The DATA REVOLUTION

Charlotte Alexander leads Georgia State’s Legal Analytics Lab
First look | Swearing-in ceremonies
Ninety-one alumni took their oaths for the Superior Court of Georgia, the Georgia Court of Appeals and/or the Supreme Court of Georgia at the 19th annual Swearing-In Ceremonies on Nov. 17, 2017.
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LEGAL EDUCATION AND THE PRACTICE OF LAW are undergoing significant changes. Advances in artificial intelligence, machine learning, programming, high-performance computing and other forms of technology are transforming the way attorneys conduct research, evaluate cases and interact with clients. To date, few law schools have made any effort to adapt their curriculum to prepare for this new reality. Leading the way for both students and the bar, the College of Law is actively engaged in anticipating and influencing how this new reality will impact the legal profession.

Our cover story tells of our partnership with Robinson College of Business to establish the Legal Analytics Lab, which combines the expertise of the Robinson faculty in unstructured data analytics with the legal expertise of College of Law faculty. Legal research that in the past would have required hundreds of hours and significant resources now can be done in a fraction of the time with a higher degree of accuracy. Under the leadership of associate professor Charlotte Alexander, the lab has developed a robust research program, fostered multiple collaborations and engaged with outside partners to tackle real legal challenges. Our emerging legal analytics curriculum and joint-degree programs will teach students to exploit these tools to solve client problems in ways never before conceived.

Our alumni already are experiencing changes occasioned by technology on the front lines of the profession. On page 20, Johnny Lee (J.D. ’99) and Todd De Jong (J.D. ’09) discuss the challenges of e-discovery and digital forensics, as well as newly emerging areas of specialization for attorneys. Kris Niedringhaus, our associate dean of library and information services, highlights the inevitable ethical challenges that will arise out of the increased use of artificial intelligence on page 16. Also, be sure to note on page 15 how the college is using data analytics to ensure our students reach the highest level of success. By identifying patterns in student achievement, we can intervene quickly when problems arise and help every student pass the bar successfully.

I have often heard it said that law schools have changed more in the last ten years than they did in the previous 100. Looking ahead to the next ten years, it’s fair to say that we haven’t seen anything yet! Fortunately, with Georgia State Law’s entrepreneurial spirit and enthusiastic approach to change, there has never been a more exciting time to teach the next generation. We look forward to partnering with you as we encounter the future.

Wendy F. Hensel
Dean and Professor of Law
Hensel named dean of college

Georgia State University named Professor Wendy Fritzen Hensel dean of the College of Law on Nov. 15, after a nationwide dean search. Hensel had been serving as interim dean since Steven J. Kaminshine stepped down in June.

“The continued success of the College of Law is essential to many dimensions of our university’s strategic plan,” said Risa Palm, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. “President Becker and I are excited to have Wendy serve in this capacity and welcome her to our leadership team. We have great confidence in her ability to lead the college through the coming years.”

“It is a true privilege to chart the strategic course of this school over the coming years,” Hensel said. “Georgia State is a leader in legal education and has the insight and expertise necessary to prepare our students for a changing profession.”

Hensel called the college innovative and entrepreneurial in a way that is unique among law schools, adding that faculty and staff are willing to take risks and try new things to provide the best for students.

“Georgia State will play a significant role not only in training the next generation of talented lawyers, but in helping the legal profession transition to new ways of practice as artificial intelligence increasingly enters the marketplace,” Hensel said. “Our new Legal Analytics Lab reflects our commitment to infusing our curriculum with the latest methodologies and areas of focus to ensure student success.”

Georgia State Law has always been and will always be a school that prioritizes its students and their success, Hensel said.

“To do that, we must identify where the profession is headed and position ourselves ahead of the changes rather than responding as they arise,” she said.

Hensel has served in various academic roles at the college since 1999. In addition to her teaching and research duties, she was associate dean for research and faculty development from spring 2012 through summer 2017. Prior to her academic career, she was an associate at Alston & Bird, clerked for Judge Orinda Evans in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia and worked as an intern with the administrative unit at the U.S. Supreme Court.

Hensel graduated from Michigan State University and earned her J.D. at Harvard Law School. Her research interests include disability, education, employment and tort law.

Judge Rich hears case with Georgia Supreme Court

Superior Court Judge Randolph “Randy” G. Rich (J.D. ’92) of the Gwinnett Judicial Circuit served in place of Justice Michael P. Boggs in the appeal of Hines v. State (S17G0024) before the Supreme Court of Georgia on Nov. 13.

“Being asked to sit on the Georgia Supreme Court is probably the biggest honor I could ever receive as a judge,” said Rich, who will participate in the court’s decision.

Designated judges are appointed when a justice must recuse himself or herself.

Rich was appointed to the Superior Court in May 2014 and was reelected in 2016. A native of Gwinnett County, Rich presides over the Gwinnett Drug Court and the Gwinnett Business Court. He serves as a master on the Bleckley Inn of Court and has taught as an adjunct law professor at Georgia State Law, Emory University School of Law and John Marshall Law School.
Alumnae receive Law and Justice awards

Ana Maria Martinez (J.D. ’09) and Phi Nguyen (J.D. ’09) were named 2017 Law & Justice Women of the Year Honorees by Women Works Media Group, in recognition of their devotion to public interest. Nguyen, litigation director, Asian Americans Advancing Justice—Atlanta, focuses on impact litigation in the areas of voting rights and immigrant rights. She also works collaboratively with the Southern Poverty Law Center and other advocacy organizations to provide direct support to immigrants detained at Stewart Detention Center. In 2016, she spearheaded Vietnamese Voices, an initiative to increase voter outreach and education among Atlanta’s Vietnamese-American community.

“Asian-American lawyers are not often steered in the direction of public interest law either by our parents or our communities. Instead, we are generally encouraged to pursue big-law jobs and in-house counsel positions. I hope that my own story helps to change that narrative,” Nguyen said.

Martinez is staff attorney for Judge Dax E. López in the State Court of DeKalb County. She co-founded and is president of the Georgia Latino Law Foundation (GLLF), an organization dedicated to increasing diversity in the legal profession and the Latino community’s access to the legal system.

“Public service is important to me because I believe we all have an obligation to reach back and pull forward those who come after us. Ultimately, the best way to elevate our profession is to make sure we are taking care of all of our members,” Martinez said.

Read more at law.gsu.edu/Martinez-Nguyen-honored.

Lawlor helps LL.M. students hone communication skills

As LL.M. students work on court briefs in their Lawyering Skills class, Leila Lawlor (J.D. ’95) and her co-instructor John Bunting, an applied linguistics and ESL lecturer, share writing tips.

The students hail from more than 10 countries where the rule of law—and the language—are often different than the U.S. legal system. They are enrolled in one of the law school’s more unusual cross-curricular courses, combining linguistics and U.S. law.

“For many of our students, English is the second—or third, or fourth—language,” Lawlor said. “The majority are trained in civil law and are unfamiliar with the U.S. legal system. That’s where this LL.M. course bridges the gap. Our program is designed to help them hone their legal communication skills as well as help them qualify to sit for the bar exam,” said Lawlor, who studied applied linguistics and became certified as a TESOL teacher to prepare for the class.

The approach appeals to Serge Luhaga (LL.M. ’18) from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

“The U.S. legal system presents many innovations that seem contrary to the civil law, making it a little challenging for Congolese lawyers,” Luhaga said. “Legal writing, and at some degree legal reasoning, learned in this class provide me with a blueprint to follow in understanding the U.S. legal system.”

Read more at law.gsu.edu/Lawlor-LLM-linguistics.

Morokuma honored for leadership in dispute resolution

Shinji Morokuma (J.D. ’98) was honored by the Georgia Supreme Court’s Commission on Dispute Resolution (GDOR) in recognition of his dedicated leadership as the executive director from 2005 to 2016.

“Shinji distinguished himself as the great ambassador for dispute resolution in the state of Georgia,” said Judge Charles Auslander III, chair of the Commission on Dispute Resolution. “He is recognized statewide for his contributions to the field, which include establishing new court programs in areas of need and the ethics and advisory opinions he authored that help to guide the professionals that practice in our state.”

Morokuma became interested in alternative dispute resolution (ADR) while working as a summer associate.

“ADR seemed to me a more sensible, productive and human way to resolve lawsuits that were fundamentally human disputes,” he said. “So I focused my remaining years of law school on studying ADR with Professor Douglas H. Yarn. Because Georgia State Law was a pioneer in offering ADR instruction, I was able to work in my chosen field right out of law school.”

“Shinji successfully shepherded the Georgia Office of Dispute Resolution through some of its most challenging times. He has shaped court-connected dispute resolution in Georgia as much as anyone,” Yarn said.

Morokuma oversaw more than 45 court alternative dispute resolution programs statewide and 2,000 registered neutrals. During his tenure, the GODR moved from being administratively attached to the Supreme Court to operating more independently.
Concentrations added to LL.M. program

Georgia State Law is adding two concentrations, Intellectual Property Law and Environmental and Land-Use Law, to its master of laws (LL.M.) program in August.

These concentrations join the Health Law, General Studies and Foreign-Trained Lawyer tracks.

“Our new domestic LL.M concentrations are tied to significant and growing areas of the U.S. economy that demand highly educated attorneys,” said Wendy F. Hensel, dean and professor of law. “These advanced degrees will provide graduates with the expertise they need to solve complex problems in specific areas and will lead to broader employment opportunities.”

Roy Sobelson, program director and professor of law, said Georgia State Law has strong faculty and multiple courses in each of the concentrations, which will allow attorneys to enhance their knowledge and/or skills.

With Atlanta on pace to be the sixth largest metropolitan area in the country by 2040, Georgia State Law is an ideal setting in which to study environmental and land-use laws, said Karen Johnston (J.D. ’08), assistant director of the college’s Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth. “As a city grappling with rapid growth and development, Atlanta provides a living laboratory for students to examine solutions to pressing issues such as transportation and affordable housing challenges, inequality, pollution and pressures on natural resources,” she said.

In the Intellectual Property Law concentration, students will learn how to apply foundational legal concepts in diverse intellectual property (IP) settings, including litigation, transactional work and prosecution.

“The LL.M. will open up our robust IP curriculum to practitioners who want to expand their understanding in this growing field of law,” said Yaniv Heled, associate professor of law and co-director of the college’s Center for Intellectual Property.

The concentration in Health Law, which began in August, offers classes across a range of topics in a complex field. The health law program is ranked nationally in the top ten. Its Center for Law, Health and Society has 12 full-time faculty and additional affiliated and adjunct faculty with expertise in areas spanning all aspects of health law.

To learn more, visit law.gsu.edu/US-LLM.

Lathrop recognized for service to college

Sarah Lathrop (J.D. ’13), assistant director of admissions, received the 2017 Marjorie L. Girth Staff Achievement Award, which recognizes Georgia State Law staff members who have given exceptional service to the college.

“Sarah is a joy to work with,” said Kelly Cahill Timmons, associate dean for student affairs and associate professor of law. “She always goes the extra mile to welcome our incoming students and help with their transition to law school.”

Lathrop works with prospective and admitted students in all aspects of the application process through matriculation.

“I really love working with the students and representing the law school,” Lathrop said. “I am happy and honored to do my best in whatever small part I have in helping the school grow and flourish.”

Students assist renters facing eviction

“A stable home is the cornerstone of holding people together,” said Jessica Hunt Bareis (J.D. ’19). “If you don’t have a safe place to go at the end of the day, it’s hard to stay in school or hold a job.”

Hunt Bareis and fellow volunteers at the Housing Court Assistance Center help renters facing eviction navigate the system, allowing time to find new housing before their belongings land on the street.

The Housing Court Assistance Center grew out of the Answer Clinic, which served evicted tenants but closed when the supporting fellowship ended.

After exploring options, representatives from Georgia State Law’s Center for Access to Justice, the Atlanta Volunteer Lawyers Foundation, Lawyers for Equal Justice and the Georgia Law Center for the Homeless formed a consortium, each using their distinct roles, to continue helping tenants with evictions.

The Center for Access to Justice’s new pro bono program connects students with short-term volunteer work. “Their service allows them to develop skills and legal knowledge, but they’re also having a direct—and positive—impact on tenants’ likelihood of success in court,” said Darcy Meals, assistant director for the Center for Access to Justice.

Volunteering is gratifying for Hunt Bareis. “It’s cool to see law actually work for people,” she said.

Read more at law.gsu.edu/Housing-Court-Assistance.
In their words | Using analytics and AI in legal practice

“Now, technological proficiency is a given, and those who are truly excelling are embracing innovation.”

Sean Christy (J.D. ’06)

How do you primarily use data analytics in your work?
In my practice, the most predominant use of legal analytics is in workflow automation, document analysis and document preparation — whether it is something as simple as generating contracts through an automated workflow completed by the client or something more complicated like using software to review a markup and prepare a responsive draft based upon pre-defined parameters.

How has the use of technology in the legal field changed since you’ve been practicing law?
I came into practice at a time when it was a differentiator to be proficient with technology; most lawyers were not skilled with computers. Now, technological proficiency is a given, and those who are truly excelling are embracing innovation.

How does your firm innovate?
Like all businesses, our business runs on people, process and technology. It just so happens that the focus of my practice is helping clients better align people, process and technology to drive efficiencies and productivity in a risk-mitigated way. We leverage that competency internally within Bryan Cave to take advantage of technology tools, continual process study and redesign to deliver better, more cost-effective solutions for our clients. Technology tools like document and workflow automation and AI-driven document analytics have become part of our day-to-day, and we are now focusing on ways to innovate not only vertically with specific clients or client projects, but also horizontally across repeated/repeatable processes in individual practices and competencies. The real art is making innovation and continuous improvement an organic part of service delivery.

What are the benefits and challenges of using AI-based technology in the legal field?
One primary benefit is to take the human equation out of service delivery tasks that do not require highly skilled thought and the benefit of subjective experience, freeing up the lawyer to focus on those considerations. That benefit also presents one of the primary challenges — automating tasks requiring less subjective experience will force all of us (including law firms and institutions of legal education) to rethink how we train young lawyers so that they gain the experience needed to deliver services at the top of the pyramid that are not ripe for automation and machine learning.

Were there any Georgia State Law classes that were particularly helpful in what you do now?
As a transactional attorney who deals in large-scale technology and other strategic services contracts, I received a foundation in contract law at Georgia State that has proven invaluable. However, the real differentiator I see in myself and in others that we recruit and hire from Georgia State is the practical skillset that graduates seem to possess in higher proportion relative to their peer group. Georgia State produces lawyers who know how to communicate and engage with clients in a meaningful way early on in their careers.

A partner at Bryan Cave, Sean Christy (J.D. ’06) is a business and legal adviser to companies in the following areas: complex business process outsourcing and information technology outsourcing transactions; strategic IT products and services; software licensing, maintenance and development agreements, including software as a service (SaaS) and cloud computing arrangements; internet-related and other technology-based service agreements.
What about the fear that robots will take over the practice of law?

Lawyers will become more dependent on technology over time. There will be some tasks that lawyers will no longer do and computers can do well, like creating form documents. But computers are not with us yet in being able to look at a situation, evaluate the people involved and chart a strategy based on that. A machine can augment what a lawyer does in some ways, but a computer cannot advocate, be passionate and zealously represent a client in the way a person can.

How do clients feel about receiving AI-assisted services?

Most clients I work with are frustrated that law firms are not moving more rapidly to innovate. The firms who are willing to partner with clients around these issues and look for ways to be more efficient and to have things cost less with better results will be the most successful.

Lisa “Lee” Schreter (J.D. ’91)

How do you primarily use AI and/or data analytics in your work?

Data analytics will be the great disruptor and differentiator for lawyers. That is particularly true in my practice, which is mostly concentrated in complex employment litigation, primarily class and collective actions. Data about the class, the claims, the jurisdiction and the individuals who are bringing these lawsuits can be the difference between a winning case and a losing one.

In addition, the more information you can gather about your adversary, the better prepared you will be for how they will approach discovery and litigation. You can get an idea of when they will think about settlement and even how much they usually settle for in similar cases. People tend to repeat things, and once you begin to discern the patterns, you can think about how to disrupt them.

Data also enables me to educate clients on what to expect. If a particular lawyer has consistently settled similar cases at a specific per claimant amount, that information helps estimate the settlement value of the case.

We are well on our way to being able to provide our clients with predictive analytics about case outcomes. If you have a case similar to one brought by a particular lawyer in a certain part of the country with the same judge, based on analytics we can predict the length of the case, the cost range and the possible outcome. That kind of information offers the power of prediction, and we serve our clients best when we can accurately predict outcomes and cost.

What are the benefits of using AI-based technology in the practice of law?

Technology has made information that was once difficult to discover more accessible. It also has capabilities that are hard to replicate across a team of lawyers. Some document review programs allow you to organize and synthesize information in a way that I think is virtually impossible to repeat in an affordable way for the average client. Twenty years ago we would have five lawyers on a big case. You would train everyone what to look for, but it was difficult to ensure that every lawyer evaluated a document in the same way.

AI helps you do some things in a more efficient way that drives down the cost, particularly in my kind of litigation.

What are some challenges?

Technology is far from perfect. Some worry that data collected on them is going to be misused. I think that can be a legitimate concern, but it’s something that can be addressed and dealt with. Part of our responsibility in representing clients is to ensure data is used in an appropriate, ethical and lawful way.

Other challenges arise from the reluctance to adopt new things. Part of the solution lies in making sure lawyers understand the technology. I have found that the adopters far outnumber the naysayers once people understand the powerfully predictive value of data.

What about the fear that robots will take over the practice of law?

Lawyers will become more dependent on technology over time. There will be some tasks that lawyers will no longer do and computers can do well, like creating form documents. But computers are not with us yet in being able to look at a situation, evaluate the people involved and chart a strategy based on that. A machine can augment what a lawyer does in some ways, but a computer cannot advocate, be passionate and zealously represent a client in the way a person can.

How do clients feel about receiving AI-assisted services?

Most clients I work with are frustrated that law firms are not moving more rapidly to innovate. The firms who are willing to partner with clients around these issues and look for ways to be more efficient and to have things cost less with better results will be the most successful.

Lee Schreter (J.D. ’91) is co-chair of the Wage and Hour Practice Group at Littler Mendelson and former chair of Littler’s board of directors. She focuses on representing employers in complex class and collective actions involving wage-related claims.
The DATA REVOLUTION

by Ray Glier
LEGAL ANALYTICS LAB
ON THE FOREFRONT OF THE
NEW DISRUPTER IN LAW
Harrison “Harry” Alex (J.D. ’19) heard the warning sighs from his circle of friends after he graduated from Wofford College and declared his intention to attend law school. “Are you sure about that?” they cautioned. The job market for lawyers is saturated, they reminded him, and hiring is still soft.

But Alex chose law school, and he chose it over medicine — the family business. “My dad is a dentist, my stepdad is a plastic surgeon, my stepmom is a dental hygienist, and my stepsister is a lab tech for a dermatologist,” said Alex. “Me, I guess I’m the black sheep.”

Alex, 24, could end up looking like a wickedly smart black sheep. He is in his second year at Georgia State Law and is focusing on the new disrupter in law: data analytics. What data collection did in revolutionizing baseball (think the bestseller, *Moneyball*) could happen for law as well.

“It is a huge market right now,” Alex said. “It’s so new that no one knows how big it is going to be. Everyone wants to be in it, and no one wants to be left out. Legal analytics has the potential to be one of the next big things.”

CHARLOTTE ALEXANDER, an associate professor of legal studies in the Department of Risk Management and Insurance at the J. Mack Robinson College of Business with a secondary appointment at the College of Law, is leading the charge down this path for law students. Alexander is director of the university’s new Legal Analytics Lab, which brings business and legal scholars together with data scientists to take on legal problems and questions using data analytics tools.

Alexander is developing a data analytics course for fall 2018, and there is also a push to have a joint degree in law and business with a focus on data mining for lawyers.

Since its launch in October, Alexander has been meeting with law firms throughout Metro Atlanta to discuss possible projects and uses for the lab. She’s noticed a common thread. “Almost every meeting involves somebody on the other side of the table saying, ‘Send us your students; we want students who are trained across analytics and law.’ We are meeting a need, particularly given the difficulties in the legal labor market. We will provide a set of skills to students that they can use in a direct way,” Alexander said.

The data analytics lab exists under the umbrella of the Institute for Insight, which provides the quantitative firepower for a variety of disciplines around campus. Now, the law school is joining the party.

**EVEN IN THIS INTERNET GENERATION**, law has lagged behind other industries in the ability to gain insights from data analytics. And as the legal field embarks into the world of AI and analytics, questions will continue to arise — for example, will data analysts be authorized to practice law? But for now, Alexander is giving Georgia State Law some traction in the new law skills.

“The purpose of the lab is to bring advances in data analytics to bear on legal questions and problems,” she said. “There have been massive steps forward in computer science and data science, particularly in the area of analyzing unstructured data (documents, PDFs). One step is how to extract information from that raw material and use it to learn about patterns. Another step is to take that learning and turn it into predictive models.”

Using data analytics, lawyers can ask questions and get answers in a more efficient manner. Instead of sifting through...
thousands of pages of documents, a computer can apply filters to cut through clutter.

A lawyer can know a little bit about where they stand in a case with analytics before they enter the courtroom, or even whether they should enter the courtroom — student lawyers will learn that data can preempt frivolous filings.

While the curriculum is being developed, Alexander and her law students will do a sprint, or short-term collaboration, with local firm Barrett & Farahany. Teams of law students and teams of master students in analytics, along with faculty, will mine data and see if they can forecast outcomes in employment lawsuits.

It is a streetwise learning model, which is keeping with the Georgia State culture.

“If algorithms are going to be one of the lawyer’s tools in a toolkit, then we want our graduates to have that tool,” said Alexander, who earned her law degree from Harvard. “Our law school has always been good at preparing graduates for the practice of law, and we see this lab as a natural extension of that historical strength.”

**ANALYTICS ARE ALSO VALUABLE** to lawyers outside of litigation. Firms that handle mergers and acquisitions or patent filings can make themselves more efficient with data, Alexander said. Skill with data can also mean wider opportunity for Georgia State Law graduates and a truly sustainable law degree.

Taimur Ghaznavi (J.D. ’11) is a manager in the Forensics Technology and Discovery Services group for Ernst & Young. His group helps companies and law firms solve complex problems related to litigation, investigations, data analytics and cyber incident response.

“Our goal is to find those needles in a haystack while also organizing that haystack into nice, little, searchable piles,” Ghaznavi said. “The haystacks are getting bigger, and we can’t just keep throwing more people at it. We have to leverage advanced technology and methodologies to help find those needles more quickly and efficiently.

“We help make the attorneys’ lives easier by reducing the time it takes to sift through data, so they can focus on higher-value tasks like analyzing and interpreting the data for their clients. Being an attorney myself allows me to bridge that gap between the technical side of the house and the legal ramifications.”

And here is where the law school comes in, Ghaznavi said. Law students need to be trained how to mine that data and interpret it correctly within legal boundaries.

Training in data analytics also gives legal job-seekers a competitive edge. There are three to four qualified J.D.s for every position, Ghaznavi said. Expertise in analytics can help differentiate you and get you in the door, as well as give you traction once inside.

“The most tech-savvy, sophisticated associates are being given the reins on some of these big projects,” Ghaznavi said. “They understand the technology and how it can further their legal strategy. Meanwhile, you still have senior partners who want every document printed out, red-lined and scanned back in. It’s only a matter of time before client demands force them to leave these outdated practices behind.

“If a client comes to them and asks, ‘Hey, what are you doing to make sure we’re not back in the Stone Age and are doing this in the most efficient way possible?’ the senior partners don’t necessarily always have the answers, but they will look to their associates for expertise in this area. Being trained on the right tools and methodologies can get you invited to client or strategy meetings that you otherwise wouldn’t. I have even seen paralegals brought in to decision-making meetings, just because they can speak the language and understand the tools.”

**WILL THE DATA ANALYTICS PATHWAY** automatically create smarter lawyers? Maybe not, but it will likely create better-informed and more-efficient lawyers.
The ability to find patterns that a lawyer may not have thought to look for and would not find without looking at enough information is a powerful tool. And it can be done quickly, searching cases across the continent. “We are focused on the analytical part of it,” Alexander said. “We’re analyzing the kind of data we can extract from legal documents that previously couldn’t be extracted in bulk.”

Alexander ticks off the questions data analytics can answer: “What patterns are there that can be identified? What predictions can be made? What can we learn by the way the law operates? What can we learn about the way litigation happens by analyzing new data and different data?”

She wants Georgia State Law grads to be able to answer those questions.

While Alexander is excited about the possibilities of data analytics, she is not blowing a mighty trumpet. She understands there are limits and gray areas — data will not convert to black and white, right and wrong, winner and loser. Data collection will not conquer all and replace the keen skills of a lawyer or improve the merits of a case on its own. “The best way to think about our lab is not so much as a lab, but as a think tank in some ways,” Alexander said. “We’re experimenting and trying to figure out how far we can push these tools to find insights and to question how reliable the insights are. How good is the data that’s available? If the data set is biased in some ways, say the lawyering is really bad, then do we want to predict an outcome based on bad lawyering? So, I try to be careful not to oversell these tools. There are things data can’t capture.”

Alex, who minored in business and accounting, is willing to bet on the numbers. He sees the career possibilities waiting for him.

Ramsi Woodcock, assistant professor, is trying to determine if legal documents, in particular court opinions, really provide reliable guidance on how judges will rule in particular cases. “Combined with work in psychology that has identified words and phrases typically associated with obfuscation, analytics promises to help us determine whether judges and lawyers are honest about their motivations in making certain legal arguments.”

Doug Yarn, professor of law, will focus on the predictive uses of data in alternative dispute resolution, including how attorneys and mediators use data to assess the risk of trial versus settlement. He also hopes to find a way to mine data from arbitration proceedings. “Analyzing that data will lead to more informed decisions about whether to go to arbitration.”

Read more about Charlotte Alexander’s project for the U.S. Department of Labor to study federal district court misclassification, using data analytics to understand how the courts distinguish between employees and independent contractors, and the factors influencing their decisions.

law.gsu.edu/alexander-labor-grant

“I think the big accounting firms are going to push to incorporate law students into the consulting services they offer,” he said. “One of the things I have been researching for Professor Alexander is identifying job opportunities. A lot of law firms and accounting firms are using analytics to find patterns in litigation and make forecasts.

“People don’t know exactly what is going to fill the bubble that burst in law with the recession, but legal analytics might be the next step.”
Data analytics may help increase bar passage rates

by Stacey L. Evans (B.A. ’02)

THE DECLINE IN bar passage rates has raised many questions in legal education, including prospective students wondering whether law school is worth the investment.

“In most cases, you need to pass the bar in order to get a job. So if law schools can’t improve bar pass rates, it will affect enrollment,” said Jessica Gabel Cino, associate dean for academic affairs and associate professor of law.

To address the problem, Georgia State Law is developing a program using data analytics to identify early warning signs for bar failure and to target interventions for at-risk students.

“Since the university has become the leader in this area, we thought we could benefit from that institutional knowledge,” Cino said.

Georgia State University has been lauded for its successful use of predictive analytics in student retention and improving grades. The College of Law is taking a similar approach and will examine data such as the grades, classes taken and bar passage rates of its roughly 1,750 students enrolled during 2009 to 2017.

“We are starting with the entering class of 2009 because we had good bar results in 2012, 2013 and 2014, but the passage rates dropped in 2015,” Cino said. “So that gives us three years of measurable data against when things declined.”

Cino and a team of student researchers are entering the information into a database, and Georgia State’s Office of Institutional Research is designing the algorithms that will measure and help interpret the data, determining which factors correlate to bar passage and/or student academic success.

“The students’ first-year GPA is often a big indicator, also what courses they took, whether those classes cover bar subjects, and how they studied for the bar,” Cino said.

Qualitative data, such as how many pro bono hours a student had, whether they participated in clinics or took experiential classes, and if they had full- or part-time jobs, also will be examined.

“It’s difficult to say definitively how those things may factor in, especially given the number of variables,” Cino said.

After an analysis provides some insight, the college’s administration will consider curriculum changes as well as ways to tweak existing or develop new programs to facilitate better outcomes for students.

“For example, we could find that a substantial number of students who failed the bar exam did not take Constitutional Law or Corporations and also have a GPA of 2.8. So, with that information, I could approach second-year students with GPAs below 2.8 and advise them to take those classes because statistics suggest they are in danger of failing the bar,” Cino said.

Kim D’Haene, the college’s new director of academic success, will assist in developing programming and individual action plans for students.

“Data analytics can help us to identify skills, challenges and attributional factors that impact our students’ academic success. From a programming and curriculum standpoint, it allows us to more precisely target specific academic skills and to more effectively utilize student strengths,” D’Haene said.

The academic success team is also implementing and expanding programs that help students self-assess, identifying their strengths and weaknesses so they can employ the study techniques that are most effective for them. That alone can have a huge impact on their success, D’Haene said.

Emphasizing academic success in the first year of law school is key, Cino said.

“We don’t want to wait until students are ready to take the bar to say, ‘You’re in danger of failing the bar.’ We want to identify those students after the first year, and then help them make changes to ensure they are on the right track.”

D’Haene, a former grader for the Georgia Board of Examiners and a Kaplan lecturer on writing for the exam, is already working to strengthen the college’s bar-prep programming.

“In the bar exam, the amount of work that you do tends to correlate closely to outcome,” D’Haene said. “Students who complete all the assignments in the bar review course and are purposeful and strategic in their preparation have a much higher success rate.”

In addition to this analytic endeavor, Cino and Andrea Curcio, professor of law, received an AccessLex Institute/AIR grant in February to assess whether LSAT scores are a predictor of success in law school and on the bar exam. They will use the data compiled for their yearlong study.
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ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE:
Divine design? Or ‘summoning the demon?’

by Charles McNair

As with other high-tech disruptions, the use of AI in legal practice raises questions. Advocates of AI in data analytics point to its amazing speed and efficiency, compared to that of mere mortals. Proponents of AI in courtrooms believe technology can help reduce human bias by impartially, emotionlessly, analyzing cases.

But other voices raise a note of caution. They point to manmade problems with the algorithms that drive AI. After all, humans — fallible humans — create bots and algorithms. What if these people, either in error or on purpose, build in bias or mistakes? What authority controls whether AI represents superior intelligence … or whether “garbage in, garbage out” drives decisions that affect human lives?

Elon Musk, co-founder of Tesla Inc. and founder of SpaceX, warns that humankind is “summoning the demon” with AI. Kris Niedringhaus, associate dean for library and information services, thinks Musk has a point.

“I may not have stated it quite as strongly as he did,” Niedringhaus said, “but I think it’s a valid call for us to pay attention to what we’re doing. As with all advancements, AI can be used for good but could also have unintended consequences. “We simply need to be very conscious about what we’re doing.”

LAW PRACTICES ARE SEEING emergent artificial intelligence (AI) technology beginning to change their world.

It’s happening on many frontiers: web robots, or bots, aid in document search processes, sometimes analyzing millions of pages for information relevant to a proceeding. Many legal research platforms now include some form of AI technology and data analytics. Judicial officials have begun to rely on artificial intelligence to support decision-making in setting bail, paroles and even sentencing. Twenty-three states use some kind of computerized risk assessment tool in criminal processes, and in Colorado, the law requires it. The applications are almost endless.

As with other high-tech disruptions, the use of AI in legal practice raises questions.

Advocates of AI in data analytics point to its amazing speed and efficiency, compared to that of mere mortals. Proponents of AI in courtrooms believe technology can help reduce human bias by impartially, emotionlessly, analyzing cases.

But other voices raise a note of caution.

They point to manmade problems with the algorithms that drive AI. After all, humans — fallible humans — create bots and algorithms. What if these people, either in error or on purpose, build in bias or mistakes? What authority controls whether AI represents superior intelligence … or whether “garbage in, garbage out” drives decisions that affect human lives?

Elon Musk, co-founder of Tesla Inc. and founder of SpaceX, warns that humankind is “summoning the demon” with AI. Kris Niedringhaus, associate dean for library and information services, thinks Musk has a point.

“I may not have stated it quite as strongly as he did,” Niedringhaus said, “but I think it’s a valid call for us to pay attention to what we’re doing. As with all advancements, AI can be used for good but could also have unintended consequences. “We simply need to be very conscious about what we’re doing.”

Let the lawyer beware

Niedringhaus, who is vice president of the board of directors of the Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction (CALI), believes technology can be oversold.

“People think with AI you simply enter words into a magic box, and it always gives you the right answer,” she said. “We need to be careful not to embrace AI without understanding what its problems are.”

She points out that artificial intelligence isn’t autonomous intelligence.

“Attorneys who use AI must understand that they remain ethically responsible for their work,” Niedringhaus emphasized. “If your legal work rests on one of these AI technologies, and you don’t understand how it works, how do you ensure that what it has produced is correct and complete?”
Niedringhaus continued, “Lawyers are responsible for understanding all that needs to be done to properly use and maintain technology, including artificial intelligence, and they also need to be aware that algorithms inherently take on the biases of the coders. With algorithms and predictive coding or legal research, you have to make sure competent people are training the systems, and you have to be continually monitoring and maintaining them to ensure the machines are doing what they are supposed to be doing.”

In 2012, the American Bar Association added a comment to its competency rule on ethics that counsels lawyers to keep up-to-date on relevant technology, its uses in law practice and its rules of confidentiality.

“There needs to be more legal education on this,” Niedringhaus said.

Data analytics and quality control
Rose Jones (J.D. ’02) is the director of e-Discovery Project Management and Client Services for Atlanta-based King & Spalding. Her practice focuses on e-discovery management, including the development of protocols for the discovery process. Jones represents clients “with millions of files and pages who must produce key documents as part of discovery.”

She compares AI technology used for data searches to tech used by Amazon and Netflix to make recommendations to a consumer based on previous habits. The system learns as it is trained, and its trainers ultimately determine its value.

“Quality assurance is the key to data analytics,” Jones said. The best way to make AI effective in e-discovery is by “collaboration among legal teams, in-house counsel, regulatory counsel and tech counsel, with input from subject-matter experts or employees,” she said.

The more knowledgeable the people who touch the training of the AI system, she says, the more valuable the discovery.

Jones also notes AI’s challenges.

“Most lawyers and judges don’t understand the math that drives algorithms,” she said. “They can’t explain it if challenged. Others can be concerned about the level of disclosure and may worry that they’ll be asked to hand over data to show how coding was created. There’s also a misunderstanding that some privileged documents or trade secrets can be handed over without the ability to review documents before they’re disclosed.

“All these issues,” she said, “can be addressed with proper advice from an experienced attorney who practices e-discovery.”

LAST SEPTEMBER, the ACLU filed an amicus brief in a California case that brings to a head a controversy over the use of algorithms and artificial intelligence in criminal law.

A DNA sample taken from a larger sample of mixed human DNA implicated Billy Ray Johnson in burglaries and sexual assaults. Johnson denied committing the crimes, but he received a sentence of life in prison without parole. Prosecutors based their case on results of a law enforcement tool running a sophisticated algorithm called TrueAllele.

Johnson’s attorneys were never allowed to examine TrueAllele’s source code, to see if it somehow held any information bias. Prosecutors successfully argued that laws protected the algorithm as a trade secret.

For Jessica Gabel Cino, associate dean for academic affairs and associate professor of law, the decision raised a big red flag.

“No technology is foolproof,” she said. “Tech is designed by humans and run by humans, so there is definitely room for human error all through the process. Moreover, the results are only as good as the input.”

Cino continued. “Systems are developed for proprietary purposes, by private companies looking to make a profit. But we’re talking about access to information that affects a person’s freedom. To deny access to validation sequences, source code or proprietary data when it affects a person’s freedom? Using a wizard hiding behind a curtain to get a conviction dilutes the integrity of the system.”

The ACLU’s Vera Eidelman, a William J. Brennan Fellow with the ACLU Speech, Privacy, and Technology project, explained further in September.

“Racial bias also often creeps into algorithms, both because the underlying data reflects existing racial disparities and because inaccurate results for smaller minority groups may be hidden in overall results,” Eidelman wrote.

“And, of course, there’s the possibility that financial incentives will pervert the goals of companies that build these algorithms. In the context of DNA typing, the prosecution, backed by the substantial resources of the state, is a company’s most likely customer—and that customer is likely to be most satisfied with an algorithm that delivers a match. So companies may build programs to skew toward matches over the truth.”

Similar concerns arise regarding the use of AI in bail and sentencing decisions. Vic Reynolds (J.D. ’86), district attorney for Cobb County, Georgia, has seen the sweep of technology in law practice in his career. He’s been on both sides of the bench, as a judge, a defense attorney and, today, a prosecutor.
New frontiers for law

There's nothing artificial about the scope of change that law practices will eventually see with AI. It's happening already, especially in the provision of legal services to people previously unable to afford them.

In the United Kingdom, a designer has created a bot for the smartphone. If a driver gets a parking ticket, the bot helps appeal the parking ticket and file appeal documents.

Applications of AI are also appearing in immigration and in sexual assault systems.

Surprising? Not really, says Niedringhaus.
“Consider that immigrants and assault victims may want to explore their legal options without talking to another human being. Having a bot that can interact with authorities offers a new kind of legal access.”

So with AI on the horizon, what should students be considering?
“Many law students get their first employment opportunity doing document review,” said Niedringhaus. “If that goes away, what kind of jobs do students need to prepare for? That’s an important conversation to be having.”

Even if entry-level jobs grow scarcer, young lawyers will likely embrace AI, says third-year student Yasmine Assar (J.D. ’18).
“I think that with any sort of new tech, the younger generation will promulgate it,” she said. “I think that younger people are more accepting of tech and more willing to utilize it.”

Niedringhaus agrees that AI will open new opportunities.
“A handful of firms have set up their own law technology or AI incubators,” she said. “Some are investing in research to develop things with AI. A lot of cutting-edge stuff will come from that.”

The human touch

In all, it’s an intelligent assumption to believe AI will forever change law practice.

However, Niedringhaus says, “There are things that machines still can’t do.
“It’s hard to imagine artificial intelligence being able to read a jury without human assistance,” she said. “AI may be able to scan responses to voir dire or analyze facial expressions, but there is another, less tangible aspect that is hard to define. At this point, I don’t know of any technology that replaces that. There are still parts of the human thought process that will be extremely difficult to replicate with AI.

“I think there will forever remain a place for the human element in the practice of law.”
Sifting through digital landfills

by Charles McNair

On July 21, 2017, the New York Times reported a legal nightmare. Wells Fargo, the nation’s third-largest bank, accidentally released 1.4 gigabytes of files containing confidential information on its wealthiest clients. A lawyer handling a defamation suit for a former bank employee received the data dump, which included financial spreadsheets, Social Security numbers and portfolio details for about 50,000 bank customers holding “tens of billions of dollars” in investments, according to the Times.

Following the blunder, legions of lawyers mobilized to examine information security at their organizations. Twenty years ago, few such legal jobs existed. Fifteen years from now, they’ll be abundant and fundamental to legal practice.

The challenges of preserving, collecting, processing and analyzing information are opening opportunities in law and changing how attorneys serve clients.

“E-discovery and digital forensics are wonky areas of the law with their own precedent and rulemaking,” said Johnny Lee (J.D. ’99), principal and national practice leader of the forensic technology services practice at Chicago-based accounting firm Grant Thornton. “The more integrated tech becomes in business, not just in law, the greater the need for lawyers with information specialties.”

The e-lephant in the room
For many years, organizations faced a choice: buy more storage space for information, or be more strategic with its governance.

As Lee puts it, “Nobody ever got fired for buying more space.” The net result of this decision was that businesses eventually owned lots of costly, duplicative — and risky — information.

Lawyers increasingly found themselves sifting through these digital landfills. Some wanted ways to responsibly reduce volume (and risk), others searched for “smoking guns” that might create risk for the organization, and still others sought evidence tied to litigation agendas.

The legal challenge of how to smartly manage information has grown more daunting by the terabyte.
“Let’s face it,” said Lee, “record-retention policies are actually record-destruction policies, as they authorize the routine, defensible destruction of information no longer deemed necessary for an organization to retain. If companies followed their record-retention and record-destruction policies, the digital haystacks would be much smaller.

“By the metrics in most industry studies, organizations could eliminate nearly 70 percent of the information they don’t need to hold except for business, statutory or litigation reasons. Accordingly, the organizational risk diminishes with every deleted item.”

**Four frontiers of opportunity**
The Great Recession forced many law departments in big business to slash costs. The website for Exterro, makers of e-discovery and information governance software, summarizes this shift: ‘A 2012 study by Rand Corp., ‘Where the Money Goes,’ found that outside counsel typically consumed about 70 percent of total e-discovery expenditures … Companies realized they could control costs … if they performed more of the activities themselves.’

Today, lawyers can find job opportunities in four areas of specialization:

- **Regulatory compliance.** “Especially,” Lee said, “where record-keeping is poor and the objective is to help establish what regular practice has been at a given organization.”
- **Regulatory enforcement.** Forensic data analysis can establish whether an organization has met its responsibilities in reporting and/or in monitoring suspicious activities.
- **Whistleblowing and fraud.** Collecting data from various sources and aggregating it into a common, searchable repository allows digital forensics to provide unique insights.
- **Theft of intellectual property or data breaches.** Forensic preservation, collection, aggregation and interrogation of data can establish what really occurred in a suspicious instance, allowing organizations to pursue claims, confirm recoveries and guard against data compromises in the future.

**Trends mean change**
Lawyers like Lee work one side of the e-discovery fence, collecting, managing, analyzing and making sense of complex data.

Todd De Jong (J.D. ’09) works another side with King & Spalding. He combines a background in IT (eight years at IBM before law school) with seven years of document review and project management in complex commercial litigation.

At King & Spalding, De Jong and some 130 other attorneys search data haystacks with predictive coding and other tools, looking for the proverbial needles that satisfy discovery obligations. King & Spalding pioneered this work, first offering e-discovery legal services two years ago.

Many graduates start careers with e-discovery jobs. A rising technology aptitude in our culture, especially among younger people, could open even more first-job opportunities, De Jong said.

“Traditionally, document review was seen as something that could be farmed out to inexperienced contract attorneys,” he said. “But now we are seeing more ‘hybrid’ attorneys with technology backgrounds. They specialize in the e-discovery management of complex projects, and they work both for law firms and legal service providers.”

De Jong sees two trends shaping e-discovery and digital forensics.

First, he cites a wave of mergers and acquisitions. In October 2016, LDiscovery paid $410 million to purchase Kroll Ontrack, creating an e-discovery giant with 12,000 clients in 19 countries. That blockbuster deal followed a $1 billion purchase in July 2016 of Epiq Systems, another e-discovery and complex data firm, by OMERS Private Equity and Harvest Partners.

“Traditionally, document review was seen as something that could be farmed out to inexperienced contract attorneys. But now we are seeing more ‘hybrid’ attorneys with technology backgrounds.”

— Todd De Jong (J.D. ’09)

“We now have billion-dollar e-discovery companies, growing and changing and evolving,” De Jong said. “Still, it’s up to law firms to manage relationships with these vendors and provide what clients need in complex legal circumstances.”

Another trend? Internationalization.

“During my first years with King & Spalding, I’m not sure I heard of anyone working on international cases. Now we have folks who regularly travel abroad to do e-discovery work,” De Jong said.

**The lawyer remains accountable**
As legal practice adapts to new technology, one thing should stay constant — the attorney’s stewardship role.

“I don’t know that we’ll reach a point where every lawyer needs to be a technology-savvy technician,” Lee said. “But I’m quite sure that every practicing litigator in a law practice 10 years from now will need some familiarity with e-discovery and digital forensics principles, at a level at least sufficient to guide specialists in their work and meet their duty of competence to their clients.”

As Lee puts it, “No matter who’s looking through the information, it will ultimately be the lawyer’s job to make sure the integrity and quality of the work is unimpeachable. That’s not going to change.”
Forging the way for a new type of business entity

by Patti Styles

HISTORICALLY, BUSINESSES HAVE had to declare themselves either nonprofit or for-profit. But some businesses are blurring the lines of these long-established categories by having two main objectives: doing public good and making money.

The number of business owners desiring to operate their companies for more than just profit-making, also called social enterprise or social entrepreneurship, is growing.

Social enterprise may also be referred to as social entrepreneurship, compassionate capitalism or conscious capitalism.
structure prevents them from having any true ownership or legacy in their organizations, and it also can significantly limit the ability to innovate and grow like for-profit companies do.

“We're so used to this binary world in which you're either nonprofit or you're for-profit, but people don't live their lives that way,” Brewer said. “We aren't entirely greedy and we aren't entirely altruistic. The law hasn't allowed business owners to engage in that balancing act. Until now, there has been no dimmer switch."

Brewer said previous generations tended to focus on making wealth and then giving back once they were older. But the younger generation isn't wedded to that idea and often will pass up a higher-paying job for one with more meaningful work. He said part of the reason is that we live in a time when most people's basic needs are met. "Due to the tech industry, stock options and the overall increase in wealth in the United States, many individuals have made their fortunes very early in their lives, so they don't want to wait until retirement to give back."

Another factor has to do with coming of age during the 2008 financial crisis. "The constant pursuit of higher and higher returns is what ultimately led to the crisis, so the mindset of the younger generation is that profitability shouldn't be the only indicator of success," he said.

For social enterprises, the good the company does matters just as much as the money it makes.

Preparing students for social enterprise law
Brewer's Law of Social Entrepreneurship course teaches Georgia State Law students about the challenges and opportunities
this emerging area brings. Now in its fourth year, the elective includes an applied learning component—a project in which students “create” social enterprises. They draft articles of incorporation and write a paper addressing technical legal issues, including shareholder voting rights for major transactions and the extent of indemnification of directors from personal liability.

Tatiana Posada (J.D. ’18) said she learned how different and complex creating a social enterprise can be. “With corporations and LLCs, there are plenty of existing legal templates that you can play with and manipulate, but with social enterprises, none of that exists. Everything from management liability to the operating agreement is new.”

Brewer pointed out that where students set up their businesses is important. Many states don’t have any laws governing social enterprises, but the number that do is growing rapidly. In 2014, only 12 states had laws. By the end of 2017, there were 36.

“The differences in these laws may seem minor, but they’re extremely important to a business lawyer,” Brewer said.

The class project drives this point home. “You’re putting together your own entity,” Posada said. “It’s exciting, but also scary because you want to make sure that what you’re doing will hold up in court.”

Justin Leef (J.D./M.P.A. ’17), an associate at PwC Public Sector, echoed this. “Social entrepreneurs may look at three different business forms, and even after deciding, they may choose the wrong one and get themselves in trouble. That’s why they’re flocking to states where these things are clearer. They want to incorporate in states that have statutory language on the books.”

Allowing for a different mindset

“Many social enterprises may only break even, but that’s OK,” Brewer said. “If that’s how they want to run their companies, they should be able to do that.”

It’s a revolutionary business model that attracts an entirely different type of shareholder—which also brings new risks.

“If social enterprises don’t benefit others enough in the eyes of their investors, they can be sued for not doing enough good. That’s unprecedented,” Brewer said.

Regardless of whether a student or graduate wants to pursue social enterprise law, it’s important to have a general understanding of this emerging field, Posada said.

“Companies need to have the choice of using a different approach,” she said. “The Georgia General Assembly is hesitant to create these laws in our state, but we need to help them understand that the market’s there and that businesses want this option.”

Leef agreed, adding that many people are willing to pay 15 to 20 percent more for products that aren’t mass-produced. He sees Georgia State playing a critical role in shaping the future of social enterprise law, as it’s one of few law schools teaching it. In addition, the university introduced a bachelor of interdisciplinary studies (B.I.S.) in social entrepreneurship last year.

“In the future, I see the College of Law becoming a hub for social enterprise,” Leef said.

Brewer concurred. “We’re nimble and flexible enough to take on brand new topics like this,” he explained. “We’re doing some cool things here at Georgia State, and this is one of them.”

---

Social innovation strategist on a mission by Patti Styles

Nicole Motter (J.D. ‘12) has been passionate about social change for as long as she can remember. However, after beginning her career working on the ground level in nonprofits, she became frustrated with many aspects of the nonprofit world.

“I felt that bigger change needed to happen, but there were institutional-level problems,” she said. “From a historical and legal perspective, the nonprofit sector was not designed to eradicate problems. It can’t accommodate that.”

Nicole Motter (J.D. ‘12)

She wanted to find a larger platform for social change than the tax-exempt space allows for, and she realized a law degree could give her some of the tools to do so.

Motter watched the social enterprise field emerge while she was a student at Georgia State Law, and she began to see an alternative—a better way to scale ideas.

Now she’s the founder and chief strategist of Social Innovation Strategies, an advisory and legal services consultancy for social enterprises. As they’re getting started, Motter helps social entrepreneurs select and set up legal entity structures. She also works with foundations to finance social enterprises through a legal tool called program-related investments (PRIs).

“PRIs allow private foundations to use grant money as seed capital—certain kinds of loans and equity investments—for organizations doing work that aligns with their mission,” she said. “They enable social enterprises to test their ideas and spark innovation and scale in ways that other types of funding don’t allow for.”

Jeffrey Vinokur, founder and CEO of Generation Genius, an educational technology platform designed to inspire students in science, technology, engineering and math, can attest to the power of PRIs.

“Nicole enabled me to get a PRI by showing me how I could present my company to a foundation,” Vinokur said. “She also helped the foundation understand how it could further its goals.”

Motter said she’s glad to see her legal alma mater offering a course in social enterprise law. “It’s great to give socially minded students a different perspective. It’s a market that’s continuing to evolve.”

24 GEORGIA STATE LAW
Alumni profile | Sheffield (J.D. ’05) pens legal thriller
by Therra Cathryn Gwyn

“MY ENTIRE LIFE, I SPOKE” I’d never be a lawyer, and if I did, I said I’d never do criminal defense,” said criminal defense lawyer Jason Sheffield (J.D. ’05). The former actor has been recognized by Georgia Super Lawyers for criminal defense work. He is also a law professor and author.

Sheffield attended Georgia State Law after earning a bachelor of science at Clemson University in pre-med. He thought he might specialize in entertainment law.

“I changed course,” he laughed. But Sheffield didn’t leave the entertainment industry entirely.

His first novel, Son of a Bitch, was published in July 2017. It’s a legal thriller about the uneven personal relationship between a mother and son (both lawyers) and the upheaval that follows when one is called upon to defend the other in court.

There is some truth woven into the pages. Sheffield’s mother, Linda, became a criminal defense lawyer when he was young, and she was one of few women in male-dominated courtrooms.

“I have some strong opinions on growing up with a mom who had to endure all that,” he said.

“All that” included his mother’s struggle to be taken seriously and the significant task of breaking the glass ceiling that existed in the late 1970s.

“I don’t think they were ready for her,” he mused.

“She was very, very smart and determined to be the best lawyer she could be for her clients. She got pushback.”

Beyond the familial details, Sheffield’s book departs into a novel so he could make a bigger point.

“I wanted to bring readers into a full story that included acceptance, forgiveness and rediscovery of love as the characters go about their experiences as criminal defense lawyers.

“Ben, the son in the story, is a lot like me in my pursuit of understanding and desire for greater love in my life. He’s also a fighter, and he’s flawed,” said Sheffield.

He enjoys writing characters who survive difficult situations. “If they can find a path to save themselves, I hope readers can too,” he explained. “I love using humor as a survival tool.”

When the title of the book first came to him, he laughed but then realized it worked on a number of levels.

“I liked the play on words,” he explained. “Of course, any woman who is strong, driven, accomplished, even brassy, is often referred to as a bitch. That’s obviously not a new conversation, but I find those values admirable.”

He also explained that Ben, the main character, “is a little bit of an S.O.B.” Ben thinks harshly of his mother because of a multitude of childhood issues with her. “But after facing his own difficulties in law school and in private practice, he begins to understand his mother’s struggles and that she isn’t a ‘bitch’ after all.”

Even with the added duties of book signings and promotion, and with a prequel novel in the works, Sheffield has no intention of giving up his day job. Going to law school at Georgia State and later attending the National Criminal Defense College were two of his best decisions, he said.

His time in law school and as associate editor of the Law Review was without a doubt one of the most life-changing experiences,” he said.

Sheffield found his niche in trial classes, where he was able to perform and write. Having grown up around criminal defense work, he found those to be the most interesting cases and decided to follow in his mother’s footsteps.

“I love standing up to the government and state and saying, ‘You’ll have to get through me before you get to my client.’”

He teaches on expert testimony as an adjunct professor at Emory University School of Law and also teaches at trial colleges in the United States and abroad, most notably at the Republic of Georgia’s Criminal Defense College.

A partner at Peters, Rubin & Sheffield in Decatur, Sheffield has handled hundreds of cases in his 13 years of practice.

“As a defense lawyer, you step into the line of fire every day,” he explained. “I love standing up to the government and state and saying, ‘You’ll have to get through me before you get to my client.’”

“I consider it my stage now,” he said. “I absolutely love it.”
Faculty news

PRESENTATIONS

Charlotte Alexander, director of the Legal Analytics Lab and associate professor of legal studies at the Robinson College of Business with a secondary appointment at the College of Law, presented at the Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences (INFORMS) Annual Meeting in Houston and at the Academy of Legal Studies in Business Annual Conference in Savannah, Georgia.

Lisa Radtke Bliss, associate dean of experiential education and clinical professor, was a keynote speaker at the International Journal of Clinical Legal Education Conference 2017 held at Northumbria University in Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom. Bliss also gave a workshop at the conference, “The Challenges in Clinical Teaching and Social Justice Lawyering in the New Era of Governing by Disruption.”

Cass Brewer, associate professor, along with Bruce McGovern, professor at South Texas College of Law–Houston, presented “Recent Developments in Federal Income Taxation” at the Southern Federal Tax Institute in Atlanta and at the Tennessee Federal Tax Conference in Nashville.

Margaret Butler, associate director for public services, co-presented “Inspire to Aim Higher” at the 2017 Access Services Conference in Atlanta; co-presented “Basic Legal Research for Non-Law Librarians” at the 2017 Georgia Libraries Conference in Columbus, Georgia; and presented the session “Copyright” at the Georgia Library Association Interlibrary Loan Workshop in Carrollton, Georgia.

Clark D. Cunningham, W. Lee Burge Chair in Law and Ethics, delivered the inaugural address, “Constraining Donald Trump with the Rule of Law,” in a lecture series celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Center for American Law Studies at the University of Warsaw in Poland.

Andrea Curcio, professor of law, presented “Formative Assessment: Beyond the Mandate” to the faculty at Chapman University and conducted a workshop on assessing law student learning outcomes for the Indiana University law faculty.

Erin C. Fuse Brown, associate professor of law, presented on consumer financial protection in health care and ERISA preemption of state health care innovation as the Distinguished Visiting Health Law Scholar at Seton Hall University School of Law, at the Next Steps in Health Reform Conference hosted by American University and ASLME and at the Deregulatory Frontiers Conference at the University of California Hastings College of the Law.

Nicole G. Iannarone, assistant clinical professor and director of the Investor Advocacy Clinic, presented at the Securities Regulation Section Program on “Offering, Selling, and Trading Securities: New Perspectives” at the AALS Annual Meeting. She presented “Ethics: What Every Attorney Should Know about Technology in Practice” at the Securities Law Institute sponsored by the Public Investors Arbitration Bar Association and was on the panel “Ethics: Working with Senior Investor Clients” during the PIABA Annual Meeting. Iannarone testified before the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Investor Advisory Committee at its fall meeting, providing commentary on the role of security arbitration clinics in ensuring economic justice.

Julian Juergensmeyer, Ben F. Johnson Chair in Law and director of the Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth, presented “An Introduction to U.S. Land Use Planning and Land Development Regulation Law” and “The Land Use Consequences of Autonomous Vehicles” at the First International Conference on Comparative Urban and Environmental Law in Brazil. He was also invited by one of the top law schools in Brazil to speak as a guest lecturer on business innovation districts in the United States. He presented “Rainwater Recapture as a Condition of Development Approval” at the Sustainable Drainage Conference and spoke at the University of Lisbon in Portugal.


Paul A. Lombardo, Regents’ Professor and Bobby Lee Cook Professor of Law, presented “John Arras: Teacher, Colleague, Contributor to Public Policy” at a University of Virginia symposium; gave the First Annual Michael Filosa Memorial Bioethics Lecture: “Looking Back at Eugenics: Buck v. Bell & the Sterilization Movement” at St. Peter’s University; spoke on “Advertising Eugenics: Selling America on Health, Heredity and Happy Babies” and “Legal Developments in Bioethics” at the American Society of Bioethics and Humanities; and presented “Buck v. Bell: Discussing a History of Injustice” at Hofstra University.

Lester testifies about IRS reform

Tameka Lester, associate director of the College of Law’s Philip C. Cook Low-Income Taxpayer Clinic and assistant clinical professor, testified before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight on Dec. 13 in Washington, D.C. The hearing was on Internal Revenue Service reform.

“It was such an honor to be asked to testify as Rep. John Lewis’ expert witness,” Lester said. “Ensuring that the voice of low-income taxpayers is considered in IRS reform is essential. The system of tax administration works best when individuals have access to representation, and access to representation should not be predicated solely on one’s ability to pay an attorney or accountant.”

At the hearing, Lester discussed the issues Low Income Taxpayer Clinic (LITC) clients encounter when engaging with the IRS. She also proposed recommendations for reform, including increasing funding to hire more representatives to staff Taxpayers Assistance Centers and establishing new centers in underserved areas. Further, those centers should begin accepting walk-in taxpayers, she said.

Improving online technology, including allowing more documents and correspondence to be transmitted electronically, would be beneficial, Lester said.

In addition, the LITC could help more taxpayers navigate the tax administration system if the statutory cap for funding were increased, she said.

“No one wants to have an issue with the IRS, and in my experience our clients have a desire to resolve their issues properly. However, they need our help in order to do that,” Lester said.

Read more: law.gsu.edu/Lester-testifies-IRS
Lauren Sudeall Lucas, associate professor of law and faculty director of the Center for Access to Justice, presented on the work of the center as part of the National Center for Civil and Human Rights’ 2017 John Lewis Fellowship Program. She also spoke at the University of California’s statewide inaugural public service law conference, “Civil Rights in the 21st Century,” and presented her research on the civil legal needs of indigent criminal defendants at the Empirical Access to Justice Workshop at the University of South Carolina School of Law and at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

Darcy Meals, assistant director of the Center for Access to Justice, presented on “Perspectives on Access to Justice” alongside U.S. Magistrate Judge Catherine M. Salinas and other panelists at Emory University School of Law.

Kristina L. Niedringhaus, associate dean for library and information services and associate professor of law, presented “Information Literacy in a False/Fake News World” at the 36th Annual Course on International Law and Legal Information: Civil Rights, Human Rights, and Other Critical Issues in U.S. Law.

Mary F. Radford, professor of law, presented “Recent Developments in Georgia Fiduciary Law” at the Georgia ICLE Recent Developments Seminar, the North Georgia Estate Planning Council and the Athens Estate Planning Institute. She was a panelist for “Ethical Ownership of, and the Dissolution & Estate Matters” at the Cobb County Superior Court ADR Office and the Clayton County ADR Office.

Charity Scott, Catherine C. Henson Professor of Law, gave presentations on conflict resolution to health care providers in Memphis, Tennessee, and to graduating law and professional students at Emory University, Morehouse College and Georgia State University. She spoke on well-being and mindfulness to a national conference of attorneys in the defense bar and on the role of mindfulness training in law schools at the annual SEALS conference.

Eric Segall, Kathy and Lawrence Ashe Professor of Law, spoke at symposia at the University of Richmond on executive power and the University of Kentucky on religious freedom.

Jonathan Todres, professor of law, presented on human rights in children’s literature at Clark University and on children’s rights at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting.

Anne Tucker, associate professor of law, presented her mutual fund scholarship to the Ninth Annual Institutional Investment Roundtable—a group of regulators, asset managers and academicians—at Boston University. She also presented her impact investment scholarship at the Wharton School of Business’s “Raising the Bar: Impact Investment Symposium.”

Harold Weston, clinical assistant professor of risk management and insurance at Robinson College of Business and the College of Law, presented at the Adolph A. Berle Jr. Symposium on Investor Time Horizons, held at the College of Law.


Patricia J. Zettler, associate professor of law, presented on FDA regulation of drugs with public health impacts, such as opioids, at the Food and Drug Law Journal’s Annual Symposium in Washington, D.C., and on the patient-driven access movement at the Stem Cell Network’s Workshop on Unproven Stem Cell Therapies in Ottawa, Canada. She also moderated a panel on human mechanistic biological models at Emory University School of Law and discussed her work on FDA oversight of novel nicotine products at the American Public Health Association’s Annual Meeting.

**PUBLICATIONS**


Pamela C. Brannon, coordinator of faculty services, published a review of ProQuest’s Regulatory Insight in the Law Library Journal.

Andrea Curcio published “Addressing Social Loafing on Faculty Committees” with Mary Lynch in the Journal of Legal Education.

Eric Segall published an essay on originalism and judicial engagement in the Fordham Law Review Online.

Harold Weston published “Flash Traders (Milliseconds) to Indexed Institutions (Centuries): The Challenges of an Agency Theory Approach to Governance in the Era of Diverse Investor Time Horizons” (co-written with Conrad Cicciolone) in the symposium volume of the Seattle University Law Review.

Leslie E. Wolf co-wrote the chapter “Incorporating Experiential Learning in Every Class: Required Courses, Seminars and Live-Client Representation” with Courtney Anderson, Jessica Cible Cino and Nicole G. Iannarone. It was published in Experiential Education in the Law School Curriculum by the Carolina Academic Press.

Douglas Yarn, professor of law and executive director of the Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution (CNCR), published a revision to his treatise, Georgia Alternative Dispute Resolution (Thomson/ West), and co-wrote a manual on establishing university-based ombudsman offices with CNCR director of programs Carolyn Lambert.


LECTURES ABROAD

Clark D. Cunningham launched this year’s teaching partnership between Georgia State Law and the University of Warsaw by teaching Introduction to American Law to more than 60 students enrolled in a yearlong program offered by the Center for American Law Studies.

Michael Landau served as a visiting professor of Intellectual Property Law at the Center for American Law Studies at the University of Warsaw in Poland.

Douglas Yarn was appointed as a visiting fellow to the Lauterpacht Centre of International Law at the University of Cambridge and taught ADR for the Center for American Law Studies at the University of Warsaw in Poland, where he advised representatives from several Central Asian universities on the development of their ombudsman offices and presented on a panel for the Global Pound Conference series.

NEW PROGRAMS

Charlotte Alexander established the Legal Analytics Lab, an initiative of the J. Mack Robinson College of Business and the College of Law. Read more on page 10.

AWARDS AND ACCOLADES

Charlotte Alexander received the Hoeber Memorial Award for Outstanding Article Published in 2017 from the American Business Law Journal.

Charity Scott received the Section on Law, Medicine and Health Care Award from the Association of American Law Schools (AALS).

Scott honored for community service

Charity Scott, the Catherine C. Henson Professor of Law, received the Section on Law, Medicine and Health Care Award for excellence in legal education from the Association of American Law Schools (AALS).

For more than two decades, Scott has worked to help develop law-related organizations and bar associations. She was a founding leader in the educational and community outreach project, the Health Law Partnership (HeLP), in 2004 as well as the founding director of the HeLP Legal Services Clinic for law and health-related graduate students.

“Perhaps the service efforts closest to my heart have been the ones to which I have contributed on an interdisciplinary basis and that have reflected my sincere commitment to improving the health of vulnerable populations through multi-professional collaborations involving not just lawyers but also doctors and other health care and public health professionals,” Scott said.

In the mid-1990s, Scott was among a small group that collaborated to set up the Health Law Section for the State Bar of Georgia. She served as its chair in 1997 – 98.

Scott also was at the forefront as the American Bar Association developed its Health Law Section, serving in numerous leadership capacities through the years. In 2012, she created its Task Force on ADR and Conflict Management in Health Care and served as its chair until August 2015.

Scott also donates her talents to nonprofit organizations, such as the American Public Health Association and the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics (ASLME), of which she is the immediate past president and a board member.

“Charity has been an incredibly important part of the health law field for decades,” said Ted Hutchinson, executive director of ASLME. “She is unquestionably recognized as the authority on teaching in our field and one of the most beloved and respected figures in our profession.”

Read more: law.gsu.edu/Scott-AALS-award

SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION

Pamela C. Brannon was appointed to the Technical Advisory Committee for LawArXiv, an open-access repository dedicated to legal scholarship. She also took over responsibility for compiling the “Recent Scholarship” column in the AALS Section on Professional Responsibility Newsletter.

Andrea Curcio serves on the Society of American Law Teachers’ Legal Education (SALT) Committee. She most recently wrote the initial draft of the SALT statement on proposed changes to the California bar exam passing score.

Erin C. Fuse Brown continues to serve as the academic liaison on the executive committee for the Health Law Section of the Georgia Bar. She also joined the board of Georgia Watch, a nonprofit consumer protection and advocacy organization in Georgia.

Nicole G. Iannarone was appointed co-chair of the 2018 PIABA Securities Law Seminar.

Karen Johnston, assistant director of the Center for the Comparative Study of Metropolitan Growth, and Stacie Kershner, associate director of the Center for Law, Health & Society, have been named affiliated faculty with the Partnership for Urban Health Research at the School of Public Health. Johnston has also been named affiliated faculty with the Georgia State Urban Studies Institute at the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies.

Paul A. Lombardo was on the selection committee for the New York Academy of Medicine Helfand Fellowship in the History of Medicine and Public Health and the Klemperer Fellowship in the History of Medicine.
Milich retiring after 34 years

This spring, after 34 years, Paul Milich, professor of law and director of Lawyering Advocacy, will teach his last Evidence class. Many former students say he played an integral role in helping them become successful litigators.

“In litigation, you must know how to use the evidence; those who do almost always have the upper hand,” said Jimmy Faircloth Jr. (J.D. ’90). “Professor Milich made sure that those who took his classes understood the rules of evidence and were comfortable with them.”

Judge J. Wade Padgett (J.D. ’90) said Milich has a gift for conveying information in ways that people can use and remember — and for sticking with you until you understand. “Not all experts in their fields can do that,” Padgett said. “Many don’t have patience for those who don’t ‘get it’ right away.”

Students often learned from Milich without realizing it, Padgett said. “You just felt like you were in a conversation with an experienced lawyer. His stories and examples were very relatable.”

His mantras helped too. “He always used to say ‘a brick is not a wall,’” joked Faircloth. In addition to teaching, Milich worked for more than two decades to get Georgia to replace its death penalty with life without parole. His mantras helped too. “He always used to say ‘a brick is not a wall,’” joked Faircloth.

Although his role is to teach others, Milich has also learned something since joining Georgia State: “Humility,” he said. “I was outstandingly arrogant in my earlier years and, although I still am a person of strong convictions, I’m much happier in my life when I listen more and talk less, pick my battles carefully and accept that despite a lifetime of reading and traveling, thinking and discussing, there is still so very much I simply don’t know.”

Padgett said he thinks of Milich as an icon in Georgia legal circles. “I don’t know how you follow him if you’re the next Evidence professor. It’s like trying to decide who the next coach is after Nick Saban.”

Milich will still teach continuing education programs for judges and lawyers, write Georgia evidence books and do consulting. He also plans to travel with his wife, Karen.
In the fall, the Center for Professional Development & Career Strategies implemented a mandatory eight-week Professional Development course for first-year students. In my opinion, the most important information I shared was this simple insight: relationships matter.

It bears repeating — relationships matter and are worth investing in. The people you encounter throughout the journey of your life are unique, fascinating and worthy of your time and respect. This includes all people, even the person you habitually park next to, custodians, neighbors, bosses and co-workers, in addition to family and friends.

**In the work place**
We have all heard the saying that business is relationships, so building relationships should be your business. Internally, it is imperative to actively develop friendships not just within your team but throughout your organization. Make an effort to interact with other departments, know their strengths and establish cross-departmental friendships and business opportunities. Always remember that it is especially important to be thoughtful and appreciative of the team members who support your practice or overall organization. Take the time to speak with them and treat them as individuals.

Be careful of how you behave toward opposing counsel even in the most adversarial situations. In the future, they may be your co-counsel on an important deal or the parent of your child’s new best friend. Keep in mind that this is a small world; I am constantly surprised by the ebb and flow within the legal community. How you treat others will have a profound impact on your happiness and success.

**Client development**
Law is a service industry, and the importance of developing and maintaining a strong client base should not be underestimated. If the idea of networking makes you slightly ill, I encourage you to reevaluate your end goal. Embrace the truth that all of life is networking. Instead of superficially “working the room” for business leads, take the opportunity to have a few sincere conversations and begin a friendship. You may meet fewer people, but you will enjoy the experience more.

Within your network, strive to have a value-add orientation as opposed to a “what’s in it for me?” approach. For example, you might share related corporate articles or employment opportunities with an acquaintance, or even introduce them to a potential client, without the expectation of personal benefit.

In addition to industry-specific networking, build relationships within the context of your natural interests, family activities and hobbies. These can range from working out at the gym to a photography class, school events or community service. I can’t tell you how many business opportunities I have encountered on the sidelines of lacrosse games or at the grocery store. The secret is to be genuinely open to new acquaintances.

**Personal relationships**
There is a heightened awareness of the importance of work-life balance within the legal profession — and there should be. The practice of law is demanding from a time and intellectual standpoint, and rewarding personal relationships can provide a vital counter to career-related stress. Invest in and prioritize your relationships with family and friends. Devote time to maintaining your mental and physical health.

Ultimately, I believe that daily interaction with others is the richest treasure of all and the measure of true success.

Lyn Rogers Knapp is the senior director of the Center for Professional Development & Career Strategies at Georgia State Law. She previously worked as a director of human resources, guiding a number of privately held corporations with a focus on strategic initiatives, cultural enhancement, broad-based recruiting and employee development. She is passionate about building relationships and social capital, particularly in the context of professional development and career success.

Contact the Center for Professional Development & Career Strategies: lawcso@gsu.edu or 404-413-9070
Bob Marcovitch, partner at Weinberg Wheeler Hudgins Gunn & Dial, was listed in the 2018 Best Lawyers in America for his work with the firm’s appellate practice group.

Mike Powell of Powell IP Law was featured in the Fit Small Business Guide regarding his legal expertise in small business matters.

Carol Michel, partner at Weinberg Wheeler Hudgins Gunn & Dial, was listed in the 2018 Best Lawyers in America for health care law and medical malpractice defense.

Jay Train, partner of counsel at Weinberg Wheeler Hudgins Gunn & Dial, was listed in the 2018 Best Lawyers in America for personal injury defense.

Keisha Lance Bottoms was elected mayor of Atlanta.

Managing partner of Klob & Larrison Attorneys Timothy M. Klob joined the board of directors for the Workers’ Injury Law & Advocacy Group, a national nonprofit group.

Jessica J. Wood, a principal at Bodker, Ramsey, Andrews, Winograd & Wildstein, was named Volunteer of the Year by the Atlanta Legal Aid Society.

Lynita Mitchell-Blackwell was accepted into Forbes Coaches Council, an invitation-only community for business and career coaches.

Carolyn Altman was sworn in as a pro tem judge for the Juvenile Court of Paulding County, Georgia, in August.

Marian C. Adeimy joined the DeKalb County Attorney’s Office as an assistant county attorney, expanding on her local government and litigation background.

Maria J. Batres was appointed to a five-year term of service on the Georgia Commission on Interpreters. The commission provides interpreter licensing and regulatory and education services for Georgia courts so they can ensure the rights of non-English speaking persons during the presentation of civil or criminal matters.

Quinton R. Beasley has joined Rutherford & Christie as an associate.

Share your news: law.gsu.edu/class-actions.
Honor roll of donors

ON BEHALF OF the Office of Development and the College of Law, thank you for your tremendous efforts to make the past year a huge success.

With your help, we raised more than $2.1 million and recorded an alumni participation rate of 18 percent. In addition, the Law Firm Campaign, a friendly competition among 41 companies/firms incorporating 421 alumni, achieved a participation rate of 66 percent, raising more than $78,000.

Substantial support among Georgia State Law’s friends was equally impressive and helped the college continue its commitment to excellence.

We are grateful every day for the tremendous support of our alumni and friends.

— Wendy F. Hensel, dean and professor of law
Michael T. Smith  
Cheryl J. Tubach

Friends  
Joyce W. Bergman  
Steven P. Bristol  
Debra D. Chambers  
Martin L. Chen  
William L. Colvin  
Robert F. Dow  
Gwendolyn Fortson  
Waring  
Manuel Galifianakis  
June P. House  
Daniel R. King  
Tania S. Malik  
Julia H. Powell  
Anandhi S. Rajan  
Joseph N. Schweers

1993  
Class agent:  
C.R. Wright  
Participation rate: 17%  
Funds raised: $11,360

Dean’s Council Associates  
Cathy C. Jamison  
Jeffrey R. Kuester  
Todd A. MacDowell  
John J. O’Brien  
Mary Jo Schrade  
Rose Marie Wade  
C.R. Wright

Supporters  
Gregory M. Cole  
Patrick L. Lail

Friends  
Susan R. Bain  
Karl M. Braun  
Robert C. Buck  
Mark J. Cicero  
Carla M. Dudeck  
Timothy H. Edwards  
Kathleen A. Giroux  
Bruce P. Hain  
Grantland G. King  
Robert L. Mack  
Tracy L. Moon  
Edith M. Shine  
Trent B. Speckhals  
Richard S. Stevenson  
Mary J. Swint

1994  
Class agent:  
Marlo O. Leach  
Participation rate: 14%  
Funds raised: $69,530

Dean’s Council Partners  
Timothy S. Babiarz  
Scott M. Frank

Dean’s Council Counselors  
Manubir Arora  
Lynne R. O’Brien

Dean’s Council Associates  
Marlo O. Leach  
Caroline B. Seay  
Donna F. Stevens and  
Michael P. Stevens

Supporters  
Dennis T. Blackmon  
Augustus B. Cochran  
George B. Taylor

Friends  
Joylyn A. Abrams  
Sandra H. Cuttler  
Linda J. Dunikoski  
Richard H. Hill  
Amelia S. Magee  
John K. McDonald  
Judy E. Phifer  
Virginia A. Sandor  
Gerald J. Schaefer  
Lesli R. Seta  
David H. White  
Jeannie L. Wyant

1995  
Participation rate: 13%  
Funds raised: $7,185

Dean’s Council Partners  
Ana M. Rountree and  
Mason B. Rountree  
Kelly W. Smith

Dean’s Council Associates  
Daniel E. Turner

Advocates  
Shaheen I. Imami  
Kirsten C. Meneghelo  
Jennifer B. Victor

Supporters  
Robert A. Demetz  
Christine A. Koehler  
Clifford S. Stanford  
Thomas C. Walts

Friends  
Steven R. Fehlenberg  
Marlilyn P. Hamilton  
David J. Marmins  
Regina L. Myers  
Cynthia F. Newcomer  
Daniel J. Santos  
Carolyn A. Seabolt  
Michael J. Tempel  
L. Kent Webb  
Amy R. Wolverton  
Angelyn M. Wright

1996  
Participation rate: 11%  
Funds raised: $45,368

Dean’s Council Partners  
Virginia A. Smith  
Michele M. Young

Dean’s Council Associates  
Joseph R. Delgado  
Douglas M. Isenberg

Advocates  
Richard R. Meneghelo

Supporters  
James H. Curry

Friends  
Vicki L. Bell  
Maurice Brown  
Michael S. Evans  
Susan M. Gordon  
Angela W. Jones  
George W. Little  
John K. Rezac  
Tracy K. Taylor  
Barbara Vazquez

1997  
Class agent:  
Kim S. Dammers  
Participation rate: 16%  
Funds raised: $11,980

Dean’s Council Associates  
Dr. Bruce H. Becker  
Thomas E. Bowen  
Charlotte A. Combre  
Bethew B. Jennings  
Lynn S. Koch

Advocates  
Kim S. Dammers  
Kean J. DeCarlo  
Joe F. O’Kelley  
Shaun C. Willie

Supporters  
Benjamin B. Reed  
Howard W. Reese and  
Susan C. Speer Reese  
Jennifer B. Sandberg  
Bradley E. Srawn  
Grace F. White

Friends  
Amy H. Bogartz  
Reyne Y. Cotton  
Charles L. Davis  
John J. Friedline  
Alton Hornsby  
Susan B. Jacobs  
Robert L. Jones

1998  
Class agent:  
Christopher J. Chan  
Participation rate: 18%  
Funds raised: $4,755

Dean’s Council Counselors  
Benjamin D. Briggs

Dean’s Council Associates  
Jason E. Bring  
Usha Rackliffe  
Lawrence A. Thrower

Advocates  
Rebecca A. DeCarlo  
Corin M. McCarthy

Supporters  
Paul E. Knowlton

Friends  
Nowell D. Berreth  
Janine A. Bowen  
David M. Childs  
Eddie H. Cooper  
Leah N. Fisher  
Patricia G. Hull  
Michael B. Husk  
Carmelia M. Jackson  
Jaimie N. Johnson  
Kevin G. Moore  
Amy B. Panessa and  
Brian K. Panessa  
David S. Perrie  
Kathryn O. Pulliam  
Linda H. Register  
Jeffery R. Saxby and  
LaMia G. Saxby  
Margaret A. Shannon  
James W. Standard  
Dane L. Steffenson  
Andrew J. Surdykowski  
Wayne S. Tattline  
Michelle G. Whitelaw  
Treasve L. Williams  
Angela Wright-Rheaves

1999  
Class agent:  
C. Carrie Young  
Participation rate: 10%  
Funds raised: $7,235

Dean’s Council Counselors  
Ana-Beatriz P Kennedy  
Thomas J. Mazzotti  
Jason N. Poulos  
Thad B. Servi  
Shanon R. Stevenson  
Anthony P. Tatum  
Mary J. Volkert  
Janice M. Wallace  
Camilla C. Williams

152 scholarship recipients in 2016 – 17

153% increase in scholarships since 2008

$467 average donation

18% participation rate among all alumni

$2.1 million total funds raised

Dean’s Council Counselors  
Cynthia F. Newcomer  
Cynthia F. Newcomer  
Cynthia F. Newcomer

Supporters  
Gary B. Andrews  
Marial L. Ellis  
Nancy C. Greenwood  
Joyce G. Lewis  
Colleen L. O’Brien  
Beth A. Stanford

Friends  
Christine A. Carson  
Roslyn S. Falk  
Harold E. Franklin  
Jo A. Jagor  
Irene M. Morgan  
Yvonne E. Peterson  
Robert H. Piat  
W. Marshall Sanders  
Kelli L. Wolk
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Class of 1994
Most Funds Raised Class Award

Class of 2005
Highest Class Participation Percentage Award

Class of 2008
Most Improved Class Participation Percentage Award

2000
Class agents:
Tunde Akinyele
John M. Merritt
Participation rate: 19%
Funds raised: $21,125

Dean’s Council Partners
Alison B. Jones

Dean’s Council Counselors
David J. Hungeling

Dean’s Council Associates
Andrew C. Burnett
Dawn M. Jones
Anthony L. Martin

Advocates
Robert F. Willis

Supporters
Tyler J. Browning
Melissa C. Howard
Jose A. Junco
Catherine L. Scarver
Richard M. Shafritz
Roger T. Weitkamp

Friends
Akintunde Akinyele
Donald L. Biola
Charles P. Boring
Jennifer B. Dempsey

Peter K. Floyd
Sumita Ghosh
Susan R. Goldfarb
William E. Grob
Stacy Hurt
Justin M. Kerényi
Jerald K. Meaders
John M. Merritt
Ruth A. Michels
Kim T. Raymond
Brent S. Reece
Suzanne S. Satterfield
Jennifer M. Taylor
Donald L. Thomas
Karen D. Visser
Roger S. Williams
Layla H. Zon

Dean’s Council Associates
Stephanie A. Everett
Anna M. Humnicky
Trishanda L. Treadwell

Advocates
Amy P. McCarthy
Joshua G. Schliffer
Gilbert M. Taylor

Supporters
John G. Edwards
Gordon E. Fowler
Judeth S. Nussbaum
David A. Stevens
Kathryn H. Wade

Funds raised: $21,125
Participation rate: 19%

2001
Participation rate: 15%
Funds raised: $8,010

Dean’s Council Associates
Wendi L. Clifton
C. D’Ree Cooper
Jaime Theriot
Jackie L. Toney

Advocates
Deborah K. Hagenbush
Wayne D. Toth

Supporters
Quetia B. Arzu
Sarah P. Jurkiewicz
Raymond C. Voght
H. Jill Wasserman

Friends
Robert A. Ambrose
Mark E. Biernath
Sherril G. Buda
Samantha Burke
Kimberly E. Civins
Glenda K. Cucher
Kristin W. Gee
Michele J. Giddens
Jack G. Gresh
William F. Kelley
Brittany L. Marigliano
Natasha H. Moffitt
Joseph M. Murray

2002
Class agents:
Stephanie A. Everett
Joshua G. Schliffer
Brian H. Sumrall
Participation rate: 22%
Funds raised: $5,970

Dean’s Council Partners
Manoj K. Mishra

2003
Class agent:
Jerri Nims Rooker
(President, Law Alumni Council)
Participation rate: 9%
Funds raised: $4,035

Dean’s Council Associates
Lawrence A. Dietrich

Advocates
Lindsey G. Churchill
Richard A. Wingate

Supporters
Jerri Nims Rooker
Leah J. Waterland
Nancy E. Wharton

Friends
Katherine S. Birmingham
Sally L. Carden
Wayne E. Grannis

Terrance K. Manion
Melana K. McClatchey
Catherine A. McCormack
Michael J. O’Hagan
Jennifer R. Sapp

2004
Class agent:
Brian C. McCarthy
Participation rate: 18%
Funds raised: $6,688

Advocates
Christopher L. Curfman
L. C. Gannaway
John W. Giannini
Amy P. McMorrow
Samantha L. Tzoberi

Supporters
Christopher S. Dillon
Belinda D. Jones
Brian C. McCarthy
Christopher M. Porterfield

Friends
Jonathan T. Barr
Derrick L. Bingham
M. Alison Boyer
Rebecca A. Davis
 Riccardo J. DeMedeiros
Rodney A. Ficker
Judith H. Fuller
James M. Gibbs
Ashley S. Groome
Nathan D. Hightower
Robert S. Horlick
Matthew S. Knoop
Joseph C. Larkin
Matthew J. Lee
Suzannah L. Lipscomb
Patricia L. Pearlberg
Petra H. McDaniel
Tyler L. Middleton
Thomas J. Mihill
Eun Y. Park
Patricia L. Pearlberg
Suzanne H. Presley
Aminah Saunders
Jean-Alain Schneider
Hillary A. Shawkat
Holly L. Sivley
Susan K. Treadaway
Anthony A. Ventry
John T. Walraven

2005
Class agents:
Elizabeth B. Ames
Ramsey A. Knowles
Participation rate: 40%
Funds raised: $51,373

Dean’s Council Partners
Kevin D. Abernethy
David J. Brauns

Dean’s Council Associates
Sean D. Christy
Ramsey A. Knowles
Sue S. Massey
Jonathan B. Pannell
Brooke P. Parris
Jerry J. Rackiffe
Jason B. Sheffield

Advocates
Nashay L. Canelo
Creighton K. Frommer
Andrew J. Gebhardt
Steven G. Hopkins
Elizabeth A. Lester

Supporters
Elizabeth B. Ames
David L. Boohaker
Jeremy P. Burnette
Jennifer S. Dolde
Daniel F. Farnsworth
Andrew D. Egan
Jonathan M. Gallant
Melanie B. Paidipalli
Emily N. Pittman
Odis W. Williams

Friends
John C. Allen
Scott J. Anderson
Scott A. Barber
Jeffrey R. Baxter
Benjamin O. Bengston
Crystal A. Blackshear
Sarah T. Brooks
Jane B. Burnette
Deborah K. Butler
Marion A. Clark
Linda A. Collett
Rachel H. Conrad
Genevieve H. Dane
Brook A. Davidson
Jennifer M. Evans
Kynna M. Garner
Natalie A. Green
Christopher C. Harris
Jeffrey M. Harvey
Kyle A. Helmstetter
Clare C. Hodge
Trisha E. Holland
Matthew T. Hoots
Beverly J. Jones
Dawn T. Jones
Brandeep J. Kowalzyk
Edward S. McKinlay
Jana L. Meeks
Megan S. Middleton
David S. Moreland
Sirce Owen
Mark E. Perry
Laura D. Pfister
Melinda C. Pillow
Jonathan R. Poole
Jeffrey T. Rickman
Elizabeth J. Satterfield
Justin A. Saxton
Steven P. Shewmaker
Nicholas P. Smith
2006

Participation rate: 14%
Funds raised: $3,625

Dean’s Council

Associates
Teresa T. Dau
Graham E. McDonald
Clay S. O’Daniel

Advocates
Adwoa W. Seymour

Funds raised: $6,653
Participation rate: 16%

Jennifer B. Ventry
Jonathan M. Hill
John P. Connell
Jodi M. Taylor

Friends
T. J. Dunaway
Teresa T. Dau

Funds raised: $3,625
Participation rate: 14%

Matthew S. Kaynard
William S. Tate

Supporters
Brent A. Howard
Lisa D. Payrow
Jodi M. Taylor

Friends
Karen E. Bain
Katherine M. Barrett
Chason A. Carroll
John P. Connell
T. J. Dunaway
Frances E. Finegan
Stephen J. Graham
Jason W. Hammer
Jonathan M. Hill
Margaret D. Louttit
Aarons K. Muse
Melissa A. Segel
Nedal S. Shawkat
Marc E. Sirotkin
Mariel F. Sivley
Rebecca E. Strickland
David P. Taylor
Brian A. Teras
Sarah A. Whalin
Zachary B. Harris

2008

Class agent:
Shelley A. Momo
Participation rate: 28%
Funds raised: $12,431

Dean’s Council

Associates
Susanne Hollinger
James G. Lanier
Grady O. Morton
Eric J. Rogers

Advocates
Joseph D. Ivey
Eric M. Teusink

Supporters
Rosaleen H. Chou
Dustin M. Covello
Jaceleen J. Green
Shelley A. Momo
Bret S. Moore
Nicola M. Pasquarelli
Aman R. Patel
Alyssa K. Peters

Friends
Andrew M. Adams
Jad K. Ali
Tiffany M. Bartholomew
Olga Bolotinskaya
Deniece A. Carrington
Dana H. Carroll
Nichole J. Carse
Amanda R. Clark Palmer
Emmanuel Condouah
Brittany H. Cone
Sean B. Cox
Nancy E. DeVettore and
Sean DeVettore
Jessica T. Grozine

2009

Class agent:
C. Noelle Whitmore
Participation rate: 14%
Funds raised: $6,948

Dean’s Council Partners
Leonard J. Lescosky

Dean’s Council

Associates
Andrew M. Hermann

Advocates
Claudia N. Whitmore

Supporters
John W. Chitty
Edwin H. Garrison
Horace C. Gill
Robert J. Lafayette
Lauren P. Purvis
Jennifer M. Smith

Friends
Robert L. Ashe
Duane L. Cochenour
Millonette O. Craig
Julia C. Freeman
Nathan A. Gaffney
David L. Gann
Jason P. Grier
Karisa M. Klee
Lauren R. Mack
Matthew McNeill
Eileen F. O’Neill
Peter A. River
William R. Tate
Amy Velasquez

2010

Class agents:
Kimberly S. Hermann
Jennifer S. Ivey
Participation rate: 15%
Funds raised: $3,848

Dean’s Council

Associates
Kimberly S. Hermann
Jason N. Wiggin

Advocates
Kevin Morris
Laura E. Reinhold

Supporters
Sweta Patel
David B. Purvis
Hillery D. Righter

Friends
Nichole Atallah
Amy B. Boring
Kevin D. Bradberry
Donald B. Brown
Shannon R. Creasy
Crystal D. Filiberto
Lindsey W. Hills
Laurence R. Lambert
Heather N. Lundy
Courtney B. Noce
Erica J. Novich
Todd J. Obijeski
Daniel H. Orrock
Jonathan A. Page
Nicholas T. Protentis
Cheryl L. Prybylski
Melissa M. Sams
Dean Y. Shahriari
Alexis N. Simpson
Christopher B. Staten
Ellenor J. Stone
Chittam U. Thakore
Alan S. Thomas
Elizabeth R. Uribe
Gregory R. Valley
Suzanne C. Wakefield

2012

Class agents:
Jeffrey S. Connelly
Brett A. Switzer (Secretary,
Law Alumni Council)
Participation rate: 20%
Funds raised: $3,486

Dean’s Council

Associates
Jane D. Vincent

Supporters
William B. Bracker
Jennifer P. Whitten

Friends
Eleni C. Bafas
Dylan A. Bess
Russell A. Britt
Naomi L. Lumpkin
Jimenez
Cherese C. Clark
Nicole C. Cohn
Jeffrey S. Connelly
Pericles E. Demestichas
Maki DePalo
Ryan E. Harbin
John P. Harper
Stephanie E. Huggins
Kevin H. Jeselnik
Michael A. Keller
Diane G. Kim
Rebecca L. Kolb and
Ryan Kolb
Madeleine G. Kvalheim
Meredith R. Linscott
Jeneinne Lowery
Nadine L. Lumpkin
Jennifer M. Miller
Everett L. Morris
Melissa S. Oellerich
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2014
Class agents: 
Michell Rivera 
Robert A. Watts 
Participation rate: 20% 
Funds raised: $4,485

Dean's Council Associates 
Richard C. Piercy

Supporters 
Christopher J. Delgado 
Gregory E. Fosheim 
Clay B. Roberts

Friends 
Michael A. Arndt 
Isaac A. Asher 
Jennifer D. Bassett 
Haley J. Bourret and 
Rich R. Bourret 
Ronald T. Bracewell and 
Tiffany R. Bracewell 
Christopher L. Collier 
Lauren A. Ouel 
Sergio A. Galvan 
Sarah M. Good 
Kara B. Gordon 
Kyle R. Gregory 
Anthony L. Guebert 
Timothy J. Guilmette 
Susan R. Haynes 
Bryan F. Jacoutot 
Dean T. Karampelas 
Cullen R. Lawson 
Christine S. Lee 
Rebecca C. Lee 
Michael C. McLaughlin 
Alexander A. Mikhailovsky 
Juliana E. Peterson 
Michelli Rivera 
Samuel M. Shapiro 
John E. Sharpe 
Elizabeth L. Simmons 
Pamela P. Stewart 
Elizabeth A. Strupe and 
John P. Strupe 
Mattelyn Tharpe 
Dustin S. Thompson 
Abraham C. Varner 
Robert A. Watts

Supporters 
Walter S. Freitag 
James C. Gallagher 
Bing Wang

Friends 
John G. Armsby 
Allison C. Averbuch 
Tyler A. Becker 
Nirvi A. Bhargava 
Kevin Coleman 
Saba N. Daneshvar 
Kori E. Eskridge 
Steven L. Ferency 
Jason D. Freiman 
Anamaria Hazard 
Ryan J. Kerr 
Clintong J. King 
Counsel W. McCullen 
Mark E. Moore 
Edgar A. Neely 
Addison U. Perry 
James E. Pritchett 
Lindsey A. Rodgers 
Barbara J. Rogers 
William H. Rooks 
Evan Rosenberg 
Ernest W. Satterfield 
Joseph H. Saul 
Meghan A. Starr 
Kay C. Tanner 
Michael C. Thaler 
Ivy R. White

2016
Participation rate: 13% 
Funds raised: $8,425

Dean's Council Partners 
Elliott J. Bourne

Dean's Council Associates 
Huiwen A. Xi

Supporters 
Luke P. Donohue 
Neil K. Wright

Friends 
Erri E. Faldwell 
Megan E. Canning 
Rachelle K. Carmel 
Chun Hao Chang 
Christopher J. Daniels 
Pierce G. Fung 
Annalese Herndon 
William C. King 
Benjamin H. Lynde 
Jacqueline E. Miller 
Kendra Mitchell 
Clayton W. Namou 
Detrachia M. Neely 
Eleanor H. Patrick 
Genevieve M. Raczik 
Alexander D. Revell 
Daniel R. Richardson 
Harry M. Rowland 
Jenna B. Rubin 
Helen V. Vargas Crebas

Thank you, Class of 2017

The Class of 2017 contributed to the Class Gift Campaign Scholarship Fund in gratitude to the College of Law. Funds raised in the annual campaign will provide immediate financial assistance to deserving students in the fall’s entering class, as well as help build an endowment for future scholarships. The Class of 2017 raised $6,987 and finished with a class participation rate of 59%.

2017 Class Gift Campaign Committee 
Joshua R. Brown 
V. Darlene Childers 
Luke E. Closson 
Susan N. Griffiths 
Christopher C. Guthrie 
Falak O. Hindash 
Aaron P. McClellan 
Shaun T. Moore 
Majda Muhic 
J. Michael Namer 
J. Michelle Namer 
Pierre-Joseph Noebes 
Alexandra J. Stone 
Marie L. Wilcox 
Steven J. Williams

Friends 
Frances C. Aiken 
Luciana Aquino 
Quinton R. Beasley 
Marisa C. Beller 
Rayner M. Bettsendorf 
Mpho G. Bratton 
Phenisha F. Bresnock 
Chandra F. Burns 
Laura G. Burtle 
Lauren S. Byrne 
Jacob J. Campbell 
Leah Y. Carroll 
Kianna P. Chennault 
Rebecca L. Clapes 
Blinn E. Combs 
Bo R. Coram 
Katlyn N. Craig 
Kristina T. Davis 
Mariya N. Davis 
Krystin T. Deal 
Dawn C. Deans 
Erica A. Dempsey 
Phoebe M. Edge 
Ifeoma J. Ekeobi 
Katherine A. Ehrlich 
William S. Fawcett 
Marcus B. Fluein 
Megan C. Gaither 
Meghan R. Gordon 
Harrell J. Gunn

LaNise S. Harrington 
Timothy O. Henshaw 
Abigail C. Herrmann 
Ryan T. Hickman 
Sydney M. Hill 
David Hsu 
Andrew P. Huffman 
Randall W. Hunt 
Bryan W. Janfalone 
Brian F. Jenabzadeh 
Sakina H. Jones 
Terretta F. Jones 
Miranda B. Jordan 
Samantha M. Jose 
M. Adam Kaye 
Sheila K. Kazemian 
David W. Kerman 
Benjamin D. Kirk 
Zachary H. Kitay 
Phillip C. Kuck 
Charlotte E. Lamirand 
Justin T. Leef 
Khart J. Little 
Karen M. Lowell 
Cameron S. Macke 
Christian B. May 
William S. McPhillip 
April M. Meeks 
Brayton L. Meyer 
Seth J. Meyerson 
Kimberly A. Miller 
Courtney L. Mills 
Chae Y. Mims 
Yeliani Montanez 
Katcharlene Moschitta 
Karsten Motzon 
Gregory J. Mullin 
Alyssa L. Myers 
Catherine T. Neel 
William C. Newsome 
Ivy A. Oxendine 
Aurea M. Padula 
Wendell H. Peterson 
Kaitlyn E. Pettet 
David H. Pierce 
Kristin K. Ramsay 
Rachael P. Reed 
Kirstin E. Rodrigues 
Benjamin R. Rosichan 
Christopher L. Rossner 
Kimmia S. Salehi 
Anthony J. Sberna 
Matthew R. Sessions 
Michael L. Seymour 
Jacob B. Siegel 
Veselin A. Simonov 
Oren Snir 
Melissa G. Sprinkle 
Adriana M. Stan 
Jessica N. Story 
Ashley L. Swan 
Jessica J. Truelove 
Jasymn L. Turner 
Michael D. Turner 
Ayodele O. Uboh 
Ethan J. Vernon 
Laurin L. Vonada 
Kevin J. Vaw 
Alex H. Ward 
Jamila G. Watts
College of Law Friends

Dean's Council Benefactors
Andrew T. Jones and Judy S. Jones
Carelle L. Karimimanesh
Atlanta Law School Foundation

Dean's Council Partners
John Chandler and Christine V. Tanis
Catherine Darland and Tye G. Darland
Betty Edge and Robert G. Edge
Glenn P. Hendrix
Lorraine O. McClain
Neha Mishra
Wanda F. Timm and Willard N. Timm
James N. Young
AT&T Corporation
Charles Koch Foundation
C.L.C. Foundation Inc.
Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta Inc.
Health Law Partnership Foundation Inc.
Law Offices of Robert E. Bourne
Rountree Law Firm

Dean's Council Counselors
Elaine B. Alexander and Miles J. Alexander
Sydney Cieland
Joel H. Cowan
David H. Flint
Brian H. Frank
Philip E. Holladay
Deane L. Johnson
George R. Kerr
Paul V. Kilpatrick
Barbara LoRusso
Mark A. O'Brien
Charles Loridans Foundation
Ernst & Young Foundation
Jackson Lewis
Jewish Federation of Greater Atlanta
Johnson & Freeman
Law Office of David Hungeling

Mark and Evelyn Trammell Foundation
National Christian Foundation
PricewaterhouseCoopers
The Arnold Foundation
The Coca-Cola Company

Dean's Council Associates
Henry F. Anthony
Rhea Ballard-Thrower
Dorothy T. Beasley
Cindy A. Becker
Paula Lawton Bevington
Edward H. Bullwinkel
Philip T. Causey
Richard H. Deane
Tracy M. Delgado
Kathy C. Dorough
Sherry L. Grubb
Evans M. Harrell and Charity Scott
Carolyne S. Hilton
Randall L. Hughes and Linda S. Hughes
William B. Johnson
Steven J. Kaminshine
John R. Kanaan and Trisha K. Kanan
Kai Ceasey and Leslie E. Wolf
Robert A. Koch
Connie Lombardo and Paul A. Lombardo
David E. Nahmias
Kyle W. Parris
R. M. Parry
Mary F. Radford and Charles L. Raudonis
John S. Sears
Lori A. Short
Bonnie G. Sobelson and Roy M. Sobelson
Thomas W. Thrash
Abbie AT&T Services
Attorneys' Title Guaranty Fund
Babiarz Law Firm
Cantor Colburn
Cobb County Bar Association
Finnegans
Fitpatrick, Cella, Harper & Scinto
Grant Thornton Foundation
Hill Kertscher & Wharton
Insley & Race
Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton
Lee & Hayes
Merchant & Gould
Microsoft Corp.
Murgiayd
O'Daniel McDonald
Raytheon Company
Sutherland
Taylor English Duma

The BCLB Becker Family Donor-Advised Fund
The Manely Firm
Thomas Horstemeyer

Advocates
Lisa R. Bliss
James T. Churchill
George E. Duncan
Christopher P. Hill
Kenneth J. Kirschner
Timothy B. Phillips
Eric J. Segall
Jo Anne P. Stubblefield and Neal D. Stubblefield
Derrick L. Sudeall
AT&T Intellectual Property Atlanta Bar Association
Bekiares Elizer DBA Founders Legal
Bloom Sugarman Bondurant, Mixson & Eimler
Cohen Pollock Merlin & Small
Emory University
Greenberg Traurig Licensing Executive Society
State Bar of Georgia
Sites & Harbison
The Schiffer Firm
The Toth Law Firm
Tzoberi Law

Supporters
Timothy C. Batten
Susan R. Boltacz
Julian C. Juergensmeyer
Amy E. Locker
John H. Rains
Benjamin S. Roth
Andrew Merritt Reilly & Smith
Drinker Biddle & Reath
Kevin H. Hendrickson
Law Office of Odis Williams
Law Offices of Benjamin Bradley Reed
National Association of Patent Practitioners
Olshon & Medlock
O'Kelley & Sorohan Attorneys at Law
Sheaffrink & Dean SunTrust Foundation
The Mack Law Firm

Friends
Ely G. Abbott and Farrar J. Abbott
Veronica Babayan
Karen G. Brandage
James T. Coe
Darrell W. Daniels
Allyson Dietrick
Stephanie J. Dennis
Mary P. Dwyer
George L. Emfinger
Brian Fitzgerald
Lindsey A. Freeman
Vincent Frolich
Reuben Goetzl
Jessica E. Harris
Andrew H. Keller
Thomas D. Hills
Phyllis J. Holmen
Cheryl Jester-George
Nicole M. Kaplan
Richard Kopelman
Jeremy D. LeFevre
David Levis
Patricia G. Lindholm
Tina Montz
William A. Morrison
Robert C. Moses
Kristina L. Niedringhaus
Cynthia P. Perry
Nancy Prager
Glen A. Reed
Pauline Reynolds
Stephen M. Schaezel
Charles R. Shuford
Franklin H. Smith
Holly Smith
Juanita M. Wheeler
Jason M. Zarrow
Katherine Zuckerman
Alicia D. Mack Law Firm
Automatic Data Processing
BakerHostetler
Blue Ridge Law
Bob Law
Bryan Cave
Cannon Mihill & Winkels
Charles M. Landrum III
Clark, Loewy & Lumpkin
Cobb County District Attorney's Office
Dame Law
Dana H. Carroll
David Taylor
Attorney At Law
Deep Blue Insight Group
Diamond Family Trust
Hall Booth Smith
Hartman & Citrin
IBM International Foundation
Keep Judge Shawn Ellen LaGrua
King & Spalding
Law Office of Aaron Strimban
Law Office of Bruce F. Hain
Law Office of John M. Merritt
Law Office of R. Andrew Fernandez
Lueder, Larkin & Hunter
Lyco Works Inc.
M. Faye McCord, Attorney at Law
McGuire Woods
NBI
O'Hagan Law Firm

Cumulative Contributors

Cumulative contributions made since 1982

Dean's Council Benefactors
Mark E. Biernath (Legacy Circle)
Martha B. Carlton (Legacy Circle)
David H. Flint
Ronald J. Freeman and Gwendolyn Freeman
Carol R. Gieger and Henry F. Anthony
Catherine C. Henson and Christopher Carpenter (Legacy Circle)
Andrew T. Jones and Judy S. Jones
Carelle L. Karimimanesh (Legacy Circle)
Kirsten C. Meneghelli and Richard R. Meneghelli (Legacy Circle)
Manan K. Mishra and Neha Mishra
Leslie A. Oakes (Legacy Circle)
Keith A. O'Daniel
William A. Pannell (Legacy Circle)
Ana M. Rountree and Mason B. Rountree
Dawn R. Smith (Legacy Circle)
Kelly W. Smith and Virginia A. Smith
Willard N. Timm
Dale S. Voyles and James E. Voyles
Hugh W. Welborn (Legacy Circle)

Atlanta Law School
WINTER 2018

37

WINTER 2018
10 companies and firms achieved 100 percent alumni participation and 25 companies and firms increased their overall fundraising totals from 2016. Most valuable firms are chosen based on meaningful and proportionate participation.

**2017 Law Firm Challenge results**

With tremendous support from the firm agents at 41 participating companies, organizations and firms and 421 participating alumni, Georgia State Law’s Law Firm Challenge had a 66 percent participation rate and raised more than $78,000. In addition, 10 companies and firms achieved 100 percent alumni participation and 25 companies and firms increased their overall fundraising totals from 2016. Most valuable firms are chosen based on meaningful and proportionate participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 1</th>
<th>(3 to 6 alumni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew, Merritt, Reilly &amp; Smith</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: Emily Yost (J.D. ’05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burr Forman</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: Jefferson Holt (J.D. ’13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constangy Brooks Smith &amp; Prophete</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: Alyssa Peters (J.D. ’08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fulton County District Attorney’s Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: William Arnold (J.D. ’14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gomel Davis &amp; Watson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: J. Chris Chitty (J.D. ’09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Law Partnership Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilpatrick Townsend &amp; Stockton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar of Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coca-Cola Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean’s Council Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin D. Abernethy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akintunde Akinyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine B. Alexander and Miles J. Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary B. Andrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy T. Beasley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce H. Becker and Cindy Becker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot J. Bourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Bourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David J. Brauns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin D. Briggs and Suzy Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason E. Bring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew C. Burnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia B. Caley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazy Lynn Causey and Philip T. Causey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin L. Chen (Legacy Circle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie L. Christie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony C. Cleland and Sydney Cleland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte A. Combre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel H. Cowan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim S. Dammers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tye G. Darland and Catherine Darland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey R. Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David N. Dorough and Kathy Dorough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert G. Edge and Betty Edge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Eisenstadt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie A. Everett and Jason Wiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy R. Faircloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian H. Frank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby R. Grubbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon M. Hartman and Ava Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn P. Hendrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew M. Hermann and Kimberly S. Hermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip E. Holladay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael B. Husk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas M. Isenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP 2</th>
<th>(7 to 10 alumni)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell &amp; Berkowitz</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: Joseph Delgado (J.D. ’96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bryan Cave</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm agent: Brent Howard (J.D. ’06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni participation: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni funds raised: $2,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GROUP 1**

**Most Valuable Firm Recognition**

**Group 1**: Williams Teusink, Eric Teusink (J.D. ’08)

**Group 2**: Littlef Mendelson, Dan Turner (J.D. ’95)

**Group 3**: Taylor English, Ramsey Knowles (J.D. ’05)

**Group 4**: Hall, Booth, Smith; Nichole Hair (J.D. ’07) and Trey Reese (J.D. ’97)
Process, Attorney's Office
Firm agents:
Charles Boring (J.D. '00)
Julianna Peterson (J.D. '14)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $280

Cox Communications
Firm agent: Mark Padilla (J.D. '91)
Alumni participation: 56%
Alumni funds raised: $800

Eversheds Sutherland
Firm agent: Chris Chan (J.D. '98)
Alumni participation: 50%
Alumni funds raised: $1,500

Fisher & Phillips
Firm agent: C.R. Wright (J.D. '93)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $2,075

Georgia Pacific Corporation
Firm agent: Noshay Collins (J.D. '05)
Alumni participation: 83%
Alumni funds raised: $1,000

Hawkins Parnell Thackston & Young
Firm agent: Catherine McCormack (J.D. '03)
Alumni participation: 22%
Alumni funds raised: $125

Littler Mendelson
(Most Valuable Firm recipient)
Firm agent: Dan Turner (J.D. '95)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $2,955

GROUP 3
(11 to 19 alumni)
Firm agents:
Andrew Hagenbush (J.D. '11)
Madeleine Simmons (J.D. '11)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $1,445
The Coca-Cola Company
Company agent: Lynne O'Brien (J.D. '94)
Alumni participation: 38%
Alumni funds raised: $3,350
Turner
Firm agent: C. D'Ree Cooper (J.D. '01)
Alumni participation: 75%
Alumni funds raised: $1,918

GROUP 4
(20 or more alumni)
Gasser, Chang, Schramkowski (J.D. '97)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $2,075

Greenberg Traurig
Firm agent: Courtney Noce (J.D. '10)
Alumni participation: 8%
Alumni funds raised: $25

GROUP 4
(20 or more alumni)
Alston & Bird
Firm agents:
Novell Berreth (J.D. '98)
Alison Jones (J.D. '00)
Cliff Stanford (J.D. '95)
Alumni participation: 70%
Alumni funds raised: $21,975

Arnall Golden Gregory
Firm agents:
Rebecca Lunceford (J.D. '12)
Lisa Payrow (J.D. '06)
Alumni participation: 75%
Alumni funds raised: $2,560

Hall Booth Smith
(Most Valuable Firm recipient)
Firm agents:
Nichole Hair (J.D. '07)
Trey Reese (J.D. '97)
Alumni participation: 100%
Alumni funds raised: $1,631

King & Spalding
Firm agents:
Harold Franklin Jr. (J.D. '99)
Anthony Tatum (J.D. '97)
Jennifer Wheeler (J.D. '87)
Alumni participation: 52%
Alumni funds raised: $2,135

Swift, Currie, McGhee & Hiers
Firm agent: C. Blake Staten (J.D. '10)
Alumni participation: 64%
Alumni funds raised: $1,030
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Two views | Embrace AI — or not?

David Johnson (J.D. ‘89)

Headlines tout a brave new world for the legal profession, as artificial intelligence (AI) pushes us into a new era. Some even speculate that attorneys may be replaced by robots. While change is inevitable as technology advances, we shouldn’t get too carried away with the promise of an AI revolution. We’ve heard this all before.

There have been many innovative ideas that, after the buzz died down, were not the huge game changers as predicted. Think Six Sigma, Total Quality Management or Management by Objective. Or mobile wallets, webTV, virtual reality and electric vehicles, which haven’t been adopted as quickly or as widely as expected—at least not yet.

Sure, big data has proven useful in some cases. An excellent example is Georgia State University’s successful use of predictive analytics to curb dropout rates.

But I’m not sure what’s being done elsewhere will have the same results in legal practice. While these technological advances may be good tools, we should approach with a measured dose of skepticism. We’ve seen where AI can go terribly wrong. Think Microsoft’s Twitter bot Tay, who within hours became incredibly racist and sexist—one example of the garbage in, garbage out theorem.

AI already raises many ethical questions, and more unforeseen consequences will undoubtedly pop up. Some research suggests our skills in critical thinking and analysis have declined as we use more tech. Will an AI revolution mean we lawyers will lose some of our essential skills? AI has already impacted job opportunities of law school grads and junior legal staff. Automated work may free us up to do more meaningful tasks, but I wonder if future attorneys will lose something in the transition. And cheaper and faster doesn’t always mean better.

While it is critical lawyers learn these new tools, I hope we can embrace this new world without becoming too reliant upon tech and without losing the human touch.

David Johnson (J.D. ‘89) is a partner at Insley & Race.

Audrey Dulmage (J.D. ‘07)

Artificial intelligence (AI) will soon become an indispensable resource to lawyers practicing in virtually every field of law. Innovative law firms are already leveraging this emerging technology to reduce costs and improve the quality of legal services. AI can significantly decrease the time it takes to sift through volumes of data to identify relevant information, leaving attorneys more time to devote to upper-level tasks that require critical thinking or human interaction, like devising case strategy, negotiating deals, appearing in court or advising clients.

AI is being used to review documents for discoverable information, conduct due diligence ahead of corporate mergers, analyze contracts and monitor regulatory compliance. It is also used to improve the efficiency and accuracy of research. AI software can even determine the chances that a certain motion will be approved by a particular judge by poring through that judge’s previous rulings.

Clients will expect lawyers to shift their focus from routine tasks that can be handled by a computer to tasks that require human expertise. For example, AI can save time and money by identifying each instance in which a certain contract clause appears within a large database of contracts. But, only an attorney can determine if that contract clause is substantively sufficient.

Technology is going to transform legal jobs, but it will not replace them entirely. It seems likely that more new jobs will be created that combine legal and technical expertise. In time, lawyers may find they work more closely with the technologists in their companies and firms to complete tasks that were once handled only by attorneys. Attorneys should embrace these changes. Just as we no longer perform legal research by going to the books, AI technologies will free attorneys from spending countless hours searching for information. That time can then be spent on tasks that provide greater value to our clients.

Audrey Dulmage (J.D. ‘07) is a discovery staff attorney at Troutman Sanders eMerge.

Audrey Dulmage (J.D. ‘07) is a discovery staff attorney at Troutman Sanders eMerge.
Bragging rights

RANKINGS

No. 1

Best Value Law School in United States by National Jurist

The college topped National Jurist’s “Top 20 Best Value Law Schools” list for 2017 and has been consistently ranked a best value school for 10 years.

Read more: law.gsu.edu/top-best-value

NATIONAL MOCK TRIAL TITLES

Georgia State Law won the William Daniel Mock Trial Competition for the second consecutive year. The STLTA team (pictured above) of Cameron A. Mobley (J.D. ’18) and Christopher Ryan (J.D. ’18), attorneys, along with the witnesses, Joshua Jones (J.D. ’19), Hayden Hillyer (J.D. ’19), Devin Rafus (J.D. ’19) and Brittany Barto (J.D. ’19), beat Maryland in the final round. The team was coached by Leyna Palmer Pope (J.D. ’16) and Deah Warren (J.D. ’07). Ryan was named Best Advocate.

Andy Navratil (J.D. ’18), Brandon Reed (J.D. ’18), Casey Wilson (J.D. ’19) and Kevin Mathis (J.D. ’19) won the Mockingbird Challenge in Alabama. The STLTA team was coached by Cheryl Champion White (J.D. ’93) and Kevin Coleman (J.D. ’15). Navratil won best advocate for his closing argument.

Read more at law.gsu.edu/STLA-mockingbird and law.gsu.edu/2017-williamdaniel-win

ACCOLADES

alumni were selected for Georgia State University’s 40 under 40 award, which recognizes achievements of alumni in their respective professional fields who are under 40 years of age.

Lisamarie Bristol (J.D. ’09)
Ana Maria Martinez (J.D. ’09)
Petrina McDaniel (B.A. ’01, J.D. ’04)
Manoj Mishra (J.D. ’02)
Carrie O’Brien (B.B.A. ’07, J.D. ’14)
Barbara Rogers (M.B.A. ’08, M.H.A. ’09, J.D. ’15)
Eric Teusink (J.D. ’08)

The award ceremony is at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 22, at 5Church Atlanta. Visit pantheralumni.com/40under40 for more information.

Tyler Almon (J.D. ’18) placed second in The Keenan Law Firm and Keenan’s Kids Foundation 15th Annual Law Student Closing Argument Competition.

GIVING

Your generous support enables the College of Law to fulfill its mission of providing an outstanding legal education that is accessible and affordable.

law.gsu.edu/giving

ORDER OF THE COIF

Seventeen alumni from the Class of 2017 were inducted into Georgia State Law’s Order of the Coif chapter. “There are many people who have gone before you who held those standards of excellence that you have maintained through your hard work and dedication,” honorary inductee Anthony Craig Cleland (J.D. ’92) said. “Do not give them up — keep the standard high.”

84.5%

Passage rate amongst Georgia State Law graduates for first-time takers on the July 2017 bar examination, ahead of the overall state rate of 79.2 percent.
TOWER TO THE TRENCHES is a monthly CLE series, including one hour of either ethics or professionalism training. January’s topic was “Tech Talk: E-Discovery from A to Z, including E for Ethics.”

Stay tuned for information on these upcoming events:

**Tower to the Trenches**
- March 23: Georgia Practices and Procedures
- April 27: TBA

**Receptions**
- May 17: Alumni Receptions
- June 8: State Bar Annual Alumni Reception (Amelia Island, Florida)