Matthew D’Amore:

So, we will get started. I am Matthew D'Amore, Associate Dean at Cornell Tech, and welcome to our discussion on Building Cultures of Innovation – What Lessons Can We Learn From Law Schools? As Dean Greg (Morrisett) mentioned, on behalf of Cornell Tech, we're thrilled to have the opportunity to work with the Permanent Commission on this conference and to bring you this panel today. This program will qualify for CLE credit, and so be sure to listen for the CLE code at the end of the session. Online forms for signing up for CLE are available on the conference website, and I'm going to put that in the chat also, so give me a sec. Except for the “can you” part, I don't know exactly why that says ... Let me paste it again. There we go. Okay.

So we will be using the chat for Q&A, but please note that it's just us, so we may not get to the chat and the Q&A until the end of the session. So what we wanted to talk about today are, as the title indicates, how law schools can work with law students and with the legal services community to adapt to the changing framework of legal technology that we're all seeing. I mean, the technical underpinnings of law are always changing. We've seen during my career, right, legal research tools that have transformed the accessibility of precedent, we've seen the emergence of e-filing, we've seen wave after wave after wave of eDiscovery technology, we're now seeing document generation and assembly tools. In the course of the pandemic, we all suddenly discovered video conferencing and virtual hearing and depositions, as the Acting Chief Judge indicated earlier today. And as you saw on RapidFire Tech, we are seeing the use of automated tools or interactive tools to provide legal information, such as Samuel's open access project or Eliza and Kyle's chatbot.

We're now on the cusp of potentially another transformation with generative AI tools that will allow the creation of customized documents, provide bespoke legal advice or "legal advice". I'll put that in quotes, since we have to avoid the unauthorized practice of law, and as we've also discussed, tools that can provide occasionally hallucinated responses. But these are tools that can do a passable job in our classes and even get a passing score on the bar exam, as has been reported. So while technology's moving quickly, in many ways, the teaching of the practice of law has evolved more slowly.

And so, let me ask the folks who are here in attendance- have you ever taken a legal technology course in law school? And so I'll ask the tech team to run the first poll. Tech team, do you have our poll? Maybe I have our poll. Do I have our poll? I think I do. All right. Well, I would ask you to show hands, but I can't count them quickly enough, right? As this panel will, oh wait- I have a privacy statement. “What this app can do”… “Open app”.

Raymond Brescia:

Well, we're all about learning by doing.

Matthew D’Amore:

We all are about learning by doing. Okay, I'm not going to play with this again, because it doesn't have my poll preloaded. So, thanks everybody for bearing with us as we experiment. So, oh, wait- here it is. The poll is launched, so please respond ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to “Have you ever taken a legal technology course in law school?” Names are not recorded, but results will be shared. I see a lot of nos in the chat. I don't see any yeses in the chat. We have 128 who-

Jonathan Askin:

Just the ones who are yeses used the poll.

Matthew D'Amore:

Yeah. So we're actually at about 10%, so 8% of folks have taken a legal technology course in law school, which is awesome, right? The question… but I'll bet everybody does use legal technology in some fashion in their role today. By legal technology, let's define that as some tool specific to the practice of law, so as compared to, not including things like Word or Zoom or Teams or email. So, let's launch a second poll: Are you using legal technology in your role today?

So, right? Everybody's using some form of legal technology. Now, some of us may have learned how to use legal research tools and other tools in library, separate from a formal class, but this is a broad indication that there is an aspect of the practice of what people are currently doing that is not being met by law schools. And so, the question for us and for our panel today is, what should law schools be doing to address these changes? And, relatedly important for this conference- how, if at all, should we connect those efforts to improving the delivery of civil legal services to those in need?

Now we've seen a couple of examples during RapidFire Tech, right? Samuel's tool and Eliza's tool are examples of technology developed in conjunction with law school efforts that are going to reach a civil legal aid community, but is that the right place for law schools? Is that the kind of work law schools should be doing? Should we be teaching technology at all? Those are the kinds of things that our panel's going to talk about today.

Now Ray, who's here and who has been one of the leading scholars on questions like this, has looked at both whether law schools should have a role in preparing students for a technology-enhanced legal practice, and in preparing students to develop their own legal technology innovations. And both of these areas, as he's written, can have a significant impact on the delivery of legal services. Those are the kinds of things that we're hoping to share with you today, and also get your comments in the chat.

So in our talk today, I'm pleased to have three leading scholars and advocates for teaching legal innovation. Jonathan Askin, clinical professor of law at Brooklyn Law School, and the founder and director of the Brooklyn Law Incubator and Policy Clinic, BLIP, Ray Brescia, professor of law at Albany Law School and the Honorable Harold R. Tyler Chair in Law and Technology, and Nicola Shaver, Adjunct Professor of Law at Cardozo Law School and currently the CEO and founder of the Legaltech Hub.

Let me start by asking each of you to give a brief overview, maybe a couple of minutes, about your course and your program for teaching legal technology. Let me ask you what you teach, what's covered in your class, and what your learning outcomes are. I guess we'll go in alphabetical order, if only because that's the way you appear on my screen, so Jonathan first, then Ray, then Nikki.

Jonathan Askin:

So my primary course at Brooklyn Law School is the Brooklyn Law Incubator and Policy Clinic, and that really is a full-service law firm for startup ventures. We have about 40 students each semester in the program, and the students sort of cut across the gamut of skills and interests and passions. So, I would say within BLIP itself, very few students really focus on legal tech specifically, although those numbers are growing. I've been trying to do more and more legal tech over the 15 years that I've been teaching. And I've got to say, 15 years ago when I first started running the clinic, almost all of the students had computer science or hard science backgrounds. They thought that was a prerequisite to be in my program. Now I've got to tell you, I would say 85% to 90% of the students come from a humanities or social sciences background with essentially no tech experience.

Now, a lot of them are still concerned and frightened to tackle the tech issues. They've been getting easier and easier, so I do see more and more students with less and less of a technical background trying to participate in our legal tech environment, but because we are a full-service law firm, we haven't

devoted that much energy specifically to legal tech. As a result, I've created a justice lab at Brooklyn Law School, where the students are more targeted and more focused on it, but they don't get credit for that. We also have a Technology for Lawyers class, where they'll learn rudimentary coding, they'll learn things like Neota Logic and Bryter and Josef, the no-code tools. They won't learn Python or more sophisticated processes. Within my clinic itself, we are now doing more and more AI-related activities. I suspect that's probably the same at a lot of law schools across the country.

I think initially, we were all quite scared and trying to keep AI in abeyance. I think most of us, at least, have probably recognized that AI's inevitable, and we better be on the forefront of figuring out how to partner with the AI. So my students have turned ChatGPT into a paralegal for our clinic, at least doing initial cuts on things, with us serving as the associate of the partner, reviewing the first drafts of the AI. I think that's still a little bit controversial, but we're starting to see that more and more. Yeah, I'll leave it at that.

Matthew D'Amore:

Let me just ask one follow up on how you're using AI there, because I'm sure that's going to be something that we're all going to talk about a bit. Are your students actually building things on top of ChatGPT, or are they using ChatGPT for its insights and results?

Jonathan Askin:

Yeah, very rudimentary. We're just using it as prompting it to write a first draft of terms of service or a privacy policy, a contract, that sort of thing.

Matthew D'Amore:

And how's it doing?

Jonathan Askin:

I think it's doing great actually, but I had low expectations. I think the students, maybe because they've played a little bit more with new-fangled technology than I may have, because it's just, I think they're more concerned about the errors. I like that there are still errors, because as a learning tool. It's fantastic.

Matthew D'Amore:

Yeah. Awesome. Ray, tell us about your class and your program.

Raymond Brescia:

Sure. But first I want to thank you, Matthew, for the invitation and for the Commission for the invitation as well, and to acknowledge that Jonathan's being a little modest- that the BLIP program was recently recognized by Bloomberg News as one of the very, very most innovative new law school programs in the country. So congratulations to you for that, Jonathan, and it really is innovative and extraordinary.

So a couple of things that we're doing at Albany Law School, one is a program called the Innovation Intensive, which is not legal tech specific, but it has our students working in the Technology Transfer Office of the SUNY Research Foundation, which holds, essentially, the IP generated across the SUNY system. So from Stony Brook to Buffalo, any IP that comes out of the SUNY system runs through the Research Foundation. And so our students are embedded in that program and working on intellectual

property, they're doing customer discovery, they're doing all the things that you would do in the technology transfer process in an academic setting. I would recommend to any law school…

We have an affiliation with the University at Albany. We're a standalone, Albany Law School, like Brooklyn Law School. We're a standalone law school, but we still have a relationship with University at Albany and this relationship with SUNY RF. But if you're at a law school like Cornell, or anywhere where there is a technology transfer office, I would recommend seeing if there's a way to embed your students in those programs, because it's a wonderful opportunity for them to see technology commercialization from ideation to patent. So that's one thing that we're doing.

Now, on the legal tech side, we have a class called the Law of Social Entrepreneurship and Exempt Organizations, which teaches students about the law of nonprofits and social entrepreneurship like benefit corporations and things like that, but in that course, they're also working on legal tech initiatives. Sometimes it's about bringing direct services to clients using technology-based tools, usually web-based tools. Sometimes it's bringing tools to lawyers themselves. And what we do most of the time is partner, again, with the University at Albany's Computer Science Department. We don't do any of the programming, for the most part. What our students do is they develop the content, they sort of storyboard out the websites, they might record podcasts or videos, explainers for laypeople and for lawyers, and then we hand that content over to the computer programmers.

And they love it because the content is there for them. They're focusing on the design, they're not focusing on the content. And there's an old joke about the factory of the future, where there'll be two employees- a man and a dog, and the man is there to feed the dog, and the dog is there to make sure the man doesn't touch the machines. Here, the programmers, we don't want them touching the content. And sometimes they do, and we're like, "Wait a minute, what's that content? Where did you get that?" "Oh, no, we felt that this was a little more elegant." "Yeah, it is a lot more elegant, but it's not what the law says." So we have to make sure that they understand that they are there to translate the design into an actual website.

We also build, I see John Mayer is on the webinar. We work with the A2J Author software as well. We did a nonprofit document assembly tool using A2J Author. So the students in that Neota Logic-based programming environment platform, they were some students who had some coding experience, some students who didn't, were able to use that really effectively. And John's team is amazing and gives lots of support to folks all along the way, from initial training to troubleshooting.

So those are the two main areas where we're exposing students to technology, in addition to the eDiscovery classes and things like that, but I'll stop there and let us go on.

Matthew D'Amore:

Nikki, tell us about your work at Cardozo.

Nicola Shaver:

Sure, thank you. It's so interesting hearing the way that different people approach this. I'm going to give a little bit of background as to how I ended up teaching the course that I teach. I was working at leading innovation at a large law firm globally, based in New York City. And in my day job, what we were concerned with was making sure that our lawyers were practicing in the best way possible- that means with the best access to content and information, using the right tools, providing the best possible client service delivery. And so we were continuously looking at solving problems and addressing pain points for our lawyers, as well as for clients. I heard from many clients of the firm that they were extremely keen to make sure that the lawyers that they worked with, the outside counsel that they worked with,

were using modern means of production, they were using technology in order to be more efficient and also reduce risk, improve consistency, and so on.

What became apparent over my years working in roles like that was that although we make this assumption that younger generations, as they come in to legal practice, will be more fluent in the use of technology and practice because they've grown up using technology, in fact, that wasn't necessarily translating into reality at the firm. Although people, sure, have grown up using technology, they still come into legal practice having had predominantly traditional law school experiences and expecting to practice law the same way that people have been practicing law for decades.

So I started asking incoming associates how many of them had taken some course on legal technology at law school, or been exposed to the fact that the practice of law was changing while they were at law school. The first time I asked this question was in 2018, and out of a class of 100 incoming summer associates, one person had taken a course of that nature. Three years later, that had expanded only in a small way. We had about seven people who had some sort of exposure.

And so we developed, at the firm, a curriculum for incoming associates to expose them during their initial summer at the firm, and then subsequently a fall program to improve the skills that they learned during that initial summer program. That would expose them to things like the way that the market is changing, the kinds of technologies available, and the way that was impacting both clients and law firms, the changing expectations of clients, the changes in regulatory regimes across jurisdictions. That was very successful in encouraging our associates to adopt new technologies and understand where in legal practice… automation, for example, might be relevant.

One thing that I feel very strongly from that time is law firms need to be doing their part but law schools also need to be doing their part. We need to be looking at the way we teach law in a different way, ensuring that graduates are prepared for the fact that 100% within their careers, they will be exposed to legal technology. As we saw from our poll just now, everyone is using it, and yet we don't really prepare people to use it terribly well.

And so, I actually pled a case to introduce a new course at Cardozo Law School and was very pleased when the dean acquiesced and let me develop a curriculum. I've now taught this course for a couple of years. Essentially, it is an introduction to new competitive forces in law, the regulatory change in the legal industry, client voices and client demand, and then an overview of the types of technologies that are having an impact in law, AI in all of its forms. It's far more ubiquitous than people think, because when we think of AI, we're thinking of neural network and now generative AI, but in fact, some form of AI has been a part of legal practice for many years now, including in our core legal research platforms.

We look at automation in the practice of law- both workflow and document automation. We look at big data, data analytics, data visualization, new ways of working, the new skill sets that are required of lawyers, the new careers that are available in law. And then, we expose them as well. I expose them to a no-code solution, and they end the semester by building an application within that no-code solution that addresses a real-world legal problem. It's extraordinary- within one semester, the extent to which they learn from zero to being able to build an application. The idea, the learning outcome, is not that they go into legal practice ready to build technology. The idea is that they go into legal practice prepared to adopt the technologies that will help them become thriving lawyers of the future and serve their clients well.

And one thing, just to finish off, if you look at eDiscovery, and the course of eDiscovery, it's one instance where we have seen the practice of law become literally inextricable from the technology that is the means to undertake that legal work. That is going to happen in more areas of law. We're seeing due diligence undergo a similar transformation. There will be other areas where it will be increasingly impossible to divide the law itself, the way that the work is done, from the technology that is the means

to do that work. If we're not setting people up to be able to use the technology increasingly, they're not going to be able to practice law the way we need them to. So that's the idea behind the course, Matt.

Matthew D'Amore:

Thanks, Nikki. A couple of you have alluded to the use of no-code tools like Neota or Bryter or A2J Author. Ray, I think you may be the outlier, that your class does not explicitly use those. Let me ask the panel- do you think that law schools should be teaching the development of applications on no-code tools, or should we be leaving that work to engineers and developers? Do we think that there's a role for lawyers in the future to be building on these tools themselves? Jonathan, Nikki, let me start with you on the pro side, then Ray, we'll get your thoughts.

Jonathan Askin:

Yeah. Well, I think students certainly have the opportunity to apply the tools. Now, when we first started doing this 15 years ago, the tools were not ready for prime time, at least for my law students, and it took us way too long to get up to speed on it. It's now- the user interfaces have become so much better and almost idiot proof, not as idiot proof as they will when the AI gets hold of it, but for now, it is getting such that you need zero coding experience to be able to use these no-code tools.

So, the way we do it is we essentially have the students come with their substantive and procedural knowledge. That's still the most important thing. Not all of the students really need to know how to use the no-code tools, even if they are the most basic of no-code tools, but they need to partner with students who do, and then input the substance. So that's how we've done it. We've used the students as essentially knowledge bases to write flow charts, to parse through a statute, parse through the state of the law, and then have colleagues who are more interested in the tech side partner with them.

Matthew D'Amore:

Thanks, Jonathan. Nikki, what about you? I know you're using Bryter in your class.

Nicola Shaver:

I very much agree. For us, we do use Bryter, which is a no-code solution in class, but the reason for that is not because I believe that lawyers should be building, necessarily, in tools themselves. It's two reasons.

First, to help them understand when and where automation may be relevant within their practice, so that when they go into practice, whether that is within a law firm or in legal aid or whatever practice they're going into, to be able to understand when there is high-volume, repetitive, manual work, that automation is relevant and should come into play. And then they can hand it over to others in order to build, but having that insight is really important.

The other thing is to be able to understand how the technology works and what is possible. I do think understanding the art of the possible is important when it comes to technology, because for many who do come, for example, from a humanities background, they just may not have that knowledge otherwise. And understanding that you can actually, for example, automate cross-jurisdictional regulatory review in a way that brings considerable consistency and can unlock traffic jams within firms- that's a really important thing to understand and to know.

I think increasingly with generative AI and large language models, which we'll be talking about in a bit, we actually will see lawyers dealing with technology, perhaps in a little bit more of a 'get your hands

dirty, get right in there' kind of way. So maybe that's changing as well, but I've never been on the side of lawyers need to learn how to code, for example.

Matthew D'Amore:

Interesting. So, Ray- how are you handling this in your class, and what's your thought on what the need will be?

Raymond Brescia:

Well, I think, as Jonathan pointed to, I do think that the new, generative AI tools, as I understand it, are going to help a lot with coding, and that we can direct that generative AI to develop programs a lot more easily in the future that may eliminate a fair amount of the most rudimentary coding requirements. I think that when we've worked with A2J Author, students across the spectrum of their ability or familiarity with coding dove into it. Some of them said "this was great, I've never done anything like this", so I think exposing people to these tools is super helpful.

But I do think, whether it's… I'll make two points. First, whether it's having students learn some of this themselves, so they get a sense of what the people doing the hardcore development, how they see the world a little bit, right, so they can get a little bit into that language. But also, we are seeing just working with the computer science folks, the AI folks from University at Albany, that interdisciplinary work, we're bringing the legal side to it, they're bringing the coding side to it, and it's a really nice marriage. It helps people see the world a little differently, from the eyes of a coder, through the eyes of a lawyer, and also, and I hope we're going to get to this, through the eyes of a legal services practitioner, through the eyes of a consumer of these services.

I think there's also a phenomenon that I'm seeing, and I'm sure that Matthew, Jonathan, Nikki, you're seeing this as well. I also help to supervise an externship program, and probably 20% of the students - we have about 40 to 50 students go through this externship program every year - probably about 20% of the students will report, at some point in their internship, "oh yeah, I was getting really frustrated with the way that the office was doing something, and I overhauled our system for X", right? Our students are bringing a little better fluency, that digital nativeness that they have. I do think, not to push back on what you said, Nikki, but I do think that there is something to them having more of a facility with the technological tools and are able to think differently.

When I was a young, legal services lawyer doing eviction cases in New York City, I would hear my colleagues walking down the hall saying, "Hey, does anyone have a defense in an eviction case of waiver?" "Oh, hey, does anyone have a repair and deduct defense?" And I said, "Hey folks, what if we created a single template of all of the possible defenses that you might have in an eviction case, and we could have it in a shared place on the server. And anytime you wanted to do a defense, instead of trying to pull all these things together, you could just cross out the things you don't need?" And it was like, boom, you know, this major lighting strike in the office.

And I was 25 at the time, with no great facility with tech. I think I was really good at Word Perfect, in fact, but I think that it's this generation of students who are coming up and looking around and saying "there's a better way to do this", and I really encourage students to do that. Obviously, they have to get the approval of their supervisors when they embark on something like that, but I think it's generally been met very favorably by their supervisors. I don't know if others have similar experience?

Matthew D'Amore:

Oh, Nikki, you're muted.

Nicola Shaver:

Yeah. To be clear, students in my class build applications. Of course, I believe and I think what I said is I think it's critical that they understand what is feasible with the technology and they have a fluency and an understanding of when and where that technology is relevant, how it can be used, and how it should be used. I just don't feel that all lawyers across the board need to learn to code. I think working in no-code tools is something that increasingly will happen in practice. I recognize this is likely different in pro bono environments and civil aid environments, but certainly in firms- having lawyers spend their time actually building the technology tools is not necessarily ideal, but having them understand how to use those tools, when they're relevant, when to leverage them in their practice, is critical. I really think it's a critical skill of the future.

Raymond Brescia:

So the only point I was just… I agree 100%. The only point I was disagreeing with you was the sense that newer lawyers, you said that they're not necessarily better with the tech. I think that there's just a little more fluency than the gray beards, for those of us with beards.

Jonathan Askin:

If I could add one piece to that, I feel like we are living right at the moment, right at that inflection point, right before Apple and Microsoft invented the user interface, all right? So it's still not quite ready for prime time, but we are just moments away from that easy user interface that any lawyer can do, and any lawyer could do really well, as long as they bring the substantive knowledge, the procedural knowledge, and play with a nicer ... Look, I think Afterpattern's terrific, I think Bryter's terrific, I think they're doing amazing things, varying degrees of complexity, but they're going to create a better interface for us soon enough.

Matthew D'Amore:

Yeah. I mean, the point you're making, right, is that we've got this technological challenge of "to what extent do we need to have students learn the nuts and bolts of programming and coding?" We have a sort of higher-order challenge, which some folks have alluded to in the chat, of being able to use and manage emerging technology to manage risks, to understand when it's providing useful information and when it's not, to be able to provide insight to the developers so that they can put guardrails around the use of these tools, as Samuel's doing. I mean, right now, you'll ask Bing or ChatGPT for legal guidance, and you'll get three good answers and one thing that it made up. It did make up a reference the other day. It gave me a fake Amazon link and everything. It was really scary. So, you're right, we're not quite there for prime time. It may be that we'll be there soon. It may also be that five years ago we thought we were going to have autonomous cars in 60 days, or autonomous vehicles in 60 days, and we're not there yet either.

A number of you have alluded to the connection between this work and the legal services organizations, right? And it's one thing, Nikki, as you've described, right, at the large firm, when you were at the firm, you had the ability to pay for tools and pay for the implementation of those tools, pay to train folks on them, and integrate them from a process perspective. Legal aid organizations don't necessarily have those resources to be able to pay for these things. So there is potentially a role for classes in programs like ours, through a clinical-type model, to provide some development support, to be able to build some of these legal information or document generation applications. Let me ask you first- do we think that's a role law schools should be playing, or is that just simply not feasible? Jonathan, let's start with you.

Jonathan Askin:

Yeah. Well, I think it's been a terrific process for us, exactly on that regard. Frankly, I think I may owe this to this conference. This conference, several years ago I think, I was there with Kevin Mulcahy from Neota Logic and the folks from LIFT, who are now the Family Legal Care Center. The three of us essentially came together and realized the three of us could actually work together and build something significant for family law vetting. So, it requires the community, and a community like this to do it. Now, every experience we've had with the nonprofits that we've been connected to have been terrific for us. What's been good is we had the latitude of time, the luxury of time, so it took us a long time to build what LIFT ultimately wanted for us.

We're now… we've got a grant from the American Family Dreams Foundation to build out a citizen reentry tool set, a whole suite of tools to help folks reenter society from incarceration, but we are fortunate in that we don't have deadlines, necessarily. So, we've spent the better part of a year and a half building out cool stuff and making it reiterative and reiterative on top of that. I don't think the nonprofits in the commercial world have that luxury. So, there is a place for us to do a couple things, prototype quickly and build reiteratively, and make mistakes along the way.

Matthew D'Amore:

And are you doing that through your justice lab?

Jonathan Askin:

Mostly through our justice lab, yeah. A little bit of BLIP clinic connection, but really it's our justice lab. Yep. Ray, what about you?

Raymond Brescia:

Well, I think that I try to partner with legal services organizations almost all the time, with all of the work that we do. I think that the luxury of time is not something that the legal services offices say that they have, and the academic calendar doesn't always fit well with the needs of the clients, right, and the legal services offices. I'm working on one potential project and being told, "Well, maybe we can look at this with an academic partner. Maybe fall of 2024 we could start looking at this." And these projects- my experience is it usually takes about a year to 18 months to develop. So, I'm saying like, "Oh, wait a minute. So, this project, we may not get off the ground until spring of 2026?" Which you've got clients along the way who are not going to be served because of that academic calendar. So, it's something that we have to work with. We have a different cycle and process than legal services offices have.

But generally speaking, partnering with legal services offices has been terrific, and even more so, partnering with consumers. So, we have brought in, we've done beta testing. Ideation starts with conversations with the legal services offices. How can we help? Is there a need that we might be able to fill? And then as we start to iterate, we do beta testing, we bring in the consumers and the legal services lawyers to help us make things better.

We also, with one of our initiatives, I told you before about our nonprofit document assembly tool, we re-changed the whole model based on those conversations, is that originally it was going to be a B2C initiative. It was going to be a document assembly tool that consumers could use directly. And then we changed the model completely based on the feedback we received. And now, if you're a lawyer in New York State, if you say you're representing a nonprofit to help them get incorporated, you can email me, get these document assembly tools, get the keys to the document assembly tools kingdom, but we don't release it to the wild, we don't allow it consumers to just have it.

We were convinced by lawyers, very passionate and sincere argument, as to why we shouldn't. I think it was partially also out of self-preservation, is that they felt that they were going to be cleaning up the mess that some of these pro se applicants might bring back to them, “oh, they messed up their filing.” But honestly, with their feedback, we changed the model. It's now exclusively B2B, which we haven't really talked about. You intimated at it early on, Matthew, when you're doing a B2B project where lawyers are going to be using your tool, that eliminates the unauthorized practices of law issue, right?

Matthew D’Amore:

Right.

Raymond Brescia:

If you've got a tool that's out there, that a licensed lawyer is using it, they are taking responsibility for their actions, right? So, there is no unauthorized practice of law issue when you're doing B2B. And that's something that we have taken to heart and we provide resources to consumers, but we also provide resources to other lawyers, giving them explainers, giving them the bases of a PowerPoint that they can give to train people on, for example, the federal limits on when a nonprofit can lobby. So, I'll stop there. I hope it was responsive, but we don't operate in a vacuum. We always work with legal services practitioners and consumers.

Matthew D’Amore:

Jonathan, one minute, and then I want to move us on to our further AI discussion.

Jonathan Askin:

Yeah, so I just want to express one frustration. And that frustration is that too often… this happens, I think, at the law school level, it happens with the legal hackers community, it happens at the nonprofit level, we're all working in this vacuum. So, I know that my students and I might build a prototype of something and don't know what to do with it. So, I think there's a golden opportunity for, it's the Permanent Commission or it's LawHelp or it's CALI to create a bulletin board, a matchmaking service. I mean, there is a lot of pent-up energy among law students to want to tackle these tasks. If there were a matchmaking services, so we can go to the Permanent Commission's website and say this nonprofit is posted, we want some students to build X, Y, or Z, well, we would go there and grab it. I think there'd be a battle among law schools to grab it.

Raymond Brescia:

Yeah.

Matthew D’Amore:

Nikki, you want to touch on that?

Nicola Shaver:

On this, I know… oh, sorry, I know we need to move on, but just jumping on that point from Jonathan, in terms of the energy that law students exude, I think, when they're working on these projects. For Legaltech Hub, in mapping the legal tech industry and ecosystem globally, one of the things we've been able to see is how does it evolve jurisdiction to jurisdiction? And inevitably, what comes first is student activity, so it's really interesting. I mean, it serves the community. It also generates legal technology

products and greater innovation that then, again, serves the ecosystem. So, there's a wonderful thing that happens when students are involved in genuine projects. And I just want to also throw out there to anyone listening, I have not yet connected my students to any organizations, but many of the solutions they come up with address problems that they see. So, if anyone would like to partner with me and my students, feel free to drop me a line, and I'd be interested in pursuing that.

Matthew D'Amore:

Thanks. So, I guess rapid fire: what do we do about AI? How do we teach that as part of our legal tech curriculum, or is it too early to begin doing that? Nikki, you're first.

Nicola Shaver:

It's critical. It's critical. Genuinely, we've reached an inflection point with the new, advanced, large language models. Large language models have been about since 2018, but in the last six months, this development has significantly changed things. One thing just to throw out there- the generic products that you're seeing on the market, ChatGPT, and the GPT series generally, from OpenAI, many of you will know this, but recognize that there are limitations and risks involved in those. They have not been engineered in order to, for example, eliminate the hallucinations that some were talking about on some of the previous panels or to have specific information about the law. They haven't been verticalized for the law. They're not secure for client information. There are a number of different risks involved in using them.

What we're seeing in the market is all kinds of legal technology companies verticalizing this technology specifically for legal purposes and eliminating the risk of hallucinations, so instead coming back and saying "I don't know the answer", or "the answer is not in the database of material at which I have been focused." So, these products are coming out that are probably going to change the way that lawyers work in a very, very significant way. And I think it is not too early at any stage to be introducing the lawyers of the future to that technology. It should really underpin most courses, in one way or another, at law schools.

Matthew D'Amore:

Thanks, Nikki. Ray?

Raymond Brescia:

Yeah. I think that there's almost no area of the law that's not going to be touched by artificial intelligence. I think no matter what substantive area you're teaching, you've got to incorporate it into it. I also go back to the example of my housing court answer. You could presumably, at some point, and probably if not now, very soon, say write me an Answer in housing court for John Smith who lives at 600 West 187th Street, who wants to claim that they paid the rent, they have these following conditions, and the landlord waived the objections, and it will generate a nice, five-page Answer for you. Obviously, the lawyer has to check over that, but I think we're going to see that more and more getting incorporated into these sort of high-volume practice areas for sure.

Matthew D'Amore:

Excellent. Jonathan?

Jonathan Askin:

So about 12 years ago, two MIT engineers came to me and my students, and they asked us to help them to build a platform- a repository of mutable, open source, free legal documents. They wanted us to populate it. And for two minutes, I said, "Are you crazy? You want us to help you build something that's going to destroy the livelihood of my students coming out of law school?" And it took about two minutes for me to realize it's inevitable, and obviously we see it's inevitable now. So my conclusion, through that experience, is that we are doing a disservice to our law students, we are doing a disservice to the justice system, we are doing a disservice to society, if we are not embracing it now. What we've got to figure out is how we partner with it, how we become the ethical layer, the judgment layer, that partners with the AI and shapes it. That is only going to happen from the legal community, those trained in legal reasoning.

Matthew D'Amore:

Excellent. And…

Raymond Brescia:

And to think that…

Matthew D'Amore:

Go ahead, Ray.

Raymond Brescia:

…lawyers don't use technology is preposterous. Lawyers use technology in almost everything that they do. And to say, oh, we can't incorporate technology more in our practice, it's just not accurate.

Matthew D'Amore:

I think, as we've seen… I'm looking at a number of comments from the chat. Who takes the bar exam, the lawyer or the AI? Well, it's still going to be the lawyer, although they have tested the AI on it, right? But I think the point is, right, the AI will challenge a lot of our senses of what lawyers do and how they operate. Hopefully it will change how we train at the large firms, it'll change how we train our junior lawyers at the legal services organizations, I'm sure it's going to change how you're training your junior lawyers. I think something we all have to keep our eye on is that as we see these more verticalized solutions that Nikki was talking about, continuing to work to make sure that they're accessible to this community.

I mean, this community has had partnerships with Bryter and Neota Logic. They've had the partnership through A2J Author and CALI, and while many of these large language models are open source, and Dean Greg (Morrisett) mentioned that the folks here at Cornell Tech are working on building some open source tools in this regard, the verticalization is going to be a for-profit model over the foreseeable future. And coming up with ways to be… because where this tool, it seems to me, is going to be really transformative is in the ability of this community to provide information to a whole host of people and really scale up their service provided, at least at that initial level, right, and then how we can help move that forward in a way to ensure that this technology is available to all.

Panel, thank you so much for your time and your energy, your enthusiasm, your knowledge, and your insights on this important topic. I look forward to continuing to work with you all, and I look forward to

the rest of the conference. Folks who are coming up- so we are at a breaking point for the conference. This is the end of the plenary sessions for today. So, give me a second…

Raymond Brescia:

I think we call that an inflection point, Matthew. We don't call it a breaking point.

Matthew D'Amore:

What do they call it?

Raymond Brescia:

An inflection point, not a breaking point.

Matthew D'Amore:

Oh, all right, fair, fair. So, the technology moderator has pointed out, has put the agenda in the chat. The agenda is now in the chat, and the agenda is where you will find the links to the breakout sessions that you'll want to go to, so please check that out. Those sessions will begin at 3:30. I'm also going to put in the chat, once again, the CLE form. I believe, from looking at the form, you can use one form for multiple sessions. You don't need to fill out the form separately for every session. That's not immediately apparent from the first page, but once you get to the second page, you'll see that you can add a couple of sessions. I will note that it did ask me for my bar number, so I couldn't fill it out because I have no idea what it is and I'm going to have to look it up.

But again, thanks panel, and thanks participants, for listening in and head off to your breakout sessions. Take care everyone.

Raymond Brescia:

Take care, everybody.

Nicola Shaver:

Thank you.