Project Biography: A short written description of the project's development, structured to address each of the enumerated categories in this rubric, minus this one. May also include a video presentation (if aiming to exceed expectations). 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.

This project is an ode to my scholarly career. As I'm nearing the end of my law school studies, I wanted to build something to commemorate that. As my peers and I are entering into a period of job applications, interviews, and most importantly job acceptances, I wanted to build something that helped facilitate the last steps of our scholarly career. This project is a Google Colab that uses a Large Language Model interpretation to generate a negotiation salary simulation. By running the Colab cells, the user will be able to enter into a simulation for a law firm based in time after accepting a job offer from them. The simulation will also provide feedback based on the simulation and the end goal is to equip users with the skills to maximize their salaries.

Intro Pitch: A five-minute presentation, with slide deck, that introduces the problem the student aims to address, including the general shape of their nascent solution. Clearly presents a problem facing legal practitioners or consumers, including: (1) a clear statement of the problem; (2) a definition of relevant stakeholders / users; (3) options currently available to users, remember doing nothing is an option; (4) an introduction to their partner; and (5) a rough sketch of how they intend to develop a solution. Quality, clarity, and focus of presentation and slide deck greatly exceed that of other presentations.

The problem I was aiming to combat here is lack of knowledge and experience on salary negotiations. As students wrap up law school, it becomes a whirlwind of keeping up with classes, possibly working an internship all while prepping for the Bar exam. I wanted to offer another quick way to educate people on how the process for salary negotiations go. My original vision was students as stakeholders, but this tool could potentially work for anyone in the workforce with a job offer. The options currently available to users are online courses, workshops, negotiation courses, Chat GPT. My partner is myself. As a student who knew little to nothing about salary negotiation, I feel my review can help determine a lot about what I need in a simulation and how similar it is to the real experience. I plan on using a former Google Colab notebook from class and editing it to ask for a salary negotiation, and writing out a scenario for a salary negotiation, and inserting my API key to do so.

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; a machine learning algorithm trained by the student; or use of an LLM with code-mediated prompting.

This project has taken on the substantial process of an expert system and an LLM with code mediated prompting. The expert system process is governed by the script I put in place for the

Google Colab negotiation simulation and it operates with the instructions I've given it. While the LLM with code mediating prompting comes from the Colab using a natural language processor to understand and give responses. It uses a Language Model, the GPT API key, to generate human-like text.

Impact and 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. More efficient selection of high-value clients, however, can count when this is reasonably projected to lead to a more than 5% increase in revenue.

The project offers an alternative for students who don't want to take a whole course on salary negotiation or don't have the ability to access it. It offers an interactive way without embarrassing the student or forcing them to bring someone else into the mix. So, instead of having to take a semester course of negotiations at law school, or having to pay anywhere from $19-$44 dollars for Interview Buddy(for example). The student who goes into the negotiation is going to have not only a simulation but also feedback on their performance for free. This would save them anywhere from the above range and they'd save 100% of the money.

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? Produces viable output.
UI is intuitive / well-documented. 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 *status quo* in nearly all conceivable use cases.

The project addresses the stated problem and the known needs of the identified users by allowing them to run several simulations based on the feedback they get from the simulation. By providing a cost free alternative, students can easily access this at all times free of cost. If they don't trust a large language model like the famed Chat GPT and have not wanted to make an account with them, they can easily sign into Google Colab with their Gmail account and go from there. This Colab simulation provides a resource that allows students to practice as much as they want with no judgment at all hours of the day-or night.

Documentation: Is there sufficient documentation to address user needs? Note: your partner is a user. 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. If partnering with self, consider that in the future you may not remember everything!

As per the feedback of an HR manager and others, I included directions at the top part of the google colab. This allows users to flow through the colab and go straight to the text box to start their simulation. If an API key stops working, as it likely will in January due to an update in Chat

GPT, then I've posted instructions on how they can obtain their own API key on one of the google notes sections.

Real World Viability: How far is the project from production? Ready for real-world use *as is*. This includes a working technical solution and all supporting documentation. It need not include placement on a server or user authentication.

The project is ready for production. It has all of the code in place ready to go with the instructions as well and can be used today.

Sustainability: How robust is the plan for continued operation? There is a clear plan for continued operation, updates, and maintenance, and the partner seems ready and willing to implement it.

The plan for continued operation is constantly checking. In addition, a google form linked at the bottom for user feedback that allows me to know when the product is not working or just for different ways for me to implement constructive criticism.