

THE CLEL/ABA JLEL SCORING GUIDE FOR STUDENT ARTICLES

**PLEASE NOTE:** This year Judges may elect to reject a paper without reading the submission in its entirety if a minimum writing standard is not met. At least five instances of errors of law or the Rules of Writing (including too many typos, grammatical mistakes, missing words per page, etc.) must be noted before such a determination can be made. Such paper must be returned to Susan Wan with noted errors on the paper itself as well as a completed Tally Sheet with the “Rejected Paper” box check marked.

Score Range	Relevance and Usefulness to Practitioners	Legal Analysis	Use of Authority	Compliance with Rules of Writing and Bluebook	Writing Style
	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses contemporary legal issues.</li> <li>- Issues addressed are very relevant to practicing attorneys.</li> <li>- Adopts a practical focus or advances important policy position.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Author adopts an insightful position and comes to a logical conclusion.</li> <li>- Remains focused.</li> <li>- Demonstrates thoughtful, creative analysis of sources of all viewpoints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent footnotes (every 1-2 sentences).</li> <li>- Detailed and helpful footnotes</li> <li>- Footnotes relate logically and effectively to the above-the-line statement.</li> <li>- Statements in the text are appropriately footnoted. Sources used offer diverse perspectives. Citations used (primary v. secondary) are appropriate to the citations made in the text.</li> <li>- Primary source materials have been used whenever available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Few or no obvious BB mistakes.</li> <li>- Few or no obvious grammatical mistakes.</li> <li>- Few or no general errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly written</li> <li>- Sentences all complete and of varying length.</li> <li>- Word choice consistent and interesting.</li> <li>- Writing is concise and focused.</li> <li>- Almost no passive voice.</li> </ul>
<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses contemporary issue that has not been widely addressed in other publications.</li> <li>- Issues presented are relevant to practicing attorneys.</li> <li>- Adopts a somewhat practical focus or advances substantial policy position.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopts a position and comes to a related conclusion.</li> <li>- Generally remains focused.</li> <li>- Demonstrates generally insightful analysis of multiple viewpoints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent footnotes (every 2 or 3 sentences).</li> <li>- Detailed and helpful footnotes.</li> <li>- Footnotes relate logically and effectively to the above-the-line statement.</li> <li>- Statements in the text are mostly footnoted appropriately. Sources used generally offer diverse perspectives. Citations used (primary v. secondary) are generally appropriate to the citations made in the text.</li> <li>- Primary source materials have been used whenever available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some BB mistakes.</li> <li>- Very few grammatical mistakes.</li> <li>- Some general errors.</li> <li>- Generally, few number of errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mostly clearly written.</li> <li>- Mostly simple sentences and some variety of sentence length.</li> <li>- Some interesting word choices.</li> <li>- Writing is focused.</li> <li>- Very little passive voice.</li> </ul>

<b>Score Range</b>	<b>Relevance and Usefulness to Practitioners</b>	<b>Legal Analysis</b>	<b>Use of Authority</b>	<b>Compliance with Rules of Writing and Bluebook</b>	<b>Writing Style</b>
	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issues addressed are either not contemporary or have been widely written about in other publications.</li> <li>- Issues addressed are somewhat relevant to practicing attorneys.</li> <li>- Paper is more academic than practical.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Author adopts an obvious position and comes to a somewhat related conclusion.</li> <li>- Paper sometimes loses focus.</li> <li>- Analysis is minimally related to the background section and uses little of the background information.</li> <li>- Demonstrates some insightful analysis and gives relatively cursory treatment to contrary viewpoints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More than one footnote per paragraph.</li> <li>- Footnotes could be more detailed and helpful.</li> <li>- Footnotes generally relate to the above-the-line statement.</li> <li>- Statements in the text generally footnoted appropriately. Sources used offer some diverse perspectives. Citations used (primary v. secondary) frequently relate to the text.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent BB mistakes.</li> <li>- Frequent grammatical mistakes.</li> <li>- Frequent general errors.</li> <li>- Generally, distracting number of errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some unclear sentences, ideas.</li> <li>- Some run-on or fragmented sentences and little variety of sentence length.</li> <li>- Appropriate but "boring" word choices.</li> <li>- Writing is adequately focused but goes on some tangents.</li> <li>- Some passive voice.</li> </ul>
<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issues addressed are not contemporary and have been widely addressed in other publications.</li> <li>- Subject matter is of little to no relevance to practicing attorneys</li> <li>- Paper adopts an entirely academic focus, with no attempt to provide guidance to practitioners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Author fails to adopt a position and fails to come to a conclusion.</li> <li>- Paper lacks focus</li> <li>- Analysis is not related to the background section and does not use the background information.</li> <li>- Mainly obvious, uncreative analysis, and addresses very few contrary viewpoints.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One or fewer footnotes per paragraph on average.</li> <li>- Footnotes lack detail/are unhelpful.</li> <li>- Footnotes do not relate to the above-the-line statement.</li> <li>- Relatively few statements in the text are footnoted appropriately. Sources used do not offer diverse perspectives. Citations used (primary v. secondary) relate somewhat to the text.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Serious BB mistakes.</li> <li>- Poor grammar.</li> <li>- Serious general errors.</li> <li>- Generally, BB and grammatical errors make it difficult to read.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unclear sentences.</li> <li>- Frequent run-on or fragmented sentences.</li> <li>- No variety of sentence length.</li> <li>- Writing is poorly focused and wanders.</li> <li>- Frequent use of passive voice.</li> </ul>
<b>1-2</b>	Little to no attempt.	Little to no attempt.	Little to no attempt.	Little to no attempt.	Little to no attempt.

