

Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education: Regulatory Drivers, Institutional Responses, and Pedagogical Challenges in Vietnam

Nguyen Dang Nghia¹

¹Ho Chi Minh City Open University, Vietnam

Email: nguyenngocanhvien.2018@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:

Nguyen Dang Nghia (2026). Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education: Regulatory Drivers, Institutional Responses, and Pedagogical Challenges in Vietnam. International Journal of Special Education, 41(25s), 189-197

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping legal work and the preparation of future lawyers, yet little is known about how centrally regulated systems are responding in law schools. This study examines AI in Vietnamese legal education by analysing regulatory drivers, institutional responses, and pedagogical challenges in the public record up to 3 October 2026. A qualitative documentary analysis was conducted on a purposive corpus of 16 documents and analysed thematically. Four findings emerged. First, between March 2025 and August 2026 Vietnam assembled a layered regulatory architecture, including the Law on Artificial Intelligence (in force 1 March 2026) and two ministerial circulars. Second, these circulars require AI content in undergraduate learning outcomes and oblige institutions to adopt an AI code of conduct. Third, documented institutional responses are uneven, while student use of AI tools advances from the bottom up. Fourth, curriculum lag, faculty capacity, academic integrity, data protection, and output reliability recur as challenges. We interpret this as a “regulatory push, practice lag” pattern and argue for verification-centred teaching and assessment. The findings are analytical, not measures of effectiveness.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, legal education, Vietnam, academic integrity, AI governance.

1. Introduction

Law is a text-intensive profession, which makes it unusually exposed to generative AI. Large language models (LLMs) can summarise judgments, draft contracts and memoranda, and answer legal questions in fluent prose. Experimental evidence involving law-student participants suggests that such assistance can speed up routine legal tasks while producing uneven effects on quality (Choi et al., 2024). The

same fluency carries a well-documented danger: general-purpose models frequently generate plausible but false legal propositions and authorities, a phenomenon described as legal hallucination (Dahl et al., 2024). For law schools these two facts pull in opposite directions. Students will use these tools and graduates will need to work with them, yet the tools can undermine the reasoning and verification skills that legal education exists to build.

Vietnam offers an instructive setting in which to examine this tension. Between 2025 and 2026 the country enacted its first comprehensive Law on Artificial Intelligence, passed by the National Assembly on 10 December 2025 by 429 of 434 votes and in force since 1 March 2026 (National Assembly of Vietnam, 2025; VnEconomy, 2025). In parallel, the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) issued standards for undergraduate law programmes (MOET, 2025) and, in mid-2026, two circulars that bring AI explicitly into the design of university programmes and the governance of academic integrity (MOET, 2026a, 2026b). Undergraduate legal education in Vietnam is delivered by a mix of specialised law universities, law schools within national and multidisciplinary universities, and private institutions (Hien & Hai, 2026), all of which now operate under this new framework.

Despite this policy activity, scholarship on the subject remains limited and fragmented (Hien & Hai, 2026), and, to our knowledge, no study has consolidated the 2025–2026 policy package with the available evidence on how law schools and students are actually responding. This matters because rules that mandate AI content do not by themselves determine what students learn or how they are assessed. The objectives of this study are therefore to (1) map the regulatory architecture that now shapes AI in Vietnamese legal education; (2) describe the institutional and learner-level responses documented in the public record; (3) identify the principal challenges reported; and (4) derive implications for pedagogy and policy. Three research questions guide the analysis. **RQ1:** What regulatory requirements now apply to AI in Vietnamese legal education? **RQ2:** How are law schools and students engaging with AI, according to the available documents? **RQ3:** What challenges are reported, and what do they imply for teaching and assessment?

The relevant literature falls into three strands. The first concerns AI and the legal profession, where research documents the automation of research, drafting, and contract review and changes to the skills expected of lawyers (Choi et al., 2024; Hien & Hai, 2026). The second

concerns the reform of legal education, where proposals include competency models such as the “T-shaped” and “Delta” lawyer, which add technology, process, and interpersonal skills to legal knowledge, and the creation of legal-technology courses and law-and-technology centres at leading law schools abroad (Hien & Hai, 2026). The third strand is emerging Vietnamese scholarship. Hoàng (2025) argues for a human-centred pedagogical philosophy in which AI acts as a guided learning partner, warning that unmanaged use may erode critical thinking and professional values. Hien and Hai (2026) assess the implications of AI for programme renewal, and Trần and Trần (2026) report how one law school revised its curriculum to meet the 2025 national standard, including new modules on skills and technology application. Internationally, UNESCO’s (2021) Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence offers a normative reference on human oversight, fairness, and transparency. What is missing is an integrated account linking Vietnam’s regulatory instruments to evidence of institutional and student practice, which this study seeks to provide.

2. Methodology

- **Design:** A qualitative documentary analysis using a descriptive single-country case-study design (Vietnam). The study is interpretive. It aims to map and explain the policy and practice landscape, not to test hypotheses or to measure the effectiveness of any intervention.
- **Participants/Sample:** No human participants were involved; the unit of analysis is the document. A purposive corpus of 16 documents was assembled in four categories: (a) four legal and regulatory instruments; (b) seven regulatory commentaries and news reports describing those instruments; (c) three scholarly articles on AI and legal or higher education in Vietnam; and (d) two institutional or tool pages (a law-school conference programme and a commercial legal-AI assistant). Inclusion criteria were:

published or updated between March 2025 and 3 October 2026; directly concerned with AI or digital technology in Vietnamese higher or legal education, or with AI governance relevant to it; and issued by a regulator, recognised legal publisher, law firm, university, or scholarly journal. Social-media posts, anonymous blogs, and vendor marketing were excluded, except that the commercial tool page was used solely to establish the tool's existence and its provider's own description. Four further sources (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Choi et al., 2024; Dahl et al., 2024; UNESCO, 2021) served as conceptual and methodological references and were not coded as part of the corpus.

- **Instruments:** Two instruments structured the analysis: a document-extraction matrix (issuing body, date, status, key provisions or claims, and type of evidence) and a coding frame with four dimensions derived from the research questions: regulatory requirements, institutional responses, learner and tool practices, and reported challenges. No questionnaires or tests were used.
- **Procedure:** Searches were run on 3 October 2026 in English and Vietnamese, using combinations of terms such as “Law on Artificial Intelligence Vietnam”, “legal education Vietnam artificial intelligence”, “chuẩn chương trình đào tạo pháp luật”, and “Thông tư AI giáo dục đại học”. Results were screened against the inclusion criteria. Hien and Hai (2026) was read in full; the other scholarly items were assessed at abstract level, and the legal instruments were accessed through official-text summaries published by legal databases and news outlets and cross-checked against more than one summary where available. Relevant passages were extracted into the matrix, coded, and compared across source types to check for consistency and conflict.
- **Data Analysis:** Data were analysed using thematic analysis in the sense of Braun and Clarke (2006), combining deductive coding against the four-dimension frame with inductive identification of sub-themes (for example, regulatory push versus bottom-up adoption). Findings are reported descriptively; counts are used only to describe the corpus. Coding was carried out by a single analyst and was not checked for inter-coder reliability (see Section 4.5).

3. Results

3.1 Regulatory architecture

The corpus shows a layered architecture built in rapid succession (Table 1). The Law on Artificial Intelligence (Law No. 134/2025/QH15) provides the horizontal framework. It applies to domestic and foreign entities engaged in the research, development, provision, deployment, and use of AI systems in Vietnam; adopts a risk-based approach under which high-risk systems face requirements such as human oversight, risk management, and registration; and requires machine-readable labelling of AI-generated audio, image, and video content (BMVN International, 2026; Massmann, 2026). Transitional periods run to 1 March 2027 for most systems already in operation and to 1 September 2027 for systems in the fields of health, education, and finance (BMVN International, 2026).

Education-sector instruments sit beneath this framework. Decision 678/QĐ-BGDĐT sets the standard for undergraduate law programmes. Circular 54/2026/TT-BGDĐT requires AI content in undergraduate learning outcomes and programme structure, and Circular 49/2026/TT-BGDĐT regulates the use of technology and AI in higher and vocational education. Their main provisions, as reported in the corpus, are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Legal and regulatory instruments relevant to AI in Vietnamese legal education

Instrument	Date / status	Provisions relevant to legal education (as reported)
Law on Artificial Intelligence (Law No. 134/2025/QH15)	Passed 10 Dec 2025; in force 1 Mar 2026	Covers research, development, provision, deployment, and use of AI systems; risk-based approach with obligations for high-risk systems; labelling of AI-generated audio, image, and video; transition to 1 Mar 2027, or 1 Sep 2027 for health, education, and finance (BMVN International, 2026; Massmann, 2026; VnEconomy, 2025).
Decision 678/QĐ-BGDĐT	Issued 14 Mar 2025	Standard for undergraduate law programmes: at least 120 credits; full-time faculty to teach at least 70% of the programme; minimum facilities including online-learning systems; digital competence reported as a graduate requirement (MOET, 2025; Hien & Hai, 2026).
Circular 54/2026/TT-BGDĐT	In force 30 Jun 2026	Undergraduate learning outcomes must include digital competence and AI content, specified in observable and measurable terms; AI is listed among the supplementary content that programmes must contain (Bảo Ngọc, 2026; MOET, 2026b).
Circular 49/2026/TT-BGDĐT	Issued 30 Jun 2026; in force 15 Aug 2026	AI is a support tool that does not replace the academic responsibility of faculty or learners; AI use is permitted in teaching, assessment, online, blended, and personalised learning; institutions must issue academic-integrity rules and an AI code of conduct; AI-enabled cheating and non-disclosure of AI use where required are violations; information security and personal-data protection are required (LSVN, 2026; MOET, 2026a; Tường San, 2026).

Note. Provisions are reported as summarised in the sources cited; Circular 54/2026 rests on a single secondary summary. Readers should consult the official texts.

Circular 49 does not impose a uniform ban on student use of AI. It states that use should be purposeful, controlled, transparent, and not misrepresent the learner's actual competence, and it delegates the specification of permitted and prohibited uses to each institution's regulations and code of conduct (Bảo Lào Cai, 2026; Tường San, 2026).

3.2 Institutional responses

Documented institutional responses are varied but small in number. The National Economics University and the University of Economics Ho Chi Minh City are reported to have introduced

courses such as "Law and the Digital Economy" and a compulsory "Application of Information Technology in Law", and Hanoi Law University is reported to be developing programmes oriented towards technology law (Hien & Hai, 2026). The University of Law, Hue University revised its law programme to meet Decision 678, updating objectives, quantifying learning outcomes, adjusting credit ratios, adding modules on skills and technology application, and strengthening internships (Trần & Trần, 2026). Ho Chi Minh City University of Law has hosted a research conference programme addressing the management of AI and the impact of the Law on

Artificial Intelligence (Ho Chi Minh City University of Law, n.d.). In the scholarly literature, a paper in the journal of Hanoi Law University proposes that AI be integrated as a guided learning partner within a human-centred pedagogy, with a transparent and verifiable legal knowledge base and alignment with professional ethics (Hoàng, 2025). The evidence consists of announcements, curricular descriptions, and proposals; no evaluation of learning outcomes was found.

3.3 Student and tool practices

The most visible change is reported to be bottom-up. Vietnamese law students are

described as widely using general-purpose LLMs such as ChatGPT to translate legal terms, summarise lengthy judgments, and review reference materials (Ho, 2025, as cited in Hien & Hai, 2026). Domestic tools are also available, including AI Law Search (aitracuuluat.vn), noted by Hien and Hai (2026), and AI Luật, which its provider describes as an AI and machine-learning application trained on the provider's repository of legal documents and able to answer questions across more than 25 fields of law (LuatVietnam, n.d.). No independent evaluation of the accuracy or currency of these domestic tools was identified in the corpus.

3.4 Reported challenges

Five recurring challenges were coded across the corpus (Table 2).

Table 2. Challenges reported in the corpus

Challenge	Evidence reported	Source
Curriculum lag	Programme approval and updating are lengthy; much course content reflects pre-internet legal thinking and is weakly linked to cyberspace and data issues.	Hien & Hai (2026)
Legal-technology skills gap	Students have little exposure to professional legal software; there is a shortage of faculty able to teach at the interface of law and computing.	Hien & Hai (2026)
Academic integrity	Risk that students complete assignments mechanically with AI; lack of unified institutional conduct rules; new national rules classify AI-enabled cheating as a violation.	Hien & Hai (2026); LSVN (2026)
Data protection, confidentiality, and bias	AI tools are not neutral; confidential or personal data entered into external systems may be stored or reused opaquely; outputs may reproduce social and linguistic biases.	Hien & Hai (2026); Trường San (2026)
Erosion of critical thinking and professional values	Unmanaged AI use may weaken critical thinking and professional values; a human-centred pedagogy is proposed.	Hoàng (2025)

Note. Table 2 reports claims made in the sources; it does not measure their prevalence.

4. Discussion

4.1 Regulatory push, practice lag

Read together, the findings describe a system in which regulation has moved faster than documented practice. Between March 2025 and

August 2026, national instruments established standards, a statutory AI framework, mandatory AI content in learning outcomes, and institutional duties on academic integrity (Table 1). By contrast, the institutional evidence consists largely of individual course introductions,

programme revisions, and conferences, and the picture of student behaviour is drawn from secondary descriptions rather than measurement. This is consistent with Hien and Hai's (2026) characterisation of integration as early-stage and uneven. It also suggests why the pattern may persist. In a standards-based system, compliance can be demonstrated through documents such as outcome statements and course lists, whereas changing what students actually do with AI requires changes to teaching and assessment that are slower and costlier. The requirement that AI outcomes be observable and measurable (Bảo Ngọc, 2026) is potentially important because it creates a hook for assessment redesign, but whether it is used that way is an empirical question the present corpus cannot answer.

4.2 From prohibition to verification

Circular 49's decision to delegate rather than prohibit places the pedagogical burden on law schools. Because general-purpose models can produce confident but false legal authorities (Dahl et al., 2024), a blanket ban would be hard to enforce and would leave graduates unprepared, while unrestricted use risks the erosion of critical thinking that Hoàng (2025) warns against. A middle path consistent with the circular's emphasis on transparency is to make verification itself the object of assessment. Examples include AI-audit exercises in which students receive an AI-generated memorandum on Vietnamese law containing planted errors, such as repealed provisions or misattributed article numbers, and must check each citation against an official legal database; assessed disclosure statements describing how AI was used; and oral examinations or process portfolios that make reasoning visible. These are proposals derived from the findings, not practices documented in the corpus, and they should be piloted and evaluated. A Vietnam-specific reason to emphasise verification is the hypothesis that models trained mainly on other jurisdictions and languages may be less reliable on a large, frequently amended, Vietnamese-language body of law. This hypothesis remains untested, since no independent evaluation of Vietnamese-language tools was found.

4.3 Teaching about AI as well as with AI

The Law on Artificial Intelligence creates a body of law on which graduates will need to advise. Duties for providers and deployers, risk classification, labelling obligations, and sector-specific transition periods (BMVN International, 2026; Massmann, 2026) point to AI compliance as an emerging practice area, and law schools are already treating AI governance as a topic for scholarship and conferences (Ho Chi Minh City University of Law, n.d.; Hien & Hai, 2026). Law schools therefore have a double role: teaching students to use AI competently and critically, and teaching the law that governs AI. They are also potential deployers of AI in education. Because education-sector systems enjoy a longer transition to 1 September 2027 (BMVN International, 2026), institutions that use AI for admissions, proctoring, or grading should monitor whether such uses are classified as high-risk once implementing instruments are issued.

4.4 Implications for policy and practice

Four implications follow. First, faculty capacity: Hien and Hai (2026) report a shortage of staff who can bridge law and computing, and a mandate for AI content cannot be met without investment in faculty development and shared teaching resources that smaller or regional institutions may be unable to provide alone. Second, evidence: with domestic legal-AI assistants already available to students, institutions and regulators would benefit from independent evaluation of their accuracy and currency before recommending or restricting them. Third, data protection and confidentiality: both the circular and the literature stress the protection of personal data (Hien & Hai, 2026; Trường San, 2026), so clinics and moot exercises that use real case materials need explicit rules on what may be entered into external AI services. Fourth, equity: differences in access to paid tools, staff expertise, and resources between well-funded and smaller institutions may widen disparities in graduate readiness. The corpus gives no direct evidence on this, but it is a foreseeable risk that monitoring should address.

4.5 Limitations

Several limitations apply. The study is documentary: it contains no primary data from students, faculty, or employers, so it cannot show how AI is actually used or whether reforms improve learning. Legal instruments were accessed through summaries published by legal databases and news outlets rather than through the official texts, and Circular 54/2026 rests on a single summary. Apart from Hien and Hai (2026), scholarly sources were assessed at abstract level. The corpus is limited to English- and Vietnamese-language sources accessible online up to 3 October 2026 and probably favours well-publicised developments, so low-profile institutional initiatives may be missing. Coding was done by one analyst without inter-coder checks. Finally, the regulatory situation is changing quickly, with implementing instruments under the Law on Artificial Intelligence still expected (BMVN International, 2026), and the findings should be read as a snapshot.

5. Conclusion

This study mapped how AI is entering legal education in Vietnam through a rapidly assembled regulatory framework, a still-uneven set of institutional responses, and fast-moving student practice. Between March 2025 and August 2026, national instruments made AI content and institutional AI codes of conduct a formal expectation of university programmes, while the documented institutional response remains concentrated in new courses, curriculum revisions, and scholarly debate. The central challenge is therefore less whether Vietnamese law schools will address AI than whether the requirements will change what students are taught, how they are assessed, and how well they learn to verify machine-generated legal output. The following recommendations follow from the analysis:

- **Law schools:** translate the national requirements into assessed competencies (AI literacy, verification of AI-generated legal authorities, disclosure, and data-protection practice) and embed them

across the law curriculum rather than only in a stand-alone elective.

- **Institutional codes:** draft AI codes of conduct that specify permitted uses by assessment type, require disclosure, and are discussed with students and faculty before enforcement.
- **Assessment:** pilot AI-audit tasks, oral examinations, and process portfolios, and publish the results so that other institutions can learn from them.
- **Regulators and professional bodies:** support shared faculty-development resources and model teaching materials, especially for smaller and regional institutions, and monitor implementing instruments under the Law on Artificial Intelligence for education-sector obligations.

Future research should move from documents to data. Priorities include surveys and interviews with students, faculty, and legal employers; curriculum mapping across law schools to show what AI content is actually taught; independent benchmarking of the accuracy and currency of Vietnamese-language legal-AI tools; and evaluation of institutional AI codes and verification-centred assessments over time.

6. Acknowledgements

- The authors received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors for this study.

7. Author Declaration

- The authors confirm that this manuscript is original, has not been published previously, and is not under consideration elsewhere.
- The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
- Generative AI tools were used to support literature searching and language drafting. The authors reviewed and verified the content and take full responsibility for it.

References

- Báo Lào Cai. (2026). Từ 15/8, người học phải tuân thủ quy định mới về sử dụng AI trong giáo dục [From 15/8, learners must comply with new rules on the use of AI in education]. <https://baolaocai.vn/tu-158-nguoi-hoc-phai-tuan-thu-quy-dinh-moi-ve-su-dung-ai-trong-giao-duc-post906163.html>
- Bảo Ngọc. (2026, July 14). Từ 30/6/2026, chuẩn đầu ra đại học phải có nội dung về AI [From 30/6/2026, university learning outcomes must include AI content]. *LuatVietnam*. <https://luatvietnam.vn/tin-van-ban-moi/tu-189-197-2026-chuan-dau-ra-dai-hoc-phai-co-noi-dung-ve-ai-189-19712-article.html>
- BMVN International. (2026, February). *Vietnam artificial intelligence law: Foundation and outlook*. <https://www.bakermckenzie.com/en/insight/publications/2026/02/vietnam-artificial-intelligence-law-foundation-and-outlook>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Choi, J. H., Monahan, A. B., & Schwarcz, D. (2024). Lawyering in the age of artificial intelligence. *Minnesota Law Review*, 109, 147–218.
- Dahl, M., Magesh, V., Suzgun, M., & Ho, D. E. (2024). Large legal fictions: Profiling legal hallucinations in large language models. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, 16(1), 64–93. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laae003>
- Hien, H. N., & Hai, P. D. (2026). Artificial intelligence and the future of the legal profession: Implications for legal education in Vietnam. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*, 30(esp. 2), Article e026076. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v30iesp2.21370>
- Ho Chi Minh City University of Law. (n.d.). *Conference programme on artificial intelligence governance and Vietnam's Law on Artificial Intelligence* [Conference web page]. <https://conference.hcmulaw.edu.vn/ai-nafosted>
- Hoàng, X. C. (2025). A.I. as a guided learning partner in legal education: Theoretical framework, international experience, and policy implications for Vietnam. *Tạp chí Luật học*, (12). https://tapchi.hlu.edu.vn/Images/Post/files/T%E1%BA%A0P%20CH%C3%8D%20LU%E1%BA%ACT%20H%E1%BB%8CC/2025/S%E1%BB%91%2012/06_%20Ho%C3%A0ng%20Xu%C3%A2n%20Ch%C3%A2u_.pdf
- LSVN. (2026, July 6). Các hành vi vi phạm khi sử dụng AI trong học tập, đào tạo, nghiên cứu khoa học [Violations in the use of AI in learning, training, and research]. *Vietnam Lawyers Journal*. <https://lsvn.vn/cac-hanh-vi-vi-pham-khi-su-dung-ai-trong-hoc-tap-dao-tao-nghien-cuu-khoa-hoc-a175369.html>
- LuatVietnam. (n.d.). *AI Luật – Trợ lý pháp lý thông minh* [AI Law – Intelligent legal assistant] [Web application]. <https://ailuat.luatvietnam.vn/>
- Massmann, O. (2026, March 3). Vietnam – The first law on artificial intelligence – What you must know. *Duane Morris Vietnam Blog*. <https://blogs.duanemorris.com/vietnam/2026/03/03/vietnam-the-first-law-on-artificial-intelligence-what-you-must-know/>
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2025). *Quyết định số 678/QĐ-BGDĐT ngày 14 tháng 3 năm 2025 ban hành Chuẩn chương trình đào tạo lĩnh vực Pháp luật trình độ đại học* [Decision No. 678/QĐ-BGDĐT of 14 March 2025 promulgating the standard for undergraduate programmes in the field of law]. <https://luatvietnam.vn/giao-duc/quyet-dinh-678-qd-bgddt-2025-chuan-chuong-trinh-dao-tao-linh-vuc-phap-luat-trinh-do-dai-hoc-393907-d1.html>
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2026a). *Thông tư số 49/2026/TT-BGDĐT ngày 30 tháng 6 năm 2026 quy định về ứng dụng công nghệ trong giáo dục đại học, giáo dục nghề nghiệp* [Circular No. 49/2026/TT-BGDĐT of 30 June 2026 on the application of technology in higher education and vocational education]. <https://khoaduoc.pnt.edu.vn/vi/van-ban-phap-quy/thong-tu-so-189-197-tt-bgddt-quy-dinh-ve-ung-dung-cong-nghe-trong-giao-duc-dai-hoc-giao-duc-nghe-nghiep>
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2026b). *Thông tư số 54/2026/TT-BGDĐT quy định về chương trình đào tạo các trình độ của giáo dục đại học* [Circular No. 54/2026/TT-BGDĐT on training programmes at all levels of higher education]. <https://luatvietnam.vn/giao-duc/thong-tu-189-197-tt-bgddt-quy-dinh-chuong-trinh-dao-tao-dai-hoc-moi-nhat-440237-d1.html>

-
- National Assembly of Vietnam. (2025). *Luật Trí tuệ nhân tạo (Luật số 134/2025/QH15)* [Law on Artificial Intelligence (Law No. 134/2025/QH15)]. <https://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Cong-nghe-thong-tin/Luat-Tri-tue-nhan-tao-2025-so-189-197-QH189-19713.aspx>
- Trần, V. L., & Trần, T. X. H. (2026). Điều chỉnh chương trình đào tạo đáp ứng chuẩn chương trình đào tạo lĩnh vực pháp luật trình độ đại học, qua thực tiễn tại Trường Đại học Luật, Đại học Huế [Adjusting training programmes to meet the standard for undergraduate law programmes: Practice at the University of Law, Hue University]. *Hanoi Open University Journal of Science*. <https://jshou.edu.vn/houjs/article/view/1034>
- Tường San. (2026, July 5). Cơ sở giáo dục phải ban hành quy tắc ứng xử về sử dụng AI trong đào tạo, NCKH [Educational institutions must issue codes of conduct on the use of AI in training and research]. *Giáo dục Việt Nam*. <https://giaoduc.net.vn/co-so-giao-duc-phai-ban-hanh-quy-tac-ung-xu-ve-su-dung-ai-trong-dao-tao-nckh-post261103.gd>
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence* (SHS/BIO/PI/2021/1). UNESCO.
- VnEconomy. (2025, December 11). *National Assembly approves Vietnam's first AI law*. <https://en.vneconomy.vn/national-assembly-approves-vietnams-first-ai-law.htm>