

Rubric for Undergraduate Internal Competition

	1-Poor	2-Fair	3-Good	4-Very Good	5-Excellent
Genre Appropriateness (Format, tone, conciseness, organization)	Memo is inappropriate for professional, internal communication.	Memo needs improvement in consistency in format, tone, or organization.	Memo's format does not add to the readability of the communication's goal.	Memo is professional with a clear layout in typical memo format.	Memo presents technology and relevance in a way that is intuitive and easy to scan.
Articulated Relevance	Memo fails to articulate the relevance of the chosen technological advancement to the project or industry.	Memo's articulation of relevance is unclear and does not engender excitement about the technology's significance.	Memo establishes a connection between the technology and its potential impact.	Memo showcases a strong connection between the technology and its potential impact on projects or the industry.	Memo makes the relevance of the technology seem apparent to the project or industry.
Depth of Exploration	Memo lacks sufficient exploration of the advancement. It fails to discuss strengths, limitations, and practical applications, showing a poor understanding of the technology.	Memo's exploration of the advancement is limited, with noticeable gaps in discussing strengths, limitations, and practical applications. The analysis is basic.	Memo explores the advancement adequately. It touches on strengths, limitations, and practical applications, providing a moderate critical analysis.	Memo explores the chosen advancement comprehensively, with minor areas for improvement. It considers its strengths, limitations, practical applications, and provides a solid critical analysis.	Memo's exploration of the advancement, feels comprehensive.
Correctness & Clarity	Memo has factual errors, significant style issues, and demonstrates a poor understanding of engineering concepts. It is confusing and lacks a clear structure, making it difficult to follow.	Memo contains noticeable errors in facts, style, or shows a limited understanding of engineering concepts. It is somewhat unclear, with gaps in organization and coherence.	Memo is generally correct, with some inconsistencies in style, and demonstrates a moderate understanding of engineering concepts. It is clear but may lack some coherence.	Memo is accurate, follows the GT Editorial Style Guide, and demonstrates a strong understanding of engineering concepts. It is clear and well-structured, with minor room for improvement.	Memo's accuracy and clarity instills a sense of confidence in the writer's words within the reader.
Persuasiveness	Memo has no arguments, insufficient evidence, and ineffective rhetorical strategies. It fails to persuade the audience.	Memo has weak arguments, limited evidence, and noticeable gaps in rhetorical strategies	Memo is moderately persuasive, with convincing elements, but lacks consistency or depth in some areas.	Memo is persuasive, with strong arguments and evidence, though there may be minor areas for improvement in rhetorical techniques.	Memo is highly convincing and engaging arguments, supported by compelling evidence and a masterful use of rhetoric.