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Legal Research Instruction and Law Librarianship in China:
An Updated View of Current Practices and a Comparison
with the U.S. Legal Education System*

Ning Han,** Liying Yu,*** and Anne Mostad-Jensen†

This article follows up on Liying Yu’s 2008 survey exploring the state of legal research instruction in Chinese law schools. The updated survey revisits the state of legal research instruction in China, explores several aspects not previously addressed, and discusses broader issues relevant to law librarianship in China such as management models, funding, staffing, and law librarian faculty status.
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Introduction

¶1 Legal research and information literacy instruction is an overlooked area of pedagogy in China’s legal education system. For decades, almost no legal research instruction was available at all, and progress to increase offers was very slow. A 2008 survey conducted by Professor Liying Yu, Law Library Director of Tsinghua University School of Law, confirmed this dearth of legal research courses.¹ Today, legal research courses are still not consistently offered at law schools in China. However, recently skills education has gained greater attention in China, and there is increased discussion of experiential learning, clinical education, and legal writing.² Legal research, an important component of skills education, deserves the same amount of attention and discussion, and we reexamine its value and practice with fresh pairs of eyes in this article.

¶2 In the United States, legal research and writing courses were first offered to law students in the late 1940s.³ As U.S. legal research instruction has developed since then, it has exhibited growing pains similar to those that legal research instruction in China is currently experiencing.⁴ Today, law schools, the American Bar Association (ABA), and the law librarian community work toward one common goal: to make law students better researchers. Standard 302(c) of the 2016–2017 American Bar Association Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools considers legal research to be a minimum competency that every law program should include in its learning outcomes.⁵ The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) has gone further by defining and setting standards for legal research competency. The AALL has also strongly advocated for making law school curriculums reflect the realities of the legal field.⁶ In July 2013, AALL approved the

Principles and Standards for Legal Research Competency with the hope of providing value to the legal profession in the following ways:

- To foster best practices in law school curriculum development and design
- To inform law firm planning, training, and articulation of core competencies
- To encourage bar admission committee evaluation of applicants’ research skills
- To inspire continuing education program development
- To impact law school accreditation standards review

§3 The U.S. practice of legal research instruction has inspired many Chinese law librarians. With this shifted focus of Chinese legal education, it is a good time to revisit legal research instruction practice in China to see whether improvements have occurred since the 2008 survey.

§4 This study, a follow-up to Yu’s 2008 work, sought to gain an updated view of legal research instructional offerings in law schools in China. We wanted to determine how legal research instruction was being delivered in terms of curriculum design, credit structure, teaching method, and assessment method, all in comparison with the U.S. model. In addition, we hoped to gain a better understanding of student and employer perceptions toward legal research skills as a way to determine whether a healthy working relationship existed between legal educators and practitioners. This article also touches on broader issues such as law library management models, funding, staffing, and law librarian faculty status to provide readers with a robust picture of the law library environment in law schools in China.

Background

China’s Legal Education System

§5 Despite China’s long history of civilization, Chinese legal education, in a strict sense, is a product of modern China. Modern Chinese legal education commenced in the late years of the Qing Dynasty (1644–1912). It moved into a new era in 1977 when formal university education was restored in China. Its very existence, then, is only a little more than a hundred years old. The modern Chinese legal education system models itself after the continental legal education systems, particularly those of Japan and Germany. It also exhibits certain influences from the

11. See id.
former Soviet Union’s legal education system. The combined merits of these three systems were adopted and modified with added Chinese characteristics, which make the Chinese legal education system unique, especially when compared with that of the United States.

One of the unique characteristics of the Chinese legal education system lies in its diverse types of law schools and law degrees. Legal education is typically offered in political science and law institutes or law schools that are associated with comprehensive universities. Legal education is also offered at independent law schools or law schools that are affiliated with community colleges or vocational schools. This study only examines legal research instruction offerings at law schools affiliated with comprehensive universities or political science and law institutes.

Under China’s current legal education structure, four types of degrees are commonly offered: Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.), Master of Laws (LL.M.), Juris Master (J.M.), and Doctor of Laws (LL.D.). Some law schools also offer dual or joint degrees of law and other disciplines. As in many other countries, law in China is primarily an undergraduate field of study. Graduates from senior high schools who have passed the national entrance examination are eligible candidates for LL.B. programs. It usually takes an LL.B. candidate four years to complete the law school program of study. As for graduate programs, the LL.M is a traditional civil law graduate degree, while the J.M. is modeled after the American J.D. degree. Only students with LL.B. degrees can apply for LL.M. programs. Unlike the large classes typical in LL.B. programs, LL.M. classes are mainly small seminars of no more than twenty students, organized according to their area of specialization. In contrast, J.M. programs are designed to attract students without LL.B. degrees and to offer students more practical and professional training with the hope of producing better legal practitioners. However, prejudice against J.M. students is reported in legal education and the job market. Firms, whether international or domestic, favor students who obtain their LL.B. degree and then their LL.M. degree, in China or abroad. Similar to the S.J.D. or J.S.D. degree in America, the LL.D. tops China’s

---

12. See id.
13. See id.
18. Id. at 66.
19. See Zhao & Hu, supra note 14, at 337.
20. See Baskir, supra note 16, at 170; Erie, supra note 17, at 68.
22. Erie, supra note 17, at 73, 75.
legal degree pyramid.\textsuperscript{23} LL.D. programs primarily focus on producing legal researchers and scholars rather than practitioners. Figure 1 illustrates the law degree system in China.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{8} The degree of disconnect between China’s legal education system and the legal profession is another unique characteristic recognized by many legal scholars and educators.\textsuperscript{25} It seems evident that law schools and the legal profession should be working together to offer the best training to future lawyers, judges, prosecutors, and public defenders and that this collaboration would be mutually beneficial.\textsuperscript{26} Although China’s legal education has developed at a rapid pace in the past two decades, it has not concerned itself with incorporating the needs and demands of the real world.\textsuperscript{27} In the United States, the ABA plays an important role in not only regulating legal education and the legal profession but also in promoting exchanges

---


\textsuperscript{26} See Zou, supra note 25, at 172.

\textsuperscript{27} Id. at 173.
and collaborations between these two stakeholders.\textsuperscript{28} In contrast, legal education in China is largely under the purview of the Ministry of Education, while the legal profession is administered by the Ministry of Justice and is guided by professional associations.\textsuperscript{29} The Ministry of Justice used to oversee five political science and law institutes,\textsuperscript{30} but the Ministry of Education started to oversee those five law institutes in 2000.\textsuperscript{31} In addition, specialized organizations related to legal practice are usually not involved in the development of legal education.\textsuperscript{32} The All China Lawyers Association (ACLA), which is the Chinese equivalent of the ABA, is charged only with the regulation and training of lawyers once they have matriculated and joined the legal profession.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{¶9} In addition, unlike legal education in the United States, which aims to cultivate legal practitioners, Chinese legal education attempts to produce legal generalists across disciplines with a basic understanding of the legal framework and philosophy, as well as vocational education.\textsuperscript{34} Professor Zhu Suli\textsuperscript{35} attributes the Chinese legal education program’s lack of skills training to a rational choice made by the consumers, or law school students.\textsuperscript{36} The majority of law school graduates choose not to practice law or perform legal-related work. Instead, they may become civil servants working in government agencies, engage in nonlegal work at private companies, start their own businesses, or even work for the media.\textsuperscript{37} Because of the variety of career choices, legal skills education is deemed less critical by Chinese law students. Statistics indicate that every year less than ten percent of law school graduates enter the legal profession directly after graduating from law school.\textsuperscript{38}

Development of Legal Research Instruction in China

\textsuperscript{¶10} Legal research instruction had a relatively late start in China, beginning only in the mid-1980s. Since 1984, the Ministry of Education has encouraged colleges and universities to offer literature retrieval or information retrieval courses with the goal of increasing the information literacy level of college students.\textsuperscript{39}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{28} About the American Bar Association, \textit{Am. Bar Ass’n}, \url{http://www.americanbar.org/about_the_aba.html} [https://perma.cc/B2TU-X45G].
\bibitem{29} Ji, \textit{supra} note 25, at 10; Zhao & Hu, \textit{supra} note 14, at 335.
\bibitem{30} The five political science and law institutes are China University of Political Science and Law, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, East China University of Political Science and Law, Southwest University of Political Science and Law, and Northwest University of Politics and Law.
\bibitem{31} Ji, \textit{supra} note 25, at 13; Zhao & Hu, \textit{supra} note 14, at 336; Zou, \textit{supra} note 25, at 173.
\bibitem{32} Ji, \textit{supra} note 25, at 13.
\bibitem{33} 中华全国律师协会章程, \url{http://www.acla.org.cn/zhangchen.jhtml} (last visited Dec. 30, 2016).
\bibitem{34} See Zhu, \textit{supra} note 2, at 81.
\bibitem{35} Su Li Zhu, also known as Su Li, is a renowned civil law scholar, retired dean, and professor of law at Peking University Law School. \textit{See Professor Zhu Suli, Legal Theory, Peking Univ. Law Sch.}, \url{http://en.law.pku.edu.cn/faculty/faculty1/11797.htm} [https://perma.cc/XH8P-U8M2].
\bibitem{36} See Zhu, \textit{supra} note 2, at 81.
\bibitem{37} See id.
\bibitem{39} In 1984, the Ministry of Education promulgated a guiding opinion encouraging higher education in China to offer information literacy and document retrieval courses. \textit{Guyu zai Gaodeng Xueuxiao Kaishce Wenxian Jiansuoke de Yijian}《关于在高等学校开设文献检索课的意见》【(84)教高一字004号】，\url{http://edu.lib.tsinghua.edu.cn/ToolBox/WenJian/jiaoyubu.htm} [https://perma.cc/V4WT-9VWW].
\end{thebibliography}
Ministry of Education highly recommended that colleges and universities require students to take document retrieval courses. Schools with limited resources could offer electives or topical workshops and then gradually transition these offerings to required courses. In 1985, the Ministry of Education instituted further requirements for course coverage, learning outcomes, credit hours, targeted audience, and more. In 1992, to further standardize the practices of research instruction in China’s colleges and universities, the Ministry of Education formed a task force to tailor trainings and guidance for research instruction practices at different institutions. The task force also worked intensively on textbook writing and editing. All of the above-mentioned efforts were fundamental to the development of research instruction in colleges and universities, as well as to legal research instruction in law schools.

However, none of the Ministry of Education’s recommendations regarding research instruction are mandatory, nor are they specifically tailored to guide legal research instruction in law schools. The lack of a national standard guiding legal research instruction has resulted in varied practices and offerings of legal research courses from school to school.

The 2008 survey conducted by Professor Liying Yu revealed that only six out of thirteen law schools surveyed offered legal research instruction as part of their formal law school curriculums. The majority of law schools at that time did not offer any formal legal research courses. Indeed, the word “dearth” was used by Kara Phillips, Wei Luo, and Joan Liu in their 2013 article Law Librarianship in China: Challenges and Opportunities to describe the limited offerings of legal research instruction in law schools in China.


42. Wenxian Jiansuo Jiaoxue de Jiben Yaoqiu, supra note 39.
43. See Yu, supra note 1. The thirteen law schools surveyed in 2008 include four political science and law institutes and nine university-affiliated law schools. They are China University of Political Science and Law, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, East China University of Political Science and Law, Southwest University of Political Science and Law, Peking University Law School, Renmin University Law School, Wuhan University School of Law, Nankai University School of Law, Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University, Nanjing University School of Law, Zhejiang University Guanghua Law School, Xiamen University School of Law, and Tsinghua University School of Law. The six law schools found to offer legal research instruction as part of the law school curriculum are: China University of Political Science and Law, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, East China University of Political Science and Law, Southwest University of Political Science and Law, Xiamen University School of Law, and Tsinghua University School of Law.
44. Phillips, Luo & Liu, supra note 4, at 13.
¶13 As Phillips, Luo, and Liu pointed out, even law schools that offer legal research instruction use varied approaches, much like U.S. law schools.45 Only a few require students to take legal research, and the number of credits granted varies. Law librarians teach legal research instruction courses independently at certain law schools, while at other schools law librarians only co-teach with career faculty or guest lecturers on research techniques as an additional component to a doctrinal law course.46 Law schools without formal legal research courses offer various types of legal research trainings, including orientation on using library resources, information literacy instruction, and specialized training on Chinese and foreign legal databases.47

¶14 The lack of a national standard guiding legal research instruction and course offerings is not the only factor that impedes the development of legal research instruction in China. In fact, since the 2008 survey, Chinese law librarians at the regional, national, and international levels have discussed whether to add legal research courses to the formal law school curriculum, how to raise awareness among students and law school administration as to the importance of legal research instruction, and how to improve legal research instruction pedagogy. Questions about whether the status of legal research instruction in China has improved within the larger context of legal education after the 2008 survey led to the study on which this article is based.

Methodology

¶15 A survey was employed as the primary data collection instrument for this study. We also reviewed literature and information such as course offerings and learning outcomes, which were collected from the websites of the law schools surveyed.

Sample Size and Composition

¶16 In 2012, China had approximately 624 law schools and 450,000 law students.48 To collect representative data about the current status of legal research instruction practices in China, we chose a sample set containing law schools of different types, ranking tiers, and geographic locations.

¶17 We surveyed twenty-five law schools, including sixteen law schools (sixty-four percent) that are affiliated with Project 985–rated universities;49 four political science and law institutes or law schools (sixteen percent) that are affiliated with...
Project 211–rated universities; three political science and law institutes (twelve percent) that are not Project 211–rated universities, and two independent or non-traditional law schools (eight percent). In addition, the surveyed law schools represent top-rated law schools in China, according to the 2012 China Discipline Ranking (CDR) conducted by the China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center. Among the twenty-five law schools surveyed, twenty-one are on the list of the top thirty Chinese law schools. Overall, the survey includes law schools either affiliated with Project 985–rated or Project 211–rated universities or stand-alone top-ranked law institutes. We purposely composed the sample this way because these law schools tend to be better funded and are often early adopters of new legal research instruction practices, such as specialized legal research. Surveying these law schools not only revealed the current practices of legal research instruction in China, but also represented the best status of the current practices of legal research instruction in China. Appendix B lists the law schools included in the survey.

Survey Objectives

The 2015 survey was designed with five objectives: (1) to determine the level of independence law libraries have within their law schools and university libraries through indicators such as funding, personnel, and administrative structures; (2) to gather data on the current practices of basic legal research instruction in China, specifically in terms of course offerings, number of credits offered, format, frequency, instruction, and assessment methods; (3) to explore the level of legal research instruction available by surveying whether advanced legal research (ALR) or specialized legal research (SLR) are offered; (4) to study students’ perceptions about research skill courses and level of support from law school administration for both law library and legal research instruction courses; and (5) to ascertain whether healthy feedback and regulatory systems are in place among employers, legal educators, the bar association, and the Ministry of Education.

50. Project 211 is a project seeking to develop one hundred leading universities in China. There are 112 Project 211–rated universities. See Minzner, supra note 49, at 346; Paradise, supra note 49, at 198. A list of 211 institutions can be found at The Office of China Initiatives, supra note 49.

51. The law school ranking is based on the 2012 China Discipline Ranking (CDR), which is the latest discipline ranking conducted by the China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center. CDR evaluates the disciplines of universities and colleges in Mainland China in accordance with the Discipline Catalogue of Degree Awarding and Talent Training approved by the Chinese Ministry of Education. In its evaluation, the CDR mainly focuses on a university or college’s teaching staff and resources, its scientific research level, its quality of talent training, and the reputation of its disciplines. The CDR carries out its evaluation in a way that combines an objective calculation of data and peer review. 2012 CHINA DISCIPLINE RANKING, http://www.cdgdc.edu.cn/xwyyjsjyyx/xxsdjdz/2012en/277261.shtml# [https://perma.cc/M4MS-J5CC].

52. The specialized legal research (SLR) course is considered to be the next generation of the advanced legal research (ALR) course, and it typically focuses on teaching research skills tied to a specialized area of law. See Cassie DuBay, Specialized Legal Research Courses: The Next Generation of Advanced Legal Research, 33 LEGAL REFERENCE SERVS. Q. 203, 205 (2014).
Survey Design

¶19 To collect data on legal research instruction practices in China in a way to aid comparative study, the survey structure is based on legal research instruction approaches introduced in Blair Kauffman’s article *Information Literacy in Law: Starting Points for Improving Legal Research Competencies*. In his article, Kauffman summarizes four approaches typically used in U.S. law schools for improving the legal research skills of prospective lawyers and encourages information professionals across borders to borrow whatever they deemed useful and transferrable from the U.S. experience. The four approaches are “(1) offering mandatory law school courses in legal research; (2) adding elective credit-based courses in legal research,” such as ALR or SLR; “(3) offering non-credit legal research support to law students at their points of need,” such as embedded legal research teaching and online live reference services or tutorials; and “(4) testing prospective lawyers on their legal research competencies as a requirement to being licensed to practice law.” We used the first three approaches as the basis for the survey construction.

¶20 The 2015 survey comprised thirty-six questions that were primarily centered on the following four areas: (1) basic information about the law school surveyed and information about the law library, such as personnel and funding; (2) basic legal research or first-year legal research instruction offerings; (3) ALR and SLR instruction offering(s); and (4) embedded legal research instruction offerings and reference services. Concepts that might be alien to Chinese law librarians were introduced in the survey to ensure a shared understanding.

¶21 The survey was built in June 2014 using SurveyMonkey, an online survey software program that Concordia University School of Law licenses for conducting surveys. For the convenience of our Chinese participants, the survey was written in Chinese except for the background introduction section. Participants were allowed to provide extensive comments, if desired. Survey questions were pretested and revised before distribution. The survey was distributed electronically in October 2014 to law library directors or acting law library directors at the twenty-five law schools mentioned above, and most responses were received by January 2015.

Survey Results, Analysis, and Discussion

¶22 In this section, we share the findings of the survey, along with analysis and discussion of the survey results.

¶23 We received twenty-two valid responses, of which twenty were returned electronically and two were returned in paper format, for a response rate of eighty-eight percent. Three individual responses received from Zhongnan University of Economics and Law were consolidated and counted as one response. Three

---

54. *Id.* at 339.
55. The survey is publicly accessible at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZPXKT2P, and a translated version of the survey is available infra appendix A.
56. Sichuan University School of Law and Peking University School of Transnational Law (STL) responded to the survey in paper. The latter school submitted responses in May 2015, after the closing date of the survey. Unlike the responses received from other law schools, STL supplied seventy-one responses that were filled out directly by their enrolled students.
law schools did not respond: Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Law, Jilin University School of Law, and Chongqing University School of Law.

**Basic Legal Research Instruction**

§24 The 2015 survey revealed a noticeable increase in the offering of basic legal research or first-year legal research courses in Chinese law schools. The 2008 survey found only six law schools among the thirteen surveyed (forty-six percent) offering basic legal research instruction as a part of the law school curriculum. In the new survey, sixteen law schools out of the twenty-two that responded (seventy-three percent) offer a basic legal research course. In addition, it came as a pleasant surprise to learn that law schools in China are more willing to offer a basic legal research course as a required course. Basic legal research courses were not a required offering at any law schools at the time of the 2008 survey. Now, four law schools that participated in the 2015 survey reported requiring a basic legal research course. Though these four schools are just the tip of the iceberg, they indicate an increased recognition of the importance of legal research instruction in the broader context of legal education in China. The other six law schools surveyed currently do not provide any formal basic legal research instruction. Figure 2 details this numerical breakdown.

§25 The 2015 survey found that twelve of the sixteen law school respondents (seventy-five percent) that offer a basic legal research course assign it two credits (see figure 3). Peking University School of Transnational Law uses a three-credit structure, while Tsinghua University School of Law and Wuhan University School of Law employ a one-credit structure. Xiamen University School of Law’s practice is a little different. Though the course is mandatory for graduate-level law students, there is no stipulated schoolwide credit requirement. The respondent from Xiamen University School of Law did not supply further information on how the course is conducted under such a unique setup. Yu reported in her article based on the 2008 survey that it is quite challenging to cover the wide range of topics, provide live demonstrations, and involve students in hands-on exercises within the limited

---

57. The thirteen law schools that participated in the 2008 survey were included in this survey as well. The thirteen schools were: China University of Political Science and Law, East China University of Political Science and Law, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Southwest University of Political Science and Law, Renmin University Law School, Tsinghua University School of Law, Peking University School of Law, Nanjing University School of Law, Zhejiang University Guanghua Law School, Nankai University School of Law, Wuhan University School of Law, Xiamen University School of Law, and Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University. The six schools in italics are the ones that reported offering basic legal research instruction as part of the law school curriculum in the 2008 survey.

58. Renmin University Law School and Nanjing University School of Law started offering a basic legal research instruction course as an elective in spring 2015, even though they answered “no” when filling out the survey. For statistical purposes, we counted both schools in this article as schools that currently offer basic legal research courses.

59. The four law schools are Xiamen University School of Law, China-EU School of Law (CESL) at the China University of Political Science and Law, Peking University School of Transnational Law (STL), and Shandong University School of Law. Xiamen University School of Law has been considered an early-adopter school with regard to legal research instruction ever since the 2008 survey. Both CESL and STL are relatively unique since their programs are modeled on EU law schools and the American J.D. program. Both programs are taught in English, and their course offerings are similar to those offered at European and American law schools.
In the future, we would like to find out whether there is any trend or movement toward making basic legal research a three-credit course in China.

Paragraph 26 There was no consensus among the schools surveyed as to whether basic legal research should be an undergraduate- or a graduate-level course. Schools tend to either offer basic legal research to their LL.B. students during the fall semester or opt to only offer it to their LL.M. or J.M. students as part of the graduate-level course of study. No schools surveyed indicated that basic legal research is offered

---

60. See Yu, supra note 1, at 31–32.
at both undergraduate and graduate levels, primarily because of a lack of sufficient personnel to support offerings at both levels. For example, Tsinghua University School of Law has only one law librarian qualified to teach legal research. The course used to be offered at the graduate level at Tsinghua Law, but now is offered at the undergraduate level due to the limited personnel capacity. Class size generally varies from thirty to two hundred, depending on the enrollment during the year and whether it is offered at the undergraduate or graduate level.

¶27 In more than eighty percent of the law schools that responded, law librarians teach the basic legal research course. The practices at the China-EU School of Law (CESL), Peking University School of Transnational Law (STL), and Peking University Law School differ slightly from the majority of law schools surveyed. The law programs offered at the CESL and STL are very much like a typical U.S. law school J.D. program. Rather than offering a separate first-year legal research course, both schools offer Legal Research and Writing, which is currently taught by American professors. In contrast, Peking University Law School employs a law school professor rather than a law librarian to teach the basic legal research and writing course.

¶28 One issue that troubled us is that the status of law librarians in China is not the same as their peers in the United States. Most law librarians in China do not have permanent employment status, not to mention faculty status. This job insecurity causes unpredictable personnel changes, which in turn affects course offerings. The limited interactions between law librarians and law school faculty result in disconnected coverage between the research courses and the doctrinal law courses. In addition, some law schools do not allow law librarians enough time to prepare for courses or compensate them properly for teaching, which further dampens law librarians’ enthusiasm and interest in teaching.

¶29 Course coverage varies from school to school. Most respondents indicated that the following topics are generally covered: introduction to legal research, research methods and strategies, legal sources and authorities, Chinese law research, foreign and international law research, reference tools and free Internet resources, database search tips, and how to communicate research results through legal writing. When asked about textbook usage and specific textbook choices, a split was found among the sixteen law schools that currently offer basic legal research courses. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that they use either commercial textbooks or internally produced textbooks. *Falu Wenxian Jiansuo* 《法律文献检

---

61. The Peking University School of Transnational Law (STL) and Peking University Law School (PKU Law) are two separate programs. STL is located at the Shenzhen satellite campus while PKU Law sits on its main campus in Beijing.


63. The course at PKU Law is currently taught by Professor Bin Ling, who also wrote a book titled *A Must-Read Book for Law Students: Legal Writing and Research* 《法科学生必修课：论文写作与资源检索》(2013), published by Peking University Press.

64. We report on more findings with regard to law librarians’ status in China in later sections of this article.
索》65 by Liying Yu and Zhongwai Falu Wenxian Jiansuo《中外法律文献检索》66 by Yanping Lin are the two most commonly used textbooks, according to the survey.67 One respondent commented that his school tends to use multiple textbooks to provide more comprehensive coverage. The survey revealed a linear correlation between course coverage and textbook usage. Textbook-supported courses are more comprehensive in their coverage. Figure 4 details these findings.

¶30 In terms of teaching method, two-thirds of responding law schools currently offering basic legal research courses reported using a combined approach of lecturing, live demonstration, and hands-on exercises, while the remaining third still rely heavily on a pure lecturing approach.68 Though there is a plethora of literature criticizing the inefficiency of a pure lecturing teaching style, it is still widely used for law school instruction in China.69 Chinese legal educators recognized the drawbacks of the lecture approach several decades ago, and some of them have avidly advocated for incorporating the Socratic method into the traditional lecturing approach to encourage in-class student engagement.70 We were pleased to learn

---

67. There currently are more than twenty textbooks on legal research. For a list of these titles, see Yu, supra note 65, at 274.
68. This mainstream teaching approach was referred as “stuffing the duck” (tianya jiaoxue) by Matthew S. Erie. See Erie, supra note 17, at 71; cf. Sharon K. Hom, Beyond “Stuffing the Goose”: The Challenge of Modernization and Reform for Law and Legal Education in the People’s Republic of China, in Chinese Education: Programs, Policies, and Prospects 287 (Irving Epstein ed., 1991).
70. There are numerous Chinese publications advocating legal education reform, especially in the areas of pedagogical change and shifting focus from theoretical education to professional education and lawyering skills education. A few serial publications include Chinese Yearbook of
from the results of this survey that this desired pedagogical change is taking place and, in fact, is already largely reflected in the teaching of legal research courses.

¶31 The assessment methods adopted by basic legal research course instructors in China are strikingly similar to those used in the United States, at least judging from the survey’s brief responses. Nine out of sixteen law schools reported that a variety of assessment methods, rather than relying exclusively on a final exam or project, are used to assess students. The assessment methods adopted by individual instructors at individual institutions could be a combination of the following: weekly assignments, quizzes, presentations, final projects, or final exams (that are either written or hands-on, based on hypotheticals given). The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar released the revised Standard 302 on Learning Outcomes and Standard 314 on Assessment of Student Learning in June 2015, which now require law schools to identify learning outcomes for its program as a whole, as well as for each course offered. The revised standards also emphasize the importance of utilizing both formative and summative assessment methods in law school curriculums to measure and improve student learning and provide meaningful feedback to students. Though the survey results confirm that the specific assessment methods used in legal research instruction in China are similar to the ones used in law schools in the United States, we are unsure whether the assessment methods chosen are tied to learning outcomes and whether both formative and summative assessments are required to be used to provide feedback to students.

¶32 The remaining six law schools reported that no formal basic or first-year legal research course is currently offered to their students. These schools did report, however, that various informal research trainings such as library resources orientations, vendor-led database trainings, and specialized research sessions as a component of a doctrinal course were offered. When asked whether their schools planned to add a basic legal research course as part of the law school curriculum, only three respondents answered affirmatively, while the rest indicated either that

Legal Education 《中国法学教育年刊》, Legal Education Research 《法学教育研究》, and China Legal Research Education 《中国法学教育研究》. A monograph and two articles that discuss the reforma-


72. See id. at 2. According to ABA Interpretation 314-1:
Formative assessment methods are measurements at different points during a particular course or at different points over the span of a student’s education that provide meaningful feedback to improve student learning. Summative assessment methods are measurements at the culmination of a particular course or at the culmination of any part of a student’s legal education that measure the degree of student learning.

2016–2017 STANDARDS, supra note 5, at 23.

73. The number of law schools that did not offer a basic or first-year legal research course at the time of the survey was eight, rather than six. Two of them, Renmin University Law School and Nanjing University School of Law, started offering basic or first-year legal research as an elective beginning in spring 2015. For statistical purposes, we did not count them as schools that currently do not offer basic or first-year legal research for this part of the discussion. See supra note 58.
there was no such plan or that they were unsure about what direction their law schools were going to take on this particular matter. What interested us most were the reasons certain law schools were less willing to include a basic or first-year legal research course as part of the formal curriculum. Reasons identified by respondents from different law schools included the law school administration’s insufficient recognition of the value of research courses; a lack of qualified law librarians; a low perceived student demand; a lack of a national committee guiding legal research instruction across law schools; and a lack of related trainings, guidance, and standards. This finding is consistent with feedback received in later parts of the study as well as the existing literature.

**Advanced Legal Research and Specialized Legal Research**

¶33 Under the U.S. system, the ALR course is generally defined as “a course offered in the law school curriculum, beyond the first year, for academic credit in which the primary focus is teaching legal research skills.” The ALR course tends to cover databases and print materials not typically covered in the basic legal research course, such as legislative histories, secondary sources, and municipal codes. The existence of ALR courses was first researched in 1983 and has now become an integral part of the law school curriculum. Of the 198 ABA-approved law schools, 53.5% offered an ALR course in 2014. The SLR course, considered the next generation of ALR courses, typically focuses on teaching research skills tied to a specialized area of law. Topics in these courses range “from tax and foreign and international law to more unique [areas] such as animal law, health law, and even space law.”

¶34 To make sure that respondents shared the same understanding of ALR and SLR courses, as well as to make sure that comparable data could be collected, we defined and introduced those two concepts when designing the survey. But it did not appear that respondents shared the same understanding of ALR and SLR when they filled out the survey. However, their understanding did not deviate very much from the concepts introduced, so the validity of the survey was not compromised. According to the responses, five law schools out of twenty-two (23%) currently offer formal ALR or SLR courses, and eight law schools (38%) offer some ALR or

74. The following schools answered affirmatively that their law schools are planning to offer a basic legal research course in the near future: Nankai University School of Law, Renmin University Law School, and Nanjing University School of Law.

75. See Phillips, Luo & Liu, supra note 4. In their article, Phillips, Luo, and Liu discuss some key issues and challenges faced by law librarians, and many of the issues echoed the findings from our survey. Some major issues raised included the lack of national standards requiring Chinese law schools to allocate sufficient funds to support law library functions; the lack of accreditation processes and accreditation standards that require law schools to have law libraries; the fundamental problem with the law library director appointment mechanism, which is largely based on seniority rather than qualifications; and the incredibly high librarian-to-student ratio, which makes it impossible to provide value-added services to faculty and students.


77. DuBay, supra note 52, at 208.

78. See id.

79. See id. at 212.

80. Id. at 216.
SLR components. The remaining nine schools do not offer any ALR or SLR courses or components at this time.

Law schools without a basic legal research course offering largely overlapped with schools that do not currently offer ALR or SLR courses. Nankai University School of Law and Fudan University Law School are two exceptions. Neither offered basic legal research instruction courses at the time of the survey, but both claimed that they offered some sort of ALR or SLR instruction. Nankai University School of Law reported that research seminars were offered in the past upon request, while Fudan University Law School reported that professors teaching British and American law tend to cover legal research in their classes. Even though both schools self-identified as schools that offer ALR or SLR courses, none of the offerings would be considered as formal ALR or SLR offerings in a strict sense, as defined above. In contrast, Shandong University School of Law and China University of Political Science and Law are ahead of the ALR or SLR game compared to the rest of the schools surveyed. Both schools regularly offer ALR or SLR to their graduate students. These courses are tailored to the students’ specializations and the special requirements of the programs in which they are enrolled. \(^{81}\) The offerings tend to be one or two credits and are usually taught by law librarians.

When asked about future plans to offer ALR or SLR courses, only five of twenty-two schools answered affirmatively. Respondents from the other seventeen law schools answered no or unknown, or simply skipped the question. The law school administrations’ insufficient recognition of the value of legal research courses was again identified as the primary obstacle that slowed down the offering of ALR or SLR courses. The study results further confirmed that the offerings of ALR and SLR courses at law schools in China are still limited, and the level of ALR and SLR offerings vary widely from school to school. The survey results send a clear message that law librarians and law school administrations in China need to further promote the value of ALR and SLR courses.

Despite the fact that the current offerings of ALR and SLR courses are less than desirable, there are some positive practices worth mentioning. Zhejiang University Guanghua Law School invited Professor Wei Luo from Washington University in St. Louis School of Law to teach an elective legal research course three years in a row beginning in 2010. \(^{82}\) In May 2015, Tsinghua University School of Law hosted Professor Joan Liu from New York University School of Law, and she offered a seminar titled International and Foreign Law Research Sources, Citations, Strategies, and Methods. Both offerings were very well received by law students in China. \(^{83}\) In addition, the Chinese and American Forum on Legal Information and Law Libraries (CAFLL) has actively promoted exchanges between U.S. and Chinese law

---

81. Law librarians at China University of Political Science and Law offer tailored ALR courses for the following schools and colleges: Law School, College of Comparative Law Studies (School of American and Comparative Law, Chinesisch Deutsches Institut für Rechtswissenschaft), Institute of Evidence Law and Forensic Science, and School of Juris Master.


83. Liying Yu & Ning Han, Zhongguo Falv Jiansuo Jiaoyu Xinfazhan (New Developments of Chinese Legal Research Instruction), CHINA LEG. EDUC. RES. (中国法学教育研究), 2016, no. 2, at 31, 41.
schools and generated valuable educational opportunities for law librarians and law school administrations in China.  

Embedded Legal Research Instruction, Reference Services, and More

¶38 Embedded legal research instruction most often provides a research component to substantive/doctrinal courses, clinical courses, or even student organizations that engage in research-related activities (e.g., law review). Also referred to as point-of-need instruction and described as a proactive reference approach, embedded legal research instruction most commonly partners with doctrinal professors. For example, a law librarian participates in a sports law course by teaching a segment on how to research sports law. A more creative embedded approach is to partner with clinical education professors. Vicenç Feliú and Helen Frazer describe their successful efforts of incorporating research instructional support in the University of the District of Columbia David A. Clarke School of Law’s clinical education in their article *Embedded Librarians: Teaching Legal Research as a Lawyering Skill*. Their experience further exemplifies how law schools can maximize the contributions of law school libraries and their librarians’ expertise by embedding law librarians in clinics, doctrinal courses, and beyond.

¶39 We solicited feedback on whether and how Chinese law schools offer embedded legal research instruction. Our study showed that law librarians in China are sufficiently aware of this type of research instruction. Seven out of twenty-two law schools (32%) reported offering embedded legal research instruction on a regular basis or on an instructor’s request. In most cases, law librarians introduced subject-related legal resources and research methods in doctrinal law courses such as environmental law, negotiable instruments, and international law, the three subject areas where this kind of collaboration was reported to happen most often. The China University of Political Science and Law successfully embedded law librarians into its Space Law Moot Court course, an experience described in one recent article that also includes an in-depth discussion of the course content design issues, given the fact that embedded research sessions tend to be short, yet highly subject specific. Another reported approach involves law librarians arranging for database vendor training specialists to join doctrinal courses. This approach does not require much involvement from law librarians, so we did not count it the same as law librarian–led research sessions. But since most law libraries in China suffer from severe staffing shortages, being able to offer alternative embedded legal research instructions is worth mentioning.

¶40 Reference services were found to be ubiquitously available when compared with the offerings of formal legal research instruction courses. Every respondent indicated reference services are not only available, but available through many dif-
different channels. Face-to-face, phone, and e-mail reference services are fairly standard among all the law schools surveyed. Some took the provision of reference services a step further by using a variety of trendy social network platforms, such as WeChat (similar to Snapchat or Line), Weibo (similar to Twitter), instant messaging, and the school’s internal discussion board. The majority of law schools reported offering standard reference services with set hours provided by law librarians. In-depth research consultations were available as well, but primarily to graduate students. Some law schools also engage in research town hall meetings where law librarians bring students up to date on the library’s latest services and resource additions, answer questions, and receive feedback from students. Respondents reported that students’ demand for reference services is mediocre overall; however, they did find students are generally happy with the services received.

Students’ Perceptions and Employers’ Expectations of Legal Research Skills

¶41 In their classic 1990 article, Joan S. Howland and Nancy J. Lewis asked firm librarians to supply their own perception of the attitudes of summer clerks and first-year associates toward legal research training.88 Students’ interest in sharpening their legal research skills is one important external driver for law school administration’s support of various legal research course offerings. Inspired by Howland and Lewis’s work, we used our survey to probe this perception issue. Respondents were asked whether they believe law students recognize the value of legal research courses and view legal research skills as an important competency that is desired by employers. Though respondents could provide only their own perceptions of the attitudes that law school students have about legal research trainings their feedback contributes value to the discussion. Nine out of twenty-two law schools (41%) indicated that their law students recognize legal research as an important skill to have. Eleven (50%) reported that students’ recognition is still at a minimum level, while two respondents (9%) indicated that their students do not care about legal research at all. Figure 5 summarizes these results. What makes this finding especially disturbing is that at least six respondents identified low student demand and perception of legal research courses as the primary obstacle limiting the offerings of legal research courses in China.

¶42 On the positive side, as mentioned earlier, we received direct feedback from seventy-one students who are currently studying at Peking University School of Transnational Law. We were surprised, yet pleased, to find that nearly all of the seventy-one students indicated they valued legal research courses and saw legal research skills as an important competency desired by employers. Though this feedback is all from a single law school and is not sufficient to represent the overall perception of all law students in China, it does give law librarians hope.

¶43 Employers’ expectations of students’ legal research competency was another factor studied in the survey. Ideally, employers’ expectations would directly affect students’ perception of legal research and encourage law school administrations to provide more resources to support legal research courses. We were interested in finding out whether a healthy feedback and response system exists between legal employers and legal educators in China. In addition, we wanted to understand how

legal employers and educators could help each other to produce practice-ready graduates. U.S. law schools often incorporate feedback from practitioners or shift the focus of their curriculums to respond to market needs. On the other side, legal employers in the United States are eager to help law schools understand and bridge the gap between skills taught in law schools and those demanded by today’s legal market. In 2015, LexisNexis commissioned 5 Square Research Inc. to conduct a survey “among 300 hiring partners and senior associates who supervise new attorneys, from litigation and transactional practices in small to large U.S. law firms” to find out “whether new law school graduates and young lawyers possess particular core skills needed by their employers.” The overarching goal of this study “was to reveal the most important skills desired by legal employers and . . . help inform law schools [how to] integrate [these skills] into applicable classes and experiential learning programs pursuant to employer demand and the [revised] ABA standards.” The study revealed that eighty-six percent of respondents “believe legal research skills are highly important in young associates.” It also reported that “[y]oung lawyers often lack advanced legal research skills such as researching more complex legal issues in cases, statutes, and regulations, determining strength of validity or primary law, and legislative or administrative intent.”


91. Id. at 3.

92. Id. at 4.
In our study, feedback was not directly solicited from legal employers. Instead, we solicited law librarians’ perceptions of employers’ demand for new graduates’ legal research skills. The first question asked was: Do you find legal employers desire law school graduates to have a high level of proficiency in legal research skills? More than thirty-six percent of the respondents (eight out of twenty-two) answered yes to this question, meaning that, in law librarians’ minds, legal research skills are desired by legal employers, even though the desire is not perceived to be across the board yet. Several comments mentioned that foreign law firms, in particular, want new law graduates to have strong legal research skills. Respondents also pointed out that legal employers nowadays prefer new law graduates to be able to do legal research independently and effectively; have a high level of familiarity of major domestic and foreign databases, such as Chinalawinfo.com, Westlaw, and LexisNexis; and to demonstrate proficiency in case law, statutory, and regulatory research.

The second question asked was: Have employers’ expectation toward law school graduates’ legal research skills increased over the years based on your observation? More than fifty percent of respondents confirmed that the demand had risen over the years, more than thirty percent said the demand has remained the same, while less than fifteen percent indicated that an increase in demand had not been observed. Regrettably, thirteen respondents replied that they hardly receive any direct feedback from practitioners, either through formal channels or casual conversations. There was a clear indication from the comments that law schools in China had not been working closely with practitioners or legal employers. For law schools to integrate the lawyering skills desired by employers, conversations between practitioners and legal educators need to be encouraged and promoted. The collaboration between legal employers and law schools in China needs to be further improved and strengthened to advance the goal of producing practice-ready law school graduates.

Law Librarians’ Self-Assessment: Adequacy and Quality of Research Course Offerings

One section of the survey was devoted to soliciting law librarians’ perception of the current status of legal research education in China. The survey questions invited law librarians to freely express what changes they would like to see, from resource support to borrowing experiences from other countries. When queried about whether the current legal research course offerings at their individual schools sufficiently met students’ demands and legal employers’ expectations, seven law schools (32%) considered their offerings sufficient. No schools indicated that they stayed ahead of the game by proactively responding to the demands. The plurality of the respondents (46%) identified their offerings as either partially sufficient or insufficient. Low enrollment rates for elective legal research courses and the lack of qualified instructors were the two primary reasons given for inadequate legal research course offerings at individual schools. Four schools that do not currently offer any legal research courses skipped the question altogether. Figure 6 details these findings.
In the same section, the respondents were asked what changes should take place to improve legal research instruction based on feedback provided by students and employers. First, respondents would like to see a basic or first-year legal research course become a required course at their individual schools for all law students at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Second, law librarians in China welcome opportunities to offer more specialized legal research courses. They would like to receive more support and recognition from their law school administrations. Pedagogy-wise, legal research courses are still taught with a strong theoretical focus in law schools in China. As a skills course, respondents suggested that the focus of the course should be shifted to research skill acquisition rather than theory acquisition. Regarding the course coverage, respondents suggested that case law research should be introduced into research courses, as the importance of being able to effectively conduct case law research has increased over the years. Zhihong Wu at East China University of Political Science and Law (ECUPL) mentioned that students had shown increased interest in case law research, especially when introduced along with current domestic and foreign cases. ECUPL students are also interested in learning about research course coverage in foreign law schools, which poses extra challenges to the instructors. In addition, respondents suggested that course content must be adjusted accordingly when new databases or resources need to be introduced. Resource management tools, such as Endnote, should be also be covered if possible.

Law Library Management Models in China

We also wanted to provide readers with a robust understanding of the Chinese law library environment while giving Chinese readers a greater understanding of the U.S. law library environment. To do so, the survey posed questions about the
law library’s independence from the university library, along with questions about funding, staffing, educational requirements for law librarians, and faculty status for law librarians. The following section reports on the results of this portion of the survey, discusses how those results compare to the U.S. law library environment, and reflects on what this means for law libraries in China.

**Autonomous Model vs. Nonautonomous Model**

¶49 In the United States, ABA Standard 602 requires that “[a] law school shall have sufficient administrative autonomy to direct the growth and development of the library and to control the use of its resources.”93 This autonomy extends to personnel, library services, and collection development.94 Additionally, the budget for the library should be “part of, and administered in the same manner, as the law school budget.”95 These standards would seem to indicate that the administration of a law library in the United States cannot fall under the main university library system. But Interpretation 602-1 provides further explication on when and under what conditions the law library can be administered as part of the university library system.96 When the law library is administered as part of the university library system, it is called a nonautonomous model of administration.97 Under the nonautonomous model in the United States, the director of the law library reports to both the dean of the law school and to the university librarian, and a portion of the law library’s budget is derived from the central library’s funds.98 While this interpretation allows for the law library to be administered as part of the university library system, the historical trend has moved away from a nonautonomous model.99 Currently ninety-six percent of law libraries in the United States fall under the autonomous model.100 All but one law library in the United States with a nonautonomous model had their administrative structures in place before ABA Standard 602 was implemented.101 The one law library that did move from the autonomous

---

93. 2016–2017 Standards, supra note 5, at 40 (Standard 602(a)).
94. Id. (Standard 602(c)).
95. Id. (Standard 602(d)).
96. Id. (Interpretation 602-1). This standard envisions law library participation in university library decisions that may affect the law library. While it is preferred that the law school administer the law library, a law library may be administered as part of a university library system if the dean, the director of the law library, and the faculty of the law school are responsible for the determination of basic law library policies, priorities, and funding requests.
98. Id.
99. Id. at 54 (citing Oscar M. Trelles II & James F. Bailey III, Autonomy, Librarian Status, and Librarian Tenure in Law School Libraries: The State of the Art, 1984, 78 Law Libr. J. 605, 670 (1984)) (45% of libraries were nonautonomous prior to 1937 and that number dropped over time to 35% in 1938, 25% in 1973, 15% in 1978, 6.5% in 1984, and 3% in 2010).
100. Id. at 53. Adelman lists ninety-seven percent of ABA accredited schools as autonomous, but Washington University Law Library was in the process of “transitioning from autonomous to nonautonomous as this chapter is being written, and therefore, is not included in the discussion of or the calculation of the 3% non-autonomous law libraries.” Id. at 53 n.4.
101. Id. at 54. (“Of the remaining law schools with nonautonomous libraries today, all were accredited prior to 1938, which suggests that nonautonomous libraries were a model that comported with pre-1940 accreditation standards.”).
structure following the implementation of Standard 602 did so to address budget challenges.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{50} Although Elizabeth G. Adelman, the director of a nonautonomous law library in the United States, has described the benefits of the model (increased training opportunities, collaboration on projects, more awareness of what is going on in different libraries, access to additional services, a more insulated budget, the ability to forum-shop between two administrators),\textsuperscript{103} there are also many challenges, and arguably many of the benefits of the nonautonomous model are not necessarily limited to a nonautonomous model. The law library director may hold more administrative responsibilities, and lack of consensus between two library administrators can slow down projects.\textsuperscript{104} The main library administrator and personnel also may not understand the ABA Standards’ effect on law library needs and services.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{51} Chinese law libraries have no equivalent requirement that they be autonomous from university libraries and no equivalent of the ABA standards. Despite that, we wanted to learn what level of independence law libraries exercise and whether they face some of the same challenges of autonomous and nonautonomous law libraries in the United States.

\textit{Administrative Structure and Facility}

\textsuperscript{52} In this section of the survey, the first question asked whether law schools in China are supported by law libraries that are independent from the university library systems. Thirteen out of the twenty-two of respondents (59\%) indicated that they were independent. This is a much lower level of independence than the ninety-six percent in the United States.\textsuperscript{106} Law schools affiliated with either Project 985 or Project 211 universities tend to receive support from independent law libraries. Among the five political science and law institutes, only Zhongnan University of Economics and Law is supported by an independent law library; the rest identified themselves as law schools with no independent law libraries. (See figure 7.) This result does not surprise us. Political science and law institutes in China tend to focus on law and law-related interdisciplinary studies. As a result, their university libraries collect heavily in legal materials and tend to function like large research law libraries. Though respondents from these schools claimed that they did not enjoy an independent law library, in a strict sense, we should consider that they do. China University of Political Science and Law, China-EU School of Law, and Peking University School of Transnational Law do not have independent law libraries. Peking University School of Transnational Law, Tsinghua University, and Harbin Institute of Technology partner with the University Town Library,\textsuperscript{107} which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{102} Id. (“During the 2013/14 academic year, Washington University Law Library announced its plans to become non-autonomous to address budget challenges.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{103} Id. at 57–58.
  \item \textsuperscript{104} Id. at 58.
  \item \textsuperscript{105} Id. at 59.
  \item \textsuperscript{106} Id. at 54.
  \item \textsuperscript{107} Ning Han & Duncan E. Alford, “A Tale of Two Countries: Behind-the-Scenes Stories of Two Unique but Newly Established Law Libraries,” presentation at the Third Chinese & American Forum on Legal Information & Law Libraries (CAFLL), Shanghai, China, June 10–12, 2013
\end{itemize}
hosts the Legal Research Center on its third floor.\textsuperscript{108} Fudan University and Beijing Normal University describe themselves as law schools with no independent law libraries. Both law schools once independently maintained their law libraries, but later they were placed under the jurisdiction of their university libraries. Fudan University Law School Library merged into the new Lee Shau Kee Library at its new Jiangwan campus in 2008. Our educated guess is that students and faculty at Fudan Law are better served since Lee Shau Kee Library is a better-funded, modern, user-centric, and technology-heavy library with a strong collection emphasizing legal materials.\textsuperscript{109}

¶53 The second question asked whether the law libraries enjoyed a separate facility, and if not, whether they had to share the space with university libraries. One would assume those independent law libraries should all enjoy a separate facility. This assumption is largely true; however, contradicting responses were received. Zhongshan University School of Law has an independent law library, but the law library is not physically independent from the university library. Southwest University of Political Science and Law and Northwest University of Politics and Law are the complete opposite.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure7.png}
\caption{Law Library Independence from University Library by Type of Law School}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item Nontraditional or Hybrid Law Schools
\item Political Science and Law Institutes
\item Law Schools Affiliated with 985 or 211 Universities
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Overall, based on the survey feedback, law libraries in China are becoming more autonomous and independent in both administrative structure and facilities as they develop.

Funding, Staffing, and Resource-Sharing Structure

To further understand how law libraries can respond to needs or desires for change, it is important to understand libraries’ structures and the relationships they have with their university libraries, especially with regard to funding, staffing, and resource sharing. With that in mind, we solicited feedback on all these areas of law library practices in China.

The survey revealed several different funding and staffing structures or arrangements between law libraries and their respective university libraries. Funding was discussed here primarily with regard to resource funding. Resources tend to be funded either solely by the law school, solely by the university library, or through a partnership between the law library and the university library. No single type of funding structure prevails. The number of law libraries with independent law school funding is the most common funding structure (see figure 8). In contrast, law library personnel are predominantly funded by their law schools, except for the law schools that do not enjoy a separate law library.

More specifically, eight law libraries out of twenty-two (36%) stated they are solely funded by their law schools. These law libraries reported having overall control of their budget in every aspect of library operations. University libraries have no oversight over the operation of the eight law libraries. Law library directors of the eight law libraries answer only to their law school deans. While remaining financially independent from their university libraries, these law libraries still rely on...
university libraries for integrated library system support, resource sharing, and more. Among the eight schools, the School of Law at University of International Business and Economics not only fully funds its law library, it has also been providing funds for its university library to acquire foreign legal materials for the past few years.

¶58 Five law libraries are reported to be cofunded by both law schools and university libraries. University appropriations are primarily used toward purchasing resources. In the case of Fudan University Law School, all law school acquisition work, including license negotiations, book purchases, and periodical subscriptions, is delegated to their university libraries. All five law libraries appoint their own law library directors and librarians. Librarians and staff are considered law school employees whose salaries come out of the law school budget. Other than the need to coordinate resource purchasing and arrange resource sharing with university libraries, all five law library directors enjoy autonomy over the operation of their law libraries.

¶59 Except for the four schools failing to supply a specific answer to this question, the other five law libraries are funded and overseen by their respective university libraries. Among the five, three are completely reliant on university library funding, from resources to facility to personnel. In other words, there are no stand-alone law libraries for the three law schools. Beijing Normal University Law School and Fudan University Law School used to have separate law libraries, which later merged into their respective university libraries. The law library of Northwest University of Politics and Law is a branch of the university library. The branch manager reports to the university library director and is part of the university library team rather than the law school team. The other two law libraries, Tsinghua University School of Law and Sichuan University School of Law, rely on university library funding for resource purchasing and management but enjoy autonomy over personnel. Personnel are funded and managed separately by their respective law schools.

Other Issues Faced by Law Libraries in China

Are Law Libraries in China Adequately Staffed?

¶60 To answer the question as to whether law libraries are adequately staffed, we asked respondents to share the number of law librarians available at their individual law libraries.111 The latest AALL Salary Survey reported that the average number of professionals per law library in the United States was 8.03 in 2015.112 This represents a decrease when compared to both 2013 and 2011, when there were averages of 8.53 and 8.69 professionals per law school library respectively.113 This average does not include paraprofessionals. The average number of paraprofessionals in 2015 was

110. Tsinghua University School of Law shares its integrated library system with the university library and also relies on university library to help with acquisition, cataloging, physical processing, and other technical services work.

111. For law schools without a stand-alone law library, we solicited the number of law subject librarians instead.

112. AM. ASS’N OF LAW LIBRARIES, AALL BIENNIAL SALARY SURVEY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS 2015, at 22, Table 8: Average Number of Professionals per Library (FTE), http://www.aallnet.org/Documents/Publications/Salary-Survey/pub-salary2015/2015AALLSalarySurvey.pdf (online version available only to AALL members).

113. Id.
This is lower than the average of 6.63 in 2013 and 7.22 in 2011.\textsuperscript{115} In addition, “the average number of students (FTE) in U.S. law schools for 2015 was 606, with an average of 44 faculty. The ratio of library professionals to students (FTE) was 1 to 79.93, while the ratio of library professionals to faculty was 1 to 5.98.”\textsuperscript{116}

The broad range of responses received showed that the number of law librarians available at each law library in China ranges from zero to twenty. Both law schools with no autonomous law libraries, Beijing Normal University Law School and Fudan University Law School, reported that they do not currently have any law librarians or even law subject librarians. Fudan University Law School reported that it has a plan in place to train and add a law subject librarian in the near future. On the other hand, Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University reported having twenty law librarians, which we discounted as invalid. We suspect that the respondent might have included the number of paraprofessionals in the count as well.\textsuperscript{117} The plurality of law libraries (nine out of twenty-two, nearly forty-one percent) stated that they had only one law librarian. The survey found that political science and law institutes tend to be supported by a larger number of law librarians. East China University of Political Science and Law has nine law librarians, China University of Political Science and Law and Southwest University of Political Science and Law each have six law librarians, and Zhongnan University of Economics and Law has two law librarians. Figure 9 depicts these findings.

Assuming the reported numbers are accurately reflecting the staffing situation at each library surveyed, the average number of law librarians per law library in China is two, discounting the invalid response supplied by Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University. What is even bleaker is the law librarian to student (FTE) ratio. A quick survey of the websites of those participating law schools revealed the average number of students enrolled for 2015 was more than 1877,\textsuperscript{118} which made the FTE ratio at least 1:938.5. Arguably these numbers do not fully compare to the American averages because our survey was not as comprehensive as the AALL Salary Survey. However, it still shows that Chinese law libraries are extremely understaffed. Each law library staff’s size is barely sufficient to keep up with the daily operation, let alone carry out advanced tasks, such as offering legal

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{114} Id. at Table 9: Average Number of Paraprofessionals per Library (FTE).
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} The respondent from the Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University identified understaffing as a main issue when asked about whether law school administration had provided adequate support to the law library in a later question. It should be safe for the authors to infer that the number supplied by this school was invalid.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} The authors asked respondents to supply the number of students (FTE) enrolled in their law schools in the survey. We were able to track that information from each individual law school’s website as well. Here are some FTE enrollment distributions: Nankai University School of Law (over 1000), Zhongnan University of Economics and Law (over 4250), Renmin University Law School (over 2000), Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University (over 2000), Zhejiang University Guanghua Law School (over 700), East China University of Political Science and Law (over 3400), China-EU School of Law (380), Shandong University School of Law (over 3000), Nanjing University School of Law (over 1200), Fudan University Law School (1800–2000), Peking University Law School (over 3000), Tsinghua University School of Law (over 1400), Peking University School of Transnational Law (over 70).
\end{itemize}
research courses at various forms or levels. More broadly, the understaffing reality means that law libraries in China cannot proactively respond to demands or provide value-added services to faculty and students. Instead they have the capacity to react to only the most basic needs. This finding of understaffing was also reflected in the comments provided by the majority of the respondents when asked in which areas they perceived a lack of support.

In the United States, law schools can rely on rankings such as the *U.S. News & World Report* or staffing levels at other institutions as leverage to maintain or request adding law librarians. Perhaps this survey finding will lend law librarians in China some help in making the argument for better staffing support.

### Educational Requirements for Law Librarians in China

The survey also inquired into what education and experience requirements different institutions had for their library personnel. This is a relevant question to ask because strong educational requirements for law librarians can help address many of the limitations law libraries face in including legal research instruction in the law school curriculum. One of the main reasons schools reported having limited legal research instruction was the lack of qualified law librarians. If the profession in China consistently compelled law librarians to meet certain educational requirements, law schools would then not need to exercise their discretion, as they currently do, in order to determine what educational backgrounds are deemed adequate for hiring law librarians.

---

¶65 In the United States there is a long history of debate over what degrees law librarians should possess.120 Currently, the overwhelming majority of law library directors have both a J.D. and an M.L.I.S. degree.121 ABA Standard 603(c) governs the educational requirements of law library directors.122 The ABA Standards regarding education requirements for law library directors changed in 2014–15.123 Under the old Standard 603(c), law schools were practically mandated to hire law library directors with both J.D. and M.L.I.S. degrees.124 Under the new Standard 603(c), law library directors “shall have appropriate academic qualifications and shall have knowledge of and experience in law library administration sufficient to support the program of legal education and to enable the law school to operate in compliance with the Standards.”125 Interpretation 603–1 states that if a law library director does not have a J.D. and an M.L.I.S., “a law school . . . bears the burden of demonstrating that it is in compliance with Standard 603(c).”126 Again, the vast majority of academic law library directors have both degrees, and the requirement of both a J.D. and M.L.I.S. degree has also become the standard for nondirector law librarian positions in academic law libraries.127 Though there are no formal requirements for nondirector positions, there have been calls for standardization of educational qualifications for law librarians in the United States.128

¶66 With regard to the survey results, admittedly, there was a wide variety of responses as to what educational requirements were used to hire library personnel at individual law schools in China. As illustrated in figure 10, eleven out of twenty-two (fifty percent) law schools now require their law librarians to have a master’s degree in either law or library and information science. Among the eleven, four law schools129 prefer their librarians to possess both law and library and information science degrees. Both Peking University Law School and Zhongnan University of Economics and Law currently employ law librarians with doctoral degrees. There are four law schools that require their law librarians to have undergraduate degrees, and they do not specify whether law or library and information science is the preferred major. In addition to the degree requirements, several other qualifications,
such as previous library experience, teaching experience, English proficiency, and familiarity with integrated library systems (ILS), were mentioned.

**Faculty Status for Law Librarians in China**

¶67 The survey also queried whether Chinese librarians enjoyed faculty status. Faculty status for law librarians is a perennial issue in law libraries in the United States. In fact, the continued study of status for law librarians is a part of the AALL Research Agenda.130 While faculty status may increase the amount of responsibilities (i.e., additional service, administration, and publishing requirements), many perceived benefits exist as well. Benefits of having faculty status include, but are not limited to, academic freedom, teaching opportunities, increased job security, increased involvement in faculty governance, and increased stature in the university.131 Both the AALL and the Association of College and Research Libraries encourage faculty status for academic librarians.132

130. *AALL Research Agenda 2013–2016, Am. Ass’n of Law Libraries* (rev. June 2013), http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Member-Resources/grants/research-grants/research-agenda.html [https://perma.cc/6J82-THT7] (“The formal status of the librarian within a broader institution creates a range of consequences both intended and unintended for both the individual and the organization. These structural arrangements should be investigated in terms of both their perceived significance as well as their actual impacts on the exercise of professional responsibilities.”).


in extraordinary circumstances, a law library director shall hold a law faculty appointment with security of faculty position." Translated into practice, then, a director could have a range of faculty appointments from being on the law school tenure track, to having multiyear contracts, to being on a law library faculty track, or serving as university library faculty. The majority of law library directors are on the tenure track within the law school. There is no equivalent ABA requirement stipulating that law schools offer nondirector law librarians faculty status. In the United States, “only between one-quarter and one-third of law librarians report holding faculty status,” through the law school, the main university, the law library, or the university library.

The survey findings confirmed that almost all law librarians in China do not currently have faculty status. Specifically, law librarians at seventeen institutions (more than 77%) are not considered law school, law library, university, or university library faculty. A few schools among the seventeen reported that their law librarians have lecturer status. Only two respondents reported having faculty status, and those two are law library directors at Renmin University Law School and Tsinghua University School of Law. Figure 11 depicts these findings.

The finding again proves that the status of law librarians in China is not nearly the same as that of law librarians in the United States. The value of law library directors, or even law librarians, having faculty status has not been recognized by law school administrations in China. Whether there are merits to offering law librarian faculty status warrants further discussion. We hope to use the findings from the survey to raise awareness among law librarians in China in regard to the faculty status issue.

Conclusion

The Ministry of Education and the Central Political and Legal Affairs Committee jointly issued the “Several Opinions on the Implementation of Outstanding Legal Talent Education and Cultivation Initiative” on December 23, 2011. Several fundamental problems of China’s current legal education system were raised in this release, including legal education programs’ lack of diversity and innovation and the tendency to stay unchanged over years. Also discussed was law school gradu-
ates’ lack of practical, analytical, and interdisciplinary skills. Most law schools failed to produce graduates with comprehensive legal knowledge who could uphold the highest ethical standards. The challenges faced by legal education in general apply to legal research education. In addition, there are more specific challenges to legal research education in China.

Problems and Challenges

¶71 For both historical and practical reasons, legal education in China was designed to meet the fast-growing economic and legal needs at many different levels. Instead of being a completely professional education like the U.S. model, legal education in China combines elite education, general education, and professional education with the goal of equipping graduates with legal knowledge and a framework that can be transferred into many different professions. Career choice of law school graduates varies in China. The majority of law school graduates ultimately choose not to engage in the legal profession by becoming practicing attorneys, judges, or prosecutors. Instead, they take up alternative career options such as becoming civil servants at various levels of governmental agencies and offices, working for corporations, opening their own businesses, or joining the press or news media.®8 According to employment statistics conducted by certain schools, fewer than ten percent of law school graduates become judges, prosecutors, and practicing attorneys.®9 For the ones who pass the Chinese bar exam, less than fifty percent choose to practice law.®0 To be more specific, every year, among the 110,000 students admitted to the bachelor of law programs, only 5000 to 6000 graduates enter the legal profession. In a strict sense, legal education in China can hardly call

---

138. Zhu, supra note 2, at 81.
139. See Zhang, supra note 38, at 3.
140. See id.
itself professional education. Arguably, skills education has never been supported by the mission of legal education in China. Students are also less motivated to acquire research skills because they are not pressured to practice law upon graduation.

¶72 In reality, it is not efficient and effective to achieve the learning outcomes skills courses strive to achieve. Civil law systems call for a different set of legal research skills. Legal education in China focuses more on jurisprudence, codified laws, and interpretations. Judicial decisions and case law analysis tend to be neglected. Due to the structure of the course of study for undergraduate law students in China, law students are not exposed to skills education, including legal research skills education, until they engage in moot court, courtroom hearings, clinical education, experiential learning, legal aid, and similar experiences in their senior years. However, the increasing load of required core courses and students’ interest in taking courses from other departments on campus to diversify their career choices make skills education even more peripheral.

¶73 In addition, there is no compulsory system governing law school programs, curriculums, and learning outcomes, not to mention regulations specific to legal research education. So far neither the Chinese government nor the Chinese Bar Association has set up standards for establishing or accrediting a law school or department in China. Individual law schools have great latitude in designing curriculum and assessing learning outcomes, which results in inconsistent practices in offering legal research courses among law schools. Vertically, it is difficult to maintain the offerings within individual law schools due to the high rate of personnel turnover.

¶74 The tie between the legal market and legal education also remains weak and disconnected. The job placement rate is used as an important indicator to assess law school programs in the United States. A similar assessment method, the Graduate Employment Rate (GER), was adopted by law schools in China to evaluate graduates’ employability as well as the quality of law school programs. However, for reasons stated above, the validity and effectiveness of the GER have been questioned. Additionally, legal employers rarely pay attention to what courses law school graduates have taken. It is a sad truth that skills courses, including legal research courses, have minimal effect on law graduates’ employability.

141. See id.
142. See Zhu, supra note 2, at 81.
143. Phillips, Luo & Liu, supra note 4, at 12.
145. See RENMIN UNIVERSITY OF CHINA REPORT, supra note 24, at 262 (arguing that there is no direct connection between GER statistics and the quality of legal education); see also Yu & Han, supra note 83, at 49.
146. We reviewed job postings for firm positions and found that the requirements are very general. There are rarely requirements for specific skills or courses. See 中国律师网律师招聘, http://www.acla.org.cn/lvsuopinyong/index.jhtml [https://perma.cc/WWK8-G8QC].
Opportunities for Future Changes

¶75 The Outstanding Legal Talent Education and Cultivation Initiative\(^{147}\) is an important step taken by the Chinese government to enhance the quality of legal education. The initiative urges law schools and practitioners to work together to produce law school graduates with a comprehensive knowledge of law, strong lawyering skills, foreign language skills, and a strong sense of ethics.\(^{148}\) The initiative especially emphasizes improving law students’ problem-solving, reasoning, and analytical skills. The initiative compels law schools to increase their offerings of experiential learning and clinical education credits/experiences. The cumulative number of skill course credits should be no less than fifteen percent of the overall program credits.\(^{149}\) This requirement opens up many opportunities for legal research instruction.

¶76 In responding to the Outstanding Legal Talent Education and Cultivation Initiative, many Chinese law schools conducted program reform and innovation. To name a few successful pilot programs, Shanghai Jiao Tong University KoGuan Law School experimented with the 3+3 program under the leadership of Dean Weidong Ji\(^{150}\) with the goal of producing elite graduates with strong practical skills and high ethical standards.\(^{151}\) This highly selective program is geared toward students who are interested in engaging in high-end domestic or international legal practice. The program selected only fifteen top-notch students when it was first piloted in 2009.\(^{152}\) Since fall 2012, Tsinghua University School of Law was able to offer a unique track of study with a heavy focus on international law, lawyering skills, and foreign language training to a select group of students who were already enrolled in Tsinghua Law.\(^{153}\) Legal research instruction benefits hugely from these two innovative programs as both programs require students to take legal research courses as part of the suggested course of study.\(^{154}\)

¶77 In addition, in May 2015, Peking University Law School hosted the second China Legal Education High-End Forum,\(^{155}\) in which a consensus was reached on the need to enhance law students’ writing and research skills, especially among graduate-level law students. Participants recognized the need to add legal writing, legal research, and law review courses to law school curriculums. Though legal research still seems to fall under the shadow of legal writing at most institutions in

---

147. We also have seen it translated as “Outstanding Legal Personnel Education Scheme.” See Shan, supra note 48, at 11.
149. See Zhu, supra note 2, at 82.
150. Dean’s Message, KoGUAN LAW SCHOOL OF SHANGHAI JIAO TONG UNIV., http://en.law.sjtu.edu.cn/About/Article0101P0.html [https://perma.cc/27Q7-KW3D].
152. See id.
153. The program is called Guojixing Falu Rencai Xiangmu 国际型法律人才项目 in Chinese.
China, emphasizing legal writing inevitably welcomes opportunities for promoting legal research since the two are closely related.

Final Thoughts

¶78 Both the results of our survey and the actions taken in response to the Outstanding Legal Talent Education and Cultivation Initiative show that, while the number of schools offering legal research instruction has increased and greater emphasis has been placed on integrating legal research skills into the law school curriculum, great challenges and opportunities remain for law librarians in China. Moving forward, with China's continued development, reform, and innovation of legal education, legal research education will inevitably be on the agenda. Law librarians should be aware of these changes and seize the opportunity to strengthen and enhance their role in legal education in China. Law librarians should also work together and collaborate, both across China and in the United States, to develop and enhance the capacity of legal research instruction and to make the provision of legal research instruction more stable across curriculums globally. Law librarians, whether in China or the United States, should work together and share experiences to strengthen students' legal information literacy and legal research skills.
Appendix A: English Translation of the Survey

Section I: Law School Profile

Q1: Type of Law School
  □ Comprehensive University
  □ Political Science and Law Institute
  □ Non-Traditional or Hybrid Law School

Q2: School profile
  What is the approximate number of students enrolled?
  What type of law degrees do you offer?

Q3: Is there a law library or law branch library for the law school?
  □ Yes
  □ No

Q4: Does the law library or the law library branch have separate facilities?
  □ Yes
  □ No
  □ Other, please specify

Q5: What is the relationship between the law library (law branch library) and
  the university library like? Is it completely independent? Or are there
  shared budgets, personnel, and resources? Is there a working relationship
  between the two libraries?

Q6: How many Reference Librarians/Law Subject Librarians do you have?

Q7: What are the required qualifications for Reference Librarians/Law Subject
  Librarians (education, experience requirements, etc.)?

Q8: Is the Library Reference Librarian/Law Subject Librarian a professor at
  the law school (do they have faculty status)?
  □ Yes
  □ No
  □ Library faculty, Lecturer, or Other, please specify

Q9: Do you get enough support for the library or law library from the school
  or law school?
  □ Yes
  □ No

  Please specify areas with sufficient or insufficient support.
Section II: About Basic or First-Year Legal Research Instruction

Q10: Is there formal or informal supervision, guidance, or a feedback system to help identify what you should be teaching as far as research instruction or legal instruction overall? For example, the Ministry of Education, the National Institute of Lawyers, legal job market, etc.

- Yes, national system
- Yes, regional or institutional system
- Yes, informal system
- No

Please supply more details based on your answer.

Q11: Do you find legal employers desire law school graduates to have a high level of proficiency in legal research skills?

- Yes, please specify
- No

Q12: If your answer to Q11 was Yes, based on your observation, have employers’ expectations toward law school graduates’ legal research skills increased over the years?

- Yes, please specify
- Remained the same
- No

Q13: Is there awareness among students that legal research skill is an important competency desired by employers?

- Yes
- A little bit
- Not at all

If you answered no, please specify what led students to have that perception.

Q14: Does your school currently offer a basic or first-year legal instruction course?

- Yes
- No, please go to Q25

Q15: Is the basic legal instruction course mandatory or elective?

- Mandatory
- Elective

Q16: How many credits is the basic legal instruction course?

- 3 credits
- 2 credits
- Other, please specify
Q17: At what level is basic legal instruction taught?

- Undergraduate
- Graduate
- Other, please specify

Q18: How frequently are basic legal research courses offered?

Q19: What is the class size?

Q20: Who teaches the basic legal research course, a law librarian or a law school professor?

Q21: What topics does the basic legal instruction course cover? Are textbooks being used? If yes, which textbook(s) is (are) used?

Q22: What teaching methods are used?

Q23: What assessment method(s) do you use to assess student research skills? Exams, semester-long independent projects, hybrid, or other?

Q24: If the basic legal research course is currently an elective, are there plans to make it mandatory?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure

Q25: If you have not offered a formal basic legal research course, are there plans to do so in the near future?

- Yes
- No
- Other, please specify

Q26: If you have not offered a formal basic legal research course, is there any other informal teaching, such as open workshops or training?

Q27: What are the reasons limiting your school from offering a basic or first-year legal research course as part of the formal curriculum?

Section III: Advanced or Specialized Legal Research Course Offerings

Q28: Are ALR or SLR courses currently offered at your law school?

- Yes, regularly
- Yes, but not regularly
- Not at the moment
- Other, please specify:

Q29: If ALR or SLR is offered at your school, what is the setup of it with regard to teachers, course content, class size, credit numbers, and assessment?
Q30: If you haven’t offered an advanced research course, is there a plan to offer one?

Section IV: Embedded Legal Research Instruction Offerings and Reference Services

Q31: Is embedded legal research instruction offered at your law school? (That is, collaboration with professors where you go into their classes and provide legal research instruction on specialized topics.) Please give examples if the answer is yes.

Q32: How are reference services conducted? Are there set reference hours? What type of reference services do you offer? Please give examples. Are students generally happy with the services received?

Section V: Other Suggestions/Recommendations

Q33: Do you think your school’s legal research/reference offerings are adequate to meet the student needs and provide them with the skills needed for the job market?

Q34: Have changes to research course offerings and the curriculum been made to meet the demands of the job market?

Q35: Based on your understanding of how legal research is taught in other countries, what practices could be borrowed to improve legal research education in China?

Q36: What is the biggest perceived obstacle in improving legal research education in China? The lack of student demand, inadequate support from the law school administration, the lack of qualified personnel, or other?
Appendix B: List of Law Schools Surveyed

Tier 1: Sixteen law schools affiliated with Project 985–rated universities:
- Beijing Normal University Law School
- Chongqing University School of Law
- Fudan University Law School
- Jilin University School of Law
- Nanjing University School of Law
- Nankai University School of Law
- Peking University Law School
- Renmin University Law School
- Shandong University School of Law
- Shanghai Jiao Tong University KoGuan Law School
- Sichuan University School of Law
- Sun Yat-Sen University School of Law
- Tsinghua University School of Law
- Wuhan University School of Law
- Xiamen University School of Law
- Zhejiang University Guanghua Law School

Tier 2: Four political science and law institutes or law schools affiliated with Project 211–rated universities:
- China University of Political Science and Law
- Kenneth Wang School of Law at Soochow University
- School of Law at University of International Business and Economics
- Zhongnan University of Economics and Law

Tier 3: Three political science and law institutes not Project 211–rated:
- East China University of Political Science and Law
- Northwest University of Politics and Law
- Southwest University of Political Science and Law

Tier 4: Nontraditional or hybrid law schools:
- China-EU School of Law at the China University of Political Science and Law
- Peking University School of Transnational Law