

Expediting Common Admin Tasks with GenAI

Katelin Shugart-Schmidt

Assistant Professor of the Practice of Law
Katelin.Shugart-Schmidt@du.edu



Overview

Options for GenAI:

- Co-Pilot (often included with Microsoft Suite)
- Pro version of ChatGPT or Claude
 - Or standard versions with anonymized data (e.g., Student 1, 2)

Case Examples

1. Student Pairings
2. Scheduling
 - Student activities
 - Regular meetings
3. Rubric Drafting



01. Maximizing Diversity in Student Pairings

Gen AI Prompt

My class is 20 students. The class runs in two semesters, fall and spring.

In the **fall**, I want to **pair the students for three assignments** and have them **work in groups of 4 students**. In the **spring**, I want to **pair the students for two assignments** and have **new groups** of 4 students.

Ideally, no student will ever work with another student directly in a pair or group more than once during the year.

For the two spring assignments, students must work in pairs where student A works on Issue 1 and student B works on Issue 2. Each pairing must together either represent the Plaintiff or the Defendant, and an equal number of teams must represent each side for each of the two assignments. **Each student must switch both their issue and side (P/D) between spring assignment 1 and 2.**

Generate a **downloadable spreadsheet** where I can fill in the names of my students and their names will auto-populate across the groups/pairings.

Optional if needed: **Do not pair** Students 1 & 2, although they can work in a group together.

Names	Fall Pair Assignments					
	Fall Pair 1		Fall Pair 2		Fall Pair 3	
Liam	Emma	Harper	Isabella	Charlotte	Harper	Abigail
Emma	Mateo	Olivia	Mia	Mateo	Mia	James
Noah	Amelia	Benjamin	Ethan	Amelia	Henry	Ethan
Olivia	Abigail	Charlotte	Liam	Elijah	Lucas	Mateo
Ava	Isabella	James	Abigail	James	Ava	Charlotte
Elijah	Sophia	Lucas	Lucas	Noah	Isabella	Amelia
Sophia	Ethan	Noah	Harper	Evelyn	Benjamin	Elijah
Mateo	Elijah	Henry	Benjamin	Olivia	Noah	Emma
Isabella	Liam	Evelyn	Sophia	Ava	Liam	Olivia
Lucas	Ava	Mia	Emma	Henry	Evelyn	Sophia
Mia						
Ethan						

Fall Groups of 4				
Group	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4
1	Benjamin	Sophia	Isabella	Emma
2	James	Liam	Mateo	Harper
3	Henry	Abigail	Amelia	Noah
4	Charlotte	Lucas	Mia	Ethan
5	Elijah	Olivia	Ava	Evelyn

Names	Spring Pair Assignments					
	Spring Pair 1			Spring Pair 2		
	Side	Issue 1	Issue 2	Side	Issue 1	Issue 2
Amelia	Plaintiff	Olivia	Harper	Defendant	Lucas	Liam
James	Plaintiff	Emma	Evelyn	Defendant	Harper	Mia
Harper	Plaintiff	Mia	Elijah	Defendant	Elijah	Emma
Benjamin	Plaintiff	Liam	Charlotte	Defendant	Evelyn	Isabella
Evelyn	Plaintiff	Isabella	Lucas	Defendant	Charlotte	Olivia
Henry	Defendant	James	Ethan	Plaintiff	Benjamin	Noah
Abigail	Defendant	Abigail	Mateo	Plaintiff	Sophia	Henry
	Defendant	Noah	Sophia	Plaintiff	Ava	James
	Defendant	Henry	Benjamin	Plaintiff	Mateo	Amelia
	Defendant	Amelia	Ava	Plaintiff	Ethan	Abigail

Spring Groups of 4				
Group	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4
1	Sophia	Harper	Elijah	Ethan
2	Emma	Olivia	Amelia	James
3	Isabella	Henry	Mia	Liam
4	Charlotte	Noah	Mateo	Evelyn
5	Benjamin	Lucas	Abigail	Ava



02. Scheduling: *student activities*

Gen AI Prompt

Assign students to **final oral argument slots**. I will upload a spreadsheet of pairings. Each argument is **1 hour**, and the **available times are** April 12 from 12-4 and April 15 from 9-12 and 1-4.

I **must accommodate** the following constraints:

- Charlotte not on Wednesday morning
- James not on Monday afternoon

I **would like to accommodate** the following constraints:

- Liam not on Monday
- Amelia not on Wednesday afternoon

Do not match the following students:

- Lucas and Liam with Sophia and Henry

*Optional if I have an **uneven number** of students:*

These are the students who have **volunteered** to go twice. They do not need to be matched with their partner for their second round. Prioritize having the volunteers do their arguments back-to-back or at least in the same general time block. The volunteering students are Evelyn, Isabella, and Mia.

Date	Time	Defendant Team	Plaintiff Team	Notes
Monday, April 12	12:00-1:00 PM	Elijah / Emma	Mateo / Amelia	No hard/soft conflicts
Monday, April 12	1:00-2:00 PM	Evelyn / Isabella	Ethan / Abigail	No hard/soft conflicts
Monday, April 12	2:00-3:00 PM	John/James	Fred/Amy	Other class
Monday, April 12	3:00-4:00 PM	Sara/Anna	Ben B / Leo	Other class
Wednesday, April 15	9:00-10:00 AM	Lucas / Liam	Benjamin / Noah	Satisfies Liam not Monday; Lucas not Wednesday afternoon
Wednesday, April 15	10:00-11:00 AM	Harper / Mia	Ava / James	Satisfies James not Monday afternoon
Wednesday, April 15	11:00 AM-12:00 PM	Jennifer / Sarah	Anne / Caroline	Other class
Wednesday, April 15	1:00-2:00 PM	Charlotte / Olivia	Sophia / Henry	Satisfies Charlotte not Wednesday morning
Wednesday, April 15	2:00-3:00 PM	Carolyn / Kait	Seth / Joseph	Other class
Wednesday, April 15	3:00-4:00 PM	Logan / Lelani	Frank / Robert	Other class



02. Scheduling: *regular meetings*

Gen AI Prompt

I need to **hold weekly meetings** with my Teaching Assistants.

I'm going to share my schedule along with theirs. Please find us options for **regular meetings of 1 hour**, sometime between Monday and Friday, ideally 10am to 4pm. Everyone must be able to attend the full hour.

Here are the constraints:

- I **can meet**: M, 10:30-12:15, 3-4; T, 9-12:40, 1:10-2:20; Th, 10:45-4:15
- Jeremy **is unavailable** from 1-3:30 on Mondays, 9-10:30 and 2:15-5 on Tuesday, and 10-11 on Thursdays.
- Anne is **generally available** except from 1:10-2:15pm every day.
- Jane **can meet** any morning before noon or Thurs from 1-4:05pm.

Optional if flexibility exists: Generate an **availability matrix** so I can see other potential meeting times.



Day	Time
Monday	10:30–11:30 AM
Monday	11:00 AM–12:00 PM
Tuesday	10:30–11:30 AM
Tuesday	11:00 AM–12:00 PM
Thursday	11:00 AM–12:00 PM
Thursday	2:15–3:15 PM
Thursday	3:00–4:00 PM

Day	Time Slot	You	Jeremy	Anne	Jane	Everyone?
Monday	10:00–11:00 AM	X (starts 10:30)	✓	✓	✓	X
Monday	10:30–11:30 AM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monday	1:00 AM–12:00 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monday	1:15 AM–12:15 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monday	3:00–4:00 PM	✓	X (unavailable 1–3:30)	✓	X	X
Tuesday	9:00–10:00 AM	✓	X (unavailable until 10:30)	✓	✓	X
Tuesday	10:00–11:00 AM	✓	X (unavailable until 10:30)	✓	✓	X
Tuesday	10:30–11:30 AM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tuesday	1:00 AM–12:00 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tuesday	1:40 AM–12:40 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tuesday	1:10–2:10 PM	✓	✓	X	X	X
Thursday	10:45–11:45 AM	✓	X (unavailable until 11:00)	✓	✓	X
Thursday	1:00 AM–12:00 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Thursday	1:00–2:00 PM	✓	✓	X	✓	X
Thursday	2:15–3:15 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Thursday	3:00–4:00 PM	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



03. Rubric Drafting

Gen AI Prompt

I want to **draft a rubric** for the attached [or copied below] assignment.

Draft a rubric that I can upload to **Canvas** that includes the **following categories**: organization, writing form, style, mechanics, citations.

I want each category to be **graded on a 5-point scale**.

*Example **Assignment Text**:*

Purpose of Assignment

This assignment is the first legal memo assignment, to be completed with your assigned first partner. This memo will use the memo format described in Chapter 6, and within that format, use the IRAC schema to organize your legal analysis.

It will address the NY Attempt and Burglary statute previously provided in the context of the *Forino* case, provided with this assignment and discussed in class.

Assignment Instructions

Your memo will address . . .

First Legal Memorandum Rubric (25 Points Total)

Criteria	5 - Excellent	4 - Proficient	3 - Developing	2 - Needs Improvement	1 - Unsatisfactory
Organization	Memo follows required format exactly (Question Presented, Brief Answer, Statement of Facts, Discussion, Conclusion). Information is logically organized. IRAC structure is consistently and effectively used within the Discussion section. Transitions guide the reader clearly.	Required sections are present and generally well organized. IRAC structure is apparent with only minor organizational weaknesses.	Most required sections are present, but organization is occasionally confusing or incomplete. IRAC structure is inconsistently applied.	Significant organizational problems. Required sections are missing or poorly developed. IRAC structure is difficult to follow.	Memo lacks required organizational structure and does not follow the assigned format.
Writing Form (Legal Analysis)	Demonstrates a strong understanding of the assignment. Clearly identifies and analyzes the relevant factors from <i>People v. Forino</i> . Applies the Attempt and Burglary statutes to the facts of Jeff Martin's case. Analysis is thorough, logical, and persuasive.	Analysis is generally accurate and applies most relevant factors and statutory provisions. Reasoning is clear with minor gaps.	Analysis demonstrates partial understanding but contains omissions, weak application of facts, or limited discussion of relevant factors.	Analysis is superficial, incomplete, or contains significant misunderstandings of the law or facts.	Analysis is largely absent, inaccurate, or unrelated to the assignment objectives.
Style	Writing is professional, objective, and appropriate for a legal memorandum. Tone is clear and concise. Sentences are precise and effectively communicate legal analysis.	Writing is generally professional and clear, with only minor issues in tone, word choice, or conciseness.	Writing is understandable but occasionally wordy, informal, vague, or repetitive.	Style frequently detracts from clarity. Writing contains substantial problems with tone, precision, or conciseness.	Writing style significantly impedes understanding and fails to meet expectations for legal writing.
Mechanics	Virtually free of errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, capitalization, and sentence structure. Formatting requirements are followed.	Minor mechanical errors that do not interfere with readability. Formatting requirements are substantially followed.	Several mechanical errors are present but meaning remains clear. Some formatting requirements may be overlooked.	Frequent mechanical errors distract the reader and reduce clarity. Formatting problems are noticeable.	Persistent mechanical errors make the memo difficult to read or understand. Formatting requirements are largely ignored.
Citations	Correctly cites the relevant statutes and <i>People v. Forino</i> when referenced. Citation format is accurate and consistent. No inappropriate outside authority is used.	Citations are generally accurate with only minor formatting or attribution errors. No significant misuse of authority.	Citations are present but inconsistent, incomplete, or occasionally inaccurate.	Citations are frequently incorrect, missing, or improperly attributed.	Citations are largely absent or fail to identify relevant authority. Uses unauthorized sources or fails to support analysis with assigned authorities.

THANK YOU

Katelin.Shugart-Schmidt@du.edu

