Litel 2

Lawyers Innovative Training for European Law

Training lawyers in the age of AI
First Milestones from LITEL 2 Project

How should tomorrow's lawyers deal with Artificial Intelligence ?
How can we integrate AI into legal training across Europe ?

These are the core questions driving **LITEL 2**, an EU-funded project launched in **February 2025**. Led by a consortium of six partners institutions - from France, Ireland, Romania, Catalonia, Belgium, and the Czech Republic — LITEL 2 aims to equip future lawyers with the **knowledge, critical perspective**, and **ethical tools** to understand and use AI in their professional practice.

📅 **19-20 May 2025**

📍 **École de Formation du Barreau (EFB), Paris**

This first Study Visit gathered the full consortium — EFB, the Law Society of Ireland, UNBR (Romanian Bar), Catalan council of bars, the Brussels Bar, and the Czech Bar Association — for two days of learning, debate and collaborative exploration. The event also welcomed guest participants from the Warsaw Bar, the Dutch Bar, the Estonian Bar Association, and the Inns of Court College of Advocacy (UK), enriching the discussions with diverse perspectives on how the legal profession across Europe is responding to the AI challenge.

PARTNERS

CZECH BAR ASSOCIATION · BARREAU DE BRUXELLES *Ordre français* · UNIUNEA NAȚIONALĂ A BAROURILOR DIN ROMÂNIA · LAW SOCIETY OF IRELAND · CONSELL DE L'ADVOCACIA CATALANA · EFB ÉCOLE DES AVOCATS

Training lawyers using AI

What are the main challenges ahead ?

As part of the study visit, a brainstorming session was held to explore the structure and content of a future **AI training module for lawyers**. The discussion aimed to align the training with both the **evolving legal landscape** and the **realities of legal practice across Europe**.

TRAINING OBJECTIVES AND TARGET AUDIENCES

Participants agreed that the training must cater to **two distinct learner profiles** :

1. Practicing lawyers seeking to use AI as a practical tool to improve productivity, client service, and internal processes.
2. Professionals aiming to specialize in legal innovation or legal tech, requiring a deeper understanding of AI models, governance, and risks.

Rather than offering a one-size-fits-all course, a modular structure was suggested, allowing for custom learning paths based on individual needs and professional goals. There was also support for a certificate-based format, helping lawyers demonstrate new competencies.

ASSESSMENT AND SKILL VALIDATION

Participants proposed that lawyers be **assessed not only on technical skills**, but also on their ability to :

- Evaluate the reliability, risks, and legal implications of AI tools.
- Interpret AI-generated outputs with appropriate professional skepticism.
- Navigate ethical dilemmas raised by AI use

Assessment methods could include scenario-based evaluations, collaborative simulations, or even mock audits of AI use in law firms. Standardized quizzes should be complemented by contextualised, reflective tasks.

ADULT LEARNING APPROACHES

Finally, the group recommended moving beyond traditional lectures to adopt **immersive learning approaches**, such as :

- Problem-based learning anchored in real-world legal use cases.
- AI tool sandboxes, where learners can safely experiment with technologies like document summarizers, contract generators, or legal research copilots.
- Interdisciplinary workshops, involving data scientists, ethicists, and legal practitioners.
- Peer-to-peer learning, including structured feedback loops between participants.

The value of **"learning by doing"** was reiterated, but should go further: learners should prototype AI workflows, conduct risk assessments, and present strategic plans for AI adoption in legal settings.

REFRAMING AI IN LEGAL EDUCATION

Rather than simply "adding" AI to legal training, the group emphasized the need to **reframe legal education** to reflect the transformative impact of AI on legal reasoning, research, writing, and decision-making. This includes :

- Embedding AI not only in technology-related modules, but also in core subjects such as legal ethics, civil procedure, and legal research.
- Addressing the limits of automation and the importance of human oversight in legal judgment.
- Encouraging critical reflection on how AI may reshape access to justice, the lawyer-client relationship, and legal responsibility.

SUSTAINABILITY AND ADAPTABILITY

Participants emphasized that the training must be **future-proof**. Given the pace of technological and regulatory change, the module should be designed with :

- A versioning system, allowing regular content updates.
- A monitoring mechanism to track how trained lawyers actually apply AI in practice.
- Collaborative governance, possibly involving national Bars and law schools, to ensure relevance and legitimacy across jurisdictions.

INSIGHTS FROM THE
Scientific Commitee

Clémentine Kleitz, Chair of the Scientific Commitee, shares the outcomes of the group's work during the Paris visit

Q **During the Paris Study Visit, the Scientific Committee began outlining the content of the future AI training toolkit. What were the main themes or priorities identified so far?**

What's interesting is that we quickly realized that the various Litel country players were expressing more or less the same priorities. It was therefore easy to reach a consensus on some of the main themes to be addressed in this AI training kit. The general idea is to offer a comprehensive introduction to artificial intelligence tools, covering technical, practical (with different levels of prompting), legal (GDPR and IP, AI act, etc.) and above all ethical and deontological aspects.

Q **From your perspective, what is the key challenge the Committee faces in designing a toolkit that is both innovative and relevant for legal training institutions across Europe?**

One of the biggest challenges is managing obsolescence. Indeed, advances in AI are happening so fast that it's a real challenge to develop a kit that will still be relevant and appropriate several months down the line. The idea is therefore to start by working on those aspects that are evolving least rapidly (such as ethics), and to finish with those that are most exposed to obsolescence. On the other hand, it seems appropriate to adopt an evolutionary kit approach that could be adapted over time.

VOICES
FROM THE FIELD

Inside legal training

Élodie Carimiggelt, Professional training for lawyers in the Netherlands

The Dutch Bar training programme is a postgraduate course for trainee lawyers preparing them to act independently and ethically. Together with Joël de Laat I serve as programme manager. We are responsible for the didactic design, the training of our lecturers and trainers, the overall quality assurance and the assessment framework.

Q **What initiatives or developments has your institution implemented so far regarding the integration of artificial intelligence into legal training?**

We have developed two podcasts exploring AI literacy in the legal profession, focusing on ethical implications and core professional values. Additionally, all assignments include an AI reflection form, requiring trainee lawyers to report whether and how they used AI, and assess their use against values like confidentiality and professional competence. Mistakes, such as AI-generated false regulations, are shared in newsletters to promote awareness. We also train our educators in AI use to ensure they can support students with relevant feedback.

Q **Based on your experience, what do you see as good practices that legal training providers across Europe could adopt when introducing AI in their curricula?**

Good practice includes embedding AI literacy in legal training, with clear alignment to the ethical duties of the profession and the AI Act. Assignments should prompt reflection on how AI was used and what was learned, to support both professional and educational objectives. Training legal educators to understand and assess AI use is equally important, ensuring coherent guidance. A shared European approach would help ensure consistent standards in preparing future lawyers for the ethical use of AI. Trainees state whether they used AI, which prompts they used and whether this respected confidentiality. They check the accuracy of the output of AI and reflect on what they learned. The form is signed and submitted. This approach helps trainee lawyers develop a professional and ethical use of AI, while also allowing us as educators to assess whether they are learning from the training itself.

AI changemakers in the legal world

Matthieu Quiniou, lawyer and lecturer at Paris 8 University

Q **You accompanied the participants during the Study Visit to the EFB, dedicated to European initiatives in AI training. What did you take away from the presentations of the different centres ?**

The Study Visit to the EFB highlighted the diversity of European approaches to AI training : some focused on ethics, others on practical experimentation, and still others on integration into existing legal curricula. This pluralism shows that there is no single model, but rather that a common culture is emerging, centred on the ability of legal professionals to understand the uses, risks, and opportunities inherent in these technologies. The meeting also provided an opportunity to exchange good practices and feedback on digital solutions serving the legal profession.

Q **Should lawyers be trained to 'read' algorithms in the same way they are currently trained to read case law? What might this 'critical reading' mean in the age of platforms and judicial AI?**

Understanding algorithms, training datasets, and AI models appears necessary to develop a critical analysis : grasping the logic of automated decision-making, questioning potential biases, identifying areas of opacity, and assessing the impact on fundamental rights. As with case law, it is a matter of deconstructing reasoning and measuring its implications. This critical reading is becoming essential in the age of platforms and judicial AI, in order to exercise genuine professional vigilance.

Q **Looking ten years ahead, how do you see the lawyer's role evolving in a legal ecosystem profoundly transformed by AI?**

In ten years time, the lawyer will be less of a producer of standardised documents and more of a strategist in data and law, a trend already initiated by the emergence of expert systems based on symbolic AI. It will automate certain tasks, freeing up time for analysis, the defense of rights, and mediation. However, the perceived value of the lawyer's expertise in the face of chatbots capable of interpreting the law and generating documents will be questioned. A major challenge, starting today, is to firmly prevent the unlawful practice of law by providers or deployers of AI systems made available to the public and improperly substituting themselves for legal advice, so as to safeguard the lawyer's specific role ten years from now.

next STEPS

4-5 DÉCEMBER

Upcoming Study Visit in Brussels focused on ethics

Let's get connected for our latest news & updates :

in Follow us on LinkedIn !