Alison Monahan: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today we're excited to have Gabe Teninbaum – law professor and creator of SpacedRepetition.com – here to talk about what law students should know about new law and legal tech. 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'd love to hear from you. And you can check out the Bar Exam Toolbox podcast if the bar exam is on your radar. With that, let's get started.

Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today we're excited to have Gabe Teninbaum – law professor and creator of SpacedRepetition.com – here to talk about what law students should know about new law and legal tech. So, welcome, Gabe.

Gabe Teninbaum: Thanks for having me, Alison. Pleasure to be here.

Alison Monahan: Oh, it's my pleasure. We have chatted before about your tool SpacedRepetition.com, so I think that's a great tool. People can check it out. They can even get 15% off if they use the code TOOLBOX, all caps. Alright, well, to start us off, can you give our listeners just a little bit of background about you and your work, just so they have some context here?

Gabe Teninbaum: Gladly. So, I'm a law professor by trade. I teach at Suffolk University Law School in Boston. And for the last 10 years or so, I've overseen our Legal Innovation & Technology program. And the premise of this program is that the future of legal work is likely going to look very different than the present day. And we want to make sure that our students are ready for it. And by extension, I try to help students at other schools too.

Alison Monahan: Nice. Do you have a tech background? How did you get into this?

Gabe Teninbaum: I'm fully self-taught. I had a colleague that was deeply interested and invested in this area, and I started using what are called low-code/no-code tools – tools that allow people that don't have a deep tech background to build things with intermediaries that make it easier to do without having that real deep knowledge.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, interesting. I'm sure we'll get more into that as we get more into the vibe coding world of today. What do you mean by "legal tech?" What are we even talking about here?

Gabe Teninbaum: Narrowly, legal tech is a set of software tools that have been created to make law practice or the delivery of legal services more efficient and effective. But broadly – and there's really no one single settled definition of legal tech – it's a mindset. And the idea is we want to adopt the right tools to solve problems in law, and often that involves using software or other technologies.

Alison Monahan: Cool. I was a programmer before law school, so you're speaking my language. But why do you even care about this? Why do you think this is important?

Gabe Teninbaum: Sure, for a couple of reasons. One, I work to serve my students and law students generally, and the reality is that one can do a better job as a legal professional if they know something about legal tech and they find the right tools to use in the right scenario. And actually the American Bar Association has thought about this and I've taken heed of the guidance they've given. They've said that all lawyers have a duty of technological competence, which is the idea that you have to be aware of the relevant tools for your area of law practice and you have to make a risk/benefit judgment about whether to use them along with your clients. And I try to incorporate that into what we teach. And then I'm going to give a part two to that. I care more broadly about society and the way that law impacts society. There are a lot of people out there that just can't get access to human lawyers or full access to legal services. They're not rich enough to afford a lawyer. They're not poor enough, or they can't wait in line long enough to get legal aid. And legal tech is a way to help those folks too. So, it's important on multiple levels.

Alison Monahan: Nice. And why do you think this should matter or does matter to students and people who are going to be graduating or recently graduated?

Gabe Teninbaum: Well, there's no doubt that the pace of technological innovation is getting faster and faster. It was only two years ago that ChatGPT and generative AI tools came along. It was only 15 or 16 years ago that we all started using iPhones. I think it was 2007 or 2008 that they came along. So, society has changed in all of these massive ways, and the reality is that law school curricula really hasn't changed very much. I mean, the same first year that you and I took or the same first year that students now are taking, it's the same first year that students in 1950 were taking. And the importance of moving us collectively forward has never been more significant, as more of these tools came along that can allow us to do better work.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. So, frame this for me. For people who aren't so familiar with the legal profession maybe yet, tell me a little bit about the traditional model of legal work, and also how things are shifting.

Gabe Teninbaum: Traditionally lawyers billed by the hour, meaning that you got paid based on how long it took for you to complete a task. So, if someone comes in and says, "Can you draft a prenuptial agreement for me?", if it took you five hours and your billable rate was $200 an hour, you would bill $1,000. And this for eons, for the last a hundred plus years, has been the dominant model of the delivery of legal services. And it's problematic for all these reasons. One is, you as a lawyer have incentives that aren't necessarily aligned with your clients. You want to, of course, do the job as effectively and as efficiently as possible, and you want there to be incentives for you to do better work and do it faster, but that's not how you get paid. And in the last 10, 15, 20 years, tools have started to emerge that allowed lawyers to flip that a little bit and to say, "Oh, I can now do most of the work of creating a document, a prenuptial agreement, using software. And instead of it taking five hours, I can make it take one hour. And then from there, I can spend more time with that client, or I can take on an additional client, or I can pass along savings to clients." So it makes for a better legal ecosystem if people have started to adopt these tools, and we're starting to see that happen at the edges. There're now law firms that make it part of their business model to use these tools to make their work more efficient. They save money for clients, they save themselves times and headaches, and they come up with a better product at the end of the day.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. That was definitely one of the most mystifying aspects to me of working in a BigLaw firm, was, "Wait, so you're going to reward me based on how long this takes me, not the shorter timeframe? I'm a programmer, I can make a lot of this a lot faster for you." And they're like, "Yeah, that's not really the business model." So, I actually read Tim Ferriss' book *The 4-Hour Work Week* while working as a BigLaw associate, and that was very eye-opening to me. I was like, "Huh, okay. Maybe this is not the way I want to spend my life." So, tell me a little bit about how tech is really changing things, and also what the expectations might be for lawyers moving forward.

Gabe Teninbaum: On the immediate level, clients are beginning to ask questions about how their time is being spent. So, historically, a lawyer would just send an invoice to the client at the end of the month and say, "30 hours for services rendered." Over time, they've been encouraged, or in some instances forced to have a really detailed itemization of how they spent their time, and clients have started to refuse to pay for certain tasks. Or they'll have their own metrics and they'll say, "Hey, you were going to write this type of letter. You charged us for three hours, we know that should only take one hour." So there's a little bit of pressure that's starting to come back from clients to law firms saying, "We're not going to overpay for this. You

need to either find a better way to do it or you need to write off those hours." So what that's meant for law firms is they've started to look meaningfully about how they can employ these sorts of technologies at the edges. And the way that they're doing that is by training some associates and also hiring wholly new roles at law firms. So historically, when you worked at a law firm as a lawyer, as a licensed legal professional, you were an associate, meaning a staff member who is an attorney that didn't own part of the firm. And if you were successful, you might have made partner. Those were the only two things that you could really be back in the old days. Now there are all of these different roles that people have at law firms as licensed attorneys that do things like make sure that you're providing the best value for the client, using the most relevant technology, having the lowest error rate, and able to communicate that effectively. So, things like knowledge engineers, people that put together little software packages, maybe like something that you would've done, Alison, in your days as a developer, or legal solutions architects, which is sort of a cool title – these are people that look at a big set of problems and say, "How can we approach this in an entirely different way to make this process work better?" There are also people that are process improvement experts that work at law firms. These ideas that were borrowed from manufacturing and from assembly lines can be applied to complex legal work. So, there are people that are either traditional attorneys that are trained in these roles or people that are hired specifically for them. And then there's one other role that we should talk about – that's Chief Innovation Officers. A Chief Innovation Officer was historically something that would exist at a Fortune 500 company, a for-profit, publicly traded company, with the idea being that you needed to express to shareholders, "Hey, we're not just doing what we're doing. We're always looking a little bit ahead." Law firms are now hiring Chief Innovation Officers with the idea being that someone needs to be in charge of being aware of what the relevant technologies are and getting that information out to the practitioners, so that they can make good decisions about them.

Alison Monahan: That's so interesting to me, because I know law firms are not necessarily known as bastions of innovation. It's so interesting that some of them actually are kind of taking this different approach. Yeah, that's very interesting. And so if students are listening to this and saying "Oh, this sounds kind of cool. Maybe I want to do that" – what kind of skills should they be thinking about trying to develop here?

Gabe Teninbaum: There are a number of skills that law students or practicing lawyers can develop, and that's even without a computer science background. The first is rule-based reasoning. Now, everyone that goes to law school knows something about rule-based reasoning. If you've taken a first-year Legal Writing class and you've been asked to take a rule and dissect that rule and apply it to facts, essentially take language and turn it into a decision tree – that is rule-based reasoning, and that's the basis of this thing that we call "computational law" or "computational

thinking". And it's being able to issue spot a legal problem and say, "Ah, that's the sort of legal problem that I could automate" or, "That's the sort of legal problem that I could take and I could build into a piece of software." And that has the advantage of allowing me to take my knowledge and to make it so I don't always have to be the one that's applying it. It can work 24/7, it can work on the Cloud, it's never going to take a sick day. There are all sorts of limitations to it, but that sort of computational thinking can be really important, and I can share some ways that people specifically can get into that. Next is having some comfort with data and metrics, the ability to think about and quantify problems, to make good judgment so that when a client comes to you and says, "Look, what's my chance on this motion for summary judgment?", it's not just based on gut instinct. It's you thinking meaningfully about, "Well, wait a minute. My firm has looked at a thousand similar matters. What can we divine from what we've done in the past, so that I can actually give a client actionable information, so that they can make some good decisions about it?" Next is the idea that one has to maintain technological competence. I made reference a little bit ago to the ABA's rule – it's Rule 1.1, Comment 8, if anyone wants to read the original language. Incidentally, it's been adopted now in 41 U.S. jurisdictions. So, almost all of your listeners will be subject to this rule. And the idea here is that one of the things that you have to do is stay up on what's relevant in legal tech, and that's an affirmative obligation that you have as a lawyer. There are easy ways to do that. There are wonderful blogs and LinkedIn pages and X/Twitter opportunities so that you can have a sense for actually what's going on in legal tech and stay aware. And then let me add one more, and this might sound sort of counterintuitive for someone that's talking about technology – it's really important to maintain what have historically been called "soft skills", although I don't love that term – things like communication and collaboration, creativity and empathy and teamwork. And the reality is that as impressive as AI tools, and specifically generative AI tools have become, they still can't replace those things. And the model that I see for the future of lawyering will require people to do more of two things. One is adopt more appropriate technologies that are going to solve problems more efficiently and effectively, but on the other end of the spectrum, be better at communicating about those things. In other words, for a client to hire you when they could just go out and pay for an app, there has to be a reason, and part of that reason has to be you as an expert have to be able to communicate with them and answer their questions and help them creatively problem-solve in ways that software can't.

Alison Monahan: Let me ask you a question. So, as you were talking about the computational thinking and the rule-based reasoning, I was thinking back to something I actually worked on in law school, because I took a clinic – very forward-thinking at the time – called Lawyering in the Digital Age. And the project I worked on was with the Housing Court in New York, and the idea was we would have this system where people would come in, tenants who were generally unrepresented and we'd walk

them through, "Do you have this problem? Do you have that problem? These are all statutory defenses." And then it would print out at the end and they could show it to the judge and it would be getting them closer to having had a lawyer. I mean, that was quite a while ago at this point. What do you think is different now? Do you think it's just the technology has advanced to the point where we could just do all of this stuff more easily?

Gabe Teninbaum: The short answer is "yes". So, what we're talking about rule-based reasoning systems in law are an old branch of artificial intelligence, which again, sounds a little bit silly, but our expert systems as form of AI has been around for 50, 60, 70 years. And consumers will know about products like LegalZoom, which use the same sort of technology to, again, go directly to consumers, cut out the lawyers, and allow them to solve certain classes of simple legal problems. What's changed is that those tools have become much, much easier for people who don't have a deep background to build on their own. So let me give one example from my own life. At Suffolk Law, we have a group called the LIT Lab, the Legal Innovation & Technology Lab. If anyone's interested, it's SuffolkLITLab.org. And what they do is they work with courts and legal aid organizations to build just the sort of solutions that you have suggested. They go to the court and they say, "What's the most important thing that people are coming to you that they're having to wait in line for a long time on, or they're coming in unrepresented and they're messing up the form?" And in some instances it's things like eviction defense forms. And if someone has a landlord who's sophisticated and has a lawyer, they're going to steamroll the tenant every single time.

Alison Monahan: Right. Every time.

Gabe Teninbaum: So the question is, can you build automation so that someone could go onto a web app or a website and answer a certain set of questions and figure out if they're eligible to defend this action? And if so, we can actually do what you did in your clinic and we can do something a step further. We can take their answers and populate them onto a form. That form is in the form that the court wants to see it from, and then we can electronically file it. And we started doing this actually at scale during the pandemic at Suffolk Law. And we started building forms, because people couldn't get into the courts. And there are forms, everything from abuse prevention orders that someone would need to fill in the information, to a blockout evictions, to children in need of supervision, to other just everyday dreary administrative forms, like someone needs to file for an alimony hearing in court, but there's a $10 fee that goes along with it and they don't have the money for it, so there's a waiver form. So, we built little automation so that someone who's comfortable – it's not going to fit everyone – but someone that is literate, computer literate, is comfortable using software, and is willing to do this instead of go waiting in line in legal aid, can go self-help. And in the last few years we've gone

from one state – Massachusetts, where we are – we're now in eight states, helping people at absolutely no cost. Last year, the statistic I saw was that we had 40,000 forms that had been downloaded and submitted to courts. And this is all stuff that's done incidentally by law students, law students without computer science background. So, it might've been that in your day and my day when you did this in a clinic, there were 12 students working on one form, and you hoped three or four of them had computer science backgrounds. The reality is that nowadays, any student who wants to make a difference can go get involved in a project like this and launch something now, within months, weeks, days, or maybe even hours. Really easy to use.

Alison Monahan: That's so interesting. Well, let's talk a little bit more about that, because I know you had some tools that you thought people might be interested in. Tell me a little more about some of the things that people could start experimenting with.

Gabe Teninbaum: Sure. So, I'll give my first, and this is actually a plug for a colleague's tool, although this is free and open-source, you're never going to be asked to pay any money for this. It's called QnAMarkup.org. QnA Markup is an expert system tool. It takes decision trees and it turns them into software. So I do an exercise with my students, where I present them with a straightforward legal problem: "Is this a violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act?" And I give them the Fair Labor Standards Act, and they dissect the language and they say, "Well, wait a minute. If I was a lawyer sitting across from a client, what questions would I have to ask? And what are all the permutations, what are all the answers that one could give, and where would that lead me to in terms of the next question?" QnA Markup allows you to take that logic and turn it into a piece of software. And you can learn how to use QnA Markup in, I don't know, 20 minutes to basic competence, an hour to being pretty good, and three or four hours to absolute expertise. It's totally free, it's open-source, which means for those techies out there that if you actually like the software but you want to change some aspect of it, you can actually download the code and change the software as you see fit. But there are also more sophisticated tools that one can use. QnA Markup is really for teaching and modeling, but there are things like Docassemble.org, which is another free, open-source tool that allows one to do the same sort of decision trees, but then to take the answers and put the answers onto a form or a document. So if you say, "Look, I know that a lot of people in my law school clinic want to get their names changed. They're getting divorced, or they've had a bad relationship and they had one name and they want to have a different name" – there's a form for that. I want to ask them the questions I would have to ask as a lawyer, and I want to take their answers and I want to push them into a form, and then I want to electronically file it. Docassemble.org would allow you to do that, and that hooks up with Python. So developers like you could then build, on top of that, if they wanted to do more sophisticated things, like put up a paywall or translate it automatically to a different

language. If that's too sophisticated – and it will be for some people – there's this really interesting class of low-code/no-code tools – tools that allow people to build things like Lego. So it's not that you're not building, it's just that it allows you to cut a few corners. One of my favorites is called Gavel.io. Gavel.io is a company that is for-profit and venture-funded and is really trying to make a place in the market. But they have free trial accounts for law students and you can build something that's really effective. I think when you pay, and it's relatively inexpensive to pay for it, the only thing that you get is they don't put their watermark on it. But if you're using it just to learn how to use it and consider whether you run a project, it's really easy to use. And it's fun and it's the sort of thing all students should do. Let me give you a couple more. Legal research has come a long way. All law students are going to have Lexis and Westlaw. But Casetext was a company that was doing really interesting things with generative AI early on, and they were bought out by Thomson Reuters Westlaw. And you can now use CoCounsel, which is the next step of Casetext directly on CoCounsel. It has all these really interesting things. So rather than do Boolean logic searching like you and I used to do, or natural language searching, which is a significant advance, you can now query it using just plain language and say, "Look, I want you to draft a motion that argues these three things. I'm going to paste some facts in there. I want you to use Massachusetts law. I want you only to use binding cases, and I want you to avoid this specific case." And it will come up with a brief that's really wonderful and excellent, almost immediately. Now, there're limitations there. The software's not perfect, it hallucinates. And also one of the problems and one of the real risks of all of these technologies is, they can be so good at helping you cut corners that you could lose something if you're too reliant on them, with the idea being that one of the things that you learn as a law student is how to reason in an analog fashion, which allows you to create a mental model, so that when you see a problem, you immediately start to say, "Oh, here's how I can resolve that problem." If rather than having that struggle, you just say, "Build me an app, build me a brief, build me a motion", you're losing something there. So I want to caution people about being over-reliant on any of these tools, particularly generative AI tools, but a little smattering of them is really important and really valuable for them.

Alison Monahan: I think it's really important to use them so that you understand the upsides and downsides and what they're good at and what they're not good at. I'll give you one example. I was working with Claude yesterday on creating some NextGen bar style content from some other content. And at a surface level, it all looks really convincing. But then sometimes when you... And I haven't gone through this in detail, because one of the things I actually need to do is print it out and really think about it. But one example is it had some short-answer question or something where it fundamentally mixed up somebody who drafted a check versus someone who'd be cashing a check from sentence to sentence. It's that kind of thing where you're like, "Oh, this doesn't actually have that type of logic. It doesn't understand

that this matters." So there are things like that that are still really bad in some of these AI tools, which I find surprising.

Gabe Teninbaum: Yeah, I think over time we'll see that there are less errors and less hallucinations, but they can always occur. I mean, if you rewind 20 years, a standard caution was, "Don't rely on Wikipedia. It's created by the crowd, you don't know who the crowd is. You don't know what they know, and it's going to be wrong." And what happened was that over time there were less and less errors in Wikipedia, to the point where actually if you tested it against traditionally published encyclopedias like Encyclopedia Britannica, Wikipedia was less error-prone. But that's not to say that there aren't still problems with it. In fact, there have been a couple of media pieces just in the last week about how politics has seeped its way into objective fact, and people are changing information all the time. And this is just an example of how, even as something might become less error-prone than the methods that you're using now, there are always going to be new threat profiles that arise with it. And staying aware of those is important.

Alison Monahan: I was curious about this one, because two years ago when they first came out, I had a similar situation where it mixed up a plaintiff and a defendant in a way that mattered, and I was like, "Oh, that's pretty obvious." And I'm like, "Wow, it's still doing that. Okay, good to know." But I think you need to use the tools. I mean, I've seen data that says people who use the AI tools are more skeptical of them than people who don't. So I think it's important to actually get your hands dirty with this stuff and see what it's good at and what it's not great at. Alright, well, what else can students be doing in law school to get exposure, if you're listening and saying, "Oh, this sounds really interesting. I want to explore this more"?

Gabe Teninbaum: Yeah, there are all sorts of wonderful resources out there. In terms of learning, checking out the software that I mentioned is really good. Another thing that you might do is check to see if your school or institution that you're associated with has an account for LinkedIn Learning. LinkedIn Learning used to be known as Linda.com. It's a just-in-time learning resource, and the quality of content is really, really high. So if you want to learn how to make pivot tables in Excel, or you want to learn how to use Power BI by Microsoft, you can go in and get really wonderful content as part of what's typically a free license at universities to learn things. And then from there, what you have to do is to start thinking about, "What are the things that I could use to help me solve real problems at work?" The other thing that people can do is they can start to stay up on legal innovation and technology so that they're aware just generally what's happening. Again, most of you are going to be obligated under your model rules of professional conduct to stay up on it. So, there are sites like the LawSites blog, there's a blogger and writer named Bob Ambrogi who writes free content, there's no paywall. And he regularly lets people know what new legal tech products are out there, and what's going on with law

firms and what law departments are doing to employ these sorts of things. And it's important for people to know what's possible. There's another wonderful one called the Artificial Lawyer – again, free and publicly available. And from there, get yourself on LinkedIn and start seeing who's writing about legal innovation and technology. You're welcome to pair with me, I tend to repost interesting things people have said. And just get a sense for what's happening in the fields that you're interested in and figure out where it makes sense for you to dive deep. And I'll say one other thing. The legal innovation and technology community is still small enough that people tend to be charmed when a law student reaches out to them. There're probably six or eight law schools in the U.S. that have taken a real investment in legal innovation and technology, and Suffolk is certainly one of them. But for the most part, law students and law graduates haven't been exposed to this. So when someone is working on legal tech and they have a law student reach out to them and say, "Hey, I go to law school X. We don't really have a program. Can you help me understand what you're doing and how I might get involved?" – it's like manna from heaven to them.

Alison Monahan: It's like, "Oh, I'd love to."

Gabe Teninbaum: Someone heard, right? And I know you talk about the importance of things like networks and mentoring, but this is still a real opportunity. It might not be in 10 years when there are enough people doing it that people are too busy for it. But for now, make that LinkedIn outreach or find someone on a website or at their company and just reach out to them and see if they'll connect with you.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I agree with you. I think people are actually very delighted that someone's interested in what they're doing oftentimes. So, if this is an area of interest, this is not, I think, probably the mindset that a lot of people who go to law school have. So, I think if you are somebody who finds this interesting, you're probably one of a relatively rarefied number of people at this point, I would imagine. Do you think that's right?

Gabe Teninbaum: Absolutely. I think there're probably only a few hundred lawyers in the country that would frame themselves as working in legal tech. So, there's a real opportunity here to make an early strong step and to get involved.

Alison Monahan: And before we wrap up, let's talk a little, what do you think the future holds? Obviously, the Gen AI stuff has come on really quickly and progressed rapidly, but what do you think the next five to 10 years might look like here?

Gabe Teninbaum: That's hard. The answer is, I don't know.

Alison Monahan: Of course.

Gabe Teninbaum: Justice as a concept has been around since history has existed. So there'll always be some form of history, and our systems will probably always be too complex for people to deal with the justice system without intermediaries. But the direct question, what will lawyering look like in a year or three years or five years or 10 years – I don't quite know. I think in a year it'll probably look basically the same. Five or 10 years, I'm not quite sure. So if you look at the charts of the impact of generative AI, it's already been significant in the sense that a lot of the tasks that lawyers do can be replaced by generative AI, and can be done much more effectively and efficiently by generative AI. And that's particularly hard because it's the kind of work that first, second, and third-year associates, as well as summer law clerks would do and bill hours for. So, I expect law firms will have to change their business models, so that they are leveraging some of these tools, so that they're moving away from a purely billable hour model and doing more things that are value-based billing. Rather than saying, "We're going to charge you $200 an hour" – or $2,000 an hour, as it more accurately is now – "We're going to charge you for the result. We're going to charge you for doing this M&A and do it as a flat fee." And once law firms change to that model, that will allow lawyering to change in a really significant way. So my hope – I don't know if my expectation, but my hope is, in the next few years, that model will really come to pass.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I read a book, I think it was by Richard Susskind recently. He's got a new book out on AI and the law, and that's kind of what he was saying. It's like, you're really selling the solution and people need to sort of get in that mindset if they're going to do well here.

Gabe Teninbaum: That's just right. And incidentally, Richard Susskind's book, *Tomorrow's Lawyers*. He has several books, including this wonderful new book on AI. *Tomorrow's Lawyers* is probably the starting point for someone that is going to enter the legal field. He wrote it a number of years ago, but the reality is that the theory still applies completely. In fact, it has been confirmed in important ways. So, do yourselves a favor. Go on Amazon and spend the 10 bucks and read that, because it'll change the way that you see things.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, exactly. He's got another like future of the profession one I've picked up. So lots of interesting stuff there. Alright, Gabe, we're about out of time here. Any final thoughts you'd like to share?

Gabe Teninbaum: Just my appreciation for you, Alison. Thank you for your time and energy. And for the listeners of the podcast, thank you for being here.

Alison Monahan: Alright. And remind us how people can reach out and find out more if they do find this interesting and they want to speak with you about it.

Gabe Teninbaum: Absolutely. You can reach out to me personally, I'm always glad to hear from anyone that's interested in this topic. I'm on LinkedIn – Gabriel Teninbaum, T-E-N-I-N-B-A-U-M. Or you can find me at the Suffolk University Law School website. Reach out, glad to talk to anyone who's interested.

Alison Monahan: Sounds great. And they can also go to SpacedRepetition and use our code. Alright, everybody. Well, thanks so much for joining us. 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 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:

SpacedRepetition.com
LinkedIn: Gabriel Teninbaum
Suffolk University: Gabriel Teninbaum
Suffolk University Legal Innovation & Technology Lab
QnA Markup
Docassemble
Gavel
CoCounsel
LinkedIn Learning
LawSites
Artificial Lawyer
Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future, by Richard Susskind
Podcast Episode 71: Soft Skills You Need to Develop to Be a Successful Attorney
Podcast Episode 441: Exploring the Impact of AI on the Legal Profession (w/Gabe Teninbaum)