Alison Monahan: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today, I'm excited to be talking with Gabe Teninbaum – law professor and creator of spacedrepetition.com – about how AI might impact the legal profession. Your Law School Toolbox host today is Alison Monahan, and typically, I'm with Lee Burgess. We're here to demystify the law school and early legal career experience, so that you'll be the best law student and lawyer you can be. Together, we're the co-creators of the Law School Toolbox, the Bar Exam Toolbox, and the career-related website CareerDicta. I also run 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 always reach us via the contact form on LawSchoolToolBox.com, and we would love to hear from you. With that, let's get started.

Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today, I'm excited to be talking with Gabe Teninbaum – law professor and creator of spacedrepetition.com – about how AI may impact the legal profession. Welcome, Gabe. Thanks for joining us again.

Gabe Teninbaum: Alison, it's a pleasure to be here again.

Alison Monahan: Oh, well, it's our pleasure, really. Well, to kick us off, can you give listeners some information on your background and your interest in technology, just for some context?

Gabe Teninbaum: Glad to do it. So by day, I'm a law professor. I teach at Suffolk University Law School in Boston. I've been there for 17 years, and I oversee our Legal Innovation and Technology program, which helps law students think about what the future is going to look like.

Alison Monahan: Well, it seems like you'd be very well situated to talk about this and to be thinking about this. If people want to learn about you or connect with you, how can they do that?

Gabe Teninbaum: They can look me up on the Suffolk website. They can go to my personal website, which is lawtomatic.com, like automatic, but with "law" inserted at the beginning. Or they can go to spacedrepetition.com, which is a fun project that I work on.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, we're big fans of that. And how did you personally get interested in technology and the legal industry?

Gabe Teninbaum: In 2011 and 2012, the American Bar Association – the group that oversees the regulation of lawyers – created this new rule on the rules of professional conduct, and that's called the duty of technological competence, which says that all lawyers, as part of their job, have to maintain competence with technology relevant to their practice areas. And my colleague Andy Perlman, who's now the Dean of Suffolk Law School, was the reporter of that group. So, it was through a conversation with him where he was telling me what he was working on and the implications of it that I first got interested.

Alison Monahan: Interesting. So that was pretty early on in kind of the tech days of law when lawyers were like, "Wait, we have to use word processing? What?" I remember the firm some older partners were still dictating to their secretaries and things like that. And it was just like, "Huh, that's interesting." I mean, I guess now they can dictate to the computer. Alright, well, people have been talking a lot about generative AI in this last year or so. Can you give us a basic overview of what this even is? What does this mean, and why might it be important for the legal profession?

Gabe Teninbaum: Sure. Generative AI is a form of artificial intelligence, and artificial intelligence is any computer software that effectively replicates the kind of thinking that a human would do. And generative AI is different in that it is trained on large language models, which is to say that the people that program these things have loaded billions and billions and billions of data points into it and said effectively, "Identify patterns in this information." And by harnessing this training set, large language model tools like ChatGPT, or the Google version, are able to create narrative that looks and feels like it's spoken by a regular human, which is the real advance that this branch of AIs have.

Alison Monahan: I find it kind of creepy a lot of times. I'm a big fan of Claude. Claude is like our new friend that we just have do stuff for us. I'm pretty sure that he's read everything we've ever posted and every transcript we've ever had on this podcast. And so, it is actually uncanny to me how I can ask Claude to do something and it kind of sounds like something I might write.

Gabe Teninbaum: It's really strange. So, one of the concepts of artificial intelligence that people that work with AI and robots talk about is this thing called the "uncanny valley", and that's this idea that if a robotic thing seems fake, it doesn't bother people. And if a robotic thing seems totally real, it doesn't bother people because they don't realize it's a robot. But there is this space where it's almost exactly real,

but it does something that makes it seem uncanny, like it has a funky glitch or it uses strange mannerisms, and it literally causes some people a sense of nausea and disorientation, and that's become known as the uncanny valley. And generative AI tools do that with writing – so, you say, "Write, a love letter in the style of this famous person from history", and it does it in a way that's so close, you say, "That's actually a little bit upsetting." And the same thing happens as you do it with legal writing and other forms.

Alison Monahan: Right. Obviously, lawyers deal with mostly – not exclusively, but a lot of written information, so I think there are a lot of people who are kind of nervous about this, saying, "Is this going to replace my job? Is it going to mean that I don't get paid as much?" What are your thoughts around that?

Gabe Teninbaum: I think it will almost certainly replace tasks. So, the question is, does a person have enough tasks that won't be replaced, that it will keep them working? Let me give you an example of that. If you created an artificial intelligence that could drive a car as effectively as a person – if your sole job was to drive that car, it might totally replace you. Of course, there will probably be regulators and others that would try to prevent that from happening. But if your job is more sophisticated than that – say you drive the car, you load the cargo, you unload the cargo, you do other things that the AI can't do – it may be that you still have a job; it's just the tasks that you do might change. And I think the same sort of thing will happen in knowledge work and has already started to happen in knowledge work. So you can imagine a world where generative AI tools will do things like draft the first draft of briefs. And if that's your sole job, then you've got a problem. But if you do other things on top of that, then you'll be safe, and the time that you would have spent doing that first draft would be better spent doing other things.

Alison Monahan: Right. In San Francisco, we definitely have what Lee's daughter calls the "ghost cars" driving around, and they're kind of creepy. You see the steering wheel turning and there's no one in there. And yeah, there are lots of interesting regulatory issues going on right now, because the City doesn't really want these here, but they don't actually have control over it. And the state board has said they can do it, but they're having these accidents and blocking fire trucks, all this stuff. I don't know the answer to this because I haven't looked it up, but I'd imagine the bar associations and things are kind of thinking about these problems.

Gabe Teninbaum: Yes, so that's the same sort of parallel you're seeing with generative AI. So you've probably heard these horror stories of lawyer submits brief with made up cases or hallucinated cases in it and the judge gets furious, because they say,

"Well, you've cited precedent for me that's not a real case." And the challenge of course is that the lawyer submitting it either is relying on someone else's work or themselves don't understand how these tools work. And what's happening in response is that judges are issuing orders about how generative AI is to be used, and bar associations are offering guidance. And some of it's quite good and others are overreaction. New technologies result in strange reactions, but eventually it'll settle its way out.

Alison Monahan: Right. And what do you think law students might want to be thinking about? At this point, if you're a 1L, you're probably just focused on trying to understand what is Palsgraf. But at some point it seems like people need to be paying attention to this, I would think. What are your thoughts on that?

Gabe Teninbaum: I think all law students – actually I would have said the same thing even before generative AI came along, and I did say the same thing before generative AI came along – should have an understanding of the technologies that are potentially relevant to the legal field and may impact their work. So, if I were a law student, I would get myself a free account – and you can get free accounts through various tools – and I would start experimenting with them. And I'd get a good understanding of what they can do, and I'd also get an understanding of what they can't do, because there're plenty of things that they can't. And the idea here is that you want to future proof yourself. You want to be ready to use these tools and make a good sense about how they can be used and what their shortcomings are, but also you want do appropriate planning steps. So 10 years ago, if you told me that you were really interested in civil procedure, I'd say, "Oh, you might want to be a discovery attorney and you might want to oversee a discovery project." And then advance a few years and these new bits of software come along called eDiscovery that can read text within documents and use machine learning to find confidential information in a way that a human couldn't do nearly as effectively or efficiently. And if your sole understanding was, "I'm going to be a discovery lawyer", you would have been out of a job. But the idea here is to use these tools to understand what the technology can do, so you can outsource that work to the technology. And then you can understand what they can't do, so that you can make yourselves more valuable in those contexts.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I think discovery is a great context to think about, because if you think about the volume of material that is now very standard to review in typical corporate litigation, it's insane. It's something that 50 years ago you would never even considered, A) because all of that material didn't exist. It's all these emails and Slack messages and texts and everything is going back and forth and

everything is in that database someplace. But it seems like the scope of the work has sort of expanded, based on what's possible.

Gabe Teninbaum: Absolutely. But you've put your finger on something important. This is actually not a new story. Technology has been working in the background of the legal industry long before either you or I were involved in it, Alison, and will continue to do so. So it may be that the way discovery works changed a few years ago and a generation before that, it was going from paper-based research to Westlaw-based research. And then from there going to artificial intelligence-based research. And now it happens to be large language models in those tools. So this is a story that has been told consistently for eons that will continue to be told in different ways.

Alison Monahan: I think that's true. Yeah, I think there are tons of interesting things that law students could spend some time with. We've talked on the podcast to the founders of Paxton AI, which is a really interesting tool and like less than a year old, I think. It's basically a year old, maybe. And I went to a Casetext demo, and that was pretty fascinating and people were asking the question of, "Oh, can this write me a brief?" And they're like, "Well, not now." I mean, this was a month ago or two months ago, so maybe by now it can. They said, "We're working on that." So the stuff is progressing very, very quickly. But I'd have to imagine if you're a law student and you reach out to any of these companies and ask them for a trial account, they're pretty likely to let you have that, I would think.

Gabe Teninbaum: They're quite generous, yes.

Alison Monahan: Yes. You are their future customers, so they'd want you to be the ones kind of pushing this. I think this sort of brings up an interesting, bigger question, and you kind of alluded to this with eDiscovery. I remember when I was in law school, I would go to firm interviews and they would say, "What type of law are you interested in practicing?" And there were kind of two answers – it was either, "Oh, I want to do litigation" or, "I want to do corporate." Maybe somebody might say bankruptcy or something if they're really specialized, but basically, this idea was like, it's a very limited universe, which I don't think is actually accurate. What kind of other ideas do you think people might want to consider, or options that they may just not understand outside of that basic dynamic of litigation or corporate?

Gabe Teninbaum: One of the areas where I focus is on getting students ready for new law careers, and we can define "new law" generally as emerging fields within the legal

industry, many of which didn't even exist 10 or 15 years ago. So, let me give you a few different ways that people can think about that. Law firms now have people that are specifically devoted to process improvement and efficiency, which is one of those sets of skills that goes back a hundred years. When they were coming up with the idea for the assembly line, they used the same sort of principles to help big complex operations get more efficient and effective. And that's been captured in these two knowledge bases called Lean and Six Sigma, which are the two leading philosophies of that. More and more law firms are using that sort of work. And incidentally, those are practice area agnostic. Being more efficient as a litigator or transactional lawyer, as a person that works in government or in any other sphere benefits from this. And there are jobs that are specifically set aside for process improvement people or legal project managers. Another set of folks work on implementing technologies around law firms and legal organizations, so that they can do things more effectively, use electronic discovery. But other stuff too – they might do things like create document assembly tools, which allow people to fill in a form on a website, and in turn that creates a court filing that they can submit more effectively and efficiently. And then I guess a final category I'd list are entrepreneurial roles. The ability of people to create their own legal future, whether it's a solo law firm that uses technology to be more efficient, to deliver better costs of legal services, or creating a startup that creates a tool that lawyers would buy, is better than it's ever been before. Venture capitalists have invested over a billion dollars into legal tech each of the last several years. And law students are doing all sorts of wonderful things. In fact, last year one of my students won on the show Shark Tank with a legal tech product. These sorts of things are starting to happen because the barrier to entry has gotten just significantly reduced in the last few years.

Alison Monahan: That is very true. I'm really excited. I just got access last week to the Claude API, which I'd asked for like months ago, and I guess they're finally handing it out. So I was like, "I don't really know what I'm going to do with this, but I've got some ideas." But that is pretty low cost. And I've also heard that even certain law firms are starting to have almost like a startup – I don't want to call it an incubator because it's kind of within there – but they're trying to become more entrepreneurial too. Obviously there're some legal regulation issues about who owns what, in terms of taking funding, but they're either spinning off, or even within the walls of the firm are coming up with new tech ideas and trying to implement them.

Gabe Teninbaum: Yes, in all sorts of different ways. So some firms are launching their own products, some are doing it as a product to sell into the market, others are doing it as a way to do access to justice work. And then other firms are

effectively becoming funders of their own. They're becoming like private equity and they're investing in legal tech products. And there are actually a couple of firms out there that host their own incubators. So, if you have a legal tech idea, you can go sort of be mentored within that firm, both in terms of running the business, but also getting feedback on the product itself. So, those exist and it's a growing field.

Alison Monahan: That's super interesting. You mentioned access to justice, which I actually think is potentially one of the best use cases for a lot of this generative AI stuff. I don't know the exact statistics, but some huge percentage of people who need legal assistance are not able to afford it. So, what are your thoughts around this?

Gabe Teninbaum: Right, so we should share those stats for those that don't have them. So, depending on the jurisdiction and the type of civil issue, of course people in your audience will probably know that all criminal defendants have a right to an attorney. Civil parties to litigation do not. So, if you're being evicted from your home, if you're being divorced or have a child custody issue, or if you have another civil problem, you're on your own to get legal representation. So, in some types of matters, like eviction, something like 92% of people go to court unrepresented. And incidentally, landlords tend to be the ones with the money and the resources – they are not unrepresented. You can imagine what outcome there's going to be. The way to solve that now is through legal aid, civil legal aid, which is funded by taxpayers and do-gooders and bar dudes and all that sort of thing. But the reality is that those are woefully insufficient. The last statistic I saw was a million qualified people were turned away from free legal aid last year alone, not because they didn't have a colorable problem, not because they were ineligible, but because there simply wasn't capacity. And these are just the people that realize they have a legal problem and actually show up at legal aid and ask for it. This is a really big problem. So, one of the things that I think about a lot, and people that are involved in this space think about a lot, is using technology to help solve those problems that are solvable with this palette of tools. Document assembly tools, expert systems tools, chatbot tools – these can all help some people with some problems. It doesn't help everyone with every problem, but fundamentally the problem is a queuing problem. If you have 10 lawyers to serve a thousand people, if you can help 500 people with an automation, that reduces the line of people that has to be served by real live attorneys. You can also build tools that do sort of a hybridized version of using technology to make legal work more efficient. One of my colleagues at Suffolk Law School – a gentleman named Quinten Steenhuis – made a tool to help people defend themselves from eviction in Massachusetts. Historically, it would take someone sitting down physically with an attorney about four hours to fill out the appropriate paperwork to make a defense to

eviction. Of course, that's if they could find someone. This tool that he created allows someone to sit with a paralegal for about an hour to get that full packet of information. So, the idea here is that you allow people to get served, not necessarily by an attorney if they don't need one, and they get help more efficiently by using the computer. And it makes the system work more efficiently. Still plenty of problems, but with enough of these sorts of efforts, it will improve things overall.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, when I was in law school, I did a clinic called Lawyering in the Digital Age, and my project was actually with the Housing Court in New York City. And we worked with the chief judge because she saw this every day – that this isn't fair, the landlords are coming in represented, the tenants are not. As I recall, there were a lot of statutory defenses, and so we basically made the checklist version of what could be implemented on a computer where we ask them, "Does your house have water leaks? Does it have mold? Does it have bugs?" All these things are sort of statutory – very low hanging fruit, really. And the idea was, they would come in and answer these pretty simple questions in four different languages or whatever, and then they could hand that to the judge who was litigating the suit, who would then be able to say, "Well, landlord, attorney, it looks like they have all these statutory defenses. Don't you think maybe you want to negotiate on it?", or whatever it was. I mean, that was quite a long time ago. So, it's interesting that some of this stuff I think is pretty low hanging fruit, but at the same time, hasn't necessarily already been implemented.

Gabe Teninbaum: That's just right, and actually it's nice that you mentioned that. There's actually a really cool free tool now called justfix.nyc. And it does those things that you're talking about – it helps people with simple evictions, and it also helps people that are having problems with their landlord short of eviction, like they have heat that doesn't work, or if they have bugs in the house, it allows them to enforce their rights. And look, let's be real – these are situations where the person would effectively have to go without legal representation in most cases, and tools like this can be used to help them. I think of it actually sort of like if your community has urgent care or a CVS MinuteClinic. Not everything has to be an ER visit, and if you have certain types of issues going on, it may be that going to your local pharmacy and seeing a nurse practitioner gets you the same exact outcome as showing up at the ER and seeing an MD. But the idea is, if you can triage appropriately, you save the ER with the MD for people that really need it. And people that have a sore throat or a sprained ankle can get the resolution they need without going there. We can do this exact same thing with legal, and it'll help a lot more people and help the system work much better.

Alison Monahan: No, that's true. I have Kaiser out in California, which is kind of a closed system. Essentially, they're doing single payer, but within a very large closed system of private insurance. And there, they invested very early on in technology. It's one of the reasons I liked it, many years ago, is I could email my doctor and all my test results are right there in this little portal. I know friends now who still don't even have that through some big insurers. And if I have a problem, I call the advice nurse and the advice nurse tells me, "Oh yeah, that sounds like something you should go in for" or, No, it sounds like we don't think that's a big deal" or also, "We'll have a doctor contact you and tell you if you should come in or not, but they don't have to see you immediately." I feel like they've thought through this on a systems level that we haven't really done with most legal situations.

Gabe Teninbaum: That's just right. You were right to raise this access to justice issue. And if you think about the way people are served in the legal system now, you have wealthy people who can afford full freight lawyers and pay lawyers and get traditional work done. And then there are poor people who effectively can't afford a lawyer and have to rely on legal aid. The big group that we're missing is what's called the "latent legal market" – these are people of some means who recognize they have a legal problem, but they're not able to find someone that can help solve it at a price point that makes sense to them. And that's why you find the growth of companies like LegalZoom, which is a multi-billion dollar company. You have regular people who say, "I probably should have a will. I probably should have guardianship guidance if I should die and the court needs to know what to do with my children. I just can't afford the 5,000 bucks. And I'm not without any means, so I can't go to legal aid." So, what do you do? And this set of tools – the access to justice tools – is also really interesting to help regular folks, people in the middle, get their problem solved at a more affordable price point to the extent that the tools exist that help them solve it. And that's also really an exciting thing. I have a number of students, there are a number of law grads who say, "Look, I want to do good in the world, but at the end of the day, my goal in coming to law school wasn't to become a poverty lawyer, not that I think anything bad about it. I want to make a good living and have good work-life balance." And this is one of the ways that you can do that as well. You can use these tools to provide good services to people at a much better price point, and everyone walks away happier for it.

Alison Monahan: Right. I remember I was working at a law firm and I read Tim Ferriss' book *The 4-Hour Workweek*, which was very eye-opening. Basically, the idea there is, you can build a product of some type – in this case, maybe the product is a basic will generator or something, whatever it is. And maybe you as an attorney spend half an hour reviewing it, or 10 minutes reviewing it or whatever it takes, but

essentially you're selling that product. You're not selling the hours of your labor that went into creating that specific will. And I think that sort of mindset shift could be really interesting for people who are thinking of entering the profession and thinking about, "Do I really want to be billing my time? Do I want that to be the way that I get paid?" Because when I read this book, I realized pretty quickly I don't want to be trading my time for money. I want to be actually having something running in the background that's making me money and letting me eat.

Gabe Teninbaum: That's just right. As a matter of fact, I'm going to reach for it. I had a sabbatical a couple of years ago and I wrote a book called *Productizing Legal Work*, which is about this specific topic. And that's not an ad, it's an academic book; wait until a professor assigns it to you. But this is something I do think about a lot – this idea that the tools are now available for people to take control and to run with an idea to create an effective prototype and to see if there's a market for it. And if there is, they can productize. They can take the thing that they would have historically done one-to-one for people in a law office and make it exist on the Internet worth 24 hours a day.

Alison Monahan: Well, Gabe, I actually do want to read that book, so I will check that out. Well, we're running a little short on time. Let's do a few more questions before we wrap up. What, globally, do you think are the biggest concerns and the biggest opportunities for the legal profession as these AI technologies start to develop?

Gabe Teninbaum: I think the successful future legal professional will not necessarily be someone that uses technology solely. It'll be someone that recognizes the value and places to implement technology. So, having what I call a "computational mindset", knowing what software can do and it can't do is really, really a key opportunity. I think the flip side of that is that the person that buries their head in the sand and says, "I'm going to do this way of law because that's the way that my mentors did it" is going to put themselves in a difficult position if they don't have some understanding of how these tools work and how to implement them.

Alison Monahan: I agree. The way I look at it, this stuff is coming whether you like it or not. So you may as well view it as an opportunity to be that person who understands this technology, who understands where it might apply, who understands the pitfalls, who understands that you don't just go to ChatGPT and be like, "Please write me a brief" and then you submit it to the court. It's no different than having a paralegal draft something, or a young associate even who, if you're signing off on that, it's your problem. But not to be that person who's like, "Oh yes, the way we've done this is the way it should always be done", because

obviously that's changing. But I do think in a lot of ways, it is an opportunity for people who are getting in on the ground floor at this point.

Gabe Teninbaum: Fully, fully. And for those people that are thinking about something outside the traditional sphere, this is a good one to invest in.

Alison Monahan: Oh, for sure. I think this is kind of where it's at for the next five to ten years in lawyering, because lawyers haven't really been disrupted that much. EDiscovery – sure, somewhat, but I feel like there most places just almost outsourced that to an eDiscovery vendor, and they're like, "Okay, cool, we'll just charge a little markup or whatever. You guys do your thing." But I feel like this is really coming for the heart of what lawyers do.

Gabe Teninbaum: That's right. So this goes to the core of lawyering. Historically, the groups that have been disrupted are people like discovery attorneys or law librarians who've had to catch up a little with the technology and change the roles that they have. But this one is different in the sense that this goes to legal analysis, which is really what clients are paying lawyers to do.

Alison Monahan: Right. Also just all of the busy work of discovery responses and junk like that. I'm pretty sure you can outsource that to an AI pretty quickly at this point. If you did it as a person, it's like, "Here are the standard responses we give to this type of question. Now you go down the list and you match it up." None of that needs to happen anymore with a person. Alright, well, before we wrap up, if law students are interested in learning more about these types of technologies, what do you suggest they do?

Gabe Teninbaum: So, the best thing to do is to start reading. There are all these wonderful resources out there that are updated regularly. Websites like LawNext are really wonderful. The ABA has a group that's focused on innovation and technology. If you're a current law student, you should see what offerings your law school has. And if your law school doesn't have any offerings, feel free to reach out to me directly and I'll try to put you in touch with the right people in your community. One of the cool things that I've discovered around the legal tech world is that there are a lot of people that are willing to mentor law students, get involved. Pretty much every city has a few people that are getting together and talking about these issues.

Alison Monahan: And tell us a little bit more about what you do at Suffolk and what kind of stuff you guys are working on.

Gabe Teninbaum: So, our Legal Innovation and Technology program has been around for over a decade, and what we do is we give students a number of experiences. So we have what's called an "academic concentration" – that's something like a JD major that's optional. Students who do that take courses in learning how to use the sort of technologies that we're talking about today, learning about new business models, learning about process improvement, legal project management, learning about things like design thinking. They build things as part of creating a portfolio, but also as part of our research and development lab. We have two full-time attorneys/developers who oversee a team of students that build real things for the real world, mostly for legal aid and court systems. But the idea here is that all of these technologies that we build for access to justice also have a role in traditional legal work in law firms and corporate law departments. So we teach our law students these skills using access to justice as a template, but they're exportable to the things that they choose to do in their everyday life. And then the last thing that we and I do at Suffolk Law is that we try to share this message with others. I mean, one of the benefits of working at a law school is fundamentally we're a charitable organization. We're a registered non-profit. So, to go out and to encourage others to get involved, that's no harm to us. It's just intended to help the system. So I spend a lot of time talking to wonderful people like you and the students that listen to this, to get them enthusiastic about the future of legal innovation and technology.

Alison Monahan: Well, I've got to say it sounds super fun. I'm going to come hang out with you guys. I see a lot of tinkerers, I'm like, "This sounds great." I mean, I was a programmer – I like this stuff. Alright, well, any final thoughts, Gabe, before we wrap up?

Gabe Teninbaum: Just to thank you and to thank everyone for your time, energy, and attention. And I will make this ask of people: Don't just read about this stuff; try this stuff. So, go out and get a free account for whatever LLM you want to try, or if there's an expert system tool or a document assembly tool. As Alison suggested before, these folks tend to be very, very generous because they think of you as future customers. Email them, tell them you're a law student, tell them you want to try it, and then actually build something using it. You can learn so much doing it and it changes your perspective.

Alison Monahan: I definitely agree. I think as soon as you experience any of these things, that's when the light bulb moment goes off. A few months ago Lee was sort of like, "Oh, I've heard about these ChatGPT things." I'm like, "No, we're going to actually use Claude. I'm going to show you this." And within 10 minutes or five minutes, she was just like, "Whoa! Okay, I get it now. I see the benefit of this. I

understand what this tool can do for me." And my mind was just blown. Alright, well, thank you so much for joining us. And remind us again how people can find you if they would like to reach out.

Gabe Teninbaum: Sure. My name, once again, is Gabe Teninbaum. I'm at Suffolk Law School in Boston. You can find me at lawtomatic.com, at spacedrepetition.com. Or you can link in with me on LinkedIn. That's the social network I participate in.

Alison Monahan: Perfect. Well, thank you again. 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 would 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 Lee or Alison at lee@lawschooltoolbox.com or alison@lawschooltoolbox.com. Or you can always contact us via our website contact form at LawSchoolToolBox.com. Thanks for listening, and we'll talk soon!

RESOURCES:

CareerDicta
spacedrepetition.com
lawtomatic.com
Suffolk University: Gabe Teninbaum
LinkedIn: Gabe Teninbaum
LawNext podcast
Casetext
Claude
JustFix: Technology for Housing Justice
LegalZoom
American Bar Association
The 4-Hour Workweek: Escape 9-5, Live Anywhere, and Join the New Rich, by Timothy Ferriss
Productizing Legal Work: Providing Legal Expertise at Scale, by Gabriel H. Teninbaum
Podcast Episode 425: Exploring the Legal Tech Ecosystem (w/Colin Levy)
Podcast Episode 430: The PaxtonAI Founders Talk About Their AI Legal Assistant