AUPCC 2025 – Memorandum to Cabinet Rubric

Team: _____ School: _____ Title: _____

FORMAT / ELEMENTS OF STYLE (10 pts)	
Points	**Overall Style (10 pts)**
10	**Cabinet-Ready:** Document is professional, cleanly formatted according to AUPCC guidelines (Memorandum to Cabinet). Writing is concise, jargon-free, persuasive, and flows logically. Few or no errors.
9 **8**	**Highly Effective:** Follows formatting with some small lapses. Writing is clear and mostly concise. Few minor grammar/citation issues.
7 **6** **5**	**Effective:** Structure mostly intact, but sections may be disorganized or wordy. Several citation/grammar inconsistencies. Still readable.
4 **3**	**Partially Effective:** Frequent formatting problems; unclear writing or heavy use of jargon. Would be hard for Cabinet Ministers to skim.
2 **1**	**Ineffective:** Disorganized, confusing, ignores formatting requirements. Difficult to read or evaluate. (No evidence = 0)
Comments:	

MINISTERIAL RECOMMENDATIONS (15 pts)	
Points	**Issue Statement (5 pts)**
5	**Cabinet-Ready:** One statement, decision-focused ("Whether to… / How to…"). Directly tied to competition theme. Readers can immediately identify the Cabinet decision required.
4	**Highly Effective:** Clear and relevant, but wordier than necessary or slightly unfocused.
3	**Effective:** Identifies an issue but vague or not decision-oriented.
2	**Partially Effective:** Loosely connected to the theme; difficult to interpret.
1	**Ineffective:** Missing, confusing, or irrelevant. (No evidence = 0)
Points	**Recommendations (5 pts)**
5	**Cabinet-Ready:** Specific actions identified. Lists exact approvals sought, roles of implicated stakeholders, and policy instruments (e.g., legislation, funding program). Directly linked to Analysis.
4	**Highly Effective:** Clear direction but missing key elements (e.g., roles, instruments, or linkage).
3	**Effective:** Effective but general (e.g., "increase investment" without mechanism).

2	**Partially Effective:** Vague or incomplete (unclear who does what).
1	**Ineffective:** No recommendations, or incoherent. (No evidence = 0)
Points	**Rationale (5 pts)**
5	**Cabinet-Ready:** Strong justification; explains urgency, identifies gaps in existing policy, and ties directly to federal priorities (e.g., Throne Speech, Cabinet agenda). Evidence-based.
4	**Highly Effective:** Logical, relevant rationale; partially persuasive but not fully evidence-supported.
3	**Effective:** Some justification but vague or thinly supported. Limited links to national/federal priorities.
2	**Partially Effective:** Weak rationale; relies on assumptions. Minimal connection to national/federal priorities.
1	**Ineffective:** No rationale or irrelevant explanation. (No evidence = 0)
Comments:	
ANALYSIS (30 pts)	
Points	**Background & Context (10 pts)**
10	**Cabinet-Ready:** Comprehensive, accurate background. Explains causes, key stakeholders, and existing policies/programs. Provides essential context to understanding the issue.
9 8	**Highly Effective:** Solid overview with 1–2 small gaps (e.g., minor stakeholders missing).
7 6 5	**Effective:** Basic context; lacks depth or misses important stakeholders/policies.
4 3	**Partially Effective:** Minimal context; superficial description or inaccuracies.
2 1	**Ineffective:** No meaningful background provided. (No evidence = 0)
Points	**Proposed Policy Approach (10 pts)**
10	**Cabinet-Ready:** Clearly articulated, evidence-based. Identifies instruments, timeline, risks, trade-offs, and mitigation. Directly tied to recommendations. Realistic.
9 8	**Highly Effective:** Strong approach with most elements present, but missing detail in one area (e.g., risks or trade-offs).
7 6 5	**Effective:** Plausible approach but underdeveloped. Limited evidence or unclear timeline.

4 3	**Partially Effective:** Unclear or unrealistic approach. Gaps in feasibility or logic.
2 1	**Ineffective:** No coherent approach. (No evidence = 0)
Points	**Alternative Options (10 pts)**
10	**Cabinet-Ready:** At least 2 credible alternatives with strengths/weaknesses analyzed. Balanced, fair, and shows awareness of political/financial trade-offs.
9 8	**Highly Effective:** Alternatives identified and partially analyzed; one may be underdeveloped.
7 6 5	**Effective:** Options mentioned but superficially described; limited analysis of trade-offs.
4 3	**Partially Effective:** Minimal or token alternatives; lacks comparison.
2 1	**Ineffective:** No alternatives provided. (No evidence = 0)
Comments:	

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (5 pts)	
Points	**Overall (5 pts)**
5	**Cabinet-Ready:** Detailed milestones (timelines, measurable outcomes), realistic budget, funding sources identified, risks addressed, and termination/wind-up strategy included.
4	**Highly Effective:** Strong plan with clear milestones and budget, but weaker detail on risks or evaluation.
3	**Effective:** General plan provided (timeline or budget mentioned) but incomplete or vague.
2	**Partially Effective:** Unclear, unrealistic, or missing multiple components.
1	**Ineffective:** No usable plan. (No evidence = 0)
Comments:	

TOTAL POINTS: /60

Additional Comments: