The Legal Technology Skills Gap: How Law Schools Can Bridge the Divide in 2026

April 7, 2026 by John Beniamin

In early April 2026, Thomson Reuters and legal training platform Hotshot announced a partnership to deliver AI-powered practical training to more than 120,000 law students across the United States — free of charge. The move was telling. One of the largest legal information companies in the world essentially acknowledged what hiring managers, legal ops leaders, and associates fresh out of law school have been saying for years: the gap between what law schools teach and what the legal profession now demands has become too wide to ignore.

The numbers confirm the urgency. According to a March 2026 report from Robert Half, 79 percent of legal leaders say a skills gap exists within their departments, and 80 percent say that gap has become more visible over the past year. Legal technology proficiency — including AI tools, e-discovery platforms, contract lifecycle management systems, and matter management software — ranks among the most significant shortfalls. Meanwhile, 66 percent of law firm leaders report that their teams lack sufficient legal tools and technology to work efficiently.

This is no longer a future problem. It is today's hiring crisis, today's productivity bottleneck, and today's competitive disadvantage. And it starts in law school.

What the Skills Gap Actually Looks Like in Practice

The legal technology skills gap is not abstract. It shows up in measurable, daily friction across law firms and legal departments. A junior associate who has never used a contract lifecycle management platform needs weeks of onboarding before contributing to deal flow. A litigation team that lacks familiarity with predictive coding workflows burns unnecessary hours on linear document review. A legal operations analyst who cannot configure basic workflow automations becomes a bottleneck rather than a force multiplier.

Bloomberg Law's preparedness survey found that attorneys consistently identify practical technology skills as something they wished they had learned before entering practice. The gap is not just about knowing that legal technology exists — it is about knowing how to use it under the pressures of billable hours, client deadlines, and regulatory compliance.

At its core, the skills gap manifests in three dimensions. First, there is **tool literacy** — the ability to navigate platforms like Relativity, Clio, or Westlaw Edge without extensive hand-holding. Second, there is **process understanding** — knowing how technology fits into legal workflows such as e-discovery, contract review, or regulatory monitoring. Third, there is **strategic thinking** — the capacity to evaluate when technology should be deployed, what its limitations are, and how to govern its use responsibly. Most law school graduates arrive at their first job with none of these three competencies adequately developed.

Why Law Schools Have Been Slow to Adapt

Understanding why law schools lag behind market demand requires looking at structural incentives. Law school curricula in most jurisdictions are shaped by bar examination requirements, accreditation standards, and faculty expertise — none of which have historically prioritized technology competency. Professors who have spent decades teaching constitutional law or civil procedure are rarely equipped to teach students how cosine similarity powers document review or why TF-IDF scoring outperforms basic keyword matching.

There is also a philosophical tension. Traditional legal education prizes analytical reasoning, doctrinal mastery, and the Socratic method. Many faculty members view technology training as vocational rather than academic — something that belongs in a CLE course or an employer's onboarding program, not a law school classroom. This perspective was more defensible a decade ago. It is increasingly untenable in a world where AI-assisted research, automated contract analysis, and algorithm-driven litigation strategy are becoming standard practice.

Resource constraints compound the problem. Developing and maintaining a legal technology curriculum requires software licenses, specialized instructors, and lab infrastructure that many schools — especially those outside the top tier — struggle to fund. The result is a two-track system where students at well-resourced institutions like Stanford (through its CodeX program) or Suffolk University Law School (which made AI training mandatory for first-year students in partnership with Hotshot) receive exposure to legal technology, while the vast majority of law students graduate without it.

The Thomson Reuters–Hotshot Partnership and What It Signals

The April 2026 partnership between Thomson Reuters and Hotshot deserves close attention not just for what it delivers, but for what it signals about industry direction. Under the arrangement, law students with existing Westlaw access gain free entry to four Hotshot courses covering AI foundations, professionalism and business skills, civil litigation basics, and transactional practice. Crucially, students also get hands-on experience with CoCounsel Legal, Thomson Reuters' AI research and drafting tool.

This is significant for several reasons. First, it places AI tool proficiency alongside traditional practice-readiness skills, treating them as equally essential. Second, it uses an existing distribution channel — Westlaw's massive law school footprint — to reach students at scale rather than requiring schools to build new programs from scratch. Third, it creates a talent pipeline: students trained on CoCounsel Legal during law school become natural adopters of Thomson Reuters products when they enter practice.

The broader signal is that legal technology vendors are no longer waiting for law schools to modernize their curricula. They are stepping into the education gap directly. This trend has implications for how the profession thinks about training, credentialing, and the relative roles of academia and industry in preparing the next generation of lawyers.

The Employer Perspective: What Hiring Managers Actually Want

Legal hiring in 2026 is being shaped by a clear set of priorities. According to the National Law Review, employers increasingly value candidates who combine legal acumen with operational insight — professionals who can manage risk, navigate compliance

frameworks, and embed technology responsibly into legal workflows. AI literacy, in particular, has moved from a nice-to-have differentiator to a baseline expectation at many firms.

Robert Half's research underscores this shift. Seventy-one percent of legal leaders plan to increase contract hiring in the first half of 2026, in part because they cannot find permanent staff with the right blend of legal and technical skills. The report identifies legal technology proficiency — spanning AI tools, e-discovery, CLM, and matter management — as a top skills gap across both law firms and corporate legal departments.

For law students and early-career professionals, the message is unambiguous. Those who graduate with demonstrable technology skills will have a significant advantage in the job market. Those who do not will face longer job searches, more onboarding friction, and a steeper learning curve once employed. For a deeper look at how this landscape is shaping career trajectories, see our complete guide to building a legal operations career.

A Curriculum Framework: What Law Schools Should Be Teaching

Bridging the skills gap does not require law schools to become computer science departments. It requires a deliberate, layered approach that integrates technology literacy into the existing curriculum rather than bolting it on as an afterthought. Based on current industry demands and the competency models emerging from programs at leading institutions, a practical framework includes four tiers.

Tier 1: Foundational Literacy (All Students) — Every law student should graduate understanding what AI can and cannot do in a legal context, how legal research platforms use algorithms to surface results, and what responsible AI governance looks like. This belongs in the first-year curriculum. Courses should cover the basics of how tools like Westlaw Edge and Harvey AI function, without requiring students to code.

Tier 2: Applied Practice (Required for Practice-Track Students) — Students preparing for litigation should gain hands-on experience with e-discovery platforms and understand how predictive coding models learn from attorney review decisions. Transactional students should work with contract lifecycle management tools like Ironclad. Clinical programs should incorporate technology into their workflows as standard practice.

Tier 3: Specialized Electives (Interested Students) — For students who want deeper expertise, schools should offer electives in legal data analytics, NLP applications in legal text analysis, constitutional AI systems, and computational law and rules-as-code. These courses prepare students for emerging roles in legal technology, legal operations, and regulatory technology.

Tier 4: Interdisciplinary Research (Graduate and PhD Level) — Advanced research programs should explore the intersection of law and computer science, producing scholarship that advances both fields. Topics might include algorithmic fairness in judicial decision-making, machine-readable legislation, or the governance frameworks needed for AI-assisted legal practice.

Tools That Are Bridging the Gap Right Now

While law schools work to modernize their curricula, several legal technology platforms are actively helping professionals — including recent graduates — close the skills gap through intuitive interfaces, built-in training resources, and AI-assisted workflows that lower the barrier to entry.

Clio has become one of the most widely adopted practice management platforms, particularly for small and mid-sized firms. Its cloud-based interface covers intake, billing, calendaring, task management, and client communication — the operational fundamentals that law schools rarely address. For new lawyers who need to learn the business side of practice quickly, Clio provides both the tools and the educational resources to ramp up fast. **Try Clio** →

Relativity remains the industry standard for e-discovery and litigation support. For associates entering litigation practice without prior exposure to document review workflows, Relativity's platform — along with its community training resources and certification programs — provides a structured path to competency. Understanding how Relativity handles analytics, review, and production is a practical skill that directly translates to billable productivity. **Try Relativity** →

Harvey AI represents the new frontier: AI-powered legal research and drafting that augments attorney work rather than replacing it. For early-career lawyers who want to develop proficiency with generative AI in a legal-specific context, Harvey offers an environment purpose-built for the profession's unique requirements around accuracy, citation, and confidentiality. **Try Harvey AI** →

What Legal Departments and Firms Can Do Internally

The skills gap cannot be solved by law schools alone. Legal departments and firms bear responsibility for developing their own workforce — and the most forward-thinking organizations are already investing heavily in internal training infrastructure.

Robert Half's 2026 report recommends a structured approach. Start by conducting a skills audit to identify where technology gaps exist within the team. Map those gaps against strategic priorities — if AI-assisted contract review is a key initiative, ensure that the professionals involved have the training to use the tools effectively. Consider blending permanent hires with contract specialists who bring targeted legal technology expertise, particularly during implementation phases.

Creating a culture of continuous learning matters as much as any single training program. Firms that encourage experimentation with new tools, allocate non-billable time for technology exploration, and reward innovation will develop technology-fluent teams faster than those that treat tech training as a one-time event. For guidance on building governance frameworks that support responsible experimentation, see our article on implementing legal AI governance policies.

The role of legal operations leadership is particularly critical here. A skilled legal ops leader ensures that technology investments align with business priorities, manages vendor selection and change management, and measures ROI — functions that determine whether AI integration succeeds or stalls.

Lessons from Other Professions — and Other Countries

The legal profession is not the first to confront a technology-driven skills gap, and looking at how other fields have responded offers useful perspective. Medicine integrated electronic health records and digital imaging into residency training decades ago. Accounting mandated technology competency as part of CPA certification requirements. Finance embedded quantitative analysis and programming into MBA curricula as standard rather than optional.

In each case, the catalyst was the same: the profession recognized that technology proficiency was no longer optional for competent practice and adjusted its training infrastructure accordingly. The legal profession is arriving at this recognition later than most, but the trajectory is clear.

Internationally, some jurisdictions are moving faster. India's legal education system is actively integrating technology platforms and data analytics into law school curricula as part of a broader 2026 reform effort. New Zealand's pioneering work on machine-readable legislation has created entirely new competency requirements for lawyers working at the intersection of law and technology. Even the challenge of modernizing legislative drafting workflows — a problem that spans parliaments worldwide — increasingly requires professionals who understand both legal process and technical systems.

The Market Forces That Will Accelerate Change

Several converging forces suggest the skills gap will narrow significantly over the next three to five years — not because law schools will voluntarily transform, but because market pressure will leave them no choice.

First, employer demand is creating a pricing signal. Graduates with demonstrated technology skills command higher starting salaries and secure positions faster. As this pattern becomes more visible through employment data, prospective students will gravitate toward schools that offer technology training, creating competitive pressure on institutions that do not.

Second, vendor-led education programs like the Thomson Reuters–Hotshot partnership are lowering the cost and complexity of curriculum integration. When a school can offer AI training to its students at no additional cost by leveraging existing Westlaw subscriptions, the barrier to adoption drops dramatically.

Third, regulatory bodies are beginning to take notice. The American Bar Association's evolving guidance on technology competence — reflected in its model rules requiring lawyers to stay current with technology relevant to their practice — creates a downstream pressure on law schools to prepare students for this obligation. As state bars increasingly interpret this duty to encompass AI literacy, schools that ignore technology training risk producing graduates who are not fully practice-ready by regulatory standards.

Fourth, the sheer scale of AI adoption in legal practice is making technology avoidance impossible. When 95 percent of legal department leaders report that their teams are already using or implementing AI-enabled software, a law school that does not expose students to these tools is functionally preparing them for a profession that no longer exists.

Frequently Asked Questions

What specific technology skills do legal employers most want from new graduates?

Based on 2026 hiring data, the most in-demand skills include proficiency with AI-powered legal research platforms like Westlaw Edge and Harvey AI, familiarity with e-discovery tools such as Relativity, competency with practice management software like Clio, and a working understanding of contract lifecycle management systems. Beyond specific tools, employers value the ability to evaluate AI outputs critically, understand data privacy requirements, and integrate technology into legal workflows without compromising quality or ethics.

Can practicing lawyers close the skills gap without going back to school?

Absolutely. Most legal technology vendors offer robust training and certification programs. Relativity's certification path, Clio's educational resources, and Thomson Reuters' CoCounsel training modules all provide structured learning for working professionals. Industry organizations like ILTACON and the Corporate Legal Operations Consortium (CLOC) run conferences and workshops focused on technology skills. Many professionals also pursue targeted credentials in legal operations, data analytics, or project management to complement their legal training. Our guide to building a legal operations career covers certifications and learning paths in detail.

How should law schools balance technology training with traditional legal education?

The most effective models do not replace doctrinal instruction — they integrate technology into it. Rather than creating a standalone "Legal Tech 101" course, progressive programs embed technology applications into existing courses. A civil procedure class

might include an e-discovery module. A contracts course might use a CLM platform for drafting exercises. Clinical programs might require students to use practice management software to track their cases. This approach — sometimes called the "honeycomb" model — ensures that technology training reinforces rather than competes with traditional legal skills development.

Is the skills gap the same across different practice areas?

No. The gap varies significantly by practice area. Litigation has been most affected by advances in e-discovery and predictive coding, making technology proficiency especially critical for trial lawyers and litigators. Transactional practice is being reshaped by contract lifecycle management and AI-assisted due diligence. Regulatory compliance is increasingly driven by RegTech tools that monitor and analyze legislative changes. Even areas like legal research — long considered a foundational skill — now require familiarity with AI-enhanced platforms that go far beyond traditional keyword searching.

What role should law firm leadership play in addressing the skills gap?

Firm leadership sets the tone. Partners and managing directors who prioritize technology training — by funding learning programs, allocating non-billable time for skill development, and tying technology competency to advancement criteria — create environments where the skills gap closes faster. Conversely, firms where technology adoption is treated as an IT function rather than a strategic priority tend to see slower uptake and wider internal disparities. The most effective approach combines top-down investment with bottom-up experimentation, supported by a dedicated legal operations function that manages the intersection of technology, process, and talent.

Your Action Checklist: Steps You Can Take Today

- **Audit your own technology skills.** Honestly assess your proficiency with the platforms relevant to your practice area. Identify two or three specific tools where deeper competency would make you more productive or more marketable.

- **Explore vendor training programs.** Sign up for a free trial or training module from Clio, Relativity, or Westlaw Edge. Most platforms offer introductory courses at no cost.
- **If you are a law school administrator, evaluate the Thomson Reuters–Hotshot model.** Determine whether your students already have Westlaw access and can benefit from the free Hotshot training courses immediately.
- **If you manage a legal team, conduct a skills gap assessment.** Survey your team on their technology comfort levels and map the results against your firm or department's strategic technology priorities.
- **Build a personal learning roadmap.** Choose one technology skill per quarter to develop, whether that is mastering Harvey AI for research, learning the fundamentals of document review algorithms, or pursuing a legal operations certification.
- **Subscribe to DilyCode** for weekly analysis of legal technology trends, tool reviews, and practical guides that help you stay ahead of the curve.

The legal technology skills gap is real, it is widening, and it affects everyone from first-year law students to managing partners. But it is also solvable. The profession has the tools, the training resources, and — increasingly — the institutional will to close the divide. The question is no longer whether law schools and legal employers will adapt. It is whether you will be ahead of the curve or behind it when they do.

Spread the word

Careers & Education

"law school curriculum reform", "legal AI education", "legal tech training", "legal technology skills gap"

‹ The Legislative Drafting Crisis Nobody Talks About — A Practitioner's View on Parliament's Outdated Workflows

› How to Build a Virtual Legal Clinic That Actually Serves Underrepresented Communities

Leave a Comment

Name *

Email *

Website

Save my name, email, and website in this browser for the next time I comment.

Post Comment

Search

Categories

Select Category

How machine learning models learn to review legal documents

5 Steps to Evaluate Litigation Analytics Tools Before Your Next Big Case

Named Entity Recognition in Legal Contracts: How AI Identifies Parties, Dates, and Jurisdictions Automatically

How to Build a Virtual Legal Clinic That Actually Serves Underrepresented Communities

The Legal Technology Skills Gap: How Law Schools Can Bridge the Divide in 2026

Glossary

Tech Laws

Tools