

# Deductive Memo Grading Rubric

|  | Below Expectations   | Meets Expectations   | Exceeds Expectations  |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Subject line and headlines</b><br>10% | Subject line incomplete or too wordy<br>Headlines are incomplete or too wordy  | Complete, meaningful, subject line<br>Complete headlines for each category/paragraph                                   | Complete, content-rich subject line that is concise but conveys meaning<br>Headlines for each category are well-written, significant, and include the why and/or how              |
| <b>Introduction</b><br>10%               | Missing main idea in introduction<br>Main idea is incomplete or lacks impact<br>Introduction does not provide a full roadmap for the memo<br>Introduction is too brief (abrupt) or too long (overshadows the memo) | Includes main idea or recommendation in the introduction<br>Provides a roadmap for the memo                            | Has fully formed, significant, and clear main idea or recommendation in the introductory paragraph<br>Provides a clear, concise roadmap for the rest of the memo                  |
| <b>Situation</b><br>10%                  | Begins the argument at a place that is either too basic or too advanced for the audience<br>Has too much or too little context to orient the audience<br>Does not lead logically to the Complication               | Appropriate level of context to orient the audience<br>Effective beginning to the argument                             | Situation is factual and non-controversial<br>Situation starts in the right place, with the right amount of context to orient the audience<br>Leads logically to the Complication |
| <b>Situation evidence</b><br>10%         | Evidence does not support the Situation<br>Evidence is weak, e.g., from only one source and/or from low quality sources<br>Missing citations   | Supporting evidence provided from 2-3 sources<br>Sources are cited   | Ample, high impact, supporting evidence from at least 3 high quality sources<br>Sources are cited   |
| <b>Complication</b><br>10%               | Complication does not add new information or interpretation<br>Does not lead logically to the Resolution   | Complication adds new information or interpretation to the discussion<br>Supporting evidence provided from 2-3 sources | Complication adds powerful new information or interpretation in a logical manner<br>Leads to a greater understanding of the validity of the coming Resolution                     |

## Deductive Memo Grading Rubric (continued)

|  | Below Expectations   | Meets Expectations   | Exceeds Expectations   |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Complication evidence</b><br>10%                  | Evidence does not support the category<br>Evidence is weak, e.g., from only one source and/or from low quality sources<br>Missing citations  | Supporting evidence provided from 2-3 sources<br>Sources are cited   | Ample, high impact, supporting evidence from at least 3 high quality sources<br>Sources are cited  |
| <b>Resolution</b><br>10%                             | Resolution does not follow logically from the Situation and Complication<br>Supported by reasons not actions   | Resolution follows from the Situation and Complication<br>Supported by actions   | Resolution follows logically and clearly from the Situation and Complication<br>Supported by actions that are high-impact  |
| <b>Tone/success of persuasion</b><br>10%             | Tone is not appropriate for the relationship between reader and writer, e.g., too formal or too informal<br>Tone is not objective or overpromises benefits<br>Argument and evidence are not aligned<br>Persuasion is not effective overall   | Tone is appropriate for the relationship between reader and writer<br>Tone is largely objective and measured<br>Argument and evidence are aligned  | Executive, professional tone throughout; appropriate for the relationship between reader and writer<br>Tone is consistently objective and measured<br>Argument and evidence are consistently aligned for powerful, effective persuasion  |
| <b>Sentence structure/ language mechanics</b><br>10% | Language does not adhere to the 6 Cs<br>Poor sentence structure (e.g., wordy, unclear)<br>Significant, distracting errors in grammar<br>Multiple typos   | Language adheres to the 6 Cs<br>Effective sentence structure<br>Correct grammar<br>Minimal typos   | Powerful use of vocabulary to convey meaning clearly and concisely<br>Language adheres to the 6 Cs<br>Excellent sentence structure<br>Flawless grammar<br>No typos   |
| <b>Formatting</b><br>10%                             | Text/headings are not left-justified<br>Bullets are not aligned<br>Has other distracting formatting, e.g., extra blank lines and spaces<br>Missing topic sentence for each paragraph<br>Dense paragraphs ( $\geq 8$ lines)<br>Conclusion is missing or too brief/abrupt<br>Sources are not cited appropriately | Meets most Questrom standards for a memo<br>Text is left-justified<br>Bullet points are aligned<br>Has a topic sentence for each paragraph or category<br>Contains a conclusion<br>Sources are cited appropriately | Flawless formatting that enhances reader's ability to process the message<br>Has well-written topic sentences for each paragraph or category<br>Conclusion provides a brief recap and next steps, and an invitation to reach out with questions<br>Sources are cited appropriately |