Alison Monahan: Welcome back to the Law School Toolbox podcast. Today we're excited to be talking with Quentin Huff – Director of Bar Support at Purdue Global Law School – about the NextGen bar exam – what's actually changing, what it means for how you should approach law school, and why your professors might need to rethink a few things too. 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. And you can check out the Bar Exam Toolbox podcast if the bar exam is on your radar. And with that, let's get started.

Today I'm excited to be talking with Quentin Huff – Director of Bar Support at Purdue Global Law School – about the NextGen bar exam – what's actually changing, what it means for how you might approach law school, and why your professors might need to change a few things too. So welcome, Quentin. I'm super excited to have you here.

Quentin Huff: Hey, thanks for having me on. I am excited.

Alison Monahan: Awesome. Well, to start us off, can you just tell your listeners a little about your background and what you do, just so they have a little context here?

Quentin Huff: So, currently, I am Director of Bar Support at Purdue Global and what I do sounds exactly like what it sounds. It's everything that's bar-related, from teaching courses at the end of the life cycle for bar students, where they get ready to transition from being law students to graduates and all of what that means. In particular, it's getting them ready to take the bar exam. Also, I do some things on the administrative level in terms of admissions, I do a few things at the beginning of the life cycle with students, some, ASP academic support types of webinars and things like that for students. So yeah, ideally it's kind of a "womb to tomb" thing.

Alison Monahan: It sounds like you are keeping busy. And if people want to learn more about you or about the school or connect, how can they do that?

Quentin Huff: They can reach out to PurdueGlobalLawSchool.edu. Go to the website. I love it if people send me email personally. So you can do that at

quentin.huff@purdueglobal.edu. And I love it when people are able to reach out.

Alison Monahan: Awesome. We'll put that in the show notes. So, let's start with some basics. For people who maybe have heard the term "NextGen", they're not really sure what's coming, what it means, can you just give us a high-level overview, like what is happening and why did the old exam need an overhaul?

Quentin Huff: This is so great, because this is the kind of conversation that I don't get to have at cocktail parties, because they're just not interesting, right?

Alison Monahan: Lee and I joke, we're like, "We're really fun at a cocktail party."

Quentin Huff: So, essentially what's happening is we are at this really cool inflection point in history where all the stakeholders – judges, lawyers, people in legal academia and people who are in the bar testing and standardized testing world – are sort of thinking, "We need a test that is a little bit more aligned with what lawyers actually do in the profession. When they become lawyers, what do they do? We need a test that sort of aligns with that." The previous test was the Uniform Bar Exam, created by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, which is an organization in Wisconsin. They create content that is used for the licensing exam, and it consisted of 200 multiple-choice questions and six essay questions, and two performance test questions. The NextGen, which it sounds so great, because it's like a Star Trek sort of sounding name – I love it, it's like a buildup to something new. But essentially, this new exam is hopefully, I think, designed to capture more of those practical skills. So, there're still foundational concepts, things that back in the day, we would call "subject areas", but these are now called "foundational concepts and principles" – your Civ Pros, your Contracts, your Criminal Law, Business Associations. They've been pared down a bit and now the structure is a little bit different. And the idea is supposed to be that in conjunction with those foundational concepts, there are foundational skills, like negotiation, like being able to counsel a client, like being able to think about dispute resolution and how to have different types of strategies and things of that nature. And not to be forgotten – which is crazy because I almost forgot it – legal research and legal writing – those things being tested in a more measured sort of way. So the phase of this is that jurisdictions, from July 2026, will hopefully hop on board. And by 2028, the old – which we will be calling the Legacy UBE – will be phased out. And by 2028, everyone will be either on the NextGen bar exam or they'll have to figure something out.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, we're going to see in California how that plays out. We're still waiting on that one. Yeah, it's an interesting exam. I've spent a lot of time in the last couple

of months kind of drafting questions for practice. We've really been diving into this exam. Some of these question types are pretty different. So, can you break down for me what people are going to see? I mean, there's multiple choice, but it's not all quite the same multiple choice. What is even happening here?

Quentin Huff: It'll be interesting to see how this conversation ages, right? It may change. But what we know now, and what's been published and put out now, is that there are three question types. There're the standalone multiple-choice questions, and within that category are two types of standalone multiple-choice questions. There's the traditional "pick one correct answer out of the four" that we have all sort of been accustomed to, and then there's the, I would call it the "pick two". It's like when you go to the...

Alison Monahan: It feels like a lottery, right? Or like a casino.

Quentin Huff: Or it's like when you go to the lunch place. It's like, "Do I want a soup or do I want a salad?" Well, you can have soup and have salad, right?

Alison Monahan: I want the combo. Right, totally.

Quentin Huff: And that's picking two correct answers out of six. My understanding is that's supposed to be out of 120 of these multiple-choice questions, because the exam is broken into three sections of three hours, right? And then you've got these three question types within all those sets. So, ultimately it's about 72 minutes. The next category would be the integrated question sets, which I like because I get to call them IQs. I'm going to be the first person to say IQs.

Alison Monahan: I like that. Yeah, we call them IQSs, which doesn't really roll off the tongue. I like IQs. We might start using that. We're going to make it a thing. You heard it here first.

Quentin Huff: That's right. And these questions, they remind me of the old questions that I remember when I took the bar exam. So, I took the bar exam back in 2003. And so, I remember there would be a set of questions that you come to in the 200 multiple choice, and it would say, "Questions 1 through 5 are based on the following fact pattern." And they were sequential. So, you read the fact pattern and then there were maybe three or four questions that built off of that fact pattern. That's kind of what the integrated question sets are doing, because it's a single fact pattern and you move through a series of questions. What's different though, and that I never saw, was that you can be provided with documents – maybe a police report, you could be provided with regulations or a statute – and it can sort of build off of that fact pattern. New questions can

come along and add things to it. Fortunately, it doesn't appear that anything changes from a previous question, like, you don't read something new and then go back like, "Oh, I need to go back and change my question." But it builds. And the reason I think that they're called "standalone multiple-choice questions" in the other category is because you can have multiple-choice questions within these integrated question sets, right? And then the last component are the performance tasks – what we knew in the UBE world as performance test questions. You have a File, you have a Library, and then you have a particular task. Usually it's writing something, but there are legal research performance tests, and those typically will be short-answer questions and multiple choice.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, it's like this funky mix of all kinds of stuff, because even with the IQS – obviously we've looked at the released samples – and one of them was what you were describing, like, "Here's something, and answer a question, and then maybe here's a short-answer question. Here's some more information, maybe on a different topic." But then you get those ones where it's, "Read this thing." And the only question is something like, "List five problems."

Quentin Huff: Right.

Alison Monahan: And the first time I read that I was like, "Huh."

Quentin Huff: Right.

Alison Monahan: Okay. Once you've seen it, you're like, "Alright, I understand what this is." But the first time I saw it I was like, "What are they asking me to do here?" So, I think the key point is, people are definitely going to need to kind of look this one over, because there is that "Huh, that's different" sort of feeling around a lot of these, I feel like.

Quentin Huff: Yeah.

Alison Monahan: Alright. Well, one of the big themes about this is, we're moving away from some of this pure memorization, which I personally think is great. I mean, I've always said if you did in practice what you do on the bar, you would be committing malpractice for sure. I was a patent litigator, they were asking me to opine off the top of my head on some criminal procedure issue. I'm just like, "What?" My advice would be, "Call a criminal defense attorney." That is not me. I've even seen estimates, I think LSAT had something that roughly 60% of this exam might be working with things you're provided, versus like 20% of the PT, the old PT. Does this kind of track with what you're seeing? I mean, that sounds like a really big change.

Quentin Huff: I think it is. And I think the biggest change is the mindset of the test taker, to go in there and sort of start off with the idea that, "I've got to know a lot of stuff, I've got to know a lot of stuff." And that's how people feel now. They feel like, "I've got to have my rules statements down." There're even books out there where people are sort of selling, "Here are the essential rules that you need for the bar exam."

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And you have to memorize every single word of it, or you're not going to pass. That's kind of the idea.

Quentin Huff: Right. And I think this sort of shift in mindset, I think it does take a little bit of that sort of pressure off. For me, I never approached the bar exam in that way, that it was all memorization. But I do think that split is definitely a bit more dramatic than we've seen in the past. So, for sure you have these things that you have to work with. Now you have to work with them though.

Alison Monahan: Right, yeah. And one thing we haven't really touched on is, within the content scope, there are these starred topics that you do still need to have memory level of, and then there is this whole other group of what they're calling "non-starred topics". And some of those I found are pretty surprising. I was kind of surprised in the criminal law world that things like murder were not something I needed to memorize. I was like, "Huh." Again, that's interesting. I would've thought that's something you might expect an attorney to know off the top of their head, but apparently not now.

Quentin Huff: That makes sense. That makes sense.

Alison Monahan: I mean, I guess this is always the big question. I've got to memorize less stuff. Do you think this exam is going to be easier?

Quentin Huff: I don't think so, actually. I don't think so. One of the things I think is great is that it's shorter. It's about nine hours. But then I think about where we are in human evolution, and I was reading something recently where actors were talking about being on streaming services. And they said that the streaming services are like, "You've got to get to the point really early in the episode, because you're going to lose people's ability to stay focused." So, a nine-hour exam these days might actually be the equivalent of the 12-hour exam that we had before. Or back in my day, there were states that had three days. I think Delaware...

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I took the three-day California bar. That last day was a nightmare. You were so tired by that point, you're just like, "I just want this to end."

Quentin Huff: Right, exactly. But I do think that the thing that's going to be difficult about it is, other skills are being emphasized. How do I acquire and refine those specific skills? Because a lot of these things are things that were always sitting in the background before. Now they're being raised to the forefront and explicitly tested. Those questions, like you talked about in the integrated question sets: "Can you give me three facts that would support one side's argument, and do it in one sentence?" It's like, "Oh, I've got to be succinct. I've got to be cognizant of what's important here." And that's a skill that hopefully I've been practicing.

Alison Monahan: Right. Well, let's talk a little bit about that, because I want to know more about what's happening on the law school side. And I know you've been involved in thinking about the curriculum mapping. Where are these skills going to be taught, where is this material going to be taught? What are you guys doing and how does this all work in the law school context?

Quentin Huff: So, curriculum mapping is something that's really close to my heart. I actually like it. The idea of it though is, it's just an index. It's just like figuring out where are specific things being taught, how is it being taught, and then how are people assessing it? How are professors assessing it? How is the school assessing it? At Purdue Global, I've been really, really lucky, because a lot of curriculum design or those things are not handled by people like me. They're already sort of built in. It's like, you can't just build a course and just make it the way you want it. There're certain very specific guidelines, we have to work with a curriculum team and all of those things. At its most simple though, I think that the best way to think about this is, it's that intersection between faculty, staff, and administration. It's actually coming together – maybe it's a special meeting, maybe it's a faculty meeting – and just having a conversation about this stuff. It's not the sexiest conversation to have, right? So, I think a lot of times there's other business that needs to be attended to, and so it doesn't always come up. But if schools are able to take the time to have that conversation, it's really worthwhile. Just one professor to say, "Hey, this is what I'm doing in my Torts class." And they may not even be inviting comments about it or feedback about it, but just so that people know what's going on in those classes is really helpful to think about what the big picture is, and maybe take a little pressure off of your academic dean.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. I'd have to imagine at least at a lot of schools, there's probably some resistance from professors. For example, in Con Law, I had a professor who was literally in his nineties, and he was an absolute legend, he was an amazing person, but he had probably been teaching the same course for, I don't know, 60 years at that point. The idea that he was suddenly going to have client

counseling in his Con Law course or whatever was probably not happening. How are these skills being addressed? It is also an interesting question, but how do you even test some of these things in a three-hour window of a standardized test, like client counseling or negotiations? What's happening on these questions?

Quentin Huff: Yeah, I think some of it is thinking about the lens through which you're asking the questions you're already asking, right? So, you have an essay question or you have a fact pattern that has a series of sub-questions. You can change the call of the question in such a way to sort of have the student think more about these other skills, besides who's going to prevail. Who prevails between P versus D? Or what's the strongest argument? Or those things that we've traditionally seen. But you can put them – just like the NextGen does – you can put them in that context and say, "Hey, imagine that you're an associate at a firm and the supervising attorney has come to you with a particular problem. What's your first research question?" And one of the things that we build into a lot of our courses are discussion posts that allow students to share what their thoughts are on a particular topic. And then part of their assignment is to respond to other people's discussion posts. And so, it makes a nice little kind of incubator to think about those kinds of questions. But as long as they're not just "P versus D, who wins?" – that's kind of the key.

Alison Monahan: I've been drafting NextGen style multiple choice for the standalone ones. And you can just, instead of saying "What's the outcome?", be like, "You're advising this client. What would you advise them the outcome is likely to be?" So, some of it's just that sort of thing. But I do think there are these more fundamental things that it's interesting that people are being asked to think about on the bar exam. And one of those you brought up earlier, was this idea of legal research. Tell me more about this. I think it's a great thing to test people on to make sure they can do something, but again, how is the NextGen handling this and how are you incorporating that? Are your Legal Writing professors involved in this? How's that all playing out?

Quentin Huff: Yeah, a lot of the NextGen questions, the samples that I've seen, are relying a bit on finding ways to get students to think about where they want to get information from, what types of legal research questions need to be asked, and also getting them to strategize about, "Okay, here's a situation that we put you in. What's the best way to counsel someone through that?" And that might include a little bit of research too. What additional information would you need to have in order to counsel someone to go from step A to step B? I feel like students would be really good at a question like that, because they're always

telling you in the essays that they used to do, they're always telling you what's not in the fact pattern, right?

Alison Monahan: Right. "If I had this information, I could answer, but I don't, so I really don't know what the answer is."

Quentin Huff: So this is really an opportunity to actually not throw that away, but to sort of bring that to bear and say, "Okay, if I did have this, the question is explicitly asking me what's not here? So what could I find that would help me move forward?" I've always felt like legal writing and legal research has been, I don't know if it's underrated, but it's definitely incredibly important.

Alison Monahan: I would say underappreciated.

Quentin Huff: Underappreciated, yes. And there's this disconnect that I've always felt between legal writing, legal research, and bar exam, but sometimes I've wondered if it's just proximity. It's just that when you get to the end of the student life cycle, that's when people start thinking about the bar exam. And those skills were near the beginning, and so it's just the time, the temporal proximity is different. So, one of the things I really like to do is to have those Legal Writing professors come back and talk to them, maybe as a supplemental workshop, or a lot of schools are supplementing bar review courses, and maybe just have a discussion about, "Hey, remember when we did these things. You could use your memo writing, you could use your persuasive writing, your objective writing. You're going to see that in the performance test. Let's talk about some of the things that we did. Remember, you know how to do this. We did this, we did something like this, we did something similar. And this is what good writing looks like." So, now what's interesting is that that might be helpful for a specific type of performance test on NextGen, but there are no essays anymore. So, the good solid writing stuff is not so much that, but what Legal Writing professors bring to bear is that lens, that ability to say, "Hey, what is the question and what lens are you supposed to be looking at this question?" And I think that's going to be incredibly valuable when it's time to figure out, "What do I write in response to these new questions?"

Alison Monahan: Yeah, and I agree with that. And I think one of the things that's useful for these first-year Legal Writing classes, is those are practical memos. It's not just like the MEE, like the old essays of, you have 30 minutes to opine on this topic. These are really the things that people are going to see on the NextGen, either troubleshooting them or writing them. So, for any 1Ls listening to this, pay attention in your Legal Writing class, I guess, is our takeaway message here,

remember the lessons. I don't know, do you have any more thoughts on if 1Ls are hearing this, what should they be taking away from those classes?

Quentin Huff: I really think that those classes, plus anything in that first year, I feel like we are always thinking about, "What am I going to do with this later? How does this apply?" And I think that when people transition into law school, the expectation of what law school is versus what we think it's going to be, always seems that there's a mismatch. I mean, I remember thinking that law school was going to be an opportunity for me to say, "Objection!", "Move to strike" – that I was going to say that somewhere because I saw it on *Law & Order*. And I never got to say it at all in law school.

Alison Monahan: Yeah.

Quentin Huff: But a lot of where my thought comes from is from music. And one of my favorite musicians is Ani DiFranco, and she has a song from way back, it's called *My IQ*. And she says something at the end of it where she says, "Every tool is a weapon if you hold it right." And I love that line, because it makes me think of if I'm a 1L and I'm sitting in a Legal Writing class and I'm thinking like, "When am I going to use this?" It's like, don't wait for the situation to grab you and say, "Oh, this is where you use this skill." You should be searching for, "Okay, when can I use this? When can I use this? How is this similar to something I learned in Contracts?" Or, "How can I use this to enhance my Contracts performance?" Because that legal writing, it is the backbone of pretty much everything else we do. And if you can master that, then you are really in a really good place. Bar exam, practicing law, all of that sort of starts there.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I agree with that. I was talking with somebody yesterday, a potential student, about this, of sort of, we have the law and then we have the facts, but we've got to have this way to figure out how they fit together. And that process, I think, is what legal reasoning and legal writing are about. And so, if you can't do that process, I feel like you're probably going to struggle on the bar exam too, because what it's asking you to do is do that over and over and over again really quickly, of what is honing in on the key stuff here. Like, what do you remember, what are we giving you, how are you putting it all together? In some ways I think it's conceptually harder than just answering a multiple-choice question.

Quentin Huff: Absolutely, absolutely.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. What about class? So we have our legal writing, but are professors starting to sort of incorporate some of this NextGen thinking into classes? Do

you think they need to be doing that? What are you seeing that a professor might be able to take away and say, "Oh, I might try that in my own class"?

Quentin Huff: Yeah. I've been incredibly lucky in the sense that as soon as NextGen started being a topic, the professors that I work with immediately started trying to like, "Okay, let me see if I can draft something like that. Let me see if I can incorporate that." From what I hear, that may be unusual.

Alison Monahan: I think it varies a lot. I'm hearing a lot of different things. Some of our tutors work at different law schools and they're reporting back from conferences, things they're hearing and not hearing. And some of them are very involved, and some of the schools are just not.

Quentin Huff: Yeah. I am of a couple of different opinions about this. On the one extreme, it can be really crucial and important, helpful, to give students an idea of exactly what they would see on the exam. So, that means that if you're only giving multiple-choice questions, you might want to think about expanding that. Or if you're only giving essay questions, you might want to think about expanding, and maybe even having something like these integrated question sets. That gives them some kind of exposure to what they might see on the exam. At the other end of the spectrum, I can respect the fact that there're people that are not necessarily comfortable with it, particularly now when there hasn't actually been an administration of the exam. It's like, why would I want to re-tool my whole course?

Alison Monahan: Right. And to be fair, they have released very few materials. Not what we were promised several years ago – let's just put that out there.

Quentin Huff: Yes. So, the way that I kind of think about it is a bit more holistic. As a professor, I would be suggesting, think about what do you want to build in a graduate? What do you want the graduates from your school to be able to do? And then how does your class contribute to the characteristics of that particular outcome? And I think when you think about it from that way, it's a little less transactional. It's less of, "Oh, I want to expose them to something", and instead it's more, "I want to transform them. I want them to be able to do something different at the end of my class than they were doing before. And what I want them to be able to do will make them a better lawyer, practitioner, thinker, legal citizen." I think if we can think about it in that way, we are going to have that evolution towards better preparation overall, because I would really hate to lose that diversity of approach. I had some really bizarre professors, but I loved them because they were so different. Some people would just stand at the podium and they'd just lecture. Some people may just stand up and recite

your cases. I had a Civ Pro professor who called himself Mad Dog. And he would make you stand up, and he was ferocious. He would come after you for the entire time. But that was amazing, because it was a skill. I was like, "Okay, I can think on my feet." And then I had other people that would break us into groups and we're sitting in a circle and we'd say...

Alison Monahan: Yeah, collaborating.

Quentin Huff: Collaborating. And I like that. I like those different types of being able to sort of think back. I have a problem today and I'm like, "I had a professor that would handle it this way. I'm going to pull from that." So I like that kind of thing.

Alison Monahan: No, I think that's great. I think I'm thinking back now on very idiosyncratic professors I had, and I'm like, "Yeah, that guy was great." My Civ Pro professor on day one announced that he didn't really find the rules that interesting, so we probably just were not going to talk about them in class. I ended up being a TA for him, it was probably one of my best classes, but we were all just like, "Huh. Okay." But again, that's a skillset. Go read the rule book, figure it out. We'll talk about very high-level theoretical things about procedure. Alright, well, before we wrap up – because we're about out of time – if somebody is listening to this right now, you're in law school, whether you're 1L, 2L, 3L – how do you think people should be thinking about this exam? Are there specific courses they definitely need to be doing? Should they be doing experiential stuff? And also if you're the people taking this first exam, how are you not just totally freaking out at this point?

Quentin Huff: Let me start with the second part of it – why not to freak out about it. And the reason I wouldn't freak out about it at this point is because although the format has changed, I feel like where students have come from up to this point, it does give them a really good foundation to now pivot, because they probably have been thinking so much about memorizing rules, memorizing rules, that now, if they can use that as a base and think beyond that and say, "Okay, the destination isn't to just memorize and then spew rules; now they're going to be asking me specific things about how to use the knowledge that I have." I find a bit of comfort in that, because the other way around I think would be difficult. If we were going from NextGen to Legacy UBE, I think that would be stark.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, the scope suddenly expands and you've got to know all these things and you're like, "Secured transaction, I don't know that is."

Quentin Huff: That would be difficult. The first question – what kinds of courses – is so fascinating, because I really think that electives really come into play here. And thinking about the track in a well-rounded way, I think would be the best way to do it. There're certain students that I've met who say, "I know I want to be transactional" or, "I know I want to be a litigator." That's great, but maybe take some things outside of your comfort zone. If there's a Food Law class, take the Food Law class. I remember taking a Consumer Protection course, mainly because I thought it would be interesting. And it was in the evening. It was like a time that I thought, "Oh, let me take a class at night." But it was amazing. We did so much statutory interpretation that I didn't even think about all the regulations and things, and it was very administrative law related. It was really cool. So, a lot of these electives can be really helpful for these softer, connective tissue skills. And then outside of that, moot court. If you want to do a journal, do a journal. Do trial practice, get on the trial team. Do a clinic, definitely do a clinic. All of those, I think, can really enhance the educational process.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. I will say Admin Law is the one class that I just thought, "Oh, this sounds so boring", and now I really wish I had taken, because I think you don't understand in law school really necessarily how fundamental that is to our modern society and government. So, that is the one I'd put on my list. I would say NextGen, you've got to take Business Associations, you've got to take Evidence. Those are basically like the MBE topics now.

Quentin Huff: And Professional Responsibility is important too.

Alison Monahan: True. I think that's already required, isn't it?

Quentin Huff: It is, but I'm just saying that it's a required course, but it's thinking about it within the context of other courses.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, yeah. We haven't really touched on that, but that's also woven into a lot of these NextGen questions, so I think that's a great point. Again, you have to take PR, but at my school, some people took it in like a week-long course in the summer or something, just so they could get the hours. But I took a full semester of it and I actually thought it was really interesting. But again, I think that's a good point. That's one people need to have on their radar, because it's woven into a lot of these questions. Alright, well, thank you so much. We're about out of time. Any other final thoughts you'd like to share here?

Quentin Huff: The only thing I want to say is that far from being afraid of the changes, just the fact that it has changed should give us some hope, because it means it's not

fixed. I don't want to sound like the Terminator, but the future is not set. There's no fate but what we make. So, it's exciting.

Alison Monahan: I know. It's funny, nobody ever thought bar world would be the exciting thing. It's been so stayed for so long, and then all of a sudden we're in this literal chaos era right now, where I don't know what California's doing in a couple of years, they haven't decided yet. But I do think it's an exciting time. I honestly think this test is a lot better as a test, it's more realistic. And I understand people are going to stress out about the whole thing, and the uncertainty and all that, but I really think you've just got to go with it, because I think that novelty and the uncertainty of what the test is, so you've just got to get used to it. Alright, well, remind us again how people can reach out if they'd like to do that.

Quentin Huff: Absolutely. You can reach out to me at quentin.huff@purdueglobal.edu. And you can reach our school website at PurdueGlobalLawSchool.edu.

Alison Monahan: Awesome. Well, thank you so much for joining us. We'll update all that in the show notes. This was super helpful, and I really appreciate it.

Quentin Huff: Thanks so much for having me.

Alison Monahan: 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. You can also check out our bar exam podcast too. Thanks for listening, and we'll talk soon!

RESOURCES:

Purdue Global Law School
Quentin Huff: quentin.huff@purdueglobal.edu
NextGen UBE Content Scope
Podcast Episode 520: Preparing for the NextGen Bar Exam with Themis