



Lee Burgess: Welcome to the Bar Exam Toolbox podcast. Today, we are talking about what the graders are looking for when they grade your bar exam. Your Bar Exam Toolbox hosts are Alison Monahan and Lee Burgess, that's me. We're here to demystify the bar exam experience so you can study effectively, stay sane, and hopefully pass and move on with your life.

We're the co-creators of the [Law School Toolbox](#), the [Bar Exam Toolbox](#), and the career related website [CareerDicta](#). Alison also runs [The Girl's Guide to Law School](#). If you enjoy the show, please leave a review on your favorite listening app, and check out our sister podcast, the [Law School Toolbox podcast](#). If you have any questions, don't hesitate to reach out to us. You can reach us via the [contact form](#) on BarExamToolbox.com, and we'd love to hear from you. And with that, let's get started.

Alison Monahan: Welcome back. Today, we're talking about what the bar graders are really looking for when they grade your bar exam answers. So, we have not actually been bar graders ourselves, although, Lee, you had the offer to be a bar grader.

Lee Burgess: I did, which I turned it down because it's really bad money.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. Which is how you ended up starting your bar tutoring business.

Lee Burgess: That's true.

Alison Monahan: But we have had graders work for us over the years, and we've talked to a lot of them. And we have reviewed stacks and stacks and stacks of graded student answers and ungraded student answers, so we have a pretty good idea what the bar graders are looking for. And I think the problem here is most bar takers don't actually think that much about what the graders are looking for. So, let's talk about that.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I think it's also important to just think about what it's like to grade these exams. If you've never been a TA, if you've never taught anything, it is weird to read a stack of questions that are all on the same thing. It is hard. It is actually really hard work to do that.

Alison Monahan: It becomes kind of like Groundhog Day.

Lee Burgess: It does. And you kind of get like visceral reactions when questions are...



Alison Monahan: And then sometimes you see really weird stuff. I remember I was working over the summer; it was after my 2L year. I have such a clear memory of sitting in my office in London at this law firm, and I was tasked with reading the Law Review submissions. And most of them, whatever, you're reading them, they're fine. You're like, "Okay, some are better than others." And then you occasionally get one where you're like, "What?"

Lee Burgess: "Did you try? Did you spell check?"

Alison Monahan: The one I remembered, I have such a visceral memory of turning this page around and being like, "This can't be true," and then flipping through the whole thing. It didn't have any punctuation, like somehow all the periods...

Lee Burgess: Even at an Ivy League law school.

Alison Monahan: ...had been stripped out.

Lee Burgess: That's very strange.

Alison Monahan: Someone submitted it with no punctuation? It was one of those that you're like, "How do you even do that?"

Lee Burgess: I know a student submitted a final exam to me once with no capital letters. I was just flummoxed. Yeah, so I think the thing that you have to remember is there are people who are going to have reactions to what you are doing on the page, and so you want to put yourself in their shoes. Most of these people are working lawyers. They are doing this at night, let's say, for fun, and on their weekends. And so, the harder you make it for them, the more of this kind of reaction that you're going to be. I think they do as good of a job as they can to be consistent, but they're still going to react to your work. So, one of the things that we wanted to do today was make sure that you understand what the graders are looking for so you can write these answers that they might look forward to reading, or at least not be so memorable, in a negative way, that they would talk about it after that.

Alison Monahan: Years. Literally years later.

Lee Burgess: Years later.

Alison Monahan: Like I remember that essay I got.



Lee Burgess: Yeah.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, I think that's right. I mean, your goal here is to blend in and maybe be slightly above average.

Lee Burgess: Exactly. I had one grader tell me once that every paper... So, the California exam is from out of 100, although it's very, very hard to get towards a 100.

Alison Monahan: I don't think I've even seen one 80.

Lee Burgess: I've seen an 80. I know that 85s are given out. But really, you're going for like a 65.

Alison Monahan: Right.

Lee Burgess: And he's like, "Every exam has like a 60, and it's your job to either show me you deserve more or disappoint me and you get less." And then I think when you start to think about it that way, that you're basically kind of coming in, not quite passing and you either need to prove to them that you're passing or then you affirm for them that you're supposed to fail. It's kind of an interesting way when you think about the details of how you're going to present yourself.

Alison Monahan: Right. So they're not starting at 100.

Lee Burgess: Right.

Alison Monahan: They're kind of starting you at slightly below passing, so you've got to give them that reason. And you have to give it to them quickly because the reality is, they are reading incredibly quickly. So if you spent an hour writing this or, say, you've spent 45 minutes writing it, because hopefully you've read the question and spent a little time outlining it – so say you spent 45 to 50 minutes writing it, you've turned out multiple pages. They're spending a few minutes grading it.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, that's for the California exam. And the UBE answers are going to be even shorter, because you only have 30 minutes to write. So they're spending just a couple of minutes to skim these answers. It is really important that you understand that they're skimming and not carefully going through word by word, because as much as you might want them to cull through your answer like a law professor and give you the benefit of the doubt if something is not quite on point, they're not going to.



Alison Monahan: No. I mean, if you bury some important issue, they are not going to find it. If you make it hard to find your analysis, they're not really going to look for it. You see this a lot actually in California, because sometimes people get a second read, which means they were close enough to passing on the first try, but not quite. And so to be fair the bar says, "Okay, we'll take a second look at your answers." However, scores can go up or down at that point.

Lee Burgess: Oh yeah, I've definitely seen people kind of tank the second reading.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. So sometimes it's interesting. I've seen them, not uncommonly, go up or down as much as 10 points, which is really substantial. That's a difference between like a 55, which is definitely failing, and a 65, which is passing. And it's kind of intriguing when you think about, what are these two people seeing differently? And I think a lot of the time, it's just the second person is probably slowing down a little bit more and they're either seeing you did talk about this, or actually, it looked like you talked about this and they got kind of swayed by that heading, but you didn't really do your analysis.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. So the reality is, if your issues aren't easy to spot, the grader's not going to be able to see them and you're not going to get credit for them. And you can't even assume you're going to get partial credit. You just might get no credit. The reality here is that if you leave points on the table because your stuff looks like a mess, that's on you.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And the same person typically is reading the same question over and over again, so you can't really fudge it. It's kind of like, they know what they're looking for.

Lee Burgess: Yeah, exactly. So, the other thing I think is important to think about, beyond the fact of how the graders are just reading the questions, is that they are really looking for precision. And I think this word "precision" is something that isn't used enough in the bar prep world, because although you don't need to be a master at all of the law, you need to be precise in what you talk about.

Alison Monahan: Right.

Lee Burgess: And I think that this is the most true with the MEE questions, where they're so short and on point that if you go off to left field and you start talking about something that you really are passionate about, or maybe you wrote a Law Review article about, or you know something about – they don't care. And I think this is why some very, very accomplished people, Ivy League lawyers, or



law student... I guess at that point they're Ivy League law graduates, but will often fail, because they almost have so much information that they're like, "I want to give you my treatise on the Fourth Amendment", and that's not...

Alison Monahan: It's like, "We actually just want you to give us the analysis on whether this one piece of evidence that we found in the trunk of the car is admissible or not."

Lee Burgess: Exactly. It's like they missed the point. And I think that that is something you really have to practice, is making sure you're delivering the answers that you're looking for. I think that there is a common misperception that as long as an essay answer looks organized and is coherent, that it's going to pass. And that's just not always true.

Alison Monahan: No, that helps, but if you know the underlying law.

Lee Burgess: Exactly. You've got to spot those issues that are triggered by the facts, and the more you use the facts precisely, the better. If you've never done this and you're studying for the bar, I would really recommend that you take a minute and read the instructions. Nobody reads the instructions, except people like me. And to be honest, I don't even think I read the instructions until I was teaching the bar. But what's interesting when you read the instructions, is the instructions always focus on the fact that you need to do analysis. There's always some language in there that refers to analyzing the facts. There's not usually language in there that talks about rote memorization of the law.

Alison Monahan: The bottom line is, nobody cares how much extra law you know, if that law is not implicated by the question.

Lee Burgess: Right.

Alison Monahan: It's like, "Okay, that's really nice that you happen to have written a Law Review paper on this particular topic. However, that is not what we asked you about."

Lee Burgess: Yep. And I think this over-focus on the law can really tank folks. One of the first courses that we developed in the bar space was called our [Writing of the Week program](#) – we call it WOW, which we did to really show you how little law you actually need to know to execute a question. So, in WOW, you get a video where we kind of talk through the law that you need to know. And when I first started developing that curriculum, even I, who had been doing this work for quite a few years, was like, "Oh wow."



- Alison Monahan: "Is that it?"
- Lee Burgess: That's it. It was like a few sides, you know? And you're like, "Huh." And then you do more and more and you're like, "Wow." You need to know the right law, but you don't need to know that much law for each question.
- Alison Monahan: And the other thing is a lot of these same topics come up over and over again. So, once you start to do a set of videos or whatnot, you start to see you really need to know conspiracy, if criminal law comes up, because accomplice liability is pretty commonly tested.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly. So we've done podcasts where I've just walked through essay questions for both California and the UBE, and I think that can also be helpful for you to just get an understanding of the scope of the law that's necessary to know for these individual questions. You don't need to know a treatise on wills and trusts. You just need to really know what a holographic will is.
- Alison Monahan: Right. Exactly.
- Lee Burgess: What are the requirements for a valid holographic will? And if you can't answer simple legal questions like that, that shows you that your studying is off.
- Alison Monahan: Right. Exactly. You need to be able to answer these basic questions about what creates an agency relationship, how do you know these things, what are the basic things, basics of community property, how are different types of property divided up?
- Lee Burgess: Exactly.
- Alison Monahan: That literally is probably an attack outline, maybe two pages. That's kind of the level you need to know. And you can look at something like a [SmartBarPrep](#) outline, [Lean Sheets](#), those kinds of things to kind of get that sense of it's really not that much material, but you need to know the right stuff.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly. So the bar graders are not going to be impressed by your treatise. If the rule doesn't apply, don't mention it.
- Alison Monahan: Oh, I love that. Sometimes you see these essays, people are like, "I just don't understand why I failed." I'm like, "Okay, send me your essays." And I look at it and I'm like, "You realize 80% of what you wrote down in this 30-minute essay is



a bunch of rules, maybe two out of the 12 of which you actually applied. Where is the rest of the essay?"

Lee Burgess: I know.

Alison Monahan: So, if you're practicing, I think sometimes what we have students do if they're in this kind of camp is really highlight in different colors, where are your rules, what facts did you use, where's your analysis, and look at that ratio. I think we even have a whole podcast about this. If that ratio is way off and you've got just a bunch of rules and no actual analysis, that's really taking away from what you're going to get points for.

Lee Burgess: Exactly. So, if you really are struggling figuring out if your balance is right, you can, on your computer screen, or you can print it out and do it with highlighters, whatever, but you need to highlight in one color what your rule statement is, highlight in one color what your analysis is, and highlight in one color your conclusion. And if in that sandwich, if the analysis one is not longer than the rule statement, that is a red flag that you are not doing enough analysis or you're doing too many rule statements, and you need to spend more time doing analysis.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. And people just like to talk about... People like to memorize, say, whole paragraphs or rule statements. People love to do this in law school, too. And in law school maybe, arguably, it was a better idea because you had a three-hour exam. But, if you have a 30-minute essay, you don't have time to write down unrelated things. Just don't even do it.

Lee Burgess: Right. And I think that the other thing is it's comforting to memorize things. Then you're like, "I know what I can write about. If I see a question on conflicts of interest, I can give you a whole paragraph." But that might not be what's necessary to apply. And I think this is where some of the essay templates can get a little squishy, because I think they can lead people to believe that what's important is that you memorize this whole template and you...

Alison Monahan: Regurgitate it word for word.

Lee Burgess: Regurgitate it word for word, even if it doesn't exactly apply. Instead of have a huge template, you need to have maybe memorized statements of the law that you're going to write, or memorized attack plans that you can pull up, based on the facts. I think that's the piece that is missing from the essay templates.



- Alison Monahan: Right. You have to think.
- Lee Burgess: You do have to think.
- Alison Monahan: They gave you these facts for a reason and you really need to spend a little bit of time thinking about what that reason is, and then applying your legal knowledge that you've crammed into your head to these exact facts, because anything that's irrelevant, you're just not getting credit for. That means you're wasting time, and you're not going to be able to get to everything.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly. Another thing that you want to keep in mind is that your graders will not piece together your answer for you. They're not going to do your work for you. They're just not going to do it.
- Alison Monahan: Right. They're not going to fill in the blanks.
- Lee Burgess: Mm-hmm (negative). So one of the things you want to look out for in your writing, and this is something else that you can do when you're self-evaluating your work is circular reasoning. We see this a lot, and so we're going to give an example. So an example of this would be, "Danny's statement is logically relevant because he was trying to prove Pamela caused the accident, which makes this logically relevant."
- Alison Monahan: Well, that's useful. It's not. You might listen to this and be like, "Okay, but that doesn't actually say anything."
- Lee Burgess: Right. It just says it's logically relevant because it's logically relevant.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah, that he was trying to prove his cause of action. Well, that's why you're in court.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly.
- Alison Monahan: We need to know what specific part of what he's trying to prove this specific fact applies to.
- Lee Burgess: Right. And you need to understand what "logically relevant" means, so you can argue that... Isn't it like making a fact more or less likely of consequences or something?



- Alison Monahan: Right, whatever that definition happens to be, you basically want to write that down and then think about, this fact makes this more or less likely because of. The fact that the bystander said he thought the light was green, makes it more likely that whatever element needs to be met, that so-and-so went through the light and caused the accident, negligent.
- Lee Burgess: Right. Exactly. So, I think one of the things we will often say to our students or that you might hear in your commercial courses is this idea that you need to just include the word "because" in the sentence, and that's going to solve all your analysis problems. But we wanted to point this out because it can be a sticky trap, where our statement of, "Danny's statement is logically relevant because he was trying to prove Pamela caused the accident, which makes this logically relevant" has a "because" in it, but it's still not explaining anything.
- Alison Monahan: Well, what comes after the "because" needs to be basically a factual reason for your analysis. So, "It is more likely that Danny caused the accident because he went through a red light."
- Lee Burgess: Right. Exactly.
- Alison Monahan: "And the bystander is saying he thought the light was green. Therefore if he's correct, then Danny didn't go through a red light, so he's not likely to be negligent."
- Lee Burgess: Yep. So you might think something is obvious and doesn't need to be explained, but the problem is you have to spell it out because they're not going to give you the benefit of the doubt, and they're not going to read your mind.
- Alison Monahan: Well, no judge is going to do that either.
- Lee Burgess: Right. So this is good for practice. And when we were prepping for this podcast, I remember this [blog post](#) Alison wrote – you wrote this a long time ago.
- Alison Monahan: About forever ago.
- Lee Burgess: About talking to your grandmother. There's a great cartoon image that you used on this one.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah, it was a little lady with her little cane. No, that is a funny one. But yeah, sometimes I think people think you have to sound so intelligent. You have to sound like you use big words. But the reality, particularly on something like the



bar exam – you need to explain things in the most simple terms possible, because assume that your grandmother might be reading this. Tell Granny what difference it makes that the light might be green or red. And I think keeping that in mind versus trying to sound so intelligent, like, "Oh, I've memorized all this law, so I'm going to sound like a lawyer." The best lawyers I ever knew often times really broke things down in the most simple ways and they saw that really as their goal. I mean, how many times have you been in court? "Well, your honor, the three most important things in this case are X, Y, and Z." And that case might be a case that's gone on for years, they've spent millions of dollars on it. But they have that ability to walk in and say, "These are the three things that you need to focus on." And I think the bar is...

Lee Burgess: Yeah. My dad was really good at that. My dad is a lifetime litigator.

Alison Monahan: Exactly.

Lee Burgess: Yeah.

Alison Monahan: Because he was a US attorney.

Lee Burgess: Right.

Alison Monahan: You don't get to that without being able to be like... Same thing with a jury – you have to be able to break this stuff down and explain it. And I think that's kind of what you can think of yourself as doing for the bar graders.

Lee Burgess: Yeah. I think I was fortunate in growing up sitting in courtrooms watching both of my parents who litigated, but my dad who was more of a career litigator. But I remember being 10 and sitting in a trial and being able to follow what he's talking about.

Alison Monahan: Yeah, because you were probably as intelligent as the average juror at that point.

Lee Burgess: Right, but then the other side would come up and I would be like, "What is he talking about?" Like, he would be talking about babies. It was actually this famous defense attorney, I remember this one, who ironically got disbarred and then was sitting in the MPRE with us retaking the MPRE to try and get his license again. There was a little tax evasion. Anyway, I remember his closing argument to the jury and he was talking about babies, and this was about drug trafficking.



Alison Monahan: And what do babies have to do with this?

Lee Burgess: And I remember being 10 and being like, "I don't understand why he's talking..." And we're walking out of the courtroom and my dad's talking to the FBI agents or whatever, and I was like, "What was it about babies?" And they were like, "That's the right response."

Alison Monahan: Yeah, you're like, "We're going to win this case."

Lee Burgess: Exactly.

Alison Monahan: Pretty sure the jury is having the same like, "What?"

Lee Burgess: Pretty sure the jury is not sure what the babies is about either.

Alison Monahan: I remember when I was in sociology, a Research Methods class once, and a professor said, "You can always tell when an academic doesn't really understand the argument they're trying to make, or their argument is weak, because suddenly the language gets a lot more convoluted." So, if you're ever reading a paper and suddenly the language gets way fancier, you know they don't know what they're talking about here. And it's the same thing on the bar. If you try to make it sound good, but you are basically BSing your way through, they're going to notice.

Lee Burgess: They're going to notice. Yeah.

Alison Monahan: So just keep it simple.

Lee Burgess: Keep it simple.

Alison Monahan: Say what you know.

Lee Burgess: Short, clear, concise.

Alison Monahan: Explain why you know what you know.

Lee Burgess: Exactly, and move on.

Alison Monahan: Yeah. Another professor at architecture liked to say, "What do you know and how do you know it?" And I thought that was always a great way of looking at it. What do you know and how do you know it? Just write that down.



- Lee Burgess: Yep. It's also important to remember that graders are going to rely on benchmarks and red flags. Since the graders do not have time to go word for word through your work, you have to remember they're not going to wade through your answers, so you have to make it easy for them to find things.
- Alison Monahan: I always love it when you look at someone's answer and I'm like, "Where are the paragraphs?"
- Lee Burgess: I know.
- Alison Monahan: You're like, "Did you think this was going to be passing? No one can find anything in here. Just put in some headers."
- Lee Burgess: You need some headers. You need some paragraphs. You need some organization. You may need some indented. You need signal words. If it's a three-prong test, if it's...
- Alison Monahan: Numbers. Three-prong test, number them.
- Lee Burgess: Number them. If it's offer, acceptance, and consideration, it's always nice to have that in a paragraph, as, "Offer: Acceptance: Consideration:" And then they're like, "Check, check, check."
- Alison Monahan: Right. Because then if they're thinking, "Did they talk about acceptance?", they can look down and be like, "Yep, they talked about that. Check."
- Lee Burgess: And as much as a lot of people find it frustrating to have to use the IRAC or CRAC – the conclusion, rule, analysis, conclusion formula that is often required for the essays, or the CREAC when it comes to the performance test, I think that these formulas also make it very easy for the grader to find things. They're always looking for the rule upfront. They're always looking for the analysis next, and you want to just rely on these formulas because it just makes their job easier. And happy graders lead to typically happy grades.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah, exactly, just say it. Again, the first thing we need to analyze is, whatever. Here's the rule that applies to that. Here are the facts that apply to that that we're going to use that rule, blah, blah, blah. And here is how I think the court is likely to come out on this issue. The next thing we need to talk about is... It's very formulaic. You can almost think of it like a slot machine. You just be like, "Cha-ching, cha-ching, cha-ching. Get in, get out."



Lee Burgess: Move on.

Alison Monahan: Get the points.

Lee Burgess: Yep. The other thing I think a lot of people don't think happens when graders are reading your essays is that they can tell when you're panicking and running out of time.

Alison Monahan: Oh yeah.

Lee Burgess: Or even planning as you go. It's very obvious. It's very, very obvious. I have graded so many essays where my comments will be something like, "I can tell here that you are unsure of what you're doing" or, "I can tell here that you have run out of time" or, "I can tell here that you have no..." It's very amazing how much you can communicate, especially when you start to read stacks of them and compare an answer who does know what they're talking about to one that doesn't. So, you've got to take some time, you've got to plan your answer. Instead of just panicking, you want to be as methodical as you can, because if you start to scramble, you're like waving flags in front of their faces to show them that you do not know what you're talking about, or you're running out of time, or you didn't manage your time well. And none of that's going to reflect well on your answer.

Alison Monahan: No, I think this is where having a process for your pre-writing outline for every single essay that you're doing, or even your performance test, what's your process, but particularly for the essays, and I think even more so really for the MEE essays. There you've got 30 minutes, and people sometimes think, "Well, I can just read the question and jump in because I need to start writing." And that is such a terrible plan.

Lee Burgess: Terrible.

Alison Monahan: It's a lack of a plan, which is a terrible idea, to be more precise, because that, say, three to five minutes that you spend... I feel like it's actually closer to three minutes typically. So for me, I would read the question once, highlight everything that I thought was really critical, maybe make a few notes, go back, read it quickly again. As I'm doing that, kind of highlight the main issues, and then maybe write down a few facts. And then as I go through my essay I'm just checking stuff off. And that minimal amount of effort really just makes it so much easier to give you points.



- Lee Burgess: Yep, exactly. And the time constraints do not allow you to just talk about whatever you want. You have to make strategic decisions about how to spend your time, and you also need to realize what are the major issues and the minor issues. And planning allows you to do that. You should star or note which ones are the major issues. If it's minor, you can't spend a lot of time on it. You don't have a lot of time. Spending a ton of time on minor issues is one great way of showing the graders that you didn't plan, because then you run out of time and you can't get the points at the end of the essay.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah. And if you look down at your pre-writing essay or pre-writing outline after you finished it and you see certain legal issues that have four or five different facts clustered around them, and you see another legal issue that has one or zero facts clustered around it, you can assume, "Okay, the one with more facts that relate to this issue is probably something I need to talk about more, because it's a major issue." And if you spend half your essay addressing something that should be a minor issue that you address in one or two sentences, those are points you're not getting.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly.
- Alison Monahan: Because they're not going to give you extra because you talked about something that was really obvious for a longer period of time.
- Lee Burgess: Yeah. So, now that you know more about what the graders are looking for, what can you do to implement all of this advice? Step one is, you need to do practice, which shouldn't be surprising, but you need to get feedback on that practice. And I think there is a lot of benefit to getting feedback from people who are not yourself, because it can be very hard to self-evaluate your work.
- Alison Monahan: I mean, you think you did a great job.
- Lee Burgess: Yeah.
- Alison Monahan: Probably.
- Lee Burgess: Probably. So, you can of course work with tutors like our team, utilize all the feedback that you can get from your school or from your commercial bar review provider. But you can also just turn to your friends. And I think that you can get a few friends together and all swap essays and give yourselves three minutes, give it a read.



- Alison Monahan: Yep, literally set a timer.
- Lee Burgess: Yeah. And then compare answers.
- Alison Monahan: What did you get out of this?
- Lee Burgess: What did you get out of this? Did you think it was good? Did you think it was bad? Did you notice that there were no capital letters? I mean, there's stuff that you can call out for folks.
- Alison Monahan: And they can kind of say, "Okay, these are the main issues I think you identified. And if you think you talked about something else, that's something that's critical to know because that information is not being conveyed."
- Lee Burgess: Exactly. It's also important to know that if you're in California, you can use a tool like BarEssays.com, where you can learn more about how things are graded, because this is a database of real student answers that are graded and have their grades. So you can say, "Does my answer look like this 65? Does my answer look like this 80? Does my answer look like this 70?" I think that that can help you do your own self-evaluation. So that's something else that you can consider, but it's unfortunately only available if you are in California.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah. I think it is a really great tool because often times people... If you look at the two sample answers that California hands out, those are student answers, but they're also the very best answers that were ever written in that entire year. So that is probably not a realistic goal for every single essay that you write. So you want to kind of use something like BarEssays. You can see, "Oh okay, this is a reasonable goal. This is what a 65 to a 70 answer looks like." And I think that's what most people really ought to be aiming for and expecting. And then I think it can also be eye opening to see what a 55 or a 50 look like, too.
- Lee Burgess: Yeah. Alright, well, I think we've given people a lot to think about, about being a bar grader.
- Alison Monahan: Yeah, exactly. What are the graders looking for? I think the key point here is just keep it simple, keep it on point, stay focused, and hopefully you help them give you as many points as they possibly can for the work that you've done.
- Lee Burgess: Exactly. Well, with that, I think we're out of time. I want to take a second to remind you to check out our [blog](http://BarExamToolbox.com) at BarExamToolbox.com, which is full of helpful tips to help you prepare and stay sane as you study for the bar exam.



You can also find information on our website about our courses, tools, and one-on-one tutoring programs to support you as you study for the UBE or California bar exam. If you enjoyed this episode of the Bar Exam Toolbox podcast, please take a second to leave a review and rating on your favorite listening app. We'd really appreciate it. And be sure to subscribe so you don't miss anything. If you're still in law school, you might also like to check out our popular [Law School Toolbox podcast](#) as well. If you have any questions or comments, please don't hesitate to reach out to myself or Alison at lee@barexamtoolbox.com or alison@barexamtoolbox.com. Or you can always contact us via our website [contact form](#) at BarExamToolbox.com. Thanks for listening, and we'll talk soon!

RESOURCES:

[Writing of the Week \(WOW\) Bar Essay Workshop](#)

[SmartBarPrep](#)

[Lean Sheets](#)

[BarEssays.com](#)

[Law School Toolbox blog: Legal Writing Tip: Imagine You're Talking to Your Grandma](#)

[Podcast Episode 10: Top 5 Bar Exam Essay Writing Tips \(w/Ariel Salzer\)](#)

[Podcast Episode 20: How to Read the Facts on an Essay \(w/Mihal Ansik\)](#)

[Podcast Episode 28: Balancing Law and Analysis on a Bar Exam Essay](#)

[Podcast Episode 24: Tackling a California Bar Exam Essay: Professional Responsibility and Evidence](#)

[Podcast Episode 32: Tackling a California Bar Exam Essay: Wills and Community Property](#)

[Podcast Episode 35: Tackling a California Bar Exam Essay: Corporations](#)

[Podcast Episode 44: Tackling a California Bar Exam Essay: Constitutional Law](#)

[Podcast Episode 49: Tackling a California Bar Exam Essay: Tort Law](#)

[Podcast Episode 37: Tackling an MEE Secured Transactions Essay Question](#)

[Podcast Episode 41: Tackling an MEE Family Law and Conflicts of Law Essay Question](#)