, (B.Aston), 13.1.2025, <https://thelegalpractice.com/tools/best-law-firm-software/>

43 Clio (2024). Legal trends Report: The Future of AI in the Legal Industry; Clio/Themis Solutions Inc., Burnaby, BC, Canada.

44 Stanford researchers tested two legal AI tools (Lexis+, Westlaw) and a general-purpose ChatGPT across three factors: a) accuracy (correct, grounded responses); b) incomplete responses (unsupported by citation, authorities, facts), and c) hallucinations (false assumptions, AI-fabricated data). The results were as follows: a) accurate responses (L 65%, WL 19%, ChatGPT 49%); b) incomplete responses (L 18%, WL 62%, ChatGPT 8%); and c) hallucinations (L 17%, WL 19%, ChatGPT 43%) (Magesh, *et al.* 2024:8-9,13).

45 The US Uniform Bar Exam has 3 components: a) the Multistate Bar Examination/MBE (200 questions testing legal knowledge (in Constitutional Law, Criminal Law and Procedure, Evidence, Civil Procedure, Contracts, Torts, Real Property); b) the Multistate Essay Exam/MEE (essay writing to demonstrate legal analysis); and c) the Multistate Performance Test/MPT (assessing lawyer skills in real-life tasks). Chat GPT demonstrated 75.7% accuracy in MBE, and 4.2 (out of 6) in MEE and MPT (Katz, *et al.*, 2024:15-16, 1).

and outperforming an average human exam-taker (Katz, Bommarito, Gao, Arredondo, 2024:1). A comparative assessment of several GenAI models' performance in legal tasks shows their different capacities in terms of accuracy, reliability, task completion, and limitations in lawyer skills: legal reasoning, analysis, interpretation, drafting documents (U-Arizona LawLib, 2025d).⁴⁶ All presented reports note that AI cannot replace lawyers in higher-order tasks (LexisNexis, 2023:12) and stress the need to check the AI-generated results and ensure close scrutiny and ultimate human responsibility (Clio, 2024; Katz, *et al*, 2024:11; Magesh, *et al*, 2024:17). The awareness of these limitations is vital not only in the process of selecting relevant AI tools for specific legal purposes but also as a reminder to keep "humans in the loop" by supplementing AI with human reasoning, analysis and supervision (Thomson Reuters, 2024; Magesh, *et al*, 2024:17). All these insights from legal and judicial practice are highly relevant for AI integration in legal education, research and professional development/training contexts as they may guide educational institutions in developing tailored AI-related programs, courses or professional training opportunities.

In *legal education*, the responses to AI integration vary depending on available infrastructural, technological, administrative, socio-economic, cultural-environmental and human-resource capacities. Several surveys may illustrate law students and teachers' attitudes. The LexisNexis survey (2023) on the use of GenAI in the USA showed that 44% of law students used GenAI for legal research, drafting briefs, document analysis, email writing (LexisNexis, 2023:5). As for legal research, a study (Law360, 2023) reported that about 33% of US law professors used ChatGPT for research but very few (7%) believed that AI could change legal education (U-Arizona LawLib, 2025a).⁴⁷ The initial skepticism, resistance or reluctance to use AI in legal education, professional training and practice were caused by observed risks and concerns about abuse, inaccuracies and reliability, and fear that AI may make administrative legal posts (junior lawyers, legal assistants) redundant (Dorf, 2023).⁴⁸ To avoid students' abuse of AI tools, many law schools banned or restricted the use of AI tools.⁴⁹ Yet, as AI tools are increasingly integrated in legal technologies, the resistance seems futile because, sooner or later, the reluctant law schools

46 See: Arizona University LawLib (2025d). ChatGPT and GenAI Legal Research Guide: Comparison of Responses: ChatGPT-3.5, ChatGPT-4, Bing and Bard, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9625828>.

47 Arizona Uni Law Library (2025a). ChatGPT and GenAI Legal Research Guide: ChatGPT uses in Legal Education, AU Law Library, J.E.Rogers College of Law, University of Arizona, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9751262>

48 Dorf, M. C. (2023). Is Resistance to AI in the Law School Classroom Futile?, in: *Verdict*, Justia Legal Portal, 19 July 2023.

49 See: Arizona Uni LawLib (2025a). AI tools in Legal Education, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9838246>

and teachers may be compelled by the realities to examine opportunities and make informed decisions on viable AI applications in specific educational and professional development contexts (Farashah, 2025).⁵⁰

The conducted research shows that many law schools already provide relevant infrastructure, resources and learning opportunities: a) AI integration policies and guidelines (Stanford Law, 2023; Berkley Law, 2023)⁵¹; b) legal tech and innovation research hubs (Harvard Legal Tech Lab; Harvard MetaLab; Stanford LS Legal Design Lab; Duke Law Tech Lab; Helsinki/FL, 2025)⁵², and AI sandboxes (Harvard AI Sandbox)⁵³; c) AI research and professional development institutes (Berkley AI Institute, 2023)⁵⁴; d) AI-focused LLM degree programs (Berkley Law, 2024)⁵⁵, AI modules, courses, seminars, workshops on AI tools, legal tech, ethics, legal research/writing, e-discovery, project management (Georgetown Law, 2024)⁵⁶, formal/informal courses on AI technology in legal practice, governance, healthcare, cyberlaw, tort law, etc. (Yale Report, 2024:62)⁵⁷; e) professional practice simulation courses (Georgetown Law, 2025)⁵⁸, webinars

50 Farashah, N. (2025). AI in the Law Classroom: Good? Bad? Or Maybe Both? in: *Richmond Journal of Law and Technology*, 2025

51 See: Stanford Law School (2025). Clinic, Law School and University AI Policies and Syllabus Language, Juelsgard Clinic, SLS <https://law.stanford.edu/juelsgaard-intellectual-property-and-innovation-clinic/clinic-and-law-school-policies-and-syllabus-language/>; Barkley Law (2025). GenAI Policy, <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/library/legal-research/chatgpt>;

52 See: Harvard Uni (2025). Harvard Law Tech Lab (since 2010), <https://cyber.harvard.edu/research/lawlab>; Harvard metaLab (2025). Harvard metaLAB (2011), Harvard BK Center for Internet & Society, Cambridge, USA, <https://cyber.harvard.edu/research/metabolab>; Stanford LS (2025). Stanford Legal Design Lab (2013), <https://www.legaltechdesign.com/>; Duke LS (2025). Duke Law Tech Lab (2018), <https://dukelaawtechlab.com/>; Helsinki LS (2025), Legal Tech Lab, Law Faculty <https://www.helsinki.fi/en/networks/legal-tech-lab>;

53 See: HUIT (2025). AI Sandbox, Harvard University Information Technology, USA, <https://huit.harvard.edu/ai-sandbox>

54 See: Berkley Law AI Institute (2023). Innovative programs for legal professionals, CA, USA, <https://executive.law.berkeley.edu/>

55 See: Berkley Law (2024). Berkeley Law Unveils Groundbreaking AI-Focused Law Degree Program, UC Berkley Law School, <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/article/berkeley-law-unveils-groundbreaking-ai-law-degree-program/>

56 See: Georgetown Law (2024). AI & Law: what it means for legal education & lawyers, 2. Jan 2024, Washington, D.C., USA; <https://www.law.georgetown.edu/news/ai-the-law-what-it-means-for-legal-education-lawyers/>

57 See: Yale Uni (2025). GenAI and Learning: AI tools and resources, <https://ai.yale.edu/yales-ai-tools-and-resources#popular>; AI guidance for teachers, <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/AIguidance>; AI guidance for students, <https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/aiadvicestudents>;

58 See: Georgetown Law School (2025). First-year simulation courses 2025, Law Center for Experiential Learning, GLS, Wash. D.C., https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jTjbonzU_mYa9ox8gW41rtt-DjW7bpDK/view

on AI literacy/skills (Kent Uni LS, 2024)⁵⁹; f) library resources and support in research, teaching/learning (Yale Report, 2024:58); g) AI tools tech support, resources, practical advice (U-Arizona LawLib, 2025e)⁶⁰, GenAI prompt engineering workshops (Michigan Uni, 2025a)⁶¹, AI detection tools (MIT, 2025)⁶²; g) instructional design guides, publications, research resources (Helsinki/LT Lab, 2025; Stanford AI & Law Society, 2025)⁶³; h) informal online courses on AI in different legal areas (AI Lund, 2024)⁶⁴, AI literacy/skills for teachers/students (U-Michigan Online, 2025b)⁶⁵; i) AI technologies in extracurricular activities: legal clinics (KU Lueven, 2024)⁶⁶, legal aid, professional training, practice simulations (crime investigation, case scenarios, moot courts) (Slaw, 2024)⁶⁷; and j) innovative research projects: e.g. Human-Computer Interaction research on AI integration in VR/AR/XR tools to enhance immersive learning

59 See: Kent University (2024). Helping Students Develop Critical Thinking Skills when using AI, Digitally Enhanced Education Webinars, 22 Nov. 2024, <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLAbF8wnSF-e-jnk358eRLrwUyDe-Xm9ld>; Kent Law School (2024). Reimagining Assessment: Critical AI Analysis in Legal Education, <https://www.youtube.com/@digitallyenhancededucation554>, University of Kent Law School, Canterbury, UK.

60 See: Arizona Uni. LawLib (2025e). Legal Technology using GenAI, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9695253>

61 See: U-Michigan (2025a). GenAI: Prompt Library (by field), <https://genai.umich.edu/resources/prompt-library>; IT Services: GenAI Workshop Series, <https://academictechnology.umich.edu/get-help/training/instructional-support/genai-workshop-series>; (accessed 25.1. 2025)

62 See: MIT Sloan (2025). GenAI for Teaching & Learning: AI in Teaching, <https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/teach/>; AI for Teaching, <https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/effective-prompts/>; AI Detectors, <https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/teach/ai-detectors-dont-work>

63 See: Stanford AI & Law Society (2025) SAILS Education Resource Modules, <https://law.stanford.edu/stanford-artificial-intelligence-law-society-sails/sails-educations-resource-modules/>

64 See: AI Lund (2024). Online Courses (MOOCs), AI Lund (open network), Lund University, Sweden, <https://www.ai.lu.se/mooc>

65 See: U-Michigan (2025b). AI Courses, <https://online.umich.edu/search/?q=AI>; AI for Lawyers, <https://online.umich.edu/series/ai-for-lawyers-and-other-advocates/>, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

66 See: KU Lueven (2024). Legal Clinic on AI and Human Rights, KU Leuven Faculty of Law & Criminology, Lueven, Belgium, <https://www.law.kuleuven.be/legal-clinic-ai-and-human-rights>

67 See: Slaw (2024). Ten Practical Strategies for Law Schools to Embrace AI, (B.Perrin, UBC Allard School of Law), Slaw, Canada's online legal magazine, 26.11.2024, <https://www.slaw.ca/2024/11/26/10-practical-strategies-for-law-schools-to-embrace-ai/>

(Saarland University, 2024).⁶⁸ The presented examples illustrate a proactive, well-structured and supported competency-based approach to AI integration in legal education aimed at empowering the participants' learning *about, for* and *with* AI in legal contexts.

2.2. AI in Legal Education and practice in Serbia

The Republic of Serbia adopted the *AI Development Strategy* (2019) and the *Ethical Guidelines for the development of Trustworthy AI* (2023), established the basic infrastructure, and embarked on innovation in public administration, business sector and applied AI.⁶⁹ The new national *AI Development Strategy* for the period 2025-2030⁷⁰ promotes further development of the AI legislative⁷¹ and regulatory framework⁷², coordination and monitoring bodies, human resources through formal/informal education and training, investments in infrastructure and research, and increased application in the public sector priority areas (GovRS/NITRA, 2025:25). Currently, there are no binding legislative acts or by-laws on AI in general or AI in education (Stevanović, 2024:430), nor are there sector-specific policies, integration guidelines, training courses or institutional resources on AI integration in education (Ignjatović, 2024a:247).

In the field of higher education (HE), to promote research and dialogue on AI use, some universities hosted conferences on applied AI,⁷³ sector-specific conferences on AI in Education,⁷⁴ or sessions on AI in education.⁷⁵ Although the

68 See: HCI Lab (2025). Research seminar: Interacting with GenAI, Human-Computer Interaction Lab, Department of Computer Science, Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany, <https://hci.cs.uni-saarland.de/research-seminar-interacting-with-generative-ai/>

69 For more on the national regulatory framework and infrastructure, see: Ignjatović, 2024a: 245-247.

70 Gov.RS/NITRA (2025). Strategija razvoja vestacke inteligencije 2025-2030, Ministarstvo nauke, tehnoloskog razvoja i inovacija/Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation, *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 5/2025, 17.01.2025,

71 The current legal framework for addressing AI issues includes the Constitution (human rights) and relevant provision of intellectual property, criminal, contract, tort, commercial/trade, consumer, media legislation (Chambers& Partners, 2024).

72 The AI Strategy (2025) envisages that the action plan for the AI Strategy implementation will be adopted by mid-May 2025 while the Serbian AI act will be adopted by 2027 (Gov. RS/NITRA, 2025: 60, 26).

73 See: Kragujevac Uni (2022). First International Conference on Applied AI, University of Kragujevac, <http://www.aa2022.kg.ac.rs/>

74 See: FP/Faculty of Pedagogy Vranje (2024). Education and Artificial Intelligence (EDAI 2024), 30.11.2024, Pedagogical Faculty Vranje, University of Niš, Serbia; <https://www.pfvr.ni.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Book-of-Abstracts-2024.pdf>

75 See: IPST (2024). International Conference EMERGE 2024: *Ethics of AI Alignment* (Book of Abstracts), Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, Uni Belgrade (12.12.2024); <https://>

AI Strategy (2025) envisages various integration activities (education *about*, *for* and *with* AI), there is a general lack of formal/informal courses on AI literacy/skills and training, particularly in high-risk domains (admissions, evaluation, assessment, proctoring). In this regard, the EU-supported research project on education for applied AI (FAAI, 2022-2024)⁷⁶ yielded valuable insights for all HE institutions pursuing AI integration. The results show that the surveyed IT students have good opportunities to develop hard skills in applied AI but they lacked soft skills (communication, management, entrepreneurship, critical thinking, professional and life skills) and AI training for sector-specific applications. The teachers reported the need for AI training courses, tech-enhanced instruction, projects with sector-specific IT industries, professional development, experimentation and innovation (Đorđević, Milojković, Spasić, Rančić, Nikolić, Milovanović, 2023:359-361). These competencies are equally important for all HE teachers/students, who may also lack the basic AI literacy/skills for AI integration in specific contexts.

In *legal education* and professional training, the efforts aimed at ensuring informed, ethical and responsible AI use may be illustrated by Serbian law schools activities: a) introduced LLM programs or courses⁷⁷; b) organized conferences⁷⁸ and seminars⁷⁹ to discuss AI issues in different professional contexts; c) published books and articles on AI issues in different legal

emerge.ifdt.bg.ac.rs/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/book-of-abstracts-emerge-2024-1.pdf

76 Within the Erasmus+ project *Future is in Applied Artificial Intelligence* (FAAI, 2022-2024), involving participants from 5 countries, several surveys (2023) were conducted to identify the labour market needs (employers), institutional research needs (teachers), and students' needs (hard and soft skills). For more, see: Đorđević, *et al*, 2023: 359-363.

77 See: LF Niš (2024) LLM program Law & ICT (2021), Law Faculty, University of Niš (including a range of AI-related courses); <https://www.prafak.ni.ac.rs/files/studije/Studijski-program-master-studija-prava-inf-tehnologije.pdf>; LF Kragujevac (2024). Master Study: Intellectual Property Module (AI & Law course), LF Kragujevac; <https://www.jura.kg.ac.rs/index.php/sr/mas-moduli.htm>; University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies (2024). Master in Informatics and Computing (AI course), Kriminalističko-policijski univerzitet, Beograd, <https://www.kpu.edu.rs/cms/studije/drugi-stepen/master-informatika>; (accessed 25.12.2024)

78 See: LF Beograd (2023). Međ.konferencija o uticaju generativne veštačke inteligencije na oblast prava (Legal Practice and AI), Pravni fakultet Beograd, 17.11.2023, <https://www.ekapija.com/news/4452983/medjunarodna-konferencija-o-uticaju-generativne-vestacke-inteligencije-na-oblast-prava>; LF Beograd (2024). Veštačka inteligencija u poslovnom pravu (AI in Business Law), Konferencija *Internet dijalog* 2024, Pravni fakultet Beograd; <https://internetdijalog.ius.bg.ac.rs/publikacije/vestacka-inteligencija-izazovi-u-poslovnom-pravu>

79 See: LF Union Beograd (2023). Seminar: Pravo u eri veštačke inteligencije (Law in the age of AI), 16.10.-8.11.2023, Pravni fakultet Univerzitet Union Beograd, 16.10.2023, <https://pravnifakultet.edu.rs/ai-seminar-na-pfuub/>; GecicLaw (2023). Pravo veštačke inteligencije (AI Law), Gecić Law Office, Belgrade, <https://www.geciclaw.com/sr/seminar-pravo-vestacke-inteligencije-union/>;

areas,⁸⁰ professional practice⁸¹ and legal education⁸²; d) collaboration with law firms in organizing seminars⁸³ and legal clinics⁸⁴; and e) participation in regional educational and research projects⁸⁵ aimed at developing knowledge, competencies and skills, sharing expertise and preparing for AI integration. Yet, law school websites provide no information about institutional AI policies, training courses, guidelines and resources on AI integration. Thus, teachers and students resort to self-study, online resources, open-source GenAI engines (ChatGPT, Gemini, CoPilot) and AI-powered tools (ChatPDF, NotebookLM) for research, writing, task management, etc.

In *legal practice*, AI tools are cautiously and sparingly integrated in the legal sector, primarily as an assistive tool for automating legal research, administrative tasks, document and client management, legal correspondence, analytics, etc. In spite of observed benefits, many practitioners distrust GenAI tools, due to observed risks (data protection, lawyer-client confidentiality issues) and still rely on digital tools.⁸⁶ Only a few large law firms with international

80 See: Prlja, D., Gasmi G., Korać V. (2022). *Ljudska prava i veštačka inteligencija* (Human Rights and AI), Institut za uporedno pravo, Beograd, <https://iup.rs/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Ljudska-prava-i-ve%C5%A1ta%C4%8Dka-inteligencija-Prlja-Gasmi-Korac.pdf>;

81 See: Nenadić, S., Miljuš I. (2022). Krivična pravda u eri veštačke inteligencije (Criminal Justice at the age of Artificial Intelligence), in: *Digitalizacija u kaznenom pravu i pravosuđu*, Institut za uporedno pravo, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Pravosudna akademija Beograd, 2022 (pp.291-315); https://www.iksi.ac.rs/izdanja/digitalizacija_u_kaznenom_pravu_i_pravosuđu_2022.pdf

82 See: Pantović, V., Milovanović D., Ćorić V.(2023). Napredne digitalne tehnologije u pravu i ekonomiji: razvoj novog interdisciplinarnog nastavnog plana (Advanced Digital Technologies in Law and Economics: New Interdisciplinary Curriculum), in: *Pravo, ekonomija i menadžment u savremenim uslovima -Veštačka inteligencija (AI)*, LEMiMA Knj.2, 2023, (p.131-151), FPSP Uni. Union-NT, Beograd; <https://www.fpsp.edu.rs/sites/default/files/2023-07/LEMiMA%20%E2%80%93%20knjiga%202.pdf>

83 See: LF Union Beograd, 2023; GecicLaw, 2023 (which co-organized a seminar *Law in the Age of AI* (2023)

84 See: Gecic Law (2024). Gecić Law and BU's Faculty of Law Cooperate on Law&Technology Clinic, 19.4.2024, Gecić Law, Belgrade, <https://www.geciclaw.com/law-and-technology-clinic> (This is the first legal clinic integrating new technologies in clinical education).

85 For example, Law Faculty Niš has embarked on a three-year project, Jean Monet module: DIGIRIGHTS (2024-2027), aimed at developing a digital learning and research ecosystem for acquiring knowledge and competencies in the field of digital technologies and digital transformation of human rights in different areas of law. For more, see: DigiRights/LF Niš, 2024.

86 See: Paragraf Lex (2025). Kancelarko -Vaša digitalna kancelarija (free software for electronic office management), <https://www.paragraf.rs/kancelarko/softver-za-administraciju-e-kancelarija-program-za-kancelariju.html>

outreach can afford to use safer tech-supported proprietary AI tools (Aleksić, Stojanović, 2023:301). As these tools are not trained on Serbian legal sources, practitioners may use general GenAI tools or chatbots available in Serbian⁸⁷ but their performance in legal contexts is limited because legal data in Serbia is not comprehensively consolidated (Chambers & Partners, 2024). As for legal technology, local tech start-ups offer tailor-made AI chatbots for different sectors (including law and education)⁸⁸ or service-specific chatbots.⁸⁹ Some legal tech providers offer custom-made AI platforms with integrated legal databases and AI chatbots,⁹⁰ and few law firms have locally hosted custom-made legal AI assistants⁹¹ for research on Serbian law, judicial practice, case management, administration, etc.

In the *judiciary*, the AI use in judicial proceedings is unregulated (IBA, 2024:252)⁹² but the national e-justice platform⁹³ may be a stepping stone in providing the appropriate form of AI integration in judicial contexts while ensuring trustworthiness, transparency, prior testing, risk assessment, effective safeguards, supervision, risk mitigation, ethical and responsible use (Toskić Cvetinović, Tošić, 2022:327, 330-331, 337). Practitioner also note that bar associations and professional chambers (for judges, prosecutors, notaries, enforcement officers) should play the key role in the process of AI integration in legal and judicial practice, by ensuring full compliance with ethical and professional standards, providing continuous professional development opportunities, developing AI integration guidelines and workshops, and continuously monitoring the implementation effects (IBA, 2024:254-255).

87 See: ChatGPT Srbija, <https://chatgptsrbija.rs/>; PitajRobota, <https://pitajrobota.com/>

88 See: AiChatBot.rs (2025). Experts in Conversational Marketing: Industries, <https://www.aichatbot.rs/chatbotzasveindustrije>; Higher education, <https://www.aichatbot.rs/chatbotzavasuniverzitetifakultet>; Legal sector, <https://www.aichatbot.rs/chatbotzava%C5%A1uagenciju>

89 See: InStore^{SR} (2021). Chatbot tehnologije u Srbiji, INB2B Media, 16.9.2021 (Academic Digital Assistant, BizChat, AI Tax Assistant), <https://www.instore.si/sr/article/18555/zastupljenost-chatbot-tehnologije-u-srbiji-u-kojoj-industriji-su-najvise-zastupljeni-i-kojaim-je-namena>.

90 See: InterLexA (2025). InterLexA-prvi pravni i poslovni AI sistem, Intermex, Beograd, <https://interlexa.rs/>; <https://interlexa.rs/lexa/>; Selecta (2025). CRM platform (customer relations management), Selecta, Beograd, <https://selectacrm.app/platforma/?lang=sr>

91 See: Zunic Law (2025). Lexpert AI Legal Research Assistant, Žunic Law Office, Belgrade, <https://zuniclaw.com/en/ai-chatbot/>

92 IBA/International Bar Association (2024). Guidelines and Regulations to provide insights on public policies to ensure Artificial Intelligence's beneficial use as a professional tool: Serbia (N.Sladaković, B.Tutić, Gecić Law Belgrade), IBA, London, 18.9.2024.

93 See: Portal pravosudja Srbije (2025). E-justice portal, Republika Srbija, <https://portal.sud.rs/sr> (accessed 1.2.2025)

Currently, the Serbian Bar Association and professional chambers are at a standstill as their websites contain no AI-related resources.⁹⁴

As for *professional development*, Serbian law schools have had a proactive approach to education *about* AI in different legal context, by establishing cooperation with law firms, government institutions and experts in providing AI-related programs⁹⁵, seminars⁹⁶, professional training⁹⁷, workshops, lectures and discussion forums⁹⁸ for academic and professional purposes (Chambers & Partners, 2024). In addition, some law firms specializing in IT and AI law offer resources and insights from practice⁹⁹ while some practitioners offer seminars for policy makers, business leaders and legal professionals.¹⁰⁰ The national Judicial Academy¹⁰¹ also provides professional development opportunities for judicial professionals, but seminars and webinars are also available through the European professional networks.¹⁰²

Given that AI integration in legal education and practice is still low, the measures envisaged in new AI Strategy (2025-2030) are expected to address the current gaps in legal regulation, infrastructure and education. In legal

94 See: Advokatska komora Srbije (https://aks.org.rs/sr_lat/); Društvo sudija Srbije (<https://www.sudije.rs/>); Udruženje javnih tužilaca RS (<https://uts.org.rs/>); Javnobeležnička komora RS (<https://beleznik.org/>); Komora javnih izvršitelja RS (<https://komoraizvršitelja.rs/>).

95 See: FON/IVI (2023). Master Class: Regulisanje veštačke inteligencije (Regulating AI: legal and ethical framework), Fakultet organizacionih nauka Beograd i Institut za veštačku inteligenciju Srbije, okt.-dec.2023, <https://ai-master-class.com/>;

96 See: LF Union Beograd (2023), Gecić Law Office, 11 Oct.2023, [https://pravnikafakultet.edu.rs/ai-seminar-na-pfuub](https://pravnikafakultet.edu.rs/ai-seminar-na-pfuub;);

97 See: Advokatska komora Vojvodine (2024). Krivični zakonik i veštačkoj inteligenciji u pravu (Criminal Code and AI), Novi Sad 10-25 Oct,2024, <https://akv.org.rs/svecano-otvaranje-vojvodjanskih-pravnickih-dana/>

98 See: AI Platform (2023). Forum o veštačkoj inteligenciji u javnoj upravi i obrazovanju (AI in public administration and education), 21. 11.2023, <https://www.ai.gov.rs/vest/sr/742/forum-o-vestackoj-inteligenciji-u-javnoj-upravi-i-obrazovanju.php>; LF Beograd (2024). Predavanje: Veštačka inteligencija: Pravni okvir i primena u praksi (AI: Legal framework and practice), 18.4.2024.

99 See: Gecić Law (2023). AI in the Real Estate Sector, 12.10.2023, Belgrade, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RLHWudHNTYc>; Zunic Law (2023). AI u pravnim uslugama (AI in legal services), [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jMORFZTPMPo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jMORFZTPMPo;);

100 See: Seminar: Pravo VI (AI Law),13.12.2024, <https://www.kecgrupa.rs/index.php/seminar-pravo-vestacke-inteligencije/>; Workshop: ChatGPT (prompt engineering for lawyers), Beograd, 26.2. 2025, <https://top-conference.com/prompt-inzenjering-radionica-za-pravnike/>

101 See: Judicial Academy (2024).Trends in High-Tech Crime: E-evidence, Cryptocurrencies and AI, Judicial Academy, Beograd, 16-17.9.2024, <https://www.pars.rs/en/news/september-16-and-17-2024-trends-high-tech-crime-electronic-evidence-cryptocurrencies-and-AI>

102 See: EJTJN (2025). Webinars: AI in the Judiciary, European Judicial Training Network, <https://catalogue.ejtn.eu/seminars-and-webinars/listing/?topic=digitalisation>

education, it entails not only ongoing training on AI literacy/skills to legal scholar, students and legal/judicial professionals but also ensuring a proactive approach, collaboration and involvement of all stakeholders in these sectors in developing adequate AI integration solutions.

3. AI in Legal Education: Analysis of some AI integration issues

The presented research results demonstrate joint efforts of tech and education experts in developed countries to assist sustainable integration of AI technologies in education (TeachAI, 2023).¹⁰³ In legal education, the presented benefits and concerns raise many technical/infrastructural, regulatory, socio-cultural and educational pedagogy questions for law schools in developing countries, which should be properly addressed in the AI integration process. Here, we focus on major decision-making issues:

1. whether and to what extent should AI technology be integrated in legal education;
2. which AI tools should be used (opportunities), for what purposes (goals) and to what effects (outcomes);
3. how should the selected AI tools be integrated in the law school curricula, instructional design and educational process to ensure ethical, responsible, human-centric and pedagogy-driven use;
4. how can AI integration promote or hinder learning for prospective legal careers in terms of subject-specific knowledge, lawyer skills, and professional aptitudes (values, ethics and responsibility)?

As there are no reports on actual AI integration practices in Serbian law schools, we may observe how these issues were addressed by law schools/universities in developed countries.

In terms of the *first* issue (whether and to what extent AI technology should be integrated in legal education), law schools in developed countries (US, UK, Canada, Australia) have little doubt about AI use for academic/professional purposes. While the scope of AI integration largely depends on institutional capacities, law schools are subscribed to proprietary legal databases (LexisNexis, Westlaw, Bloomberg)¹⁰⁴ providing legal research platforms with integrated AI tools, which are already used by the administrations, teachers and students.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ See: TeachAI (2023). *AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit*, Code, CoSN, Digital Promise, European EdTech Alliance, PACE.

(This toolkit outlines the benefits/risks, guiding principles and stages in AI integrations). For more, see: Ignjatović, 2024a:248-251.

¹⁰⁴ See: LexisNexis (2025). Law School, <https://www.lexisnexis.com/community/lawschool/>; Thomson Reuters (2025). The best free resources of law school students, <https://lawschool.thomsonreuters.com/survival-guide/the-best-free-resources-for-law-school-subjects/>

¹⁰⁵ In the USA, all ABA-accredited law schools (196) have free access to these databases, subject to library-paid annual subscription and individual registration. See: Stanford Law

AI integration support is commonly provided via law school libraries and tech services, which provide AI integration policies, guidelines, tutorials, courses, sample material¹⁰⁶ and resources on other AI legal tools (Vincent, Harvey, LawDroid), GenAI tools (ChatGPT, Gemini, CoPilot) and AI-powered research tools (ChatPDF, Notebook LM) which may be integrated in the instructional design. To make informed decisions on AI integration, teachers are encouraged to pursue professional development and experiment with AI tools in safe learning environments (AI hubs, “sandboxes”, innovation centers). Teachers may freely decide on the scope of AI integration in course syllabi and the extent of using AI tools in specific tasks, activities and assignments in line with institutional academic integrity policies, guidelines, pedagogical goals, and assessment requirements (U-Maine, 2024).¹⁰⁷

As for the *second* issue (the selection of appropriate AI tools for specific teaching/learning needs), law school in developed countries invest in proprietary legal AI tools (Lexis+, Westlaw, CoCouncil), which provide comprehensive and tech-supported user solutions.¹⁰⁸ To address ethical concerns, privacy/safety risks, equity and human rights issues, some US universities (Harvard, Michigan, California, Washington) have developed their own AI tools (platforms, assistants/chatbots, ChatGPT models) (Ithaca, 2023; IHED, 2024).¹⁰⁹ To promote research and curriculum innovation, some law schools established innovation hubs (Harvard MetaLab; Stanford Legal Design Lab), AI sandboxes for experiential learning and experimentation (Harvard AI Sandbox),¹¹⁰ testing AI text/video/audio tools, and learning with AI tutors (Nelson AI Sandbox, 2024).¹¹¹ To help

(2025). Legal Databases, Law Library, Stanford University Libraries, <https://law.stanford.edu/robert-crown-law-library/legal-databases>.

106 See: Arizona Uni LawLib (2025e). Legal AI technology, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9695253>; San Diego Uni LawLib (2025) GenAI Tools for USD Law Students, <https://lawlibguides.sandiego.edu/c.php?g=1317323&p=968674>

107 U-Maine (2024). Teaching Guides: Learning with AI, Center for Innovation in Teaching & Learning, Maine University, USA.

108 See: Bloomberg Law (2025). Law Schools, <https://pro.bloomberglaw.com/solutions/law-schools/#overview>;

109 See: Ithaca (2023). Is your university building a custom AI platform?, 28.9.2023, Ithaca, New York, USA, <https://sr.ithaca.org/blog/is-your-university-building-a-custom-ai-platform/>; Inside Higher Ed (2024). Universities build ChatGPT-like tools, 21.4.2024, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/tech-innovation/artificial-intelligence/2024/03/21/universities-build-their-own-chatgpt-ai>

110 See: HUIT/Harvard University Information Technology (2025). The AI Sandbox, HUIT, Cambridge, Mass., USA, <https://huit.harvard.edu/ai-sandbox>; GenAI (resources), <https://huit.harvard.edu/ai> (accessed 20.1.2025)

111 See: Nelson AI Sandbox (2024). Empowering people through AI, Nelson Tasman AI Institute, Nelson, New Zealand, <https://aisandbox.org.nz/>; Tutorials, <https://aisandbox.org>.

teachers make informed decisions on AI tools, law schools tech and library services provide reports on the GenAI tools' performance in different legal tasks (U-Arizona LawLib, 2025c), while teachers compare students' performance and AI-generated results in legal skills.¹¹² These evidence-based results are essential for appropriate selection and integration of AI tools in instructional design and assessment.

In terms of the *third* issue (how the selected AI tools should be integrated in the curricula, instructional design and educational process), law schools provide guidelines and resources on three major steps in the AI integration process: 1) *education about AI*: basic AI literacy/skills, prompt engineering); 2) *education for AI*: how to use AI tools for specific purposes (drafting documents, guidelines, assessment, risk-management, developing resources: subject-specific content, sample materials, activities, assignments); and 3) *education with AI*: teaching/learning by using AI in classroom settings and assignments in a responsible, creative and critical manner. Some law schools provide guides on pedagogical issues, selected AI tools, classroom integration strategies, assessment, ethical considerations, good practices, self-study literature (NSU Florida LawLib, 2025)¹¹³ and practice toolkits (U-Maine, 2025).¹¹⁴ The extensive support and resources enable teachers/students to prepare for ethical, responsible, human-centric and pedagogy-driven AI use.

In terms of the *fourth* issue (critical assessment of the benefits and risks of AI integration, i.e. how AI integration will promote or hinder learning in specific legal contexts), the research shows that AI technologies may enhance student engagement, personalized and differentiated learning, and contribute to sustainable transformation in legal education for prospective legal careers. Yet, their integration and scope of use in legal education and professional training should be justified by ultimate pedagogical goals: promoting legal knowledge, discursive skills, professional values and ethical conduct. Thus, it is essential to remain critical, pre-test and rationally assess AI tools performance

nz/curated-streams, Free AI engines, <https://aisandbox.org.nz/free-ai/>

¹¹² Alimardani (2024) compared the performance of 225 first-year law students and two AI models (ChatGPT-4 and Bard) in the criminal law exam (2023), including legal analysis and open-ended questions. The students' average (60%) was higher than the GenAIs' average (52,5%); yet, GenAIs performed better (78%) than students (68%) in open-ended question and essay-writing, while students were better in legal analysis (66%) than GenAIs (47.5%) (Alimardani, 2024:777;783,792-794).

¹¹³ See: NSU/Florida Law Library (2025). Comprehensive Guide to Incorporating GenAI in Legal Education, Nova Southwestern Uni, Law Library at NSU College of Law, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, <https://libguides.nova.edu/c.php?g=1447304&p=10760193>.

¹¹⁴ See: Maine Uni (2025). Learning with AI Toolkit, <https://umaine.edu/learnwithai/>; also see; Arizona Uni LawLib (2025f). Sample Assignments for Legal Research &Writing, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9632588>;

in specific contexts, legal tasks and learning activities, and scrutinize the impact of AI use on the teaching/learning process and outcomes (Bliss, 2024:113-115). To illustrate this point, we may refer to a critical analysis of using GenAI models in clinical legal education. Karr and Schultz (2024) question the pedagogical and ethical justifiability of teaching/learning with GenAI tools, which are incompatible with the pedagogical goals of legal clinics¹¹⁵ and cannot prepare students for practice and develop a complex set of lawyer competencies: a) knowledge and capacity to explore alternative perspectives (client, law, court, social contexts); b) discursive lawyer skills (legal analysis, reasoning, critical thinking, problem solving), professional ethics and conduct (conflict resolution, negotiation); c) interpersonal skills (communication, feedback); d) human values and aptitudes (empathy, trust, partnership, collaboration, flexibility, cultural awareness). Thus, the authors conclude that AI tools cannot properly address real-life problems, engage in dynamic lawyer-client communication and provide competent client-tailored lawyering. On the other hand, overreliance on AI tools may stifle students' creativity, intellectual and professional growth, while AI-generated data may be inadequate, inaccurate, biased or AI-fabricated (non existent), and thus misleading and unreliable. The authors conclude that GenAI use in law schools and legal clinics should be discouraged until their pedagogical value and ethical integrity are fully proven (Karr, Schultz, 2024:1869-1873,1876-1877, 1884, 1886).

On the whole, the presented good practices and critical observations may serve as guidelines for law schools in developing countries either in terms of instituting alternative digital learning solutions or considering a balanced approach to AI integration in legal education. The final part of this paper discusses the major implications, opportunities and considerations for future action.

4. Conclusion: Implications, opportunities and considerations for AI integration in Serbian legal education

The research has shown that the integration of AI technologies in Serbian legal education is lagging behind the practices in developed countries. Amidst

¹¹⁵ Karr & Schultz (2024) specify the pedagogical goals of clinical legal education: a) *practice readiness* (competence): knowledge of substantive/procedural law, lawyer skills (legal research, analysis, reasoning, critical thinking, problem-solving, oral/written communication), professional skills (interviewing, counseling, negotiation, conflict resolution, trial advocacy, document drafting, management of legal work; collaboration, cultural competency, self-evaluation), values (professional ethics, conduct and responsibility), and capacity to practice law; b) *justice readiness* (critical stance): capacity to "critically assess social and political implications of legal work and legal system" and address systemic injustices; and c) *client-centered lawyering* (human approach): professional responsibility, trust, partnership, clients' agency (Karr, Schultz, 2024: 1869, 1873,1874).

the rapid AI evolution, Serbia still does not have general AI legislation, sector-specific policies, implementation guides and AI competence benchmarks. Although the new AI Strategy RS (2025-2030) announces further investments, regulation, infrastructural activities and specific measures in education across non-technical disciplines (GovRS/Nitra 2025:25), the use of AI technologies in legal education is underdeveloped. Even though law schools have embarked on creating an environment for AI integration by establishing AI master programs, organizing conferences and seminars, and publishing research results on AI issues in different legal contexts, there are few reports on actual AI use in legal education and there are no reports on the actors' attitudes to AI integration.¹¹⁶ AI literacy/skills courses are scarce. The available professional training courses largely provide education *about* AI, but there are no reports on education *for* or *with* AI in the legal sector. Law school websites contain no indications that AI integration is under consideration. As Serbia has just scratched the surface of AI integration, it may be high time to address the multiple technical, regulatory and pedagogical issues which are a prerequisite for sustainable AI integration. Thus, good practices in developed countries may serve as milestones and signposts for viable, ethical and responsible AI use in many educational contexts.

The research shows that AI technologies are still underused in Serbian legal education and practice. Reliance on tech-supported proprietary legal AI tools in developed countries has proven to be a safer and more reliable solution, but there are no multi-purpose legal AI tools trained on the Serbian legal databases and legal sources which are still insufficiently consolidated. Some tech companies offer custom-made AI legal assistants/chatbots for legal services but most practitioners still rely on digital legal databases or experiment with open-source GenAI tools. To promote AI integration in legal education and practice, it is necessary to encourage innovation and investment in legal AI tools, or to develop local custom-made AI assistants for sector-specific purposes. Yet, there are concerns that small-scale law firms would not be able to afford legal AI tools, which may also apply to underfunded public law schools. These concerns raise a set of issues which have to be addressed by competent institutions: funding, infrastructure, tech support, human resources, sector-specific professional training, accessibility, and equal opportunities.

The presented research on practices in developed countries shows that many law schools have recognized the transformative impact of AI in legal education and practice, and taken a proactive systemic, sector-specific, or subject-matter approach to AI integration. Given that Serbia has embarked on the AI path without properly assessing the actual needs of end-users, higher education institutions should pursue a structured approach to AI integration in line with the existing knowledge on ethical principles, integration stages,

¹¹⁶ This article has been an attempt to address the first gap, while the second one remains to be addressed in separate articles.

and good practices worldwide. In legal education and practice, the structured approach includes providing clear procedures, substantial support and clear standards for ethical, responsible, human-centered and pedagogy-driven AI integration. In particular, it entails transparent sector-specific and institutional policies, infrastructure, management strategies, administrative and tech support, AI sandboxes for testing AI tools, teacher/student integration guidelines and resources, training courses, academic integrity policies, assessment scales for permissible/impermissible use, human scrutiny and intervention to mitigate risks. Such an approach may be beneficial in many ways.

First, it will map a course of action and provide a platform for consultations, collaboration and active involvement of all stakeholders (legal tech providers, support services, competent public institutions at all levels, law school management and administration services, library and tech support services, teachers and students, professional association, employers in legal/judicial practice, interested natural or legal entities, etc.) in developing sustainable AI integration solutions. *Second*, it will raise awareness about the relevance of AI competencies for legal professionals, and possibly change the conventional mindset by showing that carefully selected AI tools may support rather than hamper learning and intellectual growth in subject-specific areas. *Third*, it will encourage exploring new forms of instruction in law schools and empower teachers to select relevant AI tools, critically assess their use in subject-specific contexts and assignments, and make informed decisions on the proper form and scope of AI integration in line with academic integrity standards and pedagogical goals. *Fourth*, it will encourage innovative, creative and critical use of AI tools in the educational process, provide new learning opportunities and ultimately contribute to improving users' efficiency, productivity, critical thinking and problem-solving in educational and professional contexts. *Fifth*, instead of waiting for top-down solutions by competent public institutions, law schools' proactive and responsible approach may offer some bottom-up solutions, arising from joint action of all stakeholders; thus, instead of ignoring or banning AI tools, law schools may promote teachers and students' agency in the co-development of sustainable AI institutional framework.

In terms of observed risks, the presented research results include examples of constructive criticism on AI integration in high-risk educational, decision-making or sensitive academic/professional contexts, where AI tools cannot properly handle diverse perspectives pertinent to complex legal issues. As AI tools are prone to generating inaccurate, biased and non-existent outputs, it is vital to remain highly critical about the AI-generated results, which should be subject to human scrutiny at all times. AI integration cannot be forced or made mandatory; thus, it is essential to ensure the users' voice and choice at all integration stages, and properly address possible resistance and concerns by taking relevant action: *a)* assess the stakeholders' opinions and needs;

b) facilitate regular consultations, collaboration, equal participation and co-decisions of all stakeholders; c) provide relevant information, resources, training and experimentation spaces to empower users to make informed decisions on the form and scope of AI integration in subject-specific contexts, classroom tasks and assignments; d) encourage critical, ethical and responsible AI use to promote meaningful learning, creativity and critical thinking in authentic contexts; and e) provide safeguards, human supervision and mechanisms for assessing and mitigating risks.

In a nutshell, AI technologies should be used as a supplementary tool for enhancing efficiency, productivity and creativity rather than as a quick or fancy solution which may hinder learning and intellectual growth. In legal education and professional training, there is a need for a balanced and constructive approach to AI integration. *First*, it entails a constructive dialogue of all stakeholders, supported by evidence-based research, close collaboration, co-decisions and joint action of all interested parties. *Second*, AI tools should be carefully assessed, selected and purposefully integrated in the institutional curricula and instructional design, in line with the established regulatory framework, ethical principles, academic integrity standards; their use in classroom settings should be aligned with the discursive and pedagogical goals, and supported by comprehensive guidance, training, and education *about, for and with* AI (for educational, academic and professional purposes alike). *Third*, law schools should resort to the integrated (blended) learning framework, aligned with the principles of holistic, human-centered, competency-based and pedagogy-driven instructional design. The AI integration based on the blended learning and integrated curriculum design frameworks offers flexible methodology for education in subject-specific contexts by combining carefully selected AI tools with digital tools, face-to-face learning and experiential learning (collaborative projects, mock trial, moot courts). The structured, proactive, responsible and flexible approach to AI integration will preserve teacher-student interactions, safeguard their mental health and wellbeing, preclude possible abuse and overreliance on AI tools, and ascertain that AI technologies are applied critically and sparingly for designated pedagogical goals, in line with the highest regulatory, ethical, educational and professional standards. Considering the importance of pedagogy in AI integration processes, the author's further research on the theoretical and practical features of this holistic, human-centered and competency-based pedagogical approach, teachers' perceptions on AI integration, and collective agency in developing sustainable AI integration solutions in the context of legal education will be addressed in a subsequent scientific article.

References

- Alimardani, A. (2024). GenAI vs. law students: an empirical study on criminal law exam performance (in Australia), in: *Law, Innovation and Technology*, vol.16, no.2, 2024, (pp.777-819), Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, UK; DOI: 10.1080/17579961.2024.2392932;
- Balan, A. (2024). Examining the ethical and sustainability challenges of legal education's AI revolution, in: *International Journal of the Legal Profession*, Vol.31, no.3, 2024 (pp.323-348), <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2024.242117>
- Bliss, J. (2024). Teaching Law in the Age of Generative AI, in: *Jurimetrics*, Journal of Law, Science, and Technology, 64, 2024 (pp.111-161), ABA, Chicago, USA, https://libguides.nova.edu/ld.php?content_id=79566657
- Dorf, M. C. (2023). Is Resistance to AI in the Law School Classroom Futile? in: *Verdict*, Justia Legal Portal, 19.7.2023, <https://verdict.justia.com/2023/07/19/is-resistance-to-ai-in-the-law-school-classroom-futile>
- Farashah, N. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in the Law Classroom: Good? Bad? Or Maybe Both? in: *Richmond Journal of Law and Technology*, University of Richmond School of Law, 30.1.2025, <https://jolt.richmond.edu/2025/01/30/artificial-intelligence-in-the-law-classroom-good-bad-or-maybe-both/>
- Fornasier, M. de Oliveira (2021). Legal Education in the 21st century and the Artificial Intelligence, in: *Revista Opinião Jurídica*, Fortaleza, Brazil, no. 31, 2021, (pp.1-32), DOI:10.12662/2447-66410j.v19i31.p1-32.2021;
- Karr, J., Schultz J. (2024), The Legal Imitation Game: Generative AI's Incompatibility with Clinical Legal Education, *Fordham Law Review*, Vol.92/Iss.5/2024 (pp.1866-1886), <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol92/iss5/6>; <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6077&context=flr> ;
- Katz, D.M., Bommarito M.J, Gao Sh., Arredondo P. (2024). GPT-4 Passes the Bar Exam (15 March 2023), in: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 382, 2024 (pp. 1-35); <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4389233>;
- LexisNexis (2023). GenAI and the Legal Profession, 2023 Survey Report, LexisNexis, https://www.lexisnexis.com/pdf/ln_generative_ai_report.pdf
- Magesh, V., Surani F., Dahl M., Suzgun M., Manning Ch.D., Ho D.E. (2024). Hallucination-Free? Assessing the Reliability of Leading AI Legal Research Tools, Stanford University, USA; https://law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Legal_RAG_Hallucinations.pdf
- OECD Report (2024). Education Policy Outlook 2024: Reshaping Teaching into a thriving profession from ABCs to AI (Annex B. High-level documents on AI integration in education, pp. 142-144), OECD Paris, https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2024/11/education-policy-outlook-2024_0411a0c4/dd5140e4-en.pdf
- Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., MacVaugh, J.(2024). The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A Framework for Ethical Integration of Gene-

- rative AI in Educational Assessment, *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, vol. 21(6) 2024; <https://doi.org/10.53761/q3azde36>;
- Thomson Reuters Institute/ThRI (2024). Generative AI in Professional Services (Z.Warren, M.Abbott, L.Leach, Ch.Post, S.Seemer, A.Strunsky, G.Wirth), Thomson Reuters, Canada/US/UK, https://www.thomsonreuters.com/content/dam/ewp-m/documents/thomsonreuters/en/pdf/reports/tr4322226_rgb.pdf
- Yale Uni (2024). Report of the Yale Task Force on AI: Yale Law School Report on AI, 18 March 2024 (pp.58-62), <https://provost.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Yale%20Task%20Force%20on%20AI%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>;
- Ignjatović, G. (2024a). AI Technologies in Education: Regulatory frameworks at the international, regional and national level, *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Nišu*, br.103/2024 (pp.235-260), <https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpf1-55374>; <https://aseestant.ceon.rs/index.php/zrpf/article/view/55374/26839>
- Ignjatović, G. (2024b). Digital Learning in Legal Education: Educational policies, practices, and potentials of pedagogy-driven digital integration, *Facta Universitatis: Law and Politics*, Vol.22, No.1, 2024 (pp.25-46), <https://doi.org/10.22190/FULP240305003I>
- Aleksić, S., Stojanović B. (2023). Veštačka inteligencija u advokaturi (AI in Advocacy), in: *Čojvečanstvo pred izazovom vještačke inteligencije*, Zbornik radova sa konferencije 19.5.2023 (pp.293-302), Evropski Univerzitet Brčko Distrikt, Brčko, BiH, <https://eubd.edu.ba/MNS/XI%20TOM%20I%20B5.pdf> (Aleksić Law Office, Niš);
- Đorđević, A, Milojković M, Spasić M, Rančić D, Nikolić S, Milovanović M. (2023). Analysis of the Current Situation in Serbia related to the Education in the field of Applied Artificial Intelligence, in: *Heavy Machinery-HM 2023*, XI International Conference Proceedings, Vrnjačka Banja, 21-24.6.2023, (pp.359-363), Faculty of Mechanical and Civil Engineering-Kraljevo, Uni Kragujevac; <https://www.hm.kg.ac.rs/documents/HM2023-Proceedings.pdf>
- Stevanović, K. (2024), Veštačka inteligencija u visokom obrazovanju kroz prizmu zakonskih odredbi u Republici Srbiji (AI in HE in light of legal provision in RS), u: *Napredne tehnologije u obrazovanju i privredi*, Vrnjačka Banja 28-30.5.2024, https://napredneteh.vtsns.edu.rs/NTP_2024/radovi/pravo/62.pdf;
- Toskić Cvetinović, A., Tošić M. (2022). Primena veštačke inteligencije u pravosuđu– perspektive i izazovi (AI application in the judicial system), in: *Digitalizacija u kaznenom pravu i pravosuđu*, IUP, IKSI, PA Beograd, 2022 (pp.317-341), https://www.iksi.ac.rs/izdanja/digitalizacija_u_kaznenom_pravu_i_pravosudju_2022.pdf

Normative framework

- ABA/American Bar Association (2024). ABA Task Force on Law and AI Addressing the Legal Challenges of AI: Report on the Impact of AI on the Practice of Law, American Bar Association, USA, Aug. 2024, <https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/center-for-innovation/ai-task-force/2024ai-task-force-report.pdf>
- AIJA/Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration (2022). AI Decision-Making and the Courts: (L.B.Moses, M.Zelnieriute, M.Legg, F.Bell, J.Silove), AIJA, Sydney, New South Wales, https://aija.org.au/wp-content/uploads/woocommerce_uploads/2022/06/AI-DECISION-MAKING-AND-THE-COURTS_Report_V5-2022-06-20-1lzkls.pdf
- CBA/Canadian Bar Association (2025). Use of AI in Legal Practice: an overview, <https://www.cba.org/publications-resources/practice-tools/ethics-of-artificial-intelligence-for-the-legal-pr/guidelines-relating-to-use>
- CJC/Canadian Judicial Council (2024). Guidelines for the Use of AI in Canadian Courts, (M.Felsky, K.Eltis), Ottawa, Canada, <https://cjc-ccm.ca/sites/default/files/documents/2024/AI%20Guidelines%20-%20FINAL%20-%202024-09%20-%20EN.pdf>
- CoE (2024). CoE Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, Vilnius, 5.9.2024, CoE Treaty Series-CETS 225/2024, Strasbourg; <https://rm.coe.int/1680afae3c>.
- COE/CEPEJ (2019). European Ethical Charter on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in judicial systems 2018, CoE European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice, Strasbourg, France, 2019, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/cepej-european-ethical-charter-on-the-use-of-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-judicial-systems-and-their-environment>
- NCSC/the National Center for State Courts (2024). Artificial Intelligence Guidance for Use of AI and GenAI in Courts, AI Rapid Response Team, National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, Virginia, USA, 7.8.2024, https://www.ncsc.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0014/102830/ncsc-artificial-intelligence-guidelines-for-courts.pdf
- NSW Law Society (2024). AI for Legal Professionals, Law Society New South Wales, Australia, <https://www.lawsociety.com.au/publications-and-resources/ai-legal-professionals>;
- UK Judiciary (2023). Artificial Intelligence Guidance for Judicial Office Holders, UK Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, 12.12.2023, <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/AI-Judicial-Guidance.pdf>
- UK Law Society (2024). How AI is reshaping the future of legal practice (S.White), Law Society, London, 20.11.2024, <https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/topics/ai-and-lawtech/partner-content/how-ai-is-reshaping-the-future-of-legal-practice>
- GovRS/NITRA (2025). Strategija razvoja veštačke inteligencije 2025-2030 (AI Development Strategy 2025), *Službeni glasnik RS*, br. 5/2025, Vlada RS/Ministarstvo nauke, tehnološkog razvoja i inovacija RS, **17.01.2025**, <https://>

nitra.gov.rs/images/ministarstvo/dokumenta/strategije/Strategija%20razvoja%20ovestacke%20inteligencije%202025-2030.pdf

Online sources

- Arizona University Library (2025). AI Literacy in the Age of ChatGPT, UA Libraries, Arizona; Instructor' Guide, <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/ai-literacy-instructors/intro>; Student Guide, <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/students-chatgpt/>; ChatGPT and pedagogy, <https://libguides.library.arizona.edu/ai-literacy-instructors/teaching>
- Arizona Uni Law Library (2025a). ChatGPT and GenAI Legal Research Guide: ChatGPT uses in legal education, AU Law Library, U-Arizona College of Law, <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9751262>; Policies: <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9750521>; Research: <https://law-arizona.libguides.com/c.php?g=1301273&p=9838403>;
- Bloomberg Law (2024). Analysis: Legal Workers Use AI for Research (S.Pacheco), 4.4.2024, <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/bloomberg-law-analysis/analysis-legal-workers-use-ai-for-research-despite-red-flags>
- Chambers & Partners (2024). Artificial Intelligence 2024: Law and Practice: Serbia, (A.Radonjanin, M.Vlajković, J.Arsić, D.Stevanović, Law Firm Moravčević Vojnović & Partners/Schoenherr, Belgrade), 28.5.2024, Chambers Global Practice Guides, London, <https://practiceguides.chambers.com/practice-guides/artificial-intelligence-2024/serbia>
- Clio (2024). Legal trends Report: The Future of AI in the Legal Industry, Clio, Burnaby, BC, Canada, <https://www.clio.com/guides/ai-legal-trends/>; AI Tools for Legal Work: <https://www.clio.com/blog/ai-legal-tools/>; AI for Legal Research: Tools, Tips, and Examples, <https://www.clio.com/resources/ai-for-lawyers/ai-legal-research/>
- DEC/Digital Education Council, (2024). EU AI Act: What it means for universities, DEC (Global alliance for AI innovation for HE), 18.4.2024., <https://www.digitaleducationcouncil.com/post/eu-ai-act-what-it-means-for-universities>
- DigiRights/LF Niš (2024). Digital transformation and human rights: EU perspective (DIGIRIGHTS), Erasmus+Jean Monet Module, Faculty of Law, University of Niš; <https://digirights.prafak.ni.ac.rs/project-summary/> (25.12.2024)
- Harvard University AI (2025). AI Pedagogy Project: Creative and critical engagement with AI in Education, Harvard metaLAB, BK Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0); <https://aipedagogy.org/>; Resources, <https://aipedagogy.org/guide/resources/>; Sample Assignments, <https://aipedagogy.org/assignments/> (11.1.2025)
- IBA/International Bar Association (2024). Guidelines and Regulations to provide insights on public policies to ensure Artificial Intelligence's beneficial use as a professional tool: Serbia (N.Sladaković, B.Tutić, Gecić Law Belgrade), IBA, London, 18.9.2024; https://www.ibanet.org/PPID/Constituent/Multi-disply_Pract/anlbs-ai-report;

- Maine University (2024). Teaching Guides: Learning with AI, Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, University of Maine, <https://umaine.edu/citl/homepage/instructional-resources/teaching-resources-2/learning-with-ai/>
- OECD AI Observatory (2025a). National AI policies & strategies, OECD, <https://oecd.ai/en/dashboards/overview>
- OECD AI Observatory, (2025b). Catalogue of Tools & Metrics for Trustworthy AI: Technical, procedural and educational tools for trustworthy AI, OECD AI Expert Group, <https://oecd.ai/en/catalogue/faq> (accessed 10.1.2025)
- OECD AI Observatory (2023). How countries are implementing the OECD Principles for Trustworthy AI, 31.10.2023 (L.Ruso, N.Oder), <https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/national-policies-2> (accessed 10.1.2025)
- OECD AI Observatory (2020). The Global Partnership on AI takes off at the OECD, (A.Plonk), 9.7. 2020), <https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/oecd-and-g7-artificial-intelligence-initiatives-side-by-side-for-responsible-ai>
- Slaw (2024). Ten Practical Strategies for Law Schools to Embrace AI, (B.Perrin,UBC Allard School of Law), Slaw, Canada's online legal magazine, <https://www.slaw.ca/2024/11/26/10-practical-strategies-for-law-schools-to-embrace-ai/>
- Stanford Law School (2024). Use AI in Legal Practice, Juelsgaard Clinic, Stanford Law School, CA, USA, <https://law.stanford.edu/juelsgaard-intellectual-property-and-innovation-clinic/use-of-ai-generally-in-legal-practice/>
- TeachAI (2023). *AI Guidance for Schools Toolkit*, Code, CoSN, Digital Promise, European EdTech Alliance, PACE, https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OmT-6Nf_B9f8yA6r54QQ-DMSB85nj05JZ6qyR17jFgA/edit?tab=t.o#heading=h.i6tsgfy3sovv

Гордана Игњатовић,
Предавач Енглеског језика правне струке,
Правни факултет, Универзитет у Нишу,
Република Србија

ВИ ТЕХНОЛОГИЈЕ У ПРАВНОМ ОБРАЗОВАЊУ: ПРИМЕРИ ДОБРЕ ПРАКСЕ И СМЕРНИЦЕ ЗА ИНТЕГРАЦИЈУ ВЕШТАЧКЕ ИНТЕЛИГЕНЦИЈЕ

Резиме

Убрзани развој и све већа примена вештачке интелигенције (ВИ) доносе нове могућности у многим областима али и бројне дилеме. С обзиром да употреба ВИ технологија у Србији јос увек није адекватно регулисана, мишљења о њиховој употреби у правничком образовању и пракси су још увек подељена. У том контексту, аутор истражује употребу ВИ технологија у образовању правника на међународном и националном ниво. Након уводног прегледа различитих приступа увођењу ВИ технологија, први део рада разматра примену ВИ технологија у правном образовању и пракси, приказујући достигнућа и примере добре праксе на правним факултетима у развијеним земљама, као и актуелне прилике у Србији, како би се извукле поуке и смернице за интеграцију ВИ технологија у српско правно образовање. На основу резултата истраживања, други део анализира како су правни факултети у развијеним земљама одговорили на кључна питања ВИ интеграције у правничко образовање, нарочито у погледу успостављања институционалних оквира и свеобухватне подршке за функционалну, структуралну и одговорну употребу ВИ технологија у образовању правника. Сумирајући кључне резултате, аутор разматра импликације и могућности које треба сагледати у процесу доношења одлука и припреме за интеграцију ВИ технологија у српско правничко образовање. У том погледу, предлаже се интегрисани приступ учењу, заснован на постулатима флексибине комбиновне/хибридне наставе (*blended learning*) и интегрисаног курикума (*integrated curriculum design*), који могу понудит одржива решења за потребе академског и професионалног образовање правника.

Кључне речи: вештачка интелигенција (ВИ), ВИ технологије, правно образовање, добре праксе, ВИ интеграција.