

Editor's Note

The *Chapman Law Review* is pleased to release the first issue of volume seventeen dedicated to our annual symposium. On February 1, 2013, the *Chapman Law Review* hosted a symposium titled "The Future of Law, Business, and Legal Education: How to Prepare Students to Meet Corporate Needs." It was enlightening to hear from practitioners about their expectations for law graduates and from academics who are innovating new ways of teaching in order to meet those demands, particularly for students eschewing the litigation path. This discourse on law school reform is particularly timely as the debate over how best to utilize the 2L and 3L years continues. In fact, as we were wrapping up the final edits for this issue, even President Barack Obama weighed in on the subject, siding with the camp of reformists that believe the third year of law school should be eliminated altogether.¹

The issue opens with thought-provoking articles by Professors Moss, Rankin, Levine, Rhee, Moliterno, Brodoff, Bowman, Borden, and Cassidy. Each article outlines the author's unique proposal for improving the current law school model. The transcripts from the keynote address and the symposium panels follow. First is the keynote address by Chancellor Leo S. Strine of the Delaware Court of Chancery on how three years of vigor and keeping a generalist perspective to legal education should not be discarded in the movement for reform. Next are the panel transcripts, which address various key educational questions: Can law schools graduate students that meet the "practice ready" standard? How can current teaching methods be altered to better prepare law students? How can a law student's education be tailored to prepare him or her for a corporate lawyer role? How can new technology provide answers for upgrading the law school curriculum?

The issue then concludes with three student comments. First, *Chapman Law Review's* former Editor-in-Chief Kyle D. Mott proposes that California's now-dismantled redevelopment agencies are best equipped to carry out a state senate bill aimed at reducing greenhouse gases. Next, former Senior Notes Editor Karel Raba explains the ramifications that *Adams v. Howerton*

¹ See *For many, two years is plenty*, THE ECONOMIST (Aug. 31, 2013), available at <http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21584392-president-suggests-scrapping-last-year-law-school-many-two-years-plenty>. Thank you to Production Editor Stephan Brown and Managing Editor Dallis Pflueger-Cavallaro for sharing this current event.

may have on same-sex couples in an immigration context. Finally, former Senior Articles Editor Matthew A. Susson explores the possibility of imposing a state tax on cloud computing services.

The *Chapman Law Review* is grateful for the support of the members of the administration and faculty that made both the symposium and the publication of this issue possible. I would like to thank Dean Tom Campbell for supporting the *Chapman Law Review* throughout the many stages of planning for symposium and for imparting memorable words of wisdom as moderator. I am grateful to Professor Ripken for drawing upon her expertise as corporate counsel in developing and moderating our opening panel. Thank you to Professor Heller and Professor Funk for their participation the day of the event, as well as their roles in securing high-caliber entertainment professionals for our final panel. Thank you to Professor Rosenthal, our faculty advisor, for his guidance in refining the symposium topic. Finally, we would not have such a complete discourse on the subject of law school reform tailored to corporate needs if not for the tireless efforts of the 2012–2013 *Chapman Law Review* Executive Board, particularly former Editor-in-Chief Kyle Mott, former Managing Editor Jordana Furman, former Senior Symposium Editor Michael Preciado, and former Symposium Editor Jessica Nguyen.

Nancy Sandoval
Editor-in-Chief