Lee Burgess: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today we're talking about AI use in law school – the good, the questionable, and the not-so-good. 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 diving into AI use in law school. Well, AI's here, it is now part of our everyday life. And students, especially in higher education, as I'm sure everyone listening to this probably knows, are using AI at pretty high rates. Right, Lee?

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I've got to say in prepping for this podcast, I knew that the rates were pretty high, but I don't know, it's weird to see it in actual numbers. Basically I think everyone is using it, maybe except my parents are using it on a regular basis.

Alison Monahan: True.

Lee Burgess: I think it is pretty clear that students are playing with it in lots of different ways, and I think in the law school situation it's pretty interesting because law schools are like dinosaurs, they never want to change. So the fact that students are really using AI in law school is a unique challenge because the law schools, I think, are playing a lot of catch up. I mean, we've got data that says that basically for undergrads, like 92% of students are using AI in their studies. Do you think the numbers are similar for law students right now?

Alison Monahan: I would imagine, at least the younger cohort of law students, you have some people maybe coming back who maybe weren't exposed to this quite so much in undergrad. But we've got studies from 2025 of college students, half of them are saying that mastering AI is the most important skill they expect to gain in college, 62% saying that learning to use AI responsibly is essential for their future. So, law students are definitely living in this broader culture, even if the schools themselves are maybe not encouraging it quite as much. And some schools do. We had a podcast with some professors at your alma mater, USF, and they're using it in Legal Writing classes, which is interesting. We'll talk about it more. We use it, we use it for a lot of things. I find it very useful. I was actually using it for some legal-ish work recently and that was fascinating. We'll talk

about all this stuff, but we're not going to tell you, "Never touch it"; we're also not going to tell you, "Let it do everything." So, what we wanted to talk about was really, what are students actually doing, what's working, what seems like a good idea, what seems like not a great idea, and how to use it as a future lawyer. So Lee, what do you know about how students are currently using AI?

Lee Burgess: Well, it seems like one of the main ways that students are using AI is for study help, almost like substantive tutoring. General higher education research is also showing us that a lot of folks are using AI to support studying and prep. And some law school recommendations coming out of the schools or out of law libraries are even suggesting that it's acceptable to use AI for study uses. And the use cases I'm talking about is like explaining doctrinal law maybe in more plain language or explaining it in a different way than maybe your professor has explained it; generating practice questions or hypos, which we'll be honest, it can be hit or miss.

Alison Monahan: Okay, there could be value in realizing, "Hey, this answer is completely wrong."

Lee Burgess: Right, yeah. I think to me part of this is, yes, you can use it to generate practice questions and hypos, but you also have to evaluate those practice questions and hypos. And the evaluation may be even the more impactful part of using the AI than the actual generating of the hypo. And then some students are finding it helpful to help making flashcards or summaries, although I think the challenging thing there is that over the years, students have purchased prepackaged flashcards for various topics, especially around the bar. And some folks find that not making the flashcards means that the flashcards are kind of less helpful, because the activity of making these study materials is actually one of the ways that you learn. So, with all of these uses, I think you have to be constantly evaluating whether or not you're still engaging or getting something out of it.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I think that's so true. Anybody studying for the bar can go buy Critical Pass flashcards, and for some people that's effective. You know, they see them and that helps. I saw an interesting study about people using AI to write things recently, which suggested that people just don't remember any of it, because they didn't do it, which is very interesting. If you haven't struggled with that material, of course it's not going to be in your brain the same way. It's just like purchasing a canned outline. Not to say it doesn't have utility in some cases, but it's not the same as actually doing it yourself. So, sometimes I talk to students and it's clear they're taking a lot of shortcuts, and they seem to just be wanting to check boxes and be like, "Oh, I did that thing", without really thinking about, "Is that getting me closer to my end goal?" So, I agree, you have to be constantly evaluating, "What is this doing for me? What use am I putting it to?" If you're just like, "I'm totally confused about this topic" or, "I just need a

summary of X, Y, or Z" – sure, that's fine, whatever. You could get that from another outline too. But I do think this kind of outsourcing your brain part and outsourcing the work is really the pain point here.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, I agree. It makes me think of the studies that came out, probably decades ago, about how much less retention we get from typing, when folks were talking about how you can send an email and totally forgot that you sent it – which has totally happened to me – because we shoot off things at such speeds, and it doesn't have the same tangible engagement that handwriting out a note would do. Oftentimes we're just shooting off answers and doing things very quickly. And AI has taken us to a whole another level of cognitive offloading. And I think then the question becomes, what are you doing? What's your participation? And that's actually a really big question that we may end up over time having to redefine, like what is our own work, what is our role when computers can do some of this work for us? But being in school at this time with this emerging technology doesn't mean that you can just say, "Well, it is what it is. I'll just use it and see what happens", because you're still going to be accountable for the work that you're doing. It's still your work, even if you use assistive tools. So yeah, I think it's interesting. One of the things that I think is really powerful with AI is its ability to edit. This is one of my things that I like to talk to folks about, is that if you're allowed to use AI to edit your work, you should, but that also means there can be zero mistakes. Like, zero. And we get this when folks send us resumes. This is one of my things. I'm like, "There's really no excuse anymore for having typos on a resume when the computer will just tell you what the typos are."

Alison Monahan: Yeah, that's fair. I think the standard for a lot of things, even shooting off a quick email are probably higher because you're like, "You know what? Your program can just clean that up." And I think this writing and editing piece is interesting in the context of, if I'm thinking of it as a law professor, what boundaries am I putting around that knowing that people can do whatever they want, basically? So yeah, for me, drafting, when I was drafting these legal-ish documents, it was interesting because I'm an expert legal writer, I am an expert legal researcher. I literally got paid a lot of money by some of the most prestigious organizations anywhere to do this work. So for me, having this 10x multiplier of, "I now have a research assistant who will just do whatever I ask them to do." The problem is, it takes a lot of work to get to that point of being the expert. So, if you're not doing that hard work to get to the point where you understand what you want to say and how you want to say it, I think that's going to be really problematic for people.

Lee Burgess: I think that's true. I think where there is a lot of value is, like you mentioned, with this research assistant role. I was thinking back in law school when I was

brainstorming my note, and I remember that they would tell you to go look for circuit splits and they'd tell you to go do all this research. And I'm like, "Wow, you could do that so much faster now and have this whole AI-based conversation to help you find these open legal questions." Wow, that would've saved me so much time, and probably made note topics a whole lot more interesting. You could also search to see what other people had written on to make sure that you weren't writing on something that somebody else had written on. So, I feel like brainstorming research projects and things like that, if it's allowed by your school, is a really great way to use it. I know that some students are using it to brainstorm legal arguments and structures. And again, I think this is great, but you have to be evaluating them, and I think that's hard as a law student because you are still learning legal arguments, and you can't be sure that it's right. And sometimes its arguments are really not very good.

Alison Monahan: That is the one thing I will say. When I was doing this work, I was like, "Wow, that is not the correct analysis here. I understand why you might think this argument makes sense. I am telling you that argument is not persuasive, because I know that." But when I was in law school, I might have just been like, "Oh, alright. Well, Claude said this is what I should argue." And yeah, it's very hit or miss. Sometimes it's incredible, you're like, "That is spot on." And other times it's just like, no lawyer would ever think that was correct.

Lee Burgess: No. I also think that it's going to be interesting to see how this art form of writing changes with AI. One, is all of our legal writing going to sound exactly the same, because it's all been pushed through these bots? Two, the bots are very verbose oftentimes, unless you tell them to be very concise and precise. And I don't enjoy reading a lot of text that I don't need.

Alison Monahan: No.

Lee Burgess: And so, there needs to be an engagement around that. I also don't love reading email blasts that I get, that I can tell are written by ChatGPT.

Alison Monahan: Oh, so many.

Lee Burgess: It's just so many. And unless it's a summary of something – which I appreciate a good AI summary because it speeds up what I'm doing. If it has emojis, I just know that ChatGPT spit that out.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. The other thing on this is, you have to be really careful as a lawyer what you decide to put in writing. And in the case of, I wrote a demand letter and got a response that very clearly had been put through an AI – it was very, very, very bad. And it said things that there was literally absolutely no reason they ever

should have said. And that's the level of analysis where you need to think about these things of, what is my strategy? When we talk about legal writing with students, we talk about the statement of facts. It's not just facts; you're framing things. And so, that level of thinking is what we bring to the table as trained attorneys. And you can't just put a bunch of documents into an AI, push a button and have it write your statement of facts, because it might be saying things that you really ought not say.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. And there's a precision that comes from the law and these LLMs, unless you are telling them to be very precise, tend to not be very precise. I was doing a Pepsi/Coke challenge between Claude and ChatGPT on a question.

Alison Monahan: I was like, "Huh, what were you doing, Lee?"

Lee Burgess: You were like, "That's not in the script, I don't know what you're talking about." But the question was around tourist places in Europe, and whether or not someone had met the days and would be allowed to travel back to Europe. So, I put this question into ChatGPT, without the specific dates. I had a date that I arrived, a date that I left, and then I added in that I had spent some time outside of this, what they call the Schengen region, which I think is how you say it. And ChatGPT said, "Oh, you are fine. You have so many days, it's no problem." And I read it and I was like, "I don't feel like that's right." And so I went to Claude and I basically gave Claude the same information, and Claude's like, "Well, I need the specific dates because you're very close. You're within a couple of days." So I kept feeding Claude more specific information. Claude was right. ChatGPT was right once I told it what Claude said, and then its response was, "Oh yeah, well, I didn't know you wanted me to be really specific."

Alison Monahan: "I didn't know you wanted me to count."

Lee Burgess: But the whole question was with counting days.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, counting.

Lee Burgess: And looking for nuances, where I'm like, "Does the day that you land count? Does the day that you depart count?" These were all nuances.

Alison Monahan: I think they all count.

Lee Burgess: They all count.

Alison Monahan: Yeah.

Lee Burgess: If anyone's looking for that answer. But I didn't want to have to go deep into a Google search to find that. I assumed that these LLMs could do that, which they did; but again, it's like you have to be constantly questioning. And I think that if I'm in school and I'm relying on these AI tools before my analytical skills on these topics are pretty developed... And listen, you and I question everything. That's who we are as people.

Alison Monahan: And our training as well.

Lee Burgess: And our training as well. And we've been doing this for a long time, right? That's why people come to us to solve their problems, because we're really good at this. But if you're not actively engaging, my friend could have gone to Europe and got to the airport and not been let on the flight, or even worse, not been allowed on the flight back out.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, it could have been very problematic.

Lee Burgess: It could have been very problematic if I had just believed ChatGPT's very confident first answer.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. So, if you're thinking of research topics or anything like that – yes, get a rough overview of a topic, generate some ideas, but you have to check all of this. Even if it gives you a citation to something, you have to go and physically look at that, because it may or may not be right, as many, many lawyers have found already.

Lee Burgess: Who are now getting malpractice suits against them.

Alison Monahan: Right, as they should, because I think of any of these tools as sort of a not particularly well-informed research assistant. Very eager to do my work, very eager to please, but A) they don't know anything, and B) they may or may not be giving me correct information. So, it can be very helpful; however, I cannot fully trust it. So if somebody's thinking, "Oh, I'm going to study with this and have it make my outline" – I would really question if it's even right.

Lee Burgess: Right, it's so true. And I think this "eager to please" thing, which is something you and I have talked about a lot with each other...

Alison Monahan: So infuriating.

Lee Burgess: Which is so infuriating. But I think a lot of folks don't really recognize this. I feel like it's not discussed. You and I read a lot of articles about AI, we send them back and forth to each other. But this idea that it is a research assistant who's

not well-trained and who also will say just about anything to keep you engaged and using the tool, is a very important thing to understand. So, let's just pause for a second and remember, these tools, some of them are free. If it's free, what does that mean?

Alison Monahan: That means you are the product and they are either going to be promoting things, advertising to you, and/or using your data. So, I think that is a very important consideration of, if you are not paying – and even if you're paying, but certainly if you're not paying – you have to assume everything you put in there is essentially public.

Lee Burgess: Yep. And you also have to assume that they are making something off of you, which means that their goal is to keep your eyes on that screen as long as possible, which means they are going to give you whatever answers it believes you want, to stay engaged. And I think that is a very, very important thing to think about. And Google back in just the simple search days sort of did that with the algorithm. But this is so much more targeted, and it doesn't necessarily feel that way. In this way, it's a bit more like social media. There's a driver of, the time of engagement is so critical. The fact that it's a sycophant should be concerning to you because its goal is, one, to capitalize on the fact that we like people to be really nice to us and agree with us, but it's to keep your eyeballs there as long as possible. So, if you're a law student and you're just like, "I spent three hours studying on ChatGPT", make sure that there was actually an output from that. Or you're really just giving Sam Altman three hours of your eyeballs. And who knows what they're doing with that data? We don't all understand what they are doing, because this is still the Wild Wild West.

Alison Monahan: It really is. The other thing that occurred to me – those AI summaries, you mentioned Google – if you're skeptical, as we are, and you see some information, it is just either "Oh, that's interesting" or "That's surprising." I often click on the links that they have there. They almost never actually support that statement. So you, again, cannot think, "Oh well, I Googled something and I read the AI summary, and so it must be right. Moving on." It's just not.

Lee Burgess: Oh, and didn't I send you an article a few weeks ago how an abortion advocacy group was doing some researches and realized that ChatGPT – I think it was Chat GPT – was pulling right to life websites and providing that as pro-choice information, because it can't tell the difference.

Alison Monahan: Well, and also because it's just reinforcing all the biases that already exist on the Internet – some of them intentionally created, as in probably this situation, some of them unintentionally created, but all of the things that are out there, they were all ingested into this. So, I think you just have to maintain a very

healthy level of skepticism while recognizing there are some things that this can be useful for.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. Alright, well, here are some other things that it's useful for, now that we've ranted about all the problems. Like I mentioned earlier, I really think it's helpful for resumes. I saw a resume today come past my desk, which my first thought was, "This should have been fed into Claude and cleaned up", because it was too long, it was hard to read and get through. I understand if you as an individual are not very good at putting together something like that, I think this is exactly what these tools are designed for. So, I would make sure that your resume is clean and aesthetically pleasing and concise, and again, has no typos. I really have no patience for typos, and I am a person who has poor spelling and I understand typos, but this is what it's for – it prevents you from having typos. I think that the thing about professional emails and cover letters, my concern is, you definitely don't want it to sound like it was generated by AI. So I think you're better off drafting something yourself and having AI edit it than you are just saying, "Hey, AI, write me a cover letter to work at the Law School Toolbox." That's not good. I'm going to get that and say, "Wow, that sounds like AI wrote that." And I'm probably not going to be impressed.

Alison Monahan: Right. Although I think there are ways that you can use these tools – for example, take a standard resume, give it a lot more other information and then say, "This is the job I'm applying for. These are the things I want to emphasize in a cover letter. Draft it. I want it to be no more than three paragraphs, and here's a template that I've used before successfully." You have to give it all of that, and then you get the output and you're like, "Oh, okay. Other than that one sentence, it sounds pretty good." But just being like, "Draft me a cover letter", you're going to get something super generic, because the instructions you gave it are super generic.

Lee Burgess: Super generic. Yeah, exactly. And if I was a hiring person, a recruiter right now, the amount of just boilerplate stuff you're getting... You don't want it to look super generic. Nobody's going to pull that and think that that's interesting. So, you need to, again, use AI to enhance your own work, but make sure that you are in there, or else there's nothing that's going to stand out.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And I think this goes back to this bigger question of, what are you using these tools for and what are you bringing to the table? So, if I know I'm going to be applying for a bunch of jobs, maybe I should make a project in Claude. I assume there are other ways that you can do this in other tools, to kind of put everything I might want to reference in there, and then we can work with that material. We do stuff like that all the time – dump a bunch of stuff in that we think we're going to use, get it trained up on it, and then ask questions or do

whatever, or summarize or output in different ways. Stuff like that's fantastic. You could have very customized, very on-point, individualized materials for lots of different types of jobs and things, and send those out. But again, that's different than just saying, "Draft me a cover letter."

Lee Burgess: Right. And you're still responsible for making sure that the materials you send are perfect. And again, perfection, I think, is going to be expected. Not just rewarded, but expected. So, for instance, I saw a resume and materials come through my desk today, where somebody didn't provide these answers to these questions, which is part of our recruiting process. And maybe they did answer them, but they didn't submit them to me.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, that was weird.

Lee Burgess: And that's a problem, right? You're still responsible for submitting the work. I can't do anything if you don't submit the work. And one of the mistakes law students often make is they will send a cover letter for the wrong firm.

Alison Monahan: Yeah.

Lee Burgess: And so, it doesn't matter how perfect your materials are if you're not cross-checking that you're submitting materials to the right firm, with the right firm name and the right whole thing. And I think this cognitive offloading can often make it easier to make these mistakes, because you're not in the work. And so you're like, "Oh, I did X, Y, Z so fast, and then I uploaded all of them." But if they've got mistakes in them, no one is going to read it.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, this demand letter response that I got, first clue it might not have been particularly well thought out was when the opening paragraph had the wrong address in it. And you're like, "Oh, that's weird. Yeah, no, this is going to be really bad." And it was.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, exactly. Yeah. I mean, you're still responsible for the work. Another thing we wanted to touch on was this idea of, is an AI basically like a law student now?

Alison Monahan: No.

Lee Burgess: No. I mean, could it pass your classes? Maybe, I don't know.

Alison Monahan: Maybe. It probably depends on how you're being tested. I mean, the thing that always is still surprising to me is how many mistakes of basic logic are being made, because they can't do reasoning. It is actually just word prediction,

essentially, still. It seems incredibly impressive, but there's no distinction between a plaintiff and a defendant, necessarily, as a concept. You get these things where you're like, "That doesn't make sense. Oh yeah, you didn't get that these were two separate entities, and that matters."

Lee Burgess: I think that's true. I think that that's one of the things that's very challenging about these LLMs, is that most people who are interacting with them don't understand how they work; they only kind of understand how they work. But I was at a dinner party where a bunch of people were explaining to me how they work. So, at least I have that experience.

Alison Monahan: It's a lot of math.

Lee Burgess: Yes. And you and I talk about how they work, and you have more of an understanding of it than I do, since you have a computer science background. But I do think that's one of the challenging things, is really this idea of, most of us are interacting with these tools who do not understand what they're capable of, right? And this idea that they are doing language prediction, they're not thinking conceptually, they're not human, they're not doing independent work.

Alison Monahan: It seems like they're learning. It's like, they're not learning really in the way that we mean it. Yeah, and there are studies showing that people who interact with them less give them a better grade on their capabilities. The more you interact with them, the more you start to realize there are some things they're really good at and there are other things they are not good at at all, and it is not always obvious.

Lee Burgess: And the hallucination problem, which is what a lot of folks probably have read about or heard about, which is just that the AI makes up stuff. To me, that's one thing that can be a bit more obvious, but to me it's the problems more like my visa research, where it's like, "No, I am a hundred percent sure that this is right, and it was wrong."

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And if it's something that matters, you need to double check that, or use two. Sometimes I've used one to check the other. Stuff like that can actually be really helpful because you're like, "Oh wait, it has flagged this issue. Now I need to dig even deeper into that." So, it's not like we're saying to stick your head in the sand, but I do think there are concerns. And some of these concerns are around what your school is allowing you to do and not allowing you to do. And you really need to understand that, because if you are not explicitly allowed to do something with an AI and you do it and you get caught, that is potentially disastrous for your entire education and career. So, you do not want to find yourself in that position.

Lee Burgess: No. I mean, I don't think we have the stats out about how many students might not get licensed because of that, but just as a reminder, everyone, we have to pass a moral character. It used to be cheating, probably be seen as cheating.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, it would be.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, if you were caught cheating in law school, it's possible that your state will just not give you a law license.

Alison Monahan: Right, yeah, there could be very, very serious repercussions to this. And to be fair, I don't think schools and professors are necessarily fully up to speed on a lot of this. There may be some gray areas, but you really should understand what is allowed and not allowed, because you don't want to accidentally do something that can have really, really serious problems later on.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. There's a survey from Kaplan in 2024 saying 45% of law schools have a policy explicitly banning generative AI for writing their applications essays and their admissions essays. I'm going to guess that more students than that are using generative AI.

Alison Monahan: I'm like, "How do you possibly police that?" But okay.

Lee Burgess: Would you put it through like the readers or whatever?

Alison Monahan: I mean, again, maybe you think they won't be able to find out, but if they did, your admission could be revoked and you are not going to be admitted to the bar. I know these things sound trivial, but again, you have to understand what you're allowed and not allowed to do.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. And I think because the landscape is very varied of which law schools are kind of leaning into AI, which law schools are really saying that they don't want it in the classroom, this is where places like Reddit I think can get folks into trouble, because you may get advice or see, "Oh well, it seems like most law schools allow this, so I should be allowed", and you're still responsible for the honor code that you sign up for when you go to an individual school. And different schools have different policies, and you are being held to the standard of your law school. So, be careful when you start going down in the deep dive of Reddit and what students are, let's say, getting away with in different schools.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And it's tricky to understand, but I think you do need to try to understand it. And I talked about this with law professors – people do want to use this responsibly in general, I think. Obviously, there are people who just want to cut every possible corner – those people have already always existed. It's no

different, and it really is just easier to cut corners. But I think most people who are bothering to go to three years of law school or four years of law school, and pay for it, actually do want to learn something. We're hearing more about law school AI clubs and things like that, they're having panels and workshops. That sort of thing is actually very exciting to me as a former programmer. I think it's cool. I think the bar is starting to require competency. I mean, they already have technological competency requirements that I was talking with Gabe Teninbaum about recently, but more and more they're probably going to start requiring competency in AI. So I think these are things that you don't have to be afraid of necessarily; you just need to think really about how you're going to use them responsibly, and how you're going to learn, and is your school going to help you? And if not, there are other things you could possibly be doing, because I think it is a very quickly developing area and something that people have a lot of questions around.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I would say if I was interviewing new associates, I would probably ask questions about AI in my interviews.

Alison Monahan: A hundred percent. Yeah, there are already things you shouldn't be doing if you're going to actually be efficiently working. If you have been appropriately trained, you have the basic skillset of being a lawyer, this stuff can drastically accelerate your performance in a firm, or if you start your own firm, all these things. I just worry about people not getting that foundation.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, and to be able to critically evaluate the work.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. A hundred percent.

Lee Burgess: I mean, over and over and over again, I see article after article, I ask people at dinner parties when somebody knows, because the thing is, we're in the Bay Area, so it's like, every other dinner party has someone who codes AI. Sometimes a few people – some people at Google, some people at Apple, they all talk to each other. It's interesting. But over and over again, the feedback is, what we need to be worrying about our children is their ability to critically evaluate and do creative problem solving, and come up with different ways to interact with these tools, but to not just cognitively offload to them. And that is true for us adults as well. Yes, we talk about this with our kids, but it's true for all of us.

Alison Monahan: And I think in a way that kind of brings us full circle to, if you can be the skillset person who can direct these tools and use them in productive ways – that's highly, highly valuable. So I don't think people should be afraid, or just stick your head in the sand or be like, "Everybody around me is cheating." I don't think

that's necessarily accurate. I think you need to understand what you're allowed to do and not allowed to do. And then within those parameters, really play with these and push them and explore them, because I do think they're amazing technologies in certain ways, and I also think they're highly problematic in others.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. You definitely don't want to be not engaging with them.

Alison Monahan: Right.

Lee Burgess: But you want to be smart about how you engage with them.

Alison Monahan: Absolutely, a hundred percent agree. Well, on that note, have fun with your AI overlords.

Lee Burgess: 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 contact us via our website contact form at LawSchoolToolBox.com. Thanks for listening, and we'll talk soon!

RESOURCES:

Tutoring for Law School Success
AI in Higher Education: A Meta Summary of Recent Surveys of Students and Faculty
ABA Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence releases survey on AI and legal education
This law school is among the 1% that allow use of AI to write admissions essays
Risks of AI in Legal Practice
Podcast Episode 480: Ethical Uses of AI in Law School (w/Professor Susan Tanner)
Podcast Episode 505: Breaking ADHD Barriers with the Help of AI (w/Lindsay Scola)
Podcast Episode 517: Teaching AI in Law School (w/Megan Hutchinson and Nicole Phillips)