

Educational Policy Committee Meeting
University of California College of the Law, San Francisco
333 Golden Gate, San Francisco, CA 94102
2025-11-14 11:15 - 12:15 PST

Table of Contents

1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment Period

3. Action Item: Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes.....2

4. Report of Provost and Academic Dean Morris Ratner

 4.1. Bar Success.....6

 4.2. Employment.....7

 4.3. Student Health Services.....9

 4.4. First Generation Program.....13

 4.5. Artificial Intelligence.....15

5. Adjournment



Educational Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

University of California College of the Law, San Francisco

August 21, 2025

198 McAllister St. San Francisco, CA 94102, Auditorium. Participants and members of the public were also able to join the open session via the web link or dial-in numbers listed in the public notice of this meeting linked here: <https://www.uclawsf.edu/our-story/board-of-directors/board-meeting-notice-agendas-and-materials/>.

1. Roll Call

The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:54 p.m. and the Secretary called the roll.

Committee Members Present

Director Shashi Deb, Chair

Director C. Don Clay

Director Albert Zecher

Director Courtney Greene Power, Ex Officio

Committee Members Absent

Director Simona Agnolucci

Director Andrew Giacomini

Staff Participating

Chancellor & Dean David Faigman

Chief Operating Officer Rhiannon Bailard

General Counsel & Secretary John DiPaolo

Legal & Executive Assistant Yleana Escalante

Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer

Dean of Students Tiffany Gabrielson

Chief Communications Officer John Kepley

Assistant Dean for the Career Development Office Amy Kimmel

Assistant Chancellor & Dean/Chief of Staff to the Chancellor & Dean Jenny Kwon

Associate Director of Bar Passage Support Dan Martin

Professor Emily Murphy, Chair of Faculty Executive Committee

Director of Office of Sponsored Projects Yael Nadel-Cadaxa

Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner

Dean of Enrollment Management June Sakamoto

Chief Operating Officer David Seward

2. Public Comment Period

The Chair invited public comment. No member of the public offered comment.

3. Action Item: Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Motion:

The Chair moved to approve the May 22, 2025 meeting minutes.

Motion made and seconded. Motion carried.

4. Strategic Planning Update

Dean Faigman reported on progress by the Supplemental Strategic Planning Working Group, noting Dean Ratner and Mr. Seward, former chairs of the 2020 group, are conducting a retrospective review. Their report, evaluating academic and fiscal outcomes, is expected after Labor Day and will be shared first with the working group, then the full Board.

The group is split into educational policy and fiscal planning subgroups. Dean Sakamoto issued a memo describing uncertainties from recent policy changes, such as elimination of GradPlus loans and new borrowing limits. Dean Faigman highlighted that implementation of federal regulations under the Big Beautiful Bill Reconciliation Act might be delayed by a year. Another key issue is the extent to which the private market might fill the gap left by these changes. The working group's task is to identify uncertainties such as this and shape institutional responses. Dean Faigman acknowledged the contributions of working group members, particularly Director Power, who has been instrumental in helping the group think through strategies to address the challenges ahead.

Director Power thanked Dean Faigman, encouraged directors to review the strategic plan, and explained that the retrospective uses a rubric to assess progress. She emphasized the iterative and inclusive nature of the process. Dean Ratner stated that nearly all initiatives from the last strategic plan were completed, but some are now outdated. Future reporting to the Board will address 2020 plan priorities that remain relevant in future academic years.

5. Report of Provost and Academic Dean Morris Ratner

Dean Ratner thanked Chair Deb and noted that he would not repeat all the details already included in the written reports.

5.1. Strategic Plan Implementation and Priorities in AY25-26

Dean Ratner said the College's top priority for the current academic year is preparing for upcoming state bar exam changes in 2028. Faculty and staff have established a Bar Pivot Working Group to examine required courses and curriculum, aiming to position the College for a smooth transition once specifics of the new exam are released.

5.2. Student Success Update - Bar Passage and Employment

Dean Ratner commended Ms. Greer and Mr. Martin for their labor-intensive bar passage program, which guides over 350 graduates and is credited with improving bar passage rates. He noted that completion of the program and consistent practice are the strongest predictors of success.

Director Power asked if students understand this connection. Dean Ratner replied most do, but some believe averages do not apply to them. The coaching team customizes plans to build trust with this group.

Dean Ratner and Dean Kimmel addressed employment trends, noting that Big Law recruiting is increasingly chaotic and on-campus interviews are declining. Firms prefer direct applications and make decisions earlier, often based on first-year fall grades. Dean Kimmel described new fall programs for first-year students to start employer relationships early.

Chair Deb asked about the origins of these changes. Dean Kimmel explained they stem from removal of restrictions on early recruiting and advances in technology. Dean Kimmel noted earlier workshops and networking events now address these trends, but she acknowledged this intensifies first-year student stress.

5.3. Center Annual Reports for AY24-25

Dean Ratner summarized annual reports from campus centers and emphasized their role in executing strategic plan initiatives. He encouraged directors to review them.

Dean Ratner highlighted that establishing and expanding these centers of excellence was a key initiative in the strategic plan, and the results demonstrate that faculty and academic staff have achieved significant progress. He also noted that he would coordinate with Chair Deb to invite individual centers to directly report to the Committee at future meetings.

5.4. Grants Reporting for FY25

Dean Ratner discussed the Office of Sponsored Projects, led by Mr. Nadel-Cadaxa. He highlighted record success in 2025 despite federal uncertainty.

Mr. Nadel-Cadaxa reported that third-party research funding reached nearly 10 million in 2025, a 35 percent increase from last year. Private grants and non-exchange sources remain dominant, while federal support was at its highest and state funding declined to approximately \$160,000. Distribution of awards favored the Center for Gender and Refugee Studies and the UCSF-UC Law Consortium.

Mr. Nadel-Cadaxa noted the split of the Worklife Law Center into Worklife Law and Equality Action Center; combined, funding levels were maintained.

Director Power asked about future funding risks given the unusually high 2025 totals. Mr. Seward explained that overhead rates create flexible funds for the College's operations. Dean Ratner stated that research centers are proactive about seeking new funding sources and adjusting projections to address uncertainties in government support.

The Committee entered closed session at 1:35 p.m. pursuant to Education Code Section 9 Section 92032(b)(7).

In closed Session, the Committee approved the minutes from its May 22, 2025 meeting.

The Chair reconvened the open session at 1:37 p.m. The Chair reported that the Committee approved the closed session minutes from its last meeting.

6. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. DiPaolo, Secretary

Report 4.1 – Bar Success

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner, Director of Bar Passage Support Margaret Greer, and Associate Director of Bar Passage Support Dan Martin

The California State Bar will release results to July 2025 test takers on November 7, 2025, at 5 p.m.¹ The pass list will be posted on the Bar’s Examination Pass List webpage on Sunday, November 9 at 6 a.m. Using this data set, the UC Law SF Bar Success Team will prepare a preliminary estimate of the Class of 2025 first-time bar pass rate. We will present our initial estimates in an oral report at the November 14, 2025 Educational Policy Committee meeting.

¹ See <https://www.calbar.ca.gov/Admissions/Examinations/California-Bar-Examination/Exam-Results>.

Report 4.2 – Employment

By Assistant Dean for Career Development Office Amy Kimmel

This report provides year-over-year data for Class of 2025 employment, which is just a snapshot of outcomes that will be reported in final in the spring. In addition, the report provides updates regarding Big Law recruiting and the UC Law SF Alumni Mentor Program.

I. Class of 2025 Employment (Year Over Year Data)

The UC Law SF Career Development Office (CDO) captures employment data for the graduating class at the start of every month on our graduate tracking sheet. Our graduate tracking sheet includes anyone who is unemployed or who has not given us all the information required for reporting. There are currently 87 grads on our tracking sheet (25% of the class). Year over year numbers are below.

- November 4, 2025: 87/354¹ (25%)
- November 5, 2024: 120/366 (33%)
- November 1, 2023: 114/345 (33%)
- November 1, 2022: 107/309 (34%)
- November 1, 2021: 128/284 (45%)

II. Big Law Recruiting

As discussed, Big Law hiring has accelerated significantly this recruiting season. Some law firms started opening their 1L applications in October and a significant number opened November 3. Some of these firms also elected to open their 2L Summer 2027 applications in November as well. Other firms will open 2L Summer 2027 applications throughout December and January. We expect these firms to continue to use direct applications as their primary recruiting tool with even less reliance on OCI programs. To best serve our students and provide the employers with options to fit their needs, we are offering a 2027 2L Summer Preview Program in January. We will collect resume packets for employers and release them to employers in the third week of January.² Firms will also be able to utilize our Spring OCI program for any later recruiting needs.³

To help support our students through this process, we offered two large-scale recruiting/networking events (featuring over 30 big law firms as well as smaller firms, government agencies, and non-profits). These events were very well attended, and we received positive feedback from the students and employers. We have also updated our

¹ We expect this to be the final number of total students in this reporting cohort.

² For context, UC Berkeley is offering an OCI program January 22 and 23; UC Davis is January 27 - 29; UCLA is likely February 13, 20, and 27; Stanford is January 12-16; Santa Clara is offering a resume packet program in late January.

³ Spring OCI is open to all types of employers and occurs on an ad hoc basis throughout the semester. There are no set dates, rather employers can simply pick an interview date that works best for them and we organize the application period around that date.

Sharknet resources and communicating regularly not only with students but also educating faculty and staff on this changing cycle.

III. Attorney Mentor Program

Career Development Office Director of the Alumni Mentor Program Koreen Kelleher reports robust engagement with that service so far this year. She recently shared the following:

[T]he final number of student matches we made with attorney mentors (mostly alumni but others too from Airbnb, law firms, nonprofits and private companies) for this academic year – in partnership with the nine student organizations detailed below. The outstanding student leaders have been working with us on this project since last May. The total number of matches made is 295, plus three ad hoc matches since this summer, resulting in 298 total matches this year so far.

This number exceeds the all-time high number of matches through this program in 2023-24 at 295. In 2024-25 we made 287 matches; in 2022-23 we made 289 matches; and in 2021-22 we made 282 matches. Nearly 80% of the student matches were for 1ls, with 53 for 2Ls and 13 for 3Ls.

It was also another banner year for securing attorney mentors with 315. This was due to many returning mentors we have recruited over the past six years, plus fantastic recruitment again this year by the student leaders in the partner student organizations. We hope to match some of these “leftover” mentors with students next semester on an ad hoc basis based on practice area interest.

Partner Student Organizations and Number of Attorney Matches:

- Business Law Society (BLS): 62
- Tech & Law Society (TLS): 50
- Intellectual Property Association (LIPA): 24
- Health Law & Policy Society (HLPS): 18
- Environmental Law Association (ELA): 25
- Association of Tax Students (UCLATS): 24
- Family Law Student Association (FLSA): 17
- Women’s Law Society (WLS): 55
- Employment & Labor Law Student Association (ELLSA): 20

Since Director Kelleher shared this report, she has matched a handful of additional students bringing the total YTD matches to over 300.

Report 4.3 – Student Health Services

By Dean of Students Tiffany Gabrielson

This report describes the structure of student health services at UC Law SF, which I oversee as part of my responsibilities as Dean of Students, reporting to the Provost & Academic Dean. The report also describes efforts to solicit student feedback and collaborate with students to give them a voice in student health matters. Finally, the report identifies and discusses issues that students have identified as pain points.

I. Overview of Student Health Services

Multiple vendors create the student health services experience at the College. These include Carbon Health, UC SHIP, and Academic Health Plans.

Carbon Health serves as our campus' health center. We have a multi-year contract with them that ends in August 2027. Carbon Health has over 100 locations nation-wide, include 60 in California and over a dozen locations across the Bay Area. There are five locations in San Francisco, including one at the Civic Center. We have a capitated model of service with Carbon Health, in which students pay a fee and receive most basic services at no additional cost when visiting any Carbon Health location. In the coming months, we will evaluate services offered by Carbon Health and other possible providers to determine whether to extend the contract or consider alternative providers.

All enrolled students are required to have health insurance coverage that is compliant with the Affordable Care Act. The UC Student Health Insurance Plan (UC SHIP) is the presumptive insurance vendor for students at the College. Students are automatically enrolled in and billed for the [UC Student Health Insurance Plan \(UC SHIP\)](#) as part of their tuition. The annual cost is divided into two payments, one for the fall and one for the spring/summer. Students can also opt to enroll their dependents in UC SHIP. Students who have ACA compliant insurance that meets minimum coverage criteria can waive out of UC SHIP.

Whether a student's specific insurance is found to meet minimum requirements is determined by our waiver administrator, Academic Health Plans (AHP). AHP also assists students in enrolling themselves or their dependents in UC SHIP. There are two UC SHIP waiver periods each year, one just before the start of the fall semester and one just before the start of the spring semester. To waive out of UC SHIP insurance, the student must have a primary care location designated within 50 miles of campus.

II. Soliciting Student Feedback & Collaborative Efforts

Last year, a new Student Health Services Coordinator Savannah McLean started at the College. Coordinator McLean has an office onsite and hosts office hours so that students can drop-in with questions. This is a significant improvement from our last Coordinator, who was fully remote.

The Dean of Students and Coordinator McLean have had multiple meetings with students regarding Student Health Services, including with representatives from the UC Law SF student government, UCLAS. During these meetings, we have worked to help students better understand the student health services landscape and have also worked to better understand their concerns and address the areas within our control.

Students can give input to us about student health services in several ways. The College previously had a Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC), which is a group that provides student input on healthcare decisions and advises on issues related to UC SHIP. SHAC lapsed in a prior year due to lack of student engagement. Given revitalized student interest in the SHAC, we worked with UCLAS to solicit students interested in serving on the SHAC this fall.

UC SHIP has a student member from our campus on the Executive Oversight Board (EOB). The EOB's primary responsibilities include reviewing and voting on benefits, evaluating the plan's financial performance, and making recommendations on how to balance requests for new benefits with maintaining affordable costs for students. Coordinator McLean and I meet with this representative regularly, before and after EOB meetings.

Students can always reach out to our Health and Wellness Coordinator, Savannah McLean, to share feedback, ask questions, or get support. Beyond this, students can share feedback with the Dean of Students and can submit feedback to the Provost or Chancellor & Dean through a relevant Comment Box.

III. Student Concerns

As with the American health care system broadly, there are some pain-points with Student Health Services that are within our control to address and some that are not.

A. *Waivers*

During our interactions with students, a frequent point of contention is the necessity of waiving out of UC SHIP. Students sometimes express frustration that they must remain on UC SHIP, despite having other health insurance, if their waivers are not granted by AHP. However, AHP handles waiver decisions for all UC campuses on UC SHIP insurance and are qualified to make this assessment.

If students wish to obtain other insurance that is ACA compliant and would qualify for a waiver, they have two windows in which they can make such a request each year. We have found that most international insurance plans have not been found by AHP to be ACA-compliant. Additionally, students on Medi-Cal are permitted to waive out of UC SHIP, but to do so they must provide proof of active Medi-Cal coverage¹ location within 50 miles of the campus. We have attempted to address this through more proactive messaging to admitted students, including a presentation for incoming students this

¹ A "CA Benefits" or "BIC" card is not sufficient

past summer which provided an overview of the student health services landscape and the waiver process.

Students have also expressed frustration with the length of the UC SHIP waiver period, telling us that it is not long enough. The waiver period is 6/20/25 – 8/20/25 this fall and will be from 11/25 – 1/13/26. Because the waiver period needs to end once the plan begins and students need to be covered by UC SHIP as of the first day of each term, we've tried to lengthen the waiver period on the front-end, allowing students more time to waive. We understand that this doesn't address student concerns about wanting more time to waive out of UC SHIP once the term has begun, but that's simply not something we can provide. Students who were unable to waive out of UC SHIP in the fall because they missed a deadline will have an opportunity to waive out of it for the spring, and we are planning to send a communication out to students in the coming weeks reminding them of this.

Students who are studying abroad through our Global Programs offerings are still enrolled at the College. As such, they need ACA-compliant insurance. However, they will often also need insurance that meets the criteria specified by the visiting institution in the country they are studying at, allowing them to get care in that location. Therefore, students in these circumstances need "double insurance" (one domestic and one international) which can sometimes be a pain-point. To address this, we have worked with the Global Programs team to include this information in their presentation to students considering studying abroad so that they can understand the cost associated with both sets of insurance and plan accordingly.

Students have expressed frustration that we do not offer them a clearinghouse of insurance options, and that we cannot answer questions about their specific insurance plans beyond UC SHIP. UC SHIP is the presumptive insurance at the College and that is what we are scoped and staffed to offer information about. When a challenge arises, we will do our best to help students navigate that despite their specific insurance coverage (such as in the event that a student is on Medi-Cal and is kicked-off the plan by Medi-Cal because they did not timely/effectively waive out of UC SHIP) but we cannot and do not present a range of options to students because UC SHIP is the insurance plan that is offered by the College.

B. Referrals

Students have also complained about the referral process. Students have expressed frustration that they must visit a Carbon Health location to receive a referral to another provider. This is a requirement for UC SHIP, like any HMO plan, that we cannot change. For students who have waived out of UC SHIP, whether a referral is required is dependent upon the specific insurance provider and the requirements that provider sets.

Students have expressed concern that their referrals are not always properly sent or received by external healthcare providers. This is a pain-point of any clinical business model, where the student is not always seeing the same provider. Sometimes the referral issue is Carbon Health's fault because they did not properly send a referral out.

Sometimes the referral was sent to a provider, but that provider doesn't accurately document it. Sometimes the referral is not timely provided to the insurance provider, either by the external provider or Carbon Health. To address this, Carbon Health has appointed a person who works with us across all their clinics to ensure that referral issues are quickly addressed when there are challenges. That individual works with the various clinics to get referrals sent out to the external providers, the relevant insurance, and Carbon Health. Coordinator McLean and I meet with Anthem and UC SHIP monthly to discuss referral counts and any referral issues, and students with any referral issues are encouraged to reach out to Savannah McLean, who helps with these processes.

C. Billing Issues

While we have a capitated model of service which Carbon Health, such that students should not be charged for preventative care services, we are in the minority when it comes to the types of services rendered. Most of Carbon Health's services are directly billed to insurance. As a result, sometimes our students or the insurance providers are directly billed. When that happens, the matter can be promptly remedied. To minimize this type of billing error, we have encouraged students who are billed for preventative care services through Carbon Health to reach out to Coordinator McLean, who works with staff at Carbon Health to ensure the student or the student's insurance is not charged. In our monthly meetings with UC SHIP and Anthem, Coordinator McLean and I review any service costs that come in from Carbon Health to ensure these are caught right away and billing is reversed.

D. Appointment Availability

Some students have expressed that they cannot always timely get appointments with Carbon Health. However, I regularly review appointment availability data and have seen no evidence suggesting that this is a widespread problem. A student may not be able to get an immediate Primary Care appointment at their preferred location right away, but urgent care and telehealth appointments are generally available within a day and often that same day. For example, as of today (November 5) and in the SF Civic Center location, a student could book a Primary Care appointment on November 10, an Urgent Care appointment within the next 15 minutes, and a telehealth appointment immediately. There are also Primary Care appointments available in other SF (Market Street; Irving Street; Stonestown) and Bay Area (Alameda; Oakland; Berkeley) as early as tomorrow morning.

Report 4.4 – First Generation Program

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner

Director of the UC Law SF [First Generation Program](#) Ernest Hammond started this academic year. I announced Director Hammond's selection in a July 21, 2025 email to the UC Law SF community:

I write to announce that Ernest Hammond III is the new Director of the First Generation Program at UC Law SF. Today is his first day. (Ernest takes over this role from Mario Lopez, who launched the program several years ago and who, as the Chancellor & Dean's Office announced in May, has started a new position at a community foundation in Marin.)

In addition to serving as the Director of the First Generation Program, Ernest is an Adjunct Professor, co-teaching AI Law with Director of Applied Innovation and Professor Tal Niv. A first-generation college graduate, Ernest brings both personal experience and professional insight to his work supporting students who are the first in their families to pursue higher education. He is especially passionate about mentorship, professional identity development, and building inclusive pathways into the legal profession. Ernest also serves as Associate General Counsel, AI Product at Meta, where he advises cross-functional teams on legal issues related to generative AI, speech and language technologies, and other advanced machine learning applications. His work focuses on regulatory strategy, privacy, intellectual property, and the responsible development and deployment of emerging technologies. Before joining Meta, he held senior product counsel roles at Twilio and Uber, partnering with global teams to navigate legal risks in the technology and healthcare sectors.

Ernest's commitment to first-generation student success spans more than a decade. He previously mentored aspiring Black law students through the Bridge Builders Esq. National Mentorship Program and supported high school and college students through UStrive, a platform supporting first-generation learners. He currently mentors LGBTQ+ undergraduates through the University of Florida's Pathways to Pride Program, and has also supported LGBTQ+ law students through the mentorship program of Bay Area Lawyers for Individual Freedom (BALIF), the nation's oldest and largest association of LGBTQ+ legal professionals. To learn more about Ernest's background and experience, please see his profile page, [here](#).

Since he started, Director Hammond has launched a number of initiatives. The following is a summary list that he shared:

Program Relaunch & Orientation

- Relunched under new leadership with a renewed focus on visibility, belonging, and student support.

- First-Generation Welcome Session (Aug 11) kicked off the year during Orientation: remarks from College leaders, introductions to key offices, and light breakfast networking.
- Distributed a welcome newsletter introducing the program and goals for the semester.
- Relaunched the First-Gen Sharknet Page and conducted a Pulse Survey to capture student needs.

Leadership & Staffing

- Formed the 2025-26 Student Advisory Circle of nine 1L–3L students to guide programming and community initiatives.
- Hired Research Assistant to support events, outreach, and data tracking.

Programming Highlights

- From Roadblocks to Resilience (Oct 8): Workshop on study strategies, career storytelling, and mental-health tools.
- First-Gen × LEOP Evidence Office Hours (Oct 9 & 13): Academic support with Prof. Mai Linh Spencer.
- Levi’s × Perkins Coie First-Gen Lawyering Night (Oct 28): Panel and networking event connecting students with first-generation attorneys across in-house and law-firm roles.

Mentorship & Community Building

- Launched the First-Generation Mentorship Program (application deadline Oct 28), pairing students and attorneys in small “pods.”
- Introduced weekly virtual office hours every Thursday (1–1:30 PM) for drop-in support.

Communications & Outreach

- Regular newsletters, email opt-in campaign, and [updated Sharknet hub](#) ensure broad reach.
- Peer-to-peer engagement through the Advisory Circle enhances visibility and inclusivity.

Outcomes & Next Steps

- Engagement: Dozens of students attended events; early survey data guiding Spring planning.
- Leadership: Nine-member Advisory Circle and RA infrastructure established.
- Partnerships: Deepened collaborations with Levi’s, Perkins Coie, planning for continued collaboration with Airbnb, Apple, UCSF, and Venable in the Spring.

We moved Director Hammond’s planned presentation at the November 14 Educational Policy Committee to the full Board meeting in December so that the entire Board has the opportunity to engage with Director Hammond and learn more about his efforts to create a strong community of first-generation students at UC Law SF.

Report 4.5 – AI Updates

By Provost & Academic Dean Morris Ratner

This report focuses on two developments relevant to the College’s efforts to implement the [2024 Supplemental Strategic Plan regarding Generative AI](#) – faculty ad hoc experimentation in the classroom and the creation of a new AI-focused role for Associate Dean for Library and Technology Camilla Tubbs.¹

I. Formal Instruction and Ad Hoc Faculty Innovation

A. Systematic Instruction

Currently, students receive AI instruction via a mix of required class content and co-curricular programming for all students and opportunities to acquire deeper expertise. Required introductory programming this year includes a JD orientation session sketching AI’s impact on legal practice and modules in the fall and spring 1L legal writing classes. Optional educational opportunities include our [Technology Law & Lawyering Concentration](#) courses (e.g., [AI Law](#) [LAW*557], [International AI Law & Governance](#) [LAW*429]), and as well as co-curricular programs like [LexLab’s lunchtime speaker series](#) and the [Legal Tech Tea Time & Demos](#) series.²

B. Dispersed Faculty Innovation

In addition, individual faculty are innovating in their individual classes. The 2024 Supplemental Strategic Plan re Generative AI states as Goal 5:

Goal 5: Adopt teaching methods to account for GAI.

- a. Ensure we teach relevant skills:
 - i. Prompt generation.
 - ii. Editing.
 - iii. Critical evaluation / understanding AI’s limits and flaws.
 - iv. Professional identity/ethics.
- b. Teach via pervasive methods:
 - i. Incorporate GAI into assignments.
 - ii. Require students to show their work, including steps taken to incorporate GAI tools.
 - iii. Pervasively incorporate AI into instruction, where faculty members deem it to be helpful and appropriate.

¹ See generally, [Report 6.2.3](#) for the March 13, 2025 Board of Directors meeting.

² In addition, LexLab generally creates a community of cutting-edge practitioners Not just through its two talk series that bring entrepreneurs and AI lawyers into the center, but also through its cohort of Research Fellows and through the center’s continuing legal education program.

We reported about a few examples of relevant faculty innovation in courses last year. Over the past few semesters, experimentation has increased. Below please find examples from AY24-25 faculty annual reports, shared with permission. I shared this same information with faculty as a whole with the aim of inspiring further creativity.

- *Hiro Aragaki* – Negotiation

In my Negotiation course, I devote one week to GAI and dispute resolution, during which students do a simulation with a chatbot in lieu of a peer-to-peer simulation. I also invited Tal Niv to give a presentation focused on AI and dispute resolution to my students.... I conceived of and oversee CNDR's burgeoning AI and Dispute Resolution Initiative. This springs from a need I identified to develop better chatbots for use in negotiation teaching—bots that can serve as a more formidable negotiation sparring partner in distributive negotiations. I believe chatbots will fundamentally change the way we teach negotiation and other simulation classes and that we need to stay ahead of this curve.

- *Hadar Aviram* – Criminal Procedure: Adjudicative Process

As I did last year, I invited my CrimPro2 class to try using an AI platform during our special project on jury selection. The overall upshot of this exercise was the same as last year: the students noted that the AI platform came up with questions that were either offensively intrusive or anodyne enough that they were useless.

- *Abe Cable* – Legal Ethics

In Legal Ethics, I taught a unit on AI and lawyering based on a California Bar ethics alert highlighting key issues from using AI in practice. I also ran an experiment in which students fed different AI tools legal ethics questions based on a hypo, and we discussed the results.

- *Betsy Candler* – Con Law I

As noted above, I requested students use AI to generate multiple choice questions in all Con Law I classes. In Con Law I classes, doing an in-class practice of asking AI a question, seeing the result, noting the differences between the predicted answer from AI and a recent Court decision, and then discussion of how to adjust the question asked to understand the recent decision better.

- *Robin Feldman* – Various Courses

C4i specifically worked with 3 valiant faculty members who worked to develop different types of AI modules to test in their classrooms.... The entire process was spearheaded by VAP Zachary Henderson. In addition, I hosted a live podcast recording and Q&A on campus, inviting students in my classes and the broader student body to participate. The Q&A section included a number of insightful student questions, and the resulting video, "How I Used AI in Writing a Book on AI",

is [available on YouTube](#). It discusses some aspects of how to use AI effectively. I am thinking of following this with additional presentations on “How to Understand AI in Depth Without Using Math” and others. For my own classes, I have told students that they can use AI if they tell me, show me their prompts, and understand that I grade to a higher standard for that.... I have returned to a lot of class presentations and answering questions in class. If the work is done by an ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini, students won’t be able to discuss it on their feet in any depth.

- *Jennifer Freeland* – Torts and Legal Ethics

In both courses, I used AI to generate new hypotheticals for students. This was especially helpful, as I had relied on the same hypotheticals for several years, and AI provided a source of fresh, varied material. In Legal Ethics, students worked in groups to write their own multiple-choice questions as a form of review. I encouraged them to use AI to test their questions—either by trying to “stump” the AI or by using it to suggest edits. This exercise proved valuable, as it demonstrated how AI could be used as a study tool to generate additional practice questions and enhance understanding, but also demonstrated AI’s limits.

- *Nira Geevargis* – Various Courses

I revised AI policies for the supervisor/professor/student Bay Area Consortium on Externships Agreement and my syllabi (which I’ve shared with professors at other law schools). I discussed AI use during some site visits with placements and students. I provide supplemental reading for students for my salary negotiations class. The article illustrates how to use ChatGPT for salary negotiations.

- *Angie Gius* – LRW

In Fall 2024, my students first learned about AI via videos [produced by the UC Law SF Library]. Then, I gave a short demonstration using Lexis’s AI program to approach the students’ Memo 1 prompt. Finally, I gave students the option of using AI to write a client letter based on their Memo 1 assignment. The students who used this option were required to edit the AI’s version of the letter and write a short reflection about their experience and the quality of the AI’s work product. I did not use AI for any part of the research and writing process in LRW 2, but my class discussed AI in the context of our substantive class topic. In terms of the students’ learning experience: Providing some minimum exposure to the AI tools felt essential, so these exercises were certainly worthwhile. They were a very small part of the class, though.

- *Brittany Glidden* – Individual Representation Clinic

As mentioned above, I taught two classes about (or incorporating AI) in the fall semester. One of these classes was on using AI for written work. The learning objectives of this class were to consider how our ethical obligations interact with use of AI, to have a basic understanding of the components of an AI prompt, to identify

where AI can assist in editing writing, to identify where AI can assist in brainstorming, and to practice using AI. In the second class, I used AI to have students draft initial witness interview plans (that they had to compare using different prompts and edit), and to use AI as a way to “mock interview” a witness (with AI acting as the witness). These classes were moderately successful. One goal of mine is to introduce students to the idea that they will use AI in practice, but that they need to think critically about what they are using it for and if it is assisting them effectively. In each class, students have very different background in use of AI, and so vary in their comfort, opinions about it, and skill in using it. Because we are learning this alongside the students (as it will likely be in practice with their supervisors), I emphasize the importance of candor in explaining when and how they have used AI and to make that an open discussion with their supervisor.

- *George Horvath* – Health Law & Policy Seminar

In the Health Law and Policy Seminar, I solicited student input, then developed a class policy for the use of AI. Under the policy, students were free to use AI to identify topics for their research project and paper, to identify sources, and to brainstorm arguments. Students were not permitted to use AI once they had presented their paper claims and arguments and were not permitted to use any language that had been provided by AI.

- *Jodi Short* – Compliance & Risk Management

In Compliance & Risk Management (FA24), I built on my SP24 experiment with generative AI (GAI) as a drafting and analysis tool. I integrated GAI throughout my syllabus, both in in-class exercises and in written assignments. In-class assignments utilized GAI to produce a discussion draft analyzing problems from the casebook. In class, we compared and contrasted the answers different students elicited from the AI and used these as a springboard into broader discussion of the issues. The writing assignments I gave students were staged. For example, for one assignment, students were given a fact pattern that requested a client letter as a deliverable. Students were required to produce three graded products: (1) a draft letter generated by a GAI platform based on a prompt created by the student; (2) a memo drafted by the student evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the GAI’s draft; and (3) a final letter, edited by the student and incorporating their own feedback on the draft. I found this to be a useful way to assess students’ grasp of key concepts and develop their critical thinking and analytical skills.

- *Gail Silverstein* – Mediation Clinic

I addressed AI in my syllabus and in my first class and stated that there were fine ways to use AI (to help you prepare for your mediations in different ways) and prohibited ways to use AI (to draft a reflection essay). I also encouraged one student team to present on AI and mediation/ADR. This was a great way to get students interested in AI as they are very peer motivated.

- *Tori Timmons* – Evidence L&P

In addition to what I had last year, I added a lesson in Evidence: Law & Process to discuss the risks of using AI; the emergence of prompting as a lawyering skill and what to consider in crafting an effective prompt; strategies for using AI to enhance learning; and how prompts to an AI and AI outputs may be admissible evidence. In preparation for this lesson, I also asked students to complete the introductory readings on our Hearsay unit, then ask a generative AI tool to teach them about the definition of Hearsay and an overview of the concept. Their homework was to write a reflection comparing the AI output to the casebook and identify good/useful and wrong/misleading/ineffective aspects of the AI-generated output.

- *Kate Weisburd* – Various Courses

In my criminal law class, I included several multiple-choice questions that asked the students to evaluate information that was generated by ChatGPT. The students were asked if the information was correct or not and in what ways. In the [Criminal Practice] Clinic, the students and I discussed the pitfalls and risks of using ChatGPT to write motions.

II. New AI-Focused Role: Building AI Capacity

On October 23, Chancellor & Dean Faigman announced a new role for Associate Dean Camilla Tubbs, which starts as early as this spring term. Dean Faigman wrote:

Camilla Tubbs is moving into a new role starting as early as January 2026 - Associate Dean for Library & Academic Technology Initiatives. In this role, Dean Tubbs will continue to oversee the Library in partnership with Library Director and Professor of Practice Hilary Hardcastle. In addition, in lieu of overseeing IT, Dean Tubbs will advance the College's implementation of strategic plans pertaining to technology, including the [2024 Supplemental Strategic Plan regarding Generative AI](#). Among other things, the Associate Dean will:

- Serve as an expert regarding AI and other technologies that enhance faculty teaching.
- Serve as an expert regarding AI and other technologies that can aid faculty research, training faculty, and assisting with the selection and implementation of new research tools.
- Offer trainings and workshops to students regarding tools that aid learning.
- Offer strategic advice to the College on the integration of AI into College operations.
- Collaborate with faculty to design and develop educational content to meet defined learning objectives.
- And spearhead the development of policies and best practices regarding the use of AI and other technology tools that support teaching, research, and operations.

Dean Tubbs' role is housed in the academic program, overseen by the Provost & Academic Dean.