

What Most Law Schools Are Doing About AI — A Read of the Landscape

Where U.S. law schools sit on AI integration, as of early 2026. My read, drawn from public coverage, institutional announcements, and conversations with faculty and administrators at peer schools.

The simple version: most law schools are doing something. Very few have arrived at a settled position.

The public numbers bear this out. Bloomberg Law’s 2026 Path to Practice survey reports that roughly two-thirds of U.S. law schools have integrated some form of AI instruction into their curriculum, and 85% are considering further curriculum changes to add more AI content. A separate Bloomberg Law piece from August 2025 documented accelerated AI-training efforts at Chicago, Pennsylvania, Yale, and Harvard in response to rising AI-generated citation errors in court filings. Employer expectations are shifting alongside — 76% of hiring attorneys in that same survey said they expect law school graduates to be able to cite-check AI-generated materials, and 63% expected understanding of AI-related legal ethics.

But “doing something” is a broad tent. Four patterns are visible across the top-100 schools.

Elective AI courses. The most common response. Many schools now offer at least one upper-level course on AI and law — regulation, constitutional issues, intellectual property, the economics of AI, machine learning for lawyers. Valuable, but reaches a self-selected student subset. Chicago, Penn, Yale, NYU, Berkeley, and many others have electives on offer.

Curriculum-embedded AI integration. Less common but more structural. Penn Legal Practice Skills (described in Module III of this course) is one example; Chicago has added AI modules across its 1L curriculum aimed at baseline generative-AI literacy. Duhl’s “All In” piece in this module describes what embedding looks like inside a single doctrinal course.

AI-specific certificates or concentrations. Chicago-Kent and NYU have launched dedicated AI certificate programs. Berkeley announced an LL.M. with AI specialization. These are program-level commitments visible to prospective students as institutional positioning.

Academic-integrity and policy updates. About 69% of law schools have revised their academic-integrity policies to address AI use. Revisions range from “AI-generated work is plagiarism” to explicit permission frameworks with citation-and-disclosure requirements.

Two observations from what I see.

First, the center of gravity is still shifting. Most schools aren’t acting from a settled theory of AI-era legal education; they’re reacting to student use, employer pressure, and the ABA’s formative-assessment requirement. Curriculum changes often lag the live problem by a cycle or two.

Second, the pace of institutional change is uneven. Some schools are moving quickly and visibly; others are doing the work less publicly. Public announcements aren’t always a reliable signal of depth — and quiet adoption isn’t always a signal of depth either. The survey numbers register something real but don’t tell you what’s actually working.

Module III of this course describes one school's work in detail (Penn Carey Law's, which I know best). The landscape around it is what Module II sketches: the scholarship, the peer pedagogy cases, and this general-state snapshot. The profession is moving. The center of gravity is still being set.

*Primary sources: Bloomberg Law's 2026 Path to Practice survey "Bridging the Gap"; Elleiana Green, [Top Law Schools Boost AI Training as Legal Citation Errors Grow](#), Bloomberg Law (Aug. 19, 2025); Canadian Lawyer, *US law schools integrate AI into curriculums but remain uncertain on specific policies*; ABA Center for Innovation materials on AI in Legal Education.*