



School of Law  
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

University of Georgia School of Law  
Digital Commons @ University of  
Georgia School of Law

---

Continuing Legal Education Presentations

January 30, 2015

---

Jan 30th, 2:45 PM - 3:30 PM

## Dunning-Kruger and You: Evaluating Your Technological Competence with the Legal Tech Audit

Jason Tubinis

University of Georgia School of Law, jtubinis@uga.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/cle>



Part of the [Legal Profession Commons](#), and the [Legal Writing and Research Commons](#)

---

Tubinis, Jason, "Dunning-Kruger and You: Evaluating Your Technological Competence with the Legal Tech Audit" (2015). *Continuing Legal Education Presentations*. 5.  
<https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/cle/2015/Schedule/5>

This Event is brought to you for free and open access by the Alexander Campbell King Law Library at Digital Commons @ University of Georgia School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Continuing Legal Education Presentations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of Georgia School of Law. [Please share how you have benefited from this access](#) For more information, please contact [tstriepe@uga.edu](mailto:tstriepe@uga.edu).

# **Dunning-Kruger and You: Evaluating Your Technological Competence with the Legal Tech Audit**

**Jason Tubinis, J.D.**

Information Technology Librarian  
Alexander Campbell King Law Library  
University of Georgia School of Law  
Athens, Georgia

# Dunning-Kruger and You: Evaluating Your Technological Competence with the Legal Tech Audit

Jason Tubinis, J.D.  
Information Technology Librarian  
Alexander Campbell King Law Library  
University of Georgia School of Law  
Athens, Georgia

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
The Dilemma(s).....	3
The Solution (?).....	6
The Audit .....	8
Why You Should Care .....	10
Conclusion.....	12
Appendix 1: Legal Tech Audit feature list.....	14
Word Processing.....	14
Spreadsheets.....	15
PDF .....	16
Appendix 2: Select Training Resources .....	17
Word Processing.....	17
Spreadsheets.....	17
PDF .....	17

## Introduction

There's an enormous skill set you must develop as an attorney: an eye for detail and nuance, a critical mind capable of addressing a legal issue from multiple, often contradictory, perspectives, the poise and presence to stand before a court and present your case, the confidence to argue zealously on behalf of your client, the fortitude to work long, hard hours, and so on. One skill that is too often neglected, though, is the ability to utilize technology to ease the burden of all those aforementioned tasks for the benefit of your firm, your client, and most importantly, yourself. In fact, In August of 2013, the ABA approved a change to its Model Rules of Professional Conduct to address this very issue. The comments to Rule 1.1 on a lawyer's "duty of competence" were amended to include that "a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practice, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology..."<sup>1</sup>

One aspect of this comment is a reminder and a warning that new technology has some inherent risk as it is being adopted and understood. We need look no further than the notion of putting data into the "cloud." While it is certainly convenient for all of our information and services to be universally accessible from anywhere with an internet connection, that same information can be hacked or compromised just as easily. Part of your due diligence is making sure you understand the benefits and costs, both financial and practical, of any technology you choose to integrate into your practice.

Another aspect of the comment is that lawyers are encouraged to improve their familiarity with the technology already being used. But how much more does the one

---

<sup>1</sup> *Client-Lawyer Relationship, Rule 1.1 Competence - Comment*, [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/publications/model\\_rules\\_of\\_professional\\_conduct/rule\\_1\\_1\\_competence/comment\\_on\\_rule\\_1\\_1.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_1_1_competence/comment_on_rule_1_1.html) (Dec. 2013)

need to get out of their word processor or email client? Some would say that there's always more to learn. And they are right; there are so many functions and tools built into Microsoft Word alone that no mortal being could ever know all of them, and that is a single piece of software in a whole suite of office productivity applications.

However, some would say they know more than enough to get by. In fact, the practice of law demands a higher level of competence with those tools considering the importance of creating and transmitting documents, communicating quickly and effectively, and recording actions taken. If you've been plugging along with no issues, haven't been reprimanded or otherwise punished, and generally enjoy an uninterrupted stream of clients, your level of technological competence is probably exactly where it needs to be.

This latter mindset isn't wrong either. After all, it's your skills as a lawyer that your clients are interested in, not whether you're a Microsoft certified Excel guru. This level of tech aptitude should not be mistaken for mastery, though. The amount of expertise you have with the software is not all-encompassing, but enough to get the job done. Yet some lawyers will consider their skills to be far more advanced than they actually are. By the criteria they see before them, gainful employment and successful application of technology to daily tasks, they evaluate themselves as being competent with the technology. In other words, if you're good enough to be a successful lawyer using a word processor or spreadsheet, doesn't that mean you're a good user of that software?

If this starts to sound a bit dissonant, it's by design. Of course not all lawyers will conflate being a good lawyer with being a good technology user. And the aforementioned cognitive error (actually, a *metacognitive* error, but I'll address that

later) of falsely attributing competence based on a deficient skill set is a condition suffered by humans in general, not just lawyers. The phenomenon was identified by Justin Kruger and David Dunning in the article “Unskilled and Unaware of It: How Difficulties in Recognizing One’s Own Incompetence Lead to Inflated Self-Assessments.” While the article was published more than 15 years ago, it has been thrust back into our collective consciousness recently due to the explosive advancement of technology and the increasingly diverse ways in which we interface with it. As we struggle to assess our effectiveness in utilizing tech in a myriad of new ways, the aptly named “Dunning-Kruger effect” posits, in grossly simplified terms, that the less we know about something, the more likely we are to overestimate our competence in it.

## **The Dilemma(s)**

Evaluating and improving the technological competence of lawyers presents a two-fold dilemma. The first is simply addressing the Dunning-Kruger effect. The article describing their studies introduces three points, the first two of which seem benign: first, that success depends on knowing the rules and strategies of the domain you’re participating within, and second, that people will apply different rules and strategies in a domain with differing levels of success. The third and noteworthy point is that:

...when people are incompetent in the strategies they adopt to achieve success and satisfaction, they suffer a dual burden: Not only do they reach erroneous conclusions and make unfortunate choices, but their incompetence robs them of the ability to realize it.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Kruger, Justin; Dunning, David (1999). "Unskilled and Unaware of It: How Difficulties in Recognizing One's Own Incompetence Lead to Inflated Self-Assessments". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77 (6), 1121.

They refer to this ability to know how well they are performing, or to judge the performance of others, as *metacognition* or *metacomprehension*. To illustrate their point, the authors use the example of being able to write grammatical English. The skills necessary to complete a grammatical English sentence are the same ones needed to recognize one. They're also the same skills needed to recognize an error; "In short, the same knowledge that underlies the ability to produce correct judgment is also the knowledge that underlies the ability to recognize correct judgment."<sup>3</sup>

They found that individuals less competent in an area were more likely to overestimate their performance. Their lack of skill translated into a deficiency in the *metacognition* necessary to recognize that they had performed poorly. Interestingly enough, while the lower skilled individuals tended to overestimate their abilities, higher skilled individuals tended underestimate their performance relative to their peers. They found that they could accurately identify their absolute abilities (their score on a test), but would downplay their ability relative to the performance of their peers (average score amongst a class). The conclusion reached was that the participants assumed since they had performed well, everyone else must have done just as well.

How does this apply to lawyers and technology? This discussion about the Dunning-Kruger effect isn't to cast lawyers as a profession of luddites, blissfully unaware of all the tools at their disposal. This is simply a public service announcement, a reminder to question your preconceptions about what you do and how you do it. It's a cautionary warning, the one discussed previously about the new ABA comment regarding an attorney's duty of competence regarding technology. Just because you're doing fine with technology doesn't mean you can't be doing more, doing it better, or

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

doing it faster. Don't assume you're doing the best you can with the software or hardware at your disposal. I am sure there's some task in Word or WordPerfect that will simply ruin your day if you find yourself stuck with it. Don't live with that; make it an opportunity to improve your skills.

The second dilemma is one that flows from recognizing where there is room for improvement. Even if you can identify a piece of software that you'd like to learn better, there's a potential disincentive for lawyers to get better with technology. A technologically proficient lawyer can format reports easier, create documents automatically, compile spreadsheets with less confusion, process PDFs quicker, etc. But achieving that proficiency takes time training and learning about all the nuances and functions of the software. Improving with using technology can take a lot of time and effort. And generally speaking, this isn't time you can bill for. Getting better with technology also means you can complete tasks quicker, which means you will be billing for less hours. That's right: this second 'dilemma' comes down to the almighty dollar and ethical behavior. Will you spend more time learning something new (and potentially very challenging) in order to reduce the time you ultimately charge for? What if that same time could be instead used doing the same tasks in the longer, more inefficient way, and still be counted as billable time?

How much of a problem or perceived issue this may be depends on how cynical one is about those that practice law in the United States. Will attorneys, despite the time saving benefits presented by enhancing their prowess with the software at their disposal, continue to pad their billable hours with inefficient practices? Or will they embrace the paradox of spending more time and effort to make less money? Of course, the reality isn't nearly so nefarious, and most clients are aware. Clients are paying for their skills as



a lawyer, not for the dexterity with which they can navigate the finer functions of Microsoft Word. And even if the work is inefficient, if the end product produces a desirable result in the end, maybe the inefficiency is worth it. Regardless of whether this feeds back into the false sense of technology competency discussed earlier, many clients are interested in the outcome, not the means.

That being said, it cannot be universally claimed that no one has ever looked at the details of their bill and wondered how much could be saved if their council was a little savvier with a word processor. Enter Casey Flaherty, corporate counsel at Kia Motors America, Inc., and someone who did exactly that. And then did something about it.

## **The Solution (?)**

Flaherty's solution to the perceived overcharging for technological incompetence was a basic technology competency audit. The nature of the audit is relatively simple: a series of mock assignments testing the skills of his outside law firms in certain pieces of software, namely Microsoft Word, Excel, and Adobe Acrobat. He chose a set of tasks that take him about 30 minutes to complete, and includes such projects as formatting a motion in Word, isolating pertinent performance data in Excel, Bates stamping a series documents reproduced as PDFs, etc. Flaherty set a satisfactory completion time at an hour and had firms bidding for Kia's business send a top associate to take the audit. For each time the outside council fails to complete the tasks within that hour, he takes 5 percent off their bill. I would argue that any firm that comes with a half hour or so of that limit should not have their billing reduced. Indeed, in much of the literature written about the audit, Flaherty freely admits that the hour limit was a completely arbitrary

threshold. However, none of the outside council came even close. Of the 10 times he administered the audit, the best any of his outside firms could achieve was two and a half hours, with the worst being eight hours, or an average of five hours across all of them.

An interesting aspect of the audit was that Flaherty gave his outside council opportunities to explain that certain aspects of the audit would not be handled by an associate. In the letter sent to the associated before the audit, he explains that:

It is important to understand that the distribution of work is one focus of the audit. You should not hesitate to explain that a particular task would be performed by someone else—e.g., your secretary, a paralegal, word processing. For certain tasks, that is precisely what is expected (i.e., it is the right answer).<sup>4</sup>

This disclaimer came with a set of caveats though. First, paralegals also bill for their time, so unless they receive substantially different training, it probably won't change the fact that the tasks are being done inefficiently. Second, the audit is also intended to test general proficiency, so even if the specific task being tested may not be appropriate for the associate's position, it will still probably reveal whether they're proficient in the way the audit is concerned. Third, sufficient staff support isn't always available, especially considering the odd hours worked or work done while traveling. The tasks will still need to be accomplished by the associate in these situations, even though they would normally be handled by staff. Finally, if the associate claims that efficiency on a particular task is immaterial because it will never show up on a bill, that is fine, but then it should never show up on a bill.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Flaherty, Casey, "Could you pass this in-house counsel's tech test? If the answer is no, you may be losing business". [http://www.abajournal.com/legalrebels/article/could\\_you\\_pass\\_this\\_in-house\\_counsels\\_tech\\_test](http://www.abajournal.com/legalrebels/article/could_you_pass_this_in-house_counsels_tech_test) (July 17, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

## The Audit

The primary goal of the audit is to provide a more tangible incentive for attorneys to improve their tech skills. A stand-alone audit tool is now available that will allow clients to request that their attorneys take the audit and receive a score based on their performance. All other things being equal, or depending on the preferences of the client, the tech audit score will provide the client with a discrete value by which to evaluate attorneys or firms. The score will be a real representation of how much more, or less, a client can expect to pay. The audit addresses everything from find-and-replace to functions to purging metadata from a document. You can see a full list of the material covered in the audit In Appendix 1. The skills being tested aren't anything overly sophisticated; as Flaherty puts it, "the learning curve is neither steep nor long."<sup>6</sup> They are also tasks you can realistically expect to see requested. I must add that some tasks are hidden behind obscure or unintuitive design choices, and, in the case of some pieces of software, are downright intimidating. If not for a helpful coworker, I would still be mortally terrified of Excel.

I've had the chance to review the stand-alone version of the legal tech audit available to law students, which only touched on a couple features of Word. The lessons covered modifying and applying styles, auto-numbering headings, using the navigation panel to arrange sections of a document, viewing and using the formatting mark-up in a document to achieve the desired look, and creating templates. The system for going through the lessons and evaluations was rather restrictive, only working in Internet Explorer and one of the newer versions of Word. The integration between the lessons

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

and the practical exercises, however, responded very quickly and helped tremendously with learning.

The exact tasks included in the full audit aren't public knowledge yet, as the product is still being developed. There are a few projects tested by the audit<sup>7</sup> available by way of example, including one involving adding a provision to a generic lease in Microsoft Word. It involves adding a new section between Articles II and III. All the new content added is correct, but all of the subsequent sections (and cross-references to those sections) will need to be renumbered. In the document provided, the lease is 101 pages long and will require 136 headings to be changed, as well as 273 cross-references to be updates, or 409 necessary updates (or 'opportunities for error'). For the average user trying to make all of the updates manually, the process can take about two and a half hours. A user savvy in the type of techniques advocated by the audit can use Word's built-in styles, auto-numbering, and cross-references to make the same changes in about 20 seconds.

Another task involves providing PDFs for court, but making sure all of the active links have been removed from the documents. Flaherty uses the example of an associate who prints out the PDFs and then rescans the prints into a new PDF. Yes, technically the links are removed. But consider the process of printing, retrieving, and scanning. Maybe the whole process takes 4 minutes, but if you're billing at \$200 an hour, those 4 minutes are \$20 for a single document. Multiply that across all documents that might need to be processed this way and the costs quickly begin to accumulate.

---

<sup>7</sup> Flaherty, Casey "Legal Tech Audit" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KOfC5jQoH6Y>

These are just some of the practices Flaherty identified as taking a disproportionate amount of time compared to the way they could otherwise be completed using the right techniques. As the list of features in Appendix 1 makes apparent, there is a rather large amount that one needs to learn to pass the audit with flying colors. What is even more impressive (and daunting) are the subjects and tasks that were discussed for the audit but were not chosen to be included in the final product, including data security, email and calendaring, legal research, time and billing, and electronic discovery. For the three subject areas the legal tech audit covers, I have compiled a collection of training resources in Appendix 2. I would invite you to peruse the feature list for something you've struggled with before, or even something new, and give it a try.

## **Why You Should Care**

So will you be failing your due diligence if you can't add Bates Numbering in Acrobat? No. Is your livelihood in peril if you can't automatically generate a table of contents in Word? Unlikely. Will your billable hours be slashed if you can't link cells across multiple spreadsheets in Excel? Probably not. As discussed above, most people coming to an attorney are only tangentially concerned about their technology skills, if at all. Ultimately it is your skill as a lawyer that they are interested in, so any thought of improving your tech competency should come only after you are completely confident in your ability to represent your client's best interest.

That said, I believe that many of the skills advocated by the tech audit are well worth your time learning. While an incalculably small amount of lawyers will actively avoid training in an effort to inflate their billable hours, I believe most others have a

genuine interest in honing their skills. Having done a fair amount of research into what is involved in the audit, as well as preparing a series of instruction sessions on audit-related skills for current law students, I can personally attest that the talents and insight you can gain are incredibly helpful. Knowing how to finesse Word into creating a document the exact way I want it to look instead of fighting it tooth and nail was well worth the time and effort.

Furthermore, Flaherty's tech audit could be the next big thing. There are many different training tools available to lawyers, either provided in house, through vendors like Capensys, or free online (Appendix 2), but the tech audit is one of the first services to provide a genuine incentive to engaging in that training. Legal technologists, librarians, bloggers, and those interested in forecasting the future of the legal practice have been paying a lot of attention to what Flaherty has been saying since the audit was introduced in early 2013. The excitement initially surrounded the audit because it was the first discrete way of evaluating and motivating the improvement of tech training for lawyers. That hype has grown now that Flaherty has delivered on the promise to a localized idea into an external tool for the legal community to utilize. While the tool has taken about two years to materialize, the fact that actually arrived bodes well for its implementation

Even if the tech audit doesn't become an established practice, it's another indicator in series of efforts to address what is perceived to be an issue in the legal profession. There's a growing field of positions for people with JDs, but who don't want to become lawyers. And almost all of these new professions are in some way integrated with technology: legal knowledge engineers, legal technologists, legal process analysts, legal project managers, online dispute resolution (ODR) practitioners, legal

management consultants, legal risk managers, etc. In other words, there is a growing number of “legal entrepreneurs” who specifically specialize in the intersection of law and technology. And most of them aren’t in Atlanta, or New York, or Los Angeles, or London, or Beijing. They’re in Silicon Valley, and they see that technology can replace book stores, TV, and taxis. So why not lawyers? It’s not as strange as it sounds. Just look at LegalZoom, providing largely automated legal assistance. Or the Computer Assisted Legal Instruction center’s Access2Justice (A2J) platform, a cloud based software tool that lets you create web-based interfaces for document assembly. A2J is freely available to courts, clerk’s offices, legal services organizations, and law schools to make these tools, all without having to involve a lawyer.

Lawyers have not innovated into these kinds of high tech fields because, until now, there was virtually no alternative to an actual attorney. However, the demands of society changed, and technology has advanced to the point that these demands can be met without an admitted member of the bar. So instead of lawyers filling these new niches, the entrepreneurs, hackers, and robots have begun to do it instead. Rather than falling further behind, why not embrace this opportunity to reclaim relevance.

Absent all of those things, if you’re already competing for clients, why not compete on technological proficiency as well? It certainly can’t hurt your cause to be a good technologist on top of being a good lawyer.

## **Conclusion**

Embrace this opportunity to reexamine your presumptions about where you are professionally and technologically. This author did, and I’ve found that the most empowering aspect of engaging in the legal tech audit was removing a lot of the anxiety

surrounding figuring something out. Too many times do I find myself trying to learn (unsuccessfully) in the middle of a project, getting frustrated, and attacking it in a brute force way that would ultimately leave me feeling stressed out and unsatisfied with the final product. My view of the audit has thusly evolved, from some new, needlessly onerous potential reason for punishment, to a legitimate reason to want to improve my level of comfort in engaging with the software I thought I understood. I once again encourage you to give the process a shot, and to start (or continue) the journey of becoming a tech savvy lawyer.



# Appendix 1: Legal Tech Audit feature list

## Word Processing

Align Text: center  
Align Text: justified  
Align Text: left  
Align Text: right  
Bookmark  
Breaks: Page  
Breaks: Page - Column  
Breaks: Section - Next Page  
Bullets  
Columns  
Comment: delete  
Comment: delete all  
Comment: insert new  
Comment: next  
Comment: previous  
Compare  
Copy  
Create PDF  
Cross-Reference  
Cross-Reference: update  
Cross-Reference: update all  
Cut  
Endnote  
Find  
Find & Replace  
Find & Replace All  
Find & Replace: Format  
Find & Replace: Special  
Font  
Font color  
Font size  
Font style  
Font: all caps  
Font: bold  
Font: highlight  
Font: italics  
Font: small caps  
Font: strikethrough  
Font: superscript  
Font: underline  
Footnote  
Format Painter  
Header & Footer: different first page  
Header & Footer: edit  
Header & Footer: format page number  
Header & Footer: insert page number  
Header & Footer: link to previous  
Hyperlink  
Indent: decrease  
Indent: First line  
Indent: increase  
Insert: Shapes  
Insert: Symbol  
Insert: Text Box  
Margins  
Multilevel List  
New Window  
Numbering  
Orientation  
Pagination: Keep lines together  
Pagination: Keep with next  
Paste  
Paste: Keep Text Only  
Paste: Merge Formatting  
Permissions  
Picture: crop  
Picture: insert  
Picture: styles  
Picture: wrap text  
Prepare for Sharing  
Redo  
Restrict Editing  
Save  
Save as  
Show/Hide ¶  
Show: Navigation Pane  
Show: Ruler  
Spacing: after paragraph  
Spacing: before paragraph  
Spacing: line spacing  
Styles: apply  
Styles: modify  
Styles: update to match selection  
Table: autofit  
Table: borders  
Table: delete column  
Table: delete row  
Table: insert column  
Table: insert row  
Table: insert table  
Table: shading  
Table: text alignment  
Track Changes: accept  
Track Changes: accept all  
Track Changes: next  
Track Changes: on/off  
Track Changes: other authors  
Track Changes: previous  
Track Changes: reject  
Track Changes: reject all  
Track Changes: show final  
Track Changes: show markup  
Undo  
Views: Draft  
Views: Outline  
Views: Print Layout  
Styles: apply  
Styles: modify  
Styles: update to match selection

## Spreadsheets

Align Text: center  
Align Text: left  
Align Text: right  
Align: bottom  
Align: middle  
Align: top  
AutoFill  
AutoSum  
Borders  
Breaks  
Cells: delete  
Cells: format  
Cells: insert  
Charts  
Clear  
Columns: autofit  
Columns: delete  
Columns: format  
Columns: hide  
Columns: insert  
Columns: unhide  
Conditional Formatting  
Copy  
Copy as a Picture  
Create PDF  
Cut  
Defined Names  
Fill Color  
Filter  
Find & Replace  
Find & Select  
Find & Select: go to special  
Font  
Font color  
Font size  
Format Painter  
Formula: add  
Formula: cell references  
Formula: divide  
Formula: multiply  
Formula: subtract  
Freeze Panes  
Function: AVERAGE  
Function: COUNT  
Function: COUNTA  
Function: HLOOKUP  
Function: IF  
Function: IFERROR  
Function: INDEX  
Function: ISBLANK  
Function: ISERROR  
Function: ISNUMBER  
Function: ISTEXT  
Function: LEFT  
Function: LOOKUP  
Function: MATCH  
Function: MAX  
Function: MIN  
Function: RANK  
Function: RIGHT  
Function: ROUND  
Function: SUM  
Function: SUMIF  
Function: VLOOKUP  
Hyperlink  
Indent: decrease  
Indent: increase  
Margins  
Merge & Center  
Name Box  
New Comment  
Number Format  
Orientation  
Page Break Preview  
Page Layout  
Paste  
Paste Special  
Permissions  
Picture  
PivotTable: multiple filters  
per field  
PivotTable: column labels  
PivotTable: insert  
PivotTable: report filter  
PivotTable: row labels  
PivotTable: show values as  
PivotTable: summarize  
values by  
PivotTable: values  
Prepare for Sharing  
Print Area  
Print Titles  
Protect Workbook  
Remove Duplicates  
Rows: autofit  
Rows: delete  
Rows: format  
Rows: hide  
Rows: insert  
Rows: unhide  
Save  
Save as  
Scale to Fit  
Select All  
Shapes  
Size  
Sort  
Styles  
Table  
Worksheet: delete  
Worksheet: hide  
Worksheet: insert  
Worksheet: move or copy  
Worksheet: rename  
Worksheet: select all  
Worksheet: tab color  
Worksheet: unhide  
Wrap text

## **PDF**

Advanced Search  
Bates Numbering  
Bookmark: add  
Bookmark: delete  
Bookmark: go to  
Bookmark: rename  
Callout Box  
Create PDF: combine files into a single PDF  
Create PDF: from clipboard  
Create PDF: from file  
Draw  
Encrypt  
Find  
Full Text Index with Catalog  
Header & Footer  
Highlight Text  
Link  
Pages: delete  
Pages: extract  
Pages: insert  
Pages: replace  
Pages: rotate  
Recognize Text (OCR)  
Redact  
Remove All Links  
Remove Hidden Information  
Remove Links  
Snapshot  
Sticky Note  
Text Box  
Text Edit

## **Appendix 2: Select Training Resources**

### **Word Processing**

Microsoft Office Training and Tips

<https://office.microsoft.com/en-us/support/results.aspx?ctags=CEO01017196&queryid=485752a4-82eb-47c1-96f8-0825904423cf&av=all>

Word Help and How-To's

<https://office.microsoft.com/en-us/word-help/word-help-and-how-to-FX101818070.aspx>

Get the Most Out of Microsoft Word

[http://www.americanbar.org/publications/law\\_practice\\_magazine/2012/march\\_april/get-the-most-out-of-microsoft-word.html](http://www.americanbar.org/publications/law_practice_magazine/2012/march_april/get-the-most-out-of-microsoft-word.html)

CompuSavvy's Word & WordPerfect Tips

<https://compusavvy.wordpress.com/>

Allen Wyatt's WordTips

<http://word.tips.net/>

### **Spreadsheets**

Excel and Numbers Templates for Attorney Billing Timesheets

<http://www.esquiremac.com/blarg/2009/5/5/excel-and-numbers-templates-for-attorney-billing-timesheets.html>

Excel for Litigators: Tips to Present Numbers and Calculations at Trial

<http://cogentlegal.com/blog/2014/06/excel-for-litigators/>

Law Firm Project Tracker

<https://office.microsoft.com/en-us/templates/lawfirm-project-tracker-TC001140479.aspx>

Litigation Task Based Budget Excel Spreadsheet

<http://hytechlawyer.com/?p=2361>

### **PDF**

Acrobat for Legal Professionals

<https://blogs.adobe.com/acrolaw/>

PaperlessChace PDF Blog

<http://www.paperlesschase.com/category/pdfs/>

AcrobatUsers Tutorials

<https://acrobatusers.com/tutorials>

Digital Trends: How to Edit a PDF

<http://www.digitaltrends.com/computing/how-to-edit-a-pdf/>