Lee Burgess: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today, we are talking about how to start putting everything you've covered so far together, and making sense of it so you can apply it on an exam. Your Law School Toolbox hosts are Alison Monahan and Lee Burgess, that's me. We're here to demystify the law school and early legal career experience, so you'll be the best law student and lawyer you can be. We're the co-creators of the Law School Toolbox, the Bar Exam Toolbox, and the career-related website CareerDicta. Alison also runs The Girl's Guide to Law School. If you enjoy the show, please leave a review or rating on your favorite listening app. And if you have any questions, don't hesitate to reach out to us. You can reach us via the contact form on LawSchoolToolBox.com, and we'd love to hear from you. And with that, let's get started.

Alison Monahan: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today we're talking about how to start putting everything you've covered together, so you can make sense of it and apply it on an exam. Well, I think, Lee, this is a good time to go back to some of the fundamental steps in the law school learning process, which we describe as Absorb, Ponder, Practice, and Perform. I've always felt we should have a snappier acronym for that, but it is what it is.

Lee Burgess: APPP?

Alison Monahan: Yeah, A-Puh-Puh-Puh. Yeah, so just think A-Puh-Puh-Puh. Maybe like APPPLE. Maybe we can make an L-E at the end something.

Lee Burgess: Alright.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, "Law School Exam." Hey, it could work. "Absorb, Ponder, Practice, Perform, Law School Exam." Why not? Anyway, so there's your APPPLE. The first month or so of law school, you're in what I call "absorb mode". So, you're a sponge. Everything's new, it's not clear what's important, and your job is really just to do the reading, go to class, take some notes, and be patient. But now is the time in the middle of the semester where you really need to start pondering this material and making sense of it, because until you do this, it's really hard to practice productively. You're just guessing if you don't have a framework. What we do when we ponder is we take all of the individual pieces that you've learned about – that might be cases, or statues, or other materials – and you use those to create a logical structure. I went to architecture school, so I think of this like a "scaffolding" that you can apply to new problems. So, before we really jump in, let's just take a trivial example. In your Torts class, if you're taking Torts, you've probably talked about negligence. If not, I promise that you will,

but assume that you have. So you've read a bunch of cases, they introduced different aspects of this law, probably over the course of several weeks, or even months. And by the end of that semester, hopefully, any law student is going to be able to confidently recite the basic elements of negligence. Those, in case you don't know: duty, breach, causation, and harm.

And the beauty of this list is it tells you exactly how to structure your analysis of a new hypo. You know what to start with, you know what to look for, and all these things. And, critically, it lets your professor give you points because you're giving them information in the format they're expecting it, so your answer is easy to read and easy to award points to. That's a really simple example, but that's kind of what we're going for. So, how do we get there? That's the big question. So, let's talk first about how to build useful outlines and other study aids, and later we're going to talk about how you might be able to use AI to help you study and learn this material. So Lee, what's up first in your list of how to make a useful outline?

Lee Burgess: Well, when we talk to 1Ls, I think it's really interesting how this word "outlining" has so much power.

Alison Monahan: Right.

Lee Burgess: Like it's these magical things you're supposed to be doing. And really, it's just creating study materials that may or may not look like an outline.

Alison Monahan: Exactly.

Lee Burgess: So, we're going to use the term "outline", but it may be an outline, it may be pictures, it may be flowcharts, it could be bubbles. It doesn't really matter exactly what it is, as long as it makes sense to you. But when you're thinking about making your own study materials or an outline, you definitely have to start pulling things together, and that means that you've got to have some solid class notes, you've got your class syllabus, you've got maybe a past outline for a class – that can be a very powerful tool. Maybe you have one or two – but probably not more than two – usually just one commercial outline. You're really just trying to say, "These are all of the things that are going to have the answers to questions that I may have as I'm building out this law in order to study it." And then you have to start at the high level. So going back to your example on negligence, the high level of negligence is duty, breach, causation, and harm or damages, depending on how your professor wants you to say it. There seem to be two very strange camps: harm versus damages. I don't know.

Alison Monahan: Right. I know that we always say it differently, so that's clearly what we were taught.

Lee Burgess: I know. Maybe it was an East Coast/West Coast thing, I don't know.

Alison Monahan: Maybe so. Yeah, so this is a great example of the same concept being put in the words of your professor, and that is another thing you want to pay attention to when you're doing your outlining or study aids.

Lee Burgess: So, if I was going to outline negligence, I would say, "Okay, I know that I have to talk about duty, breach, causation, and I'm going to say damages because I just want to dare to be different." And then I want to say, "Okay, now what have I learned about duty?" And it may surprise you if you've never taken Torts before that duty seems like a very simple concept, but you're going to probably learn 10+ different rules about duty. Because there's the standard duty of care, and then you have the duty of care for all sorts of specific things: a minor, a rescuer, a doctor, a landlord.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, a trespasser versus somebody who's invited to your house. You have different duties to those people, believe it or not.

Lee Burgess: Exactly. And so, you're going to have a whole list of these possible duties, and one of your jobs when you're outlining is to say, "Okay, so now I'm getting into all the details about duty." And so you might have a secondary list under "Duty", which is all of these different types of duty. And then you're going to have more detail, because when you look at your class notes, you're like, "Wow, we spent a whole lot of time talking about landowner and occupier." So I better look at where I've written down landowner and occupier and say, "Okay, what do I know about a landowner/occupier?" And then you're going to have very specific rules about that. And then you may even have some details from some cases that will help you interpret what fact pattern fits into what area of the law. So, this idea – I like to think of it as almost like file folders on a computer. You want to say, "I need to know about negligence", so you double-click, and inside "Negligence" you have duty, breach, causation, damages, then double-click again. Under "Duty" you're going to have maybe lots more file folders, and then when you want to access information, let's say, about landlord or occupier, you double-click on that, and then you're going to have more details. But if you can approach studying like this, the benefit is then you don't lose the structure of the law. You're not doing legal trivia, which is one of the things that we always encourage students to look out for. You're seeing how this law fits together, and

then you can apply it in a much more efficient way. So that's the general idea of what you're trying to do when you create these study materials.

Alison Monahan: I think that's a great analogy, and I really like what you said about leaving the structure, because if I'm thinking about, "Okay, I have a new question. I'm working on a hypo, and I have a situation where maybe there is somebody who is a good Samaritan and also somebody who is a landlord, and we have somebody who trespassed on the property and was injured." Do I just start jumping in and say, "Oh, this is the duty of the landlord"? No, you don't do that. You start with the basic stuff – negligence requires that we show duty, breach, causation, harm/damages. And then the big question is, "Well, what is a duty?" Okay, then you write down your basic rule for duty – everybody has a duty to behave as a reasonable person – or however your professor phrased it. Then at some point, you're going to write down the rules for these other things: "There's a rescue" or, "That's an issue. Okay, the rule on that is X, Y, and Z", "There's a landlord. The rule on that is X, Y, and Z." When you have that structure, it makes it super easy to move through in a logical way and actually get those points.

Lee Burgess: It also helps you when you're trying to decide what to talk about in a question, because in a fact pattern, which is a constructed reality – your professors are creating a wild story – I mean, some of these stories are incredibly wild – of things that happened. You're going to have to ask yourself, "What are all the possible duty issues that could be coming up?" And if you have this list of possible duties memorized, or if you are taking an open-book exam – if you have a list of possible duties on a handy-dandy one-page sheet, then you're going to be able to quickly reference them and say, "Okay, well, it looks like these three things are triggered by this fact pattern. Those are the three things I need to talk about, and this other stuff is not." So, it helps you identify what you may need to talk about, which is also very important to collect lots of points. So, you want that structure that's a little bit of an attack plan – which we've talked about in our other podcast – this idea that you have something to check your analysis against to see if you've raised all of the legal issues that could be coming up.

Alison Monahan: Right, and I think Torts is one of those subjects, at least with negligence, that really lends itself to that structured attack plan approach. If you, for whatever reason, decide that you want to start talking about causation before you talk about duty, that is not going to be probably a high-scoring essay. There are just certain things that people expect in terms of what you talk about first. You can't talk about breach until you have defined the duty. How would we know if it's breached unless we know what it is? This stuff seems trivial, but I guarantee you there are people on a Torts exam who immediately start jumping in and talking,

say, about causation, because maybe that is the harder part of the question or the trickier thing or whatever, or they just think this other stuff is really obvious and doesn't need to be written down. So I think a solid study aid can help you take that deep breath, make sure you're writing everything you need to write down, and get those points.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. The other thing to think about is, what are the really important legal phrases in terms of art that also need to be in this? Because I think that negligence is a great example for that when you think about things like causation. You have two types of causation: you have but-for causation and then you have proximate cause. And if your but-for causation analysis does not include the words "but-for"…

Alison Monahan: Or "in fact", depending…

Lee Burgess: "In fact", yeah, depending on what it is. There are just some buzzwords. Or proximate cause usually needs to have the word "foreseeable" in its definition, and if you don't have the word "foreseeable" in your outline, that can be problematic. And so, you also want to be very careful as you're building these outlines, that you're looking for these terms of art, because they are going to be what your professor's looking for. And if you have an open-book exam, which means that you have the rules in front of you, there is no tolerance, like a zero-tolerance policy on bad law. But even if it's a closed-book exam, you are really required to know these terms of art and know these important words that the law is built on, because that's what you're being tested on.

Alison Monahan: Right, and "foreseeable" is a great example – that has legal meaning. So, it may not be the meaning that you might have thought that word had before you went to law school. And there are a lot of terms of art like that. So yeah, I think flagging those in some way, whether it's highlighting or underlining or something in your outline, is always a good idea, just to make sure that in the heat of the moment, you don't forget to say them.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. The other thing that we see students struggle with is what to do with cases in their outlines. So, you read all these cases – lots and lots and lots and lots of cases. And then you get to outlining and you're like, "But I have all these notes and briefs and everything on all these cases. What do I do? I better include my briefs in my outline", which is a terrible idea.

Alison Monahan: Oh, that's so popular.

Lee Burgess: It's so popular, but it's a terrible idea. Instead, you want to reference cases and only include notes about legally significant facts. Because what the cases are going to show you is typically how the law is applied or has been interpreted by the courts, and that is going to be part of your analysis. It's often going to be a reference to a case, or say that your fact pattern is or is not like a given case. But you do not need to have these full mini-briefs, as we typically call them, in your outlines. It's a waste of time to write them, you're never going to memorize them, and even if it's an open-book test, you're not going to read them. So, just don't do it.

Alison Monahan: No, and it just doesn't get you to the end goal. Like in Torts, *Palsgraf* is the case for proximate cause. Fine, you can drop that in. Is it even necessary? Probably not, because everyone knows that case. You're not getting any real points for it. But yeah, if you just have a whole bunch of briefs, which I think makes people feel like they're doing something, because you get a really long outline out of it. If your outline is this much space, a whole paragraph for every case you've read, it's going to be really long. And you might feel great about, "Oh, I have a 100-page outline. I'm doing so much work", but does that really help you get to duty, breach, causation, harm, there are two types of causation, there are four types of landlord rule? No, it doesn't help you get to that, which is what you're actually going for here.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. So, if you're listening to this podcast and you're like, "Sounds great. I have no idea what I'm doing or even where to start" – that's totally fine. I think almost every law student feels this way when they sit down to start working on their outlines. You can always start somewhere, which is typically with the structure of your syllabus. Because typically, the syllabus is organized to cover the law in a logical – we hope – a logical way. So you can just start at the headers, with the syllabus. You probably have a header that says "Negligence", and then underneath it, it starts with "Duty". And then it may even list out all the different duties you're going to cover in class.

Alison Monahan: Right.

Lee Burgess: So, that's a great place to start, and then you're not starting with a blank page. I think the other thing to try if you're really feeling lost is to try to outline a little bit. So, don't outline everything; just outline a bit, and then test it using a hypo. Can you explain negligence?

Alison Monahan: Right, does this help you?

Lee Burgess: Does this help you? And if it doesn't, whoops-a-daisy – you better go back to the beginning and do it again.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I think that's great advice, because I think sometimes people spend a lot of time and energy doing something, and they are not testing it and iterating along the way. And then you get to the end and you realize, "Wow, that was really a waste of a lot of time, and I don't actually have anything that's going to really help me", and then you've got a real problem. So, if you are just getting started, maybe you have mid-terms, which is a great place to start learning whether your study materials are working. But if you don't, you really need to start doing that practice as soon as you make a section of the outline even, so that you can see what is working, what is not working, and hopefully by the end, you've got something that's really dialed.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. You also want to make sure that you're not getting bogged down and overwhelmed with one piece of the outline, because you have to get through the whole class. So, make sure that you're not getting so bogged down with some nuance. You can always mark it, you can flag it, you can go to office hours, you can talk to your study group about it. But it's a good idea not to spend a whole afternoon struggling with one concept, because you're missing the bigger picture of how all this fits together if you do that.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, and I think a lot of law students have these perfectionist tendencies and are a little anxious maybe, that "If I don't put this one thing in, that's going to be the whole exam and I'm going to miss it." Well, if you're eight levels deep in your outline and maybe there's something you're not putting in, that is not going to sink or swim your grade. What is going to sink your grade is if you do not have this big-picture structure that you can apply to a question. So, I think going back to what we were saying earlier, you've got to start at this high level and go and fill in details as you go over time. But go through the whole topic, go back through it, take a test, see what's missing. If you miss something, it's not in your outline, go back, put it in. You've got to iterate through, versus "I have to have the perfect outline before I can start doing any practice", because like we said, you may not be making the right thing. You don't know at this point.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, I think that's true. Some people also think it's a good idea to just split up the outline.

Alison Monahan: Oh, I love this one: "Well, I have a study group. Can't we just all split the outline and then we'll have a really perfect outline?" Can't they do that, Lee?

Lee Burgess: It's a terrible idea, because it's not a group project to take your exams. Now, what I do think can be helpful is if your study group individually works on the outline, and you want to come together and compare the outlines and see if there's consistency. I think that's great. But doing the work is part of the learning, so you really don't want to "peace out" on doing the work.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, it's the same problem that we've talked about before, of you just taking someone else's perfect outline who got a great grade in the class. And your school will give you these; it's not really a secret. You can just go and get them, usually off of a drive, and people are like, "Oh, this looks great. This is so detailed. It has everything I need." But the person who made that actually learned the material while they were making it, so for you just to take it – it's kind of the difference between reading a book and writing a book. Obviously, you know more after writing it. So, the study group split is kind of the same process; it's just a different variation of, "Let me take someone else's work and their thinking, and read through it and hope that I get to the same point they're at." Unfortunately, that just really doesn't work that well. It could be a starting point; it just isn't going to get you really where you need to be.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. So, I think that's a pretty good explanation on generally how to begin outlining. But now I want to switch to our new favorite topic to talk about…

Alison Monahan: We're really excited.

Lee Burgess: …which is artificial intelligence and AI. And I have to give you credit that I was hiding from any sort of discussion about AI and all these chatbots and all this stuff, because I thought it was scary and inaccessible, and you drew me in and now I'm really excited about it.

Alison Monahan: I know. I mean, it might eventually put us out of business, but we're really psyched about it for now.

Lee Burgess: Hey, for now we're going to go with it.

Alison Monahan: Exactly. So a few months ago, I started playing around with the first version of ChatGPT just out of curiosity, and I pretended I was a law student. I had it walk me through some different law, give me a few questions. That was kind of interesting; it was not particularly accurate, to be honest. It made some logical errors, and I put it aside for a little while. But then I found this new thing called Claude, and Claude is free, Claude is our new best friend. It's Claude.ai – we're not getting paid for this – we just are kind of obsessed with it. But I was really

curious how it might help a law student. And just to say this upfront – obviously it is not perfect. You cannot outsource your thinking to this generative AI that we have absolutely no idea what it learned about. It has, however, been trained on the law. So that's interesting because it's much, much better at legal principles than something like ChatGPT, at least the version I've used. But I was really interested, what could it do for me if I'm a law student? So I asked it actually to quiz me on the concept of duty. And it was pretty wild. I think I'm actually going to make a YouTube on this, because it was pretty crazy. So, it actually gave me a list of really solid questions. It went through them with me one by one. It asked for my answers, it kind of critiqued them. If I got something totally wrong, it would explain it to me and ask me the question again. But I think this could be a super interesting way for somebody who's really struggling to maybe even get an overview of the topic. I mean, I haven't done this. Maybe I'll add it to the YouTube, but I'm guessing if I ask Claude, "Hey, I'm a law student. I am trying to outline the topic of Duty and Negligence. Can you give me a high-level outline to the topic?", it probably could do that. Again, you can't just take that because it might not be right, and also it's basically just like taking someone else's outline. But it just seems like it's a little more interactive. I don't know. What do you think?

Lee Burgess: I think it's really interesting, and I think it depends on the person. I think sometimes people really have a hard time sitting down and studying this stuff on their own. And the nice thing about Claude – our new friend – is that Claude doesn't include all the distractions of a study group. Oftentimes, study groups come with a lot of chatting about things that are off-topic, or stress and drama. Claude's not stressed.

Alison Monahan: Oh, it's also been trained on coaching. It's so friendly and nice and helpful. It's very, very friendly. It's very light-touch on the corrections.

Lee Burgess: It is. So I think that for someone who's craving some sort of interactivity but is struggling either finding the right person at school to do this, or they're finding that their study group isn't productive, I think it could be really interesting. I also think it is a bit more active than a lot of passive learning. I like the fact that you at least have to ask Claude questions and interact with Claude. I think that as long as you take it with the disclaimer that you have to thoughtfully review Claude's responses and make sure that Claude is right – because Claude has a lot of confidence, but may not always be right.

Alison Monahan: Right. Another thing I actually played around with a little bit that I think could be interesting as people start getting into doing more practice – you can actually upload a practice question, a hypo, and ask it to help you go through that

question. So, you can ask it, basically, "Outline an answer to this question." And oftentimes, what I found is it does give very one-sided viewpoints. We've talked a lot about ambiguity, and ambiguity being where the points are – I don't know that Claude really deals well with ambiguity, but you can ask those follow-up questions. So, if you are getting feedback that your answers are too conclusory, you might be doing the exact same thing – you're deciding on a viewpoint, you're deciding where it's going to end up, and you're making the case. But you can actually ask Claude to give you the other side. You can say something like, "Okay, well, you've said X, Y, and Z. Are there any counterarguments you can think of?" And it'll generate the counterarguments. I think that would actually be a great way of helping you get creative and making sure you're really looking at both sides of an issue. Again, this is a crutch. You can't rely on it. It's going to take your exam for you. But I do think for somebody who's really motivated to push themselves a little bit and wants to think a little more creatively on some of the counterarguments and things like that, it could be really powerful.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I think it's worth playing around and seeing how it resonates with you. And it's just kind of fun. I don't know. I'm introducing Claude to a lot of people.

Alison Monahan: I am too. I'm kind of obsessed. Yeah, everybody's like, "Oh, wow." I really think it's more friendly than the other AIs I've tried. I think that's kind of their jam.

Lee Burgess: I will say, as someone who doesn't have a programming background like you do, that I kind of had to frame it for myself, though, of what Claude is. And I'm not going to explain AI, because my explanation would be terrible. But the idea is, it's not Google. And I think that initially you kind of want to ask it questions.

Alison Monahan: It's not so great with facts. It just gets a lot of factual stuff totally wrong, and makes stuff up, and you don't know that it's making stuff up. So, I don't think factual stuff is really where it is. Yeah, exactly; it's not Google. You can't just be like, "Tell me when the dates of this war were", because it might make something up completely.

Lee Burgess: Right, yeah. And feel confident about it, and sound very confident about it.

Alison Monahan: You might take that away and be like, "No, that is not..." I read something, an article yesterday actually about someone who's an author who found that his books were in this database of things that Meta had trained their AI on illegally. Well, I don't know if they're illegally, but "without permission", shall we say?

Lee Burgess: It's definitely a gray area, but it's not looking good.

Alison Monahan: Well, yeah, without permission. So anyway, he started basically talking to one of the chatbots – I can't remember which one – about this topic, and he has the same name as this other author. So he did this whole thing where he asked it, "Well, do you know that there are two of these people?" And it's like, "Oh, yes" – very confidently came back to be like, "There's Mr. X and Mr. Y, middle initial, and they both write. That one writes on this topic and one writes on the other." He's like, "None of this was right. It's literally read these books and it doesn't know who we are." He's like, "It's very bizarre." So I think stuff like that, they're not that great at. But I think for things like summarizing and explaining certain things, it could be pretty useful.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, I also think... Now that we've been talking about this, I've been playing with Claude, and now my Instagram feed thinks I'm obsessed with AI, because…

Alison Monahan: You are.

Lee Burgess: I am, and now it gives me all of these tips for using AI. But you do have to get used to how to give the prompt to Claude. Like you said, "I'm a law student, and I am studying Negligence, and I would like you to do this." Or if you're asking for Claude to play a role, then you need to give Claude the role. And so I do think that you have to practice with it a little bit. You can't just dive in. You have to give it some context about what it's trying to do to help you.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, and ask follow-up questions and things like that. So yeah, I will probably do a whole demo on this, because I just thought it was kind of fun and I was actually really shocked what a great job it did. I was surprised, I will say.

Lee Burgess: We're going to do some more AI content because clearly, we're spending quite a bit of time learning about this. But another thing is, we've used it to brainstorm talking points for things, we have used it in a number of different contexts. I was interviewing for a position and it suggested interview questions that I should be asking folks, and then I asked it to drill down on certain topics. So, when you have some free time – which may not be right now because you're studying for exams – but there is some interesting stuff that you can play with and see if it can help you brainstorm, or help you freshen up things that you may have done a lot of times, because it's offering a different AI point of view.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And I do think there's a lot of stuff you can use in a job hunt, which we will probably do a full episode on soon, so stay tuned. Well, unfortunately, now that we've gone on about AI for a while, I think we're pretty much about out of time. But before we wrap up, let's talk about what to do if someone is really

struggling at this point. So, I think number one is, you have to simplify things. That might mean using a commercial outline for the basics. It might be doing a very high-level outline, and just really trying not to get so lost in the details, I think is my number one advice.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I would also add to that, just don't get caught up in the busy work. Because when things are going poorly, it is so comforting to say, "I'm going to outline for eight hours", when you'd probably be better off doing a higher-level outline and doing more practice. And depending on the structure of your exams, my advice might be slightly tailored. But just don't assume that being busy is getting you to your goals. Being busy isn't the same thing as being productive.

Alison Monahan: That is a great point. And I think my number two point was to force yourself to do practice, whether you feel ready or not. And then really to ask for help. You know if things are not going great, so you need to find help, whether that's a study group, whether it's a different resource, whether it's your new friend Claude, whether it is your professor in office.

Lee Burgess: Us.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, your professor in office hours, a tutor – we can help you, academic support. There are lots and lots of people and resources. And I think if you are really struggling in the middle of the semester, it is so much better to deal with that than to just hope things get better by the end, because they're probably just going to get worse.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. And that second half of the semester goes so fast, so much faster than the first half. So, if you get some gnarly feedback on those mid-terms, then it's time to regroup quickly, because those final exams are going to come up really fast.

Alison Monahan: That's true. And we are here for you, so feel free to reach out.

Lee Burgess: Exactly. Well, as we wrap up, I think my final thought is to just really remember to balance these activities that everyone seems to be doing, with what really works for you. Because not everybody is going to be able to learn off the same study materials. Not everybody is going to find Claude as helpful as we do, although I think there's a lot there. But you need to find out what works for you, and don't get caught up just doing what everybody else is doing, assuming that it's going to get you to the outcome that you need.

Alison Monahan: I think that's great advice. I was much more of a flowchart person, and I really felt a lot of pressure my first semester to do a written outline, and at some point I just realized, "This is not really helping me." And so I started doing diagrams and coloring things, and people thought I was crazy, but it worked. So, you do you.

Lee Burgess: Yep. Alright, well, with that, I think we're finally out of time. If you enjoyed this episode of the Law School Toolbox podcast, please take a second to leave a review and rating on your favorite listening app. We'd really appreciate it. And be sure to subscribe so you don't miss anything. If you have any questions or comments, please don't hesitate to reach out to myself or Alison at lee@lawschooltoolbox.com or alison@lawschooltoolbox.com. Or you can always reach us via the contact form on LawSchoolToolBox.com. Thanks for listening, and we'll talk soon!

RESOURCES:

Claude.ai
Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.
Podcast Episode 65: How to Make a Useful Law School Outline
Podcast Episode 67: Mid-Semester Law School To-Do List
Podcast Episode 213: Why Practice Is So Important in Law School
Podcast Episode 312: Mid-Term Exam Prep Basics for Law Students
Wondering What an Attack Plan Is?
Surviving the October Freakout