

Levels of Quality			
	Exemplary	Competent	Developing
	Advanced work for a first year law student – on a job, the work would need very little revision for a supervising attorney to use Score 2 for each exemplary criterion met	Proficient work for a first year law student– on a job, the work would need to be revised with input from a supervising attorney Score 1 for each competent criterion met	Work needs additional content or skills to be competent - on a job the supervising attorney would need to start over Score 0 for each developing criterion met
If a section is missing (Introduction, Issue, Facts Argument, Conclusion) Score = 0			
Legal Analysis Skills: Intro/conclusion/issue(s)/facts– (5 criteria)			
INTRO- DUCTION and CONCLUSION	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies parties and reasons for the memo/brief; provides short clear conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Introduces parties and reasons for the memo/brief but less clear or conclusion less clear or concise	<input type="checkbox"/> Parties not identified and/or reasons for the memo/brief unclear or conclusion unclear or wordy
ISSUE or QUESTIONS PRESENTED	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes clear legal issue/s and jurisdiction and most significant facts	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes legal issue/s but may lack clarity or legal references or missing some significant facts	<input type="checkbox"/> Is unclear or identifies a different issue or missing major parts
FACTS	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes all material facts; excludes extraneous facts and legal conclusions <input type="checkbox"/> Includes key facts for other party <input type="checkbox"/> Organized logically and persuasively	<input type="checkbox"/> Includes most material facts; excludes most extraneous facts; includes no legal conclusions <input type="checkbox"/> Omits some key facts for other party <input type="checkbox"/> Organized reasonably logical and persuasive	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacks significant material facts; includes many extraneous facts or legal conclusions <input type="checkbox"/> Omits key facts for other party <input type="checkbox"/> Disorganized, unpersuasive or and hard to follow
Legal Writing – (3 criteria)			
ORGANI- ZATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Document follows format; paragraphs effectively organized <i>and</i> well ordered to communicate logical and persuasive progression; uses thesis sentences	<input type="checkbox"/> Document follows requested format; paragraph organization and order usually effective; sometimes uses thesis sentences or somewhat effective	<input type="checkbox"/> Document does not follow format or paragraph organization and order usually ineffective; thesis/topic sentences rare
Writing Style and Conventions (see competencies)	<input type="checkbox"/> Based on word choice, issue, location in paragraph, transitions, and grammar, organizes sentences for efficient and fluid reading-writing is a pleasure to read <input type="checkbox"/> Writing is concise and uses nearly error-free mechanics and conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Based on word choice, issue, location in paragraph and grammar, organizes sentences for somewhat efficient reading <input type="checkbox"/> Contains some excess words or legalese or some inaccurate mechanics or conventions	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences are hard to follow; may have to be reread to understand <input type="checkbox"/> Contains excess words or legalese or inaccurate mechanics or conventions

Legal Analysis – persuasive argument – (14 criteria)			
ARGUMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively organizes around issues and sub-issues – leads with strongest points <input type="checkbox"/> Uses effective and persuasive point headings throughout <input type="checkbox"/> Contains persuasive theory or story <input type="checkbox"/> Persuasively and accurately identifies rules, including sub-rules/sub-elements/sub-issues and exceptions <input type="checkbox"/> Synthesizes cases persuasively <input type="checkbox"/> Selects effective and sophisticated range of authorities for client, including accurately applying weight of authority <input type="checkbox"/> Describes the rules using authorities <input type="checkbox"/> Explains the reasons for the rules <input type="checkbox"/> Shows <u>how</u> the analysis applies to facts for the client <input type="checkbox"/> Explains <u>why</u> the analysis applies to client facts <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and refutes counter-arguments <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and distinguishes other party's main rules and authorities <input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and distinguishes other party's key facts <input type="checkbox"/> Selects appropriate reasoning methods (deductive, inductive) based on rules, nature of law and client facts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Organizes around issues and sub-issues – somewhat persuasive <input type="checkbox"/> Point-headings mostly effective, somewhat persuasive <input type="checkbox"/> Theory or story somewhat clear <input type="checkbox"/> Accurately identifies important rules, including sub-rules/sub-elements/sub-issues and exceptions – lack persuasiveness <input type="checkbox"/> Some cases synthesized <input type="checkbox"/> Selects basic authorities for client; applies weight of authority mostly accurately <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat describes the rules using authorities <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat explains the reasons for the rules <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat shows <u>how</u> the analysis applies to facts <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat explains <u>why</u> the analysis applies to facts <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat identifies and refutes counter-arg <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat identifies and distinguishes other party's rules and authorities <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat identifies and distinguishes other party's key facts <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective reasoning methods (deductive, inductive) based on rules, nature of law and client facts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Organization unclear or not persuasive <input type="checkbox"/> Point-headings somewhat effective or not persuasive <input type="checkbox"/> Theory or story unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Important rules, including sub-rules/sub-elements/sub-issues and exceptions – are inaccurate or missing <input type="checkbox"/> Cases described individually <input type="checkbox"/> Selects some basic authorities for client; applies weight of authority somewhat accurately <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat describes the rules with limited use of authorities. <input type="checkbox"/> Reasons for the rules unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <u>how</u> the analysis applies to facts <input type="checkbox"/> Unclear <u>why</u> the analysis applies to facts <input type="checkbox"/> D/n identify or refute counter-arg <input type="checkbox"/> D/n identify or distinguish other party's rules and authorities <input type="checkbox"/> D/n identify or distinguish other party's key facts <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks effective reasoning methods (deductive, inductive) based on rules, nature of law and client facts

Score: _____ /44 Legal Analysis, Organization, Writing, Format

Score: _____ / 6 Citation – See Citation Rubric

Total _____/50

This Memo: _____

Class average: _____

Class median: _____

Memo Draft (x .4) = _____/20 Final Memo (100%)= _____/50
