

Final Project Grading Rubric (Lawyering in the Age of Smart Machines)

Fall 2016 - Suffolk University Law School, David Colarusso & William Palin

Deliverables Checklist*

Show your work! We can only provide credit for the work you document. Absence of evidence *will* be considered evidence of absence. If you feel that your collection of deliverables is missing information we need to properly assess your work according to the rubric below, please provide additional information. Note: the best place to do this is most likely in your Project Biography. See below.

- ☐ Feedback from user testing (e.g., user feedback forms, email impressions, etc.)
- ☐ Solution documentation for all user types (described below under *Product*)
- ☐ Project Biography (described below under *Product*)
- ☐ Your final technical solution, including source code and final executable when applicable (e.g., QnA interview, HotDocs document, python scripts)
- ☐ One 15 minute presentation/demo (described below under *Product*) to be given during either the penultimate or ultimate class session.
- ☐ A 300-500 summary of your final project in the tone of a blog post for a general audience. Note: this deliverable is not technically part of your final project. It is taking the place of your portfolio page. So it is not referenced in the rubric below. We mention it here as you will likely turn it in with your project.

*All deliverables are due on the last day of the exam period--December 20th.

Process (40%)

Category	Exceeds Expectations (9-10 pts)	Meets Expectations (8-8.9 pts)	Below Expectations (0-7.9 pts)	Weight
Framing.	Description of problem has	Description of problem has	Description fails to provide	1

How well does the student define a problem facing legal practitioners or consumers, including a definition of relevant stakeholders / users?	sufficient detail to facilitate the creation of an extraordinarily well-tailored solution, including an enumeration of all potential user types / stakeholders (e.g., client and attorney users) and model personas for same.	sufficient detail to facilitate the creation of a well-tailored solution, including an enumeration of all potential user types / stakeholders (e.g., client and attorney users).	sufficient detail for the creation of a well-tailored solution.	
Research. How extensive is the student's research of existing solutions?	Substantial review of existing solutions, including relevant technical and content-based solutions (e.g., form banks) and involving consultation with practitioners. Depth and breadth of research greatly exceeds that of other projects.	Substantial but no-exhaustive review of existing solutions, including relevant technical and content-based solutions (e.g., form banks). May involve consultation with practitioners.	Cursory or no review of existing solutions, far below that done for other projects.	3
Ideation & Prototyping. How well does the student explore the available space of potential solutions?	Considers and weighs the costs & benefits of multiple technical solutions or design configurations. Creates prototype only after considering at least three alternatives. These may be the subject of A-B testing below.	Considers and weighs the costs & benefits of multiple technical solutions or design configurations. These may be the subject of A-B testing below.	Fails to considers and weighs the costs & benefits of multiple technical solutions and design configurations.	2
User Testing. How rigorously does the student engage in user	Makes use of two or more of the following in close to real-world conditions: A-B	Makes use of at least one tester other than themselves for each type of user in close	Fails to make use of a tester other than themselves; or fails to	3

testing, and how realistic are such tests?	testing, multiple testers other than themselves for each type of user, potential real-world user(s). Captures user feedback in a uniform comparable manner. Student provides copy of user feedback.	to real-world conditions. Captures user feedback in a uniform comparable manner. Student provides copy of user feedback.	replicate close to real-world conditions; or fails to capture user feedback in a uniform manner.	
Refinement. How well does the student integrate feedback from user testing into subsequent versions of their solution?	User feedback is thoughtfully integrated into the final version of the solution (where the solution includes both the technical product and documentation). At least two rounds of user testing were conducted with iterative improvements to the solution after each round. Use of multiple tests amount to more than testing for testing's sake.	User feedback is seriously considered and used to inform the final version of the solution (where the solution includes both the technical product and documentation). The final version is not the same as the original version (i.e., there are at least two versions).	Fails to seriously consider user feedback in final version of solution or fails to create multiple iterations of the solution.	2

Product (60%)

Category	Exceeds Expectations (9-10 pts)	Meets Expectations (8-8.9 pts)	Below Expectations (0-7.9 pts)	Weight
Novelty. How original is the project?	Entirely novel application of legal tech, involving a difference in kind over other	Non-derivative application of legal tech, on par with the majority of other	Entirely derivative & overdone application of legal tech (e.g., a tool for	0.5

	projects not just a difference in degrees.	projects.	creating a 93A demand letter).	
Complexity/Robustness To what extent is the project taking on a substantial process?	Involves non-trivial use of at least two of the following: an expert system; document automation; data scraping from a data source not in the student's control.	Involves non-trivial use of an expert system or document automation.	Fails to make non-trivial use of an expert system or document automation.	3
Impact & Efficiencies. Does the project offer the prospect of greatly increasing the efficiency or expanding the reach of existing practice?	Expands the reach of a single practitioner by more than 100 or decreases the amount of time expended on the automated task by more than 50%. Note: expanded reach must account for all work flowing from the solution such that this work will not result in new work for a practitioner. That is, it assumes the practitioner is already working at full capacity. So increased lead generation doesn't count.	Expands the reach of a single practitioner by more than 10 or decreases the amount of time expended on the automated task by more than 10%. Same reach considerations as <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> .	Fails to expands the reach of a single practitioner by more than 10 and fails to decreases the amount of time expended on the automated task by more than 10%. Same reach considerations as <i>Exceeds Expectations</i> .	1
Fit/Completeness. How well does the project address the stated problem and known needs of the identified users? Does it do what it was designed for?	Directly addresses the stated problem for the stated user types such that it is reasonable to assume almost all users of any user type would find the solution a great improvement over the <i>status quo</i> in nearly all	In broad terms, the solution address the stated problem for the stated user types such that it is reasonable to assume most users of any user type would find the solution an improvement over the <i>status quo</i> except	The solution as executed would reasonably be expected to create confusion or frustration when used through poor design or incompleteness.	3

	conceivable use cases.	for a small set of edge cases.		
Documentation. Is there sufficient documentation to address user needs? Documentation includes all “help” text, including that found inside your solution. It need not be an external document.	Well written and approachable for the overwhelming majority of potential users. Sufficient to address all likely user concerns as well as important edge cases.	Clearly written and accessible for most potential users. Sufficient to address all likely user concerns.	Unclear or insufficient to address all likely user concerns. This includes failing to provide documentation for a user type.	2
Real World Viability. How far is the project from production?	Ready for real-world use as <i>is</i> . This includes a working technical solution and all supporting documentation. It need not include placement on a server or user authentication.	Identifies what steps are needed before real-world use, and such steps are estimated by the instructors to be less than two day’s work, excluding placement on a server or user authentication.	Fails to identify what steps are needed before real-world use, or such steps are estimated by the instructors to be more than two day’s work, excluding placement on a server or user authentication.	2
Project Biography. A short informal written description of the project’s development, structured to address each of the enumerated categories in this rubric, minus the last two, to be turned in on date of presentation.	Sufficiently descriptive to answer almost all instructor questions regarding the above categories when combined with a copy of your working solution, user documentation and user feedback. These materials alone would be sufficient to grade the project on the preceding categories.	Sufficiently descriptive to answer the majority of instructor questions regarding the above categories when combined with a copy of your working solution, user documentation, and user feedback. Only a few followup questions are needed in addition to these	Insufficiently descriptive to answer the majority of instructor questions regarding the above categories when combined with a copy of your working solution, user documentation, and user feedback.	2

		materials to grade the project on the preceding categories.		
Presentation/Demo. A presentation to LASM introducing and demonstrating the project.	Includes a successful live demonstration of your actual solution. Touches upon all but the last two rubric categories. Brings the audience up to speed on your current progress. Quality, clarity, and focus of presentation greatly exceed that of other presentations.	Includes a successful live demonstration of your actual solution, on par with the majority of presentations. Brings the audience up to speed on your current progress. Touches upon all but the last two rubric categories.	Fails to include a successful live demonstration of your actual solution or Fails to bring the audience up to speed on your current progress or fails to meet the quality of the majority of presentations or fails to touch on all the rubric categories, excluding the last two.	3

Grading: The number of points earned in each category will be multiplied by the value in the corresponding weight column to determine a score for each category. The sum of these scores will be divided by 27.5 and multiplied by 10 to arrive at a percentage score between 0 and 100. These scores will be translated into grades (e.g., 90 is an A-).

Related Documents:

- [Final Project Presentation Sign Up](#)
- [Final Project Process Checklist](#)
- [Your Online Portfolio & Uploading to Our Website](#)
- [Everything You Wanted to Know About QnA-Based Data Collection and Document Automation but Were too Afraid to Ask](#)