Quimbee Multistate Essay Examination (MEE) and Multistate Performance Test (MPT) Grading Rubric

Please note that this grading rubric was created by Quimbee to assist you in assessing your work and has not been reviewed or approved by the National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE).

Organization and Clarity	Does the writing have the basic "look and feel" of legal analysis?
❻ This answer nailed it.	The form of written reasoning is consistently organized and clear across the following factors: the analysis follows a traditional framework, such as IRAC, CRAC, or CREAC, distinguishing issues, rules, applications, and conclusions; the analysis follows all instructions and is directly responsive to the prompts in a way that is obvious to the reader; the tone is appropriate to the purpose of the assignment (objective or persuasive); the analysis is concise and broken down into paragraphs and sentences of appropriate length and complexity; all conclusions are stated plainly, with no need for the reader to infer them; sentences are generally in active voice; and all verbs and pronouns agree with subjects and antecedents; terms appear to be used consistently, with no ambiguities or changes in meaning.* *Note that although grammar and spelling are not separately graded, some kinds of errors make an analysis difficult to understand and are therefore likely to result in lower ratings in organization and clarity.
❺ Only a law professor would gripe.	The form of the written reasoning is mostly organized and clear across all factors, with only a few minor gaps.
❹ This is on the lower end of professional performance.	The answer contains a single, significant gap in organization or clarity OR minor gaps in organization or clarity across a few factors.
❸ This is borderline unprofessional.	The answer contains significant gaps in organization or clarity OR minor gaps in organization or clarity across most factors.
❷ This is just not okay.	The answer contains significant gaps in organization or clarity across most factors.
❶ I don't know what to make of this.	The answer contains significant gaps in organization and clarity across most factors, and those gaps make it difficult to ascertain the writer's level of success in identifying or understanding relevant content or applying the law to the facts in a logical way.

Legal and Factual Content	Does the writer basically know the rules and spot the relevant facts?
6 This answer nailed it.	Doctrinal content is consistently accurate and complete across the following factors: the general rules are stated accurately for context, and all relevant parts of the general rules, as well as any relevant exceptions to the rules, are further broken down and accurately explained; all relevant facts are explicitly and precisely stated; no irrelevant doctrinal or factual content is included (unless included only to explain its irrelevance); and no significant legal rule or corresponding fact is ignored.
5 Only a law professor would gripe.	The legal and factual content is mostly accurate and complete across all factors, with only a few minor gaps.
4 This is on the lower end of professional performance.	The answer contains a single, significant gap in legal or factual content OR minor gaps in legal or factual content across a few factors. OVERALL, the writer's performance in the Legal and Factual Content category is closer to a 5 or 6 rating than it is to a 1 or 2 rating. The answer reflects the substantive knowledge and issue-spotting ability of a beginning attorney who is struggling a bit with mastering the rules or spotting the relevant facts but who demonstrates enough substantive knowledge to be minimally competent in spotting legal issues and conducting substantive research on behalf of clients.
3 This is borderline unprofessional.	The answer contains significant gaps in legal or factual content OR minor gaps in legal or factual content across most factors. OVERALL, the writer's performance in the Legal and Factual Content category is closer to a 1 or 2 rating than it is to a 5 or 6 rating. The answer reflects the substantive knowledge of a writer who may have difficulty in the beginning practice of law without improvement in this category.
2 This is just not okay.	The answer contains significant gaps in legal or factual content across most factors.
1 I don't know what to make of this.	The answer contains significant gaps in legal and factual content across most factors, and those gaps make it difficult to ascertain the writer's level of success in applying the law to the facts in a logical way.

Application, Logic, and Reasoning	Does the writer make the basic connections and distinctions necessary to arrive at conclusions that make sense?
6 This answer nailed it.	The application of law to facts is consistently well reasoned and logical across the following factors: the legal rules and facts are used in the analysis as distinct premises that support conclusions without circular or other flawed logic; the facts are connected back to rules by way of legal elements or definitions; the general rules are appropriately limited in applications based on exceptions to the rules or the possibility of distinctions among individual cases; all arguments are precisely stated without overbroad generalizations into unsupportable rules; the relative certainty or uncertainty of conclusions is communicated; the use of noncontrolling authorities is appropriately limited; and the analysis leaves no obvious counterarguments unaddressed.
5 Only a law professor would gripe.	The application of law to facts is mostly well reasoned and logical across all factors, with only a few minor gaps.
4 This is on the lower end of professional performance.	The answer contains a single, significant gap in application, logic, or reasoning OR minor gaps in application, logic, or reasoning across a few factors.

OVERALL, the writer's performance in the Application, Logic, and Reasoning category is closer to a 5 or 6 rating than it is to a 1 or 2 rating. The answer reflects the reasoning of a beginning attorney who is struggling a bit with crafting logical legal arguments but is weaving enough analysis together to be minimally competent in presenting analysis to clients, colleagues, and courts. |
| **3** This is borderline unprofessional. | The answer contains significant gaps in application, logic, or reasoning across a few factors OR minor gaps in application, logic, or reasoning across most factors.

OVERALL, the writer's performance in the Application, Logic, and Reasoning category is closer to a 1 or 2 rating than it is to a 5 or 6 rating. The answer reflects the reasoning of a writer who may have difficulty in the beginning practice of law without improvement in this category. |
| **2** This is just not okay. | The answer contains significant gaps in application, logic, or reasoning across most factors. |
| **1** I don't know what to make of this. | The answer contains significant gaps in application, logic, and reasoning across most factors, which make the analysis incoherent. |