

**Department of Civil Engineering
University of Toronto
Evaluation Guidelines for Final Report**

Final Report	/40	Description
v. poor	<20 (50%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Grammar and spelling errors; difficult to read / understand ▪ Plagiarism: portions of information copied and not fully attributed ▪ Incomplete and Incorrect information ▪ Background and strategic analysis is missing or completely ineffective ▪ Detailed design is trivial, clearly incomplete, unrealistic, unjustified ▪ No evaluation or no future work presented ▪ Unprofessional quality
poor	22 (55%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ English needs work - grammar, spelling, tenses - but can work through ▪ Poorly organized ▪ Incomplete; Significant omissions in report requirements ▪ Background and strategic analysis is poor ▪ Detailed design poorly described ▪ Evaluation is ill-founded, and future work unrealistic ▪ Poor presentation quality
mediocre	24 (60%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not well-written ▪ Information essentially complete; Omissions in report requirements ▪ Simplistic analysis technique, not technically challenging ▪ Background and strategic analysis is missing elements or is unclear ▪ Detailed design adequately described, but requires modifications ▪ Evaluation of design is unconvincing, with mediocre assessment of future work ▪ Mediocre presentation quality
good	28 (70%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reasonably well-written ▪ Substantially complete ▪ Background and strategic analysis is good, & reasonably link in to detailed design ▪ Detailed design good, require some modifications ▪ Evaluation is preliminary but good, and future work is reasonable ▪ Good quality, with minor issues in presentation quality
v. good	30 (75%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly written with few grammatical errors ▪ Complete information; with good organization of material ▪ Very good background and strategic analysis, complete ▪ Detailed design complete, generally realistic, convincing ▪ Very good evaluation, convincing, but preliminary ▪ Professional quality with one or more minor issues
excellent	32 (80%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very well-written, shows thorough understanding ▪ Complete information, and very good assembly of information ▪ Excellent background and strategic analysis, clearly setting the stage ▪ Detailed design shows careful planning, refinement ▪ Excellent analytically supported design evaluation, with clear understanding of limitations ▪ Professional quality document
award/ publication quality	36+ (90%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exceptionally well-written, complete, concise, outstanding, no errors ▪ Complete information, beyond expectations, elegantly organized ▪ Background and strategic analysis laid out exceptionally well ▪ Detailed design is excellent, very impressive work ▪ Evaluation is insightful, analytically supported, nuanced. All limitations are clearly identified with a clear plan for addressing ▪ Highly professional appearance with publication quality tables, diagrams