**How to use the scheme:**

In each of the areas of the evaluation scheme, circle any language that pertains to the student’s errors. Doing this as a first step will give the professor an overview of the essay and allow for more objective grading.

Fill in the bubble that indicates the student’s performance for each assignment component. As a guide, use the scale at top; or, if you are more accustomed to letter grading, base the evaluation for each component on the grades at the bottom. Each row of bubbles is weighted equally. This is why when adapting the scheme to different assignments, it is wise to keep the number of rows to four or five, not including the row for the total, as doing so keeps the tabulation simple.

Roughly average the bubbles and fill in the corresponding bubble in the bottom row for the total. E.g., if the essay unity is good but not compelling, with an arguable thesis and three distinct controls but not very nuanced; if the support is sufficient but maybe lacking in elaboration and specification; if the cohesion veers toward the formulaic and away from the stylistic; if the essay contains the required sources but could use some more, and the citation and references need addressing; and if the grammar is for the most part fine but contains pronoun errors and a few fragments, etc., then it would be the third row of bubbles all the way down for a total of 10.5/15 (B).

**How to copy the scheme for different assignments:**

Create only four or five rows, not including the one for the total. This keeps the tabulation simple (i.e., 4 x 25% or 5 x 20%).

For the purpose of weighting, you might need to group together items that in the assignment are apart, e.g. for a formal report, intro and conclusion paragraphs together in one row, and discussion in another.

Change the totals in the bottom row, depending on the assignment’s course weight.

It is much, much faster and more accurate to have rows for language and documentation than to do deductions at the end. Save deductions for plagiarism, lateness, and guidelines not followed. Aren’t language and documentation integrated, anyway?

Page two is a marking legend. There is a simple syntax to this legend. For instance, “¶u: ≠ thesis” means the paragraph lacks unity, not relating to the thesis. Here and there on the student’s work one clarify how to fix problems, e.g., “refine thesis,” and comments at the end can be reserved for something like “Come see me regarding a rewrite,” “Good stuff!” “Please see me to discuss academic integrity,” etc.