

Evidence Law Curriculum System Construction Guided by Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law

Wenhua Wang

Law school, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

ABSTRACT

As a core course in legal education and a crucial component of judicial practice, the theoretical development and pedagogical reform of Evidence Law must be rooted in the spirit of the times and the grand blueprint of national rule of law construction. Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law, with its profound theoretical connotations and distinct practical orientation, provides the fundamental guidance and action plan for the construction and refinement of the Evidence Law system with Chinese characteristics. This article systematically elucidates the guiding role of Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law in the theoretical construction of the Evidence Law curriculum system from four dimensions: the shaping of the core values of Evidence Law by the concept of "Fair Justice"; the concrete implementation of the principles of "Sound Laws and Good Governance" and "Justice for the People" in evidence rules; the guidance of the "Socialist Rule of Law Path with Chinese Characteristics" for the localization and innovation of evidence systems; and the methodological insights provided by "Systems Thinking" for the top-level design of Evidence Law. By integrating theory with classroom practice, we aim to construct an Evidence Law curriculum system that more closely aligns with the practical needs of China's rule of law and highlights Chinese characteristics, thereby contributing intellectual power to the cultivation of rule of law talent in the new era and the modernization of national governance capabilities.

KEYWORDS

Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law; Evidence Law; Curriculum System; Ideological and Political Education; Judicial Fairness.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the new historical journey of comprehensively advancing the rule of law, legal education shoulders the epochal task of cultivating high-quality rule of law talent for the nation. Evidence Law, as a pivotal discipline connecting substantive and procedural law and running through the three major litigation processes, directly impacts the professional competence of future legal practitioners and the bottom line of fairness in judicial practice. Its theoretical soundness, systematic completeness, and pedagogical effectiveness are paramount. Therefore, the curriculum reform and theoretical deepening of Evidence Law should be a focal point of attention in the legal community. Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law, as the latest achievement in adapting Marxist rule of law theory to the Chinese context, serves as the fundamental guidance and action plan for comprehensively advancing the rule of law in the new era[1]. It comprehensively and profoundly addresses a series of major questions, such as why comprehensive rule of law should be implemented and how to implement it in the new era. Integrating the essence and core tenets of Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law comprehensively, systematically, and deeply into the theoretical research and curriculum teaching of Evidence Law is not only an inevitable requirement for fulfilling the fundamental task of fostering virtue through education and promoting "Curriculum Ideological and Political Education"

(Curriculum Civics) construction, but also an imperative for promoting the creative transformation and innovative development of Evidence Law theory and constructing an autonomous knowledge system of Evidence Law with Chinese characteristics.

2. VALUE SHAPING: FAIR JUSTICE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF "COMPREHENSIVELY ADVANCING THE RULE OF LAW"

Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law elevates "Upholding Comprehensive Advancement of the Rule of Law" to an unprecedented strategic height, with "Fair Justice" as its cornerstone. President Xi Jinping profoundly pointed out: "Fairness is the soul and life of justice, and fair justice is the last line of defense safeguarding social fairness and justice.[2]" This statement provides fundamental guidance for re-examining and repositioning the core functions and value orientation of Evidence Law from the holistic perspective of building a rule of law state. Evidence Law is no longer merely a collection of litigation technical rules; it becomes an institutional carrier bearing the core values of realizing judicial fairness, responding to people's expectations, and maintaining social fairness and justice.

2.1. Evidence-Based Adjudication Oriented by Fair Justice

"Basing judgments on facts and taking law as the criterion" is a fundamental principle of modern rule of law and the logical starting point and core path for achieving judicial fairness. The primary prerequisite for judicial fairness is the fair determination of facts, which relies on evidence that is lawful, authentic, and relevant. This concept must permeate the entire teaching design of Evidence Law courses. Teaching should not be limited to simply listing types of evidence or rules for examination and evaluation. Instead, students must be guided to deeply understand that every stage – from the collection, preservation, submission, and cross-examination of evidence to its final examination and determination – must strictly adhere to the principles of rule of law, ensuring procedural propriety, thereby striving to guarantee the discovery of substantive truth. Every detail of evidence rules relates to the realization of judicial fairness and the people's faith in the rule of law. The establishment of the illegal evidence exclusion rule in Article 56 of the Criminal Procedure Law (CPL) is a direct manifestation of the "Fair Justice" concept. The absolute exclusion of testimonial evidence obtained through illegal means such as torture not only safeguards the human rights of suspects and defendants but also aims to curb the abuse of judicial power at its source, upholding the dignity and authority of the rule of law. This resonates with the requirement to "respect and protect human rights" emphasized in Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law. In civil litigation, the rules for allocating the burden of proof are the core content of Evidence Law, directly impacting the litigation interests of parties and representing the most intuitive manifestation of the concept of "fairness and justice" in judicial practice. Due to the significant information asymmetry and disparity in evidence-collecting capability between ordinary individuals and large enterprises or institutions, rigidly adhering to the principle of "he who asserts must prove" (*onus probandi incumbit ei qui dicit*) often results in inadequate protection for the disadvantaged party. Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law emphasizes "putting the people at the center," demanding that rule of law construction must respond to social concerns and safeguard social fairness and justice. This drives the continuous evolution of burden of proof allocation rules towards substantive fairness. For example, in consumer rights protection cases, when a consumer suffers harm due to a product defect, the burden of proving the absence of a defect falls on the business operator.

2.2. "Promoting Fairness through Openness": Technology-Empowered Evidence Application

"Sunlight is the best disinfectant. We must promote fairness through openness and guarantee integrity through transparency.[3]" This is an important exposition in Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law concerning judicial openness. The practice of this concept in the field of Evidence Law is demonstrating unprecedented breadth and depth with the development of technology. The transparency of evidence disclosure, cross-examination, and determination processes is key to enhancing judicial credibility, and internet justice and cutting-edge technologies provide powerful tools for this. Taking blockchain-based evidence preservation technology as an example, its characteristics of decentralization, immutability, and traceability offer revolutionary solutions to the challenges of electronic data being easily forged and difficult to verify[4]. In June 2018, the Hangzhou Internet Court adjudicated the nation's first judicial case involving blockchain evidence preservation. The court admitted evidence preserved using blockchain submitted by the plaintiff and determined the infringement facts based on it, marking the first judicial recognition of blockchain evidence preservation. In July 2019, the nation's first criminal case involving blockchain evidence preservation was adjudicated by the Shangyu District People's Court in Shaoxing City, Zhejiang Province, extending its application to criminal justice. In August 2021, the "Online Litigation Rules for People's Courts" came into effect, explicitly stipulating the scope of validity and review rules for blockchain evidence preservation for the first time[5]. In curriculum teaching, these judicial practice achievements can be incorporated. Students can be organized to discuss how to utilize technologies like public verification of electronic data and transparent operations of blockchain preservation to promote in-depth openness of procedures such as evidence disclosure and courtroom cross-examination. For instance, discussions could focus on how blockchain technology can be used to preserve evidence of infringing webpages in intellectual property infringement cases and enable instant, public verification through hash value comparison in court. This teaching approach not only enables students to master cutting-edge knowledge of evidence rules but also helps them understand how technology empowers justice, using "openness" and "transparency" to guarantee the credibility and legality of evidence determination, thereby internalizing and externalizing President Xi Jinping's concept of "Sunlight Justice."

3. CULTIVATING RULE OF LAW THINKING: EXPLORING THE CONNECTION AND EMBODIMENT OF XI JINPING THOUGHT ON THE RULE OF LAW IN EVIDENCE LAW

President Xi Jinping emphasized, "We must strive to make the people feel that fairness and justice are served in every judicial case," and pointed out that "we should make socialist rule of law sound laws and good governance." The core tenets in Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law, such as "sound laws and good governance" and "justice for the people," are not abstract slogans suspended in mid-air. Rather, they possess a profound intrinsic connection with the specific institutional design and practical logic of Evidence Law. Guiding students to explore and understand this intrinsic connection is key to deepening Evidence Law teaching and cultivating their rule of law thinking.

3.1. "Sound Laws and Good Governance": The Art of Balance in Evidence Rules

"Sound laws" refer not only to substantive justice but also to procedural reasonableness and efficiency; "good governance" requires that the implementation of law can truly resolve social contradictions and achieve the unity of legal and social effects. The design of evidence rules is precisely an exquisite arena for achieving this balance. Taking the exclusionary rule for illegally obtained evidence in civil litigation as an example, compared to the "absolute exclusion" of illegal testimonial evidence in criminal procedure, Article 106 of the "Supreme People's Court Interpretation on the Application of

the Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China" stipulates: "Evidence formed or obtained by methods that seriously infringe upon the lawful rights and interests of others, violate legal prohibitions, or seriously contravene public order and good morals shall not be used as the basis for determining the facts of a case." The term "seriously" here embodies the legislative wisdom. It avoids making minor procedural flaws grounds for excluding evidence, thereby preventing the abuse of procedural rules and "procedural idling" that could prevent the realization of substantive justice[6]. For example, mere audio recordings made without the other party's consent are generally not excluded if they do not infringe upon significant interests of others. This rule design adheres to the bottom line of protecting fundamental rights such as personal rights while balancing the litigation goals of discovering case facts and achieving substantive justice. It is a vivid manifestation of the practical logic of "sound laws and good governance."

3.2. "Justice for the People": Evidence Systems Safeguarding Parties' Rights

"Justice for the people" is the fundamental stance of Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law, demanding that judicial activities always adhere to the principal position of the people and actively respond to the people's needs for the rule of law. In the field of Evidence Law, the requirement to "strive to make the people feel that fairness and justice are served in every judicial case" materializes as a series of institutional arrangements designed to balance parties' evidence-collecting capabilities and safeguard their litigation rights. Disparities in parties' evidence-collecting capabilities objectively exist in civil litigation. If courts remain passive when a party cannot collect evidence due to objective reasons, so-called "procedural equality" can degenerate into substantive injustice. To this end, China's evidence system designs multiple safeguard mechanisms. For example, it strengthens the judge's duty of elucidation (clarification), requiring judges to explain and clarify when a party might suffer adverse consequences due to misunderstanding the rules of burden of proof allocation, thereby guiding them to present evidence correctly. It refines the system for applying to the court for evidence investigation and collection, providing a relief channel for parties who cannot access key evidence. It establishes a document production order system, compelling a party holding key documentary evidence to submit it to the court, failing which they will bear adverse legal consequences[7]. The implementation of these rules effectively safeguards parties' litigation rights and enhances the protective power of evidence law over those rights. In practical teaching sessions such as moot courts, the above scenarios can be specifically designed. Through such immersive training, students can personally experience how the evidence system translates the grand concept of "justice for the people" into concrete actions safeguarding the litigation rights of every individual party. This cultivates their practical awareness of using evidence rules to uphold judicial credibility, truly implementing the "justice for the people" concept in every case.

4. UPHOLDING FUNDAMENTALS WHILE INNOVATING: THE CHINESE CHARACTERISTICS OF EVIDENCE LAW GUIDED BY XI JINPING THOUGHT ON THE RULE OF LAW

President Xi Jinping clearly stated: "The path of rule of law and the type of rule of law system a country adopts are determined by its basic national conditions." This important assertion points the direction for the development of Evidence Law theory in China: we must adhere to proceeding from China's actual conditions and judicial practice to construct an Evidence Law system with Chinese characteristics, Chinese style, and Chinese ethos, rather than simply copying or blindly transplanting Western theories.

4.1. Theoretical Confidence: The Chinese Path Reflected in Adherence to the "Three-Attribute Theory"

There are mainly three theories regarding the fundamental nature of evidence attributes. The first is the indigenous view of litigation evidence attributes represented by the "Three-Attribute Theory." The early Three-Attribute Theory held that objectivity, relevance, and legality constitute the attributes of litigation evidence. As theoretical understanding of litigation deepened, the New Three-Attribute Theory defined the attributes of litigation evidence as authenticity, relevance, and legality. The second theory, represented by the "Two-Capacity Theory" (evidence admissibility and probative value), is mainly advocated by civil law countries. Evidence admissibility refers to the qualification of tangible objects to be used as evidence, while probative value refers to the actual role evidence plays in the court's determination of the facts to be proved. The third expression comes from common law countries, focusing on relevance and admissibility. Some domestic scholars have rejected the Three-Attribute Theory, arguing that China's Evidence Law knowledge system should center on admissibility, and evidence norms should focus on admissibility rules. Some textbooks advocate replacing the "Three-Attribute Theory" with the "Two-Capacity Theory," deeming the former scientifically inadequate. Regarding the Two-Capacity Theory and the admissibility theory, adopting either wholesale in China is problematic. The common law definition of litigation evidence attributes as admissibility and relevance is inherently linked to the adversarial system and jury trials, creating a natural disconnect with China's unitary adjudication structure; mechanical transplantation is unworkable. As for the "Two-Capacity Theory," on one hand, scholars have questioned its origins in civil law systems, pointing out that summarizing litigation evidence attributes as admissibility and probative value is mainly the prevailing view in Japan and Taiwan, China, and its formation was deeply influenced by common law evidence admissibility theory[8]. On the other hand, the connotation of evidence admissibility is vague; analyzing its elements reveals disputes still revolve around the relevance, legality, and authenticity of evidence-bringing us back to the theoretical construction of the Three-Attribute Theory. It is evident that the theoretical construction of the "Three-Attribute Theory" is not a simple rejection of Western theories but is deeply rooted in China's judicial practice. "Authenticity" aligns with China's longstanding ideological line of seeking truth from facts, providing a theoretical cornerstone for curbing subjective assumptions and preventing miscarriages of justice. "Relevance" requires evidence to have a logical connection to the case facts, forming the basis for fact-finding. "Legality" refers not only to the form of evidence but, more crucially, to the legality of its source and collection procedures. In China's judicial practice, the connotation of "legality" has continuously deepened; for example, the aforementioned illegal evidence exclusion rules enrich and develop its content. Upholding and developing the "Three-Attribute Theory" reflects the theoretical confidence of Chinese Evidence Law scholarship. It refuses to regard Western rule of law theories as the only "standard answer," instead building a theoretical discourse system suited to its own judicial traditions based on national conditions. In curriculum teaching, instructors should guide students to dialectically view the differences between Chinese and Western evidence theories. They need to understand the essence of Western theories while profoundly comprehending the rationality and vitality of the "Three-Attribute Theory" within China's judicial practice. This cultivates students' ability to solve legal problems based on Chinese reality and strengthens their conviction in following the path of socialist rule of law with Chinese characteristics.

4.2. Responding to the Times: The Pursuit of "Digital Justice" in Designing Rules for New Types of Evidence

In the era of the digital economy, new types of evidence such as electronic data, expert opinions, and audio-visual materials play an increasingly important role in litigation. Designing scientifically sound rules for their examination and application is a challenge of the times for Evidence Law. President Xi Jinping's important expositions on "using rule of law thinking and rule of law methods to deepen reforms and promote development" and "empowering justice with technology," provide direction for

institutional innovation in this field. Revisions to China's evidence rules actively respond to the era's demand for "digital justice." In academic discussions and curriculum design, students can be guided to focus on cutting-edge issues like electronic data, expert assistants, and scientific evidence, exploring how rule design can better serve the practical needs of China's "digital economy" and "smart society" construction while drawing on foreign experience. This not only stimulates students' academic interest but also motivates them to closely integrate their study and research of Evidence Law with the grand goal of serving the modernization of national governance.

5. METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE: THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE LAW GUIDED BY SYSTEMS THINKING

The "Systems Thinking" in Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law is a creative application and development of the Marxist scientific methodology, requiring us to adhere to comprehensive, interconnected, and developmental viewpoints when observing and handling issues. Applying systems thinking to the theoretical construction and institutional design of Evidence Law means placing Evidence Law within the entire national rule of law system and governance system for holistic planning, achieving its internal coordination and external cohesion.

5.1. Internal Coordination: Deepening the Connection between Substantive Law and Procedural Law

Evidence Law naturally serves as a bridge connecting substantive law and procedural law. Firstly, it encompasses both procedural rules for collecting and examining evidence and norms like standards of proof that affect substantive determinations, representing the intersection of substantive and procedural law. Secondly, the determination of case facts is the prerequisite for deciding substantive rights and obligations, and fact-finding relies on evidence rules. The fact-finding foundation provided by evidence rules, the rights realization path provided by procedural law, and the adjudication standards provided by substantive law interact organically to ultimately form an appropriate judgment result. Examining Evidence Law through the lens of systems thinking requires us to break down the barriers between departmental legal disciplines and deepen the synergistic linkage between evidence rules and substantive and procedural law norms. For example, the issue of admissibility standards for scientific evidence is not merely a matter of evidence law; it is intrinsically related to the determination of substantive facts. If courts lack scientific standards and capabilities for reviewing complex scientific evidence, erroneous judgments may be made, damaging judicial authority[9]. Therefore, the top-level design of Evidence Law requires establishing sound expert assistant systems, improving mechanisms for expert witnesses to testify in court, and exploring the establishment of neutral scientific advisory bodies to ensure accurate interpretation and fair admission of scientific evidence.

5.2. External Cohesion: Promoting the Integrated Construction of Domestic and Foreign-Related Rule of Law

As China increasingly moves towards the center of the world stage, coordinating the advancement of domestic rule of law and foreign-related rule of law has become a major strategic task. President Xi Jinping emphasized the need to "accelerate the strategic planning of foreign-related rule of law work.[10]" The evidence system, being a core link in foreign-related civil and commercial litigation, must adapt its rule design to this strategic requirement. While firmly safeguarding national judicial sovereignty, it must actively align with internationally accepted evidence rules to enhance the international credibility and influence of China's judiciary. In foreign-related civil and commercial cases, challenges such as the taking and authentication of evidence located abroad, the ascertainment of foreign law, and international judicial assistance place new demands on China's evidence system.

In rule design, we need to deeply research international treaties like the Hague Evidence Convention and the evidence rules of major trading partners, seeking convergence points between domestic law and international rules to build a set of foreign-related evidence rules that conform to China's national conditions while aligning with international standards. This not only effectively resolves foreign-related disputes but also serves as an important window showcasing China's open, confident, and fair rule of law image to the world.

6. PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION: INNOVATIONS IN EVIDENCE LAW CLASSROOM TEACHING

After addressing critical theoretical issues concerning value orientation, mindset cultivation, distinctive perspectives, and methodological guidance, the next imperative is to translate these conceptual achievements into practice—with classroom teaching serving as the primary vehicle for implementation. As a pivotal means of shaping students' legal literacy and practical competencies, classroom teaching must undergo corresponding innovations in response to evolving guiding principles. Against the backdrop of a rapidly transforming educational landscape and increasingly diverse legal practice demands, the limitations of traditional evidence law teaching methods have become increasingly apparent. To revitalize evidence law pedagogy and advance the development of ideological and political education in legal studies, innovative approaches—such as integrating teaching content, fostering interactive and dialogic teaching—must be adopted.

6.1. Shortcomings of the Current Ideological and Political Education System in Classroom Teaching

6.1.1. Teaching Content: An Incomplete Evidence Law System Overshadowed by Criminal Evidence

Currently, evidence law scholarship in China is predominantly driven by scholars in criminal procedure law, resulting in textbooks that disproportionately emphasize criminal evidence law while neglecting civil and administrative evidence law. Some authoritative textbooks even erroneously classify principles exclusive to criminal proceedings—such as the "strict adjudication principle of evidence" and the "privilege against self-incrimination"—as fundamental principles of evidence law, constituting a systemic error. Unlike other legal disciplines, evidence law has long suffered from an unclear disciplinary framework. Against this backdrop, the design of evidence law curricula has been characterized by continuous exploration and trial-and-error adjustments. In practice, civil cases far outnumber criminal cases. Consequently, an overemphasis on criminal evidence law not only undermines the scientific and rational structure of the curriculum but also impedes students' comprehension and mastery of evidence law as a whole. Moreover, it leaves graduates who predominantly engage in civil litigation ill-equipped to apply civil evidence rules and principles to resolve practical issues.

6.1.2. Teaching Approach: Barriers to Integrating Ideological and Political Education

Evidence law courses encompass content from all three major procedural laws, presenting a complex and abstract theoretical system closely tied to litigation practice. In traditional teaching models, case selection for evidence law instruction often serves the narrow purpose of illustrating specific doctrinal points. Furthermore, case analysis tends to focus on factual dissection, statutory interpretation, and theoretical critiques, with insufficient attention paid to extracting ideological and political themes embedded in practical cases. Additionally, evidence law evolves rapidly, with its content deeply intertwined with criminal, civil, and administrative procedure law. Legislative developments in these three procedural domains have accelerated significantly. Thus, curriculum design must promptly incorporate updates that align with the latest legislative changes to ensure the relevance of ideological and political education.

6.1.3. Teaching Methodology: Unidirectional Lecture-Based Instruction Limits Student Engagement

Traditional evidence law courses predominantly employ didactic, lecture-based teaching, which efficiently delivers a structured knowledge framework and cultivates students' abstract reasoning and analytical skills. However, this unidirectional approach imposes a rigid and uniform pace that may suit students of average comprehension but inevitably leaves high- and low-achievers disengaged. Passive knowledge absorption, without active intellectual inquiry, also hinders deep cognitive retention.

6.1.4. Assessment Methods: Overreliance on Final Examinations Undermines Ideological and Political Education

The conventional closed-book final examination fails to adequately evaluate the effectiveness of ideological and political education in evidence law courses. Evidence law theory originates from litigation practice but transcends it, with real-world application often diverging from textbook doctrines and statutory provisions. The inherently practical nature of evidence law demands strong integrative analytical skills, particularly the ability to synthesize prior substantive law knowledge. Traditional final exams, however, emphasize quantifiable responses within a constrained timeframe, rendering them ill-suited to assess the depth, breadth, and applicability of students' ideological and political learning.

6.2. Strategies for Classroom Teaching Reform

6.2.1. Teaching Content: Integrative Curriculum Design with a Focus on Civil Evidence Law

As noted, law graduates are statistically more likely to practice civil rather than criminal or administrative law. Therefore, evidence law curricula must transcend the current overemphasis on criminal evidence law and accord civil evidence law its due prominence in course design.

6.2.2. Case-Based Integration of Ideological and Political Education

Landmark cases embody the zeitgeist and reflect the evolution of societal values in specific historical contexts. A thematic case repository, curated around such cases, can address ideological and political education objectives at both macro-national and micro-individual levels. By drawing on evidentiary practices of police, prosecutors, judges, attorneys, and litigants, educators can refine ideological and political themes tailored to students' developmental needs, guiding them to critically examine the interplay of law, reason, and equity in legal practice. This approach transforms ideological and political education from a linear, didactic exercise into an organic process that embeds social responsibility, professional ethics, and personal character development into theoretical and practical instruction. A well-rounded case bank-spanning classic domestic and international cases and contemporary issues-can prompt students to analyze value systems from historical, comparative, national, and professional perspectives. Additionally, given the adversarial nature of litigation, fostering proper professional ethics among legal practitioners should be a cornerstone of ideological and political education in evidence law.

6.2.3. Teaching Methodology: Teacher-Led Instruction with Multifaceted Learning Support

To mitigate the limitations of unidirectional lectures, classroom instruction should uphold the teacher's role as the primary decision-maker while adopting dialogic teaching methods to stimulate student inquiry. The decision-making primacy stems from the specialized nature of legal education: the vast foundational knowledge and requisite socio-cultural understanding necessitate expert-guided instruction, where pedagogical efficacy hinges more on subject-matter expertise than general teaching skills. To ensure systematic knowledge construction and enhance learning outcomes, teachers must retain curricular authority. This does not preclude innovative pedagogies. Teachers should facilitate

student participation in dialogues, encouraging critical thinking, questioning, and constructive feedback. Through sustained interaction, students construct meaning and refine cognitive processes, achieving higher-order thinking. Specifically, teachers should orchestrate structured lesson plans, design content and discussion topics judiciously, moderate theoretical debates effectively, and provide balanced evaluations. Under this framework, classroom dynamics should emphasize teacher-student exchanges. Teachers pose theoretical or case-based questions, students respond, and teachers then deepen the inquiry based on student input. This iterative dialogue elucidates doctrinal nuances and jurisprudential foundations while seamlessly integrating ideological and political elements.

Amid the digital transformation of education, computer-assisted learning offers real-time, personalized feedback, addressing the shortcomings of traditional teaching and enabling smart, efficient pedagogy. **Simulation Training Modules:** Incorporating virtual reality (VR) and artificial intelligence (AI), these modules recreate litigation scenarios across all procedural stages. Students engage in immersive training via a "scene reconstruction + material presentation + quiz" tripartite model, experiencing evidence collection to courtroom adjudication firsthand. Complemented by "moot court simulation modules," students use VR devices for interactive role-playing as judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, or parties, practicing evidence presentation, cross-examination, and argumentation. This experiential learning deepens understanding of evidentiary procedures and enhances professional skills, bridging the gap left by traditional lectures. **Blockchain Evidence Drills:** Utilizing judicial blockchain platforms, students simulate processes such as electronic contract hashing, hash verification, and node consensus, mastering blockchain-based evidence preservation. These exercises demystify digital evidence and cultivate technological literacy, equipping students for future legal practice while sharpening their sensitivity to emerging legal-tech intersections.

6.2.4. Assessment Methods: Comprehensive Evaluation Metrics and Multidimensional Perspectives

A hybrid assessment system-combining pre-class evaluations, regular assignments, and final exams-enriched by diverse evaluators, ensures robust standards.

Students form collaborative study groups that compete for research topics. For instance, in studying medical malpractice evidence issues, groups conduct literature reviews, analyze regulations and cases, and present findings. Teachers oversee progress, providing feedback at each stage-from preliminary research to final reports. This approach fosters active learning, teamwork, and healthy competition while ensuring academic rigor.

Inviting legal practitioners (e.g., attorneys, forensic experts) as "teaching partners" enriches case discussions with real-world insights. These collaborators co-teach specialized modules or supervise clinical projects, leveraging their expertise to provide nuanced feedback on student analyses. Their involvement introduces practical complexity into classroom debates, refining evaluation mechanisms.

7. CONCLUSION

Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law not only charts a grand blueprint for the rule of law construction in China in the new era but also injects powerful ideological impetus into the theoretical deepening and pedagogical reform of Evidence Law as a specific branch of law. From the profound shaping of the core values of Evidence Law by "Fair Justice" to the exquisite embedding of the principles of "Sound Laws and Good Governance" and "Justice for the People" in specific rules; from the theoretical confidence and institutional innovation guided by the path of "Chinese Characteristics" to the macro-level top-level design informed by "Systems Thinking," the essence and core tenets of Xi Jinping Thought on the Rule of Law have been comprehensively and deeply integrated into the construction process of the Evidence Law system with Chinese characteristics. Looking to the future, the pedagogical reform of Evidence Law must transcend the mere teaching of traditional knowledge points, organically integrating value guidance, theoretical inquiry, and practical skill cultivation.

Instructors should guide students to stand at the strategic height of comprehensively advancing the rule of law, deeply understanding the spirit of the rule of law and the values embedded within evidence rules; encourage students to examine the local characteristics and contemporary development of China's evidence system with a critical and constructive perspective; and cultivate students' ability to apply systems thinking, placing evidence issues within the grand context of national governance. Only in this way can we cultivate truly high-caliber rule of law talent that meets the requirements of the new era-talent possessing both firm belief in the rule of law and solid professional expertise, capable of grounding themselves in Chinese practice while possessing an international vision. Such talent will contribute an unceasing stream of intellectual insights and practical innovation to the comprehensive construction of a modern socialist country on the track of the rule of law.

REFERENCES

- [1] Xi Jinping. Winning the battle to complete the building of a moderately prosperous society in all respects and securing a great victory for socialism with Chinese characteristics in the new era[N]. People's Daily, October 28,2017(001).
- [2] Resolution of the CPC Central Committee on the major Achievements and Historical Experience of the Party's Centenary Struggle [N]. People's Daily, 17 November 2021 (001).
- [3] Zhang Wenxian. Research on Xi Jinping's Thought on the Rule of Law (Part II) -- Core Views of Xi Jinping's Comprehensive Rule of Law [J]. Legal System and Social Development, 2016,22(04):5-47.
- [4] Wang Fuhua. The Justice System of Internet Justice [J]. China Law Science, 2024, (01):124-144.
- [5] Hu Ming. Application and Regulation of Blockchain Judicial Deposit [J]. Modern Law, 2022,44(04):158-170.
- [6] Zhou Cui. Normative interpretation and practical observation of exclusion of illegal evidence in civil cases [J]. China Law, 2020, (03):223-243.
- [7] Wang Zhanlin and Yang Zhichao. On the Problems and Improvement of the Explanatory System in Civil Procedure [J]. Legal Application, 2019, (20):83-92.
- [8] Chen Xuequan. Chinese Expression of the Attributes of Litigation Evidence [J]. Legal System and Social Development, 2024,30(01):129-146.
- [9] Zong Bo. On the Substantive Review of Scientific Evidence [J]. Law and Business Research, 2024,41(01):150-167.
- [10] Huang Hui-kang. Strengthening the Top-level Planning of the Foreign-related Legal System Construction -On the Study and Implementation of the Important Speech Spirit of General Secretary Xi Jinping [J]. Wuhan University International Law Review, 2024,8(01):1-23.