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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Report</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| v. poor <20   | - 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       | - 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   | - 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       | - 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    | - 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  | - 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/         | - 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 |
| publication    | quality 36+ |

**Note:** The table includes a range of grades from v. poor to excellent, with specific descriptions for each level. The final column provides a description of the corresponding grade.