Association of
British Columbia
Land Surveyors

#301-2400 Bevan Avenue
Sidney BC V8L 1W1

Tel: (250) 655-7222
Fax: (250) 655-7223

e-mail: office@abcls.ca
www.abcls.ca

Field Project Marking Rubric

Examiners will compare the field project report to this rubric to determine how well it aligns with the competencies required of a new land surveyor.

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
	(70% or more)	**(less than 70%)**	
Project Planning	- Candidate developed a plan that addresses major steps of the project, identified significant risks, and stated reasonable risk controls	- Candidate started to develop the plan, but it is missing some steps or risk controls	- Candidate proceeds with the job with little to no evidence of any planning
Cost Estimating	- Candidate developed a cost estimate, quotation, or budget that accounts for all expected costs and contingency for the project (actual numbers need not be included) - Candidate demonstrates an understanding of all the cost components of a survey project	- Candidate shows an understanding of the cost structure for only a portion of the project - The report misses important cost drivers for the project	- Item is not addressed or is only briefly mentioned - Candidate quotes a price with no evidence of how that price is constructed
Research	- Research path indicates a sound understanding of the nature of the land survey issues for this project - Candidate's research includes information sources and any significant findings that affect the work - Candidate addressed why any typical source was not searched for this project	- Candidate shows evidence of research, but it is incomplete or is not relevant - Candidate barely explains the source relevance	- Candidate does not show clear evidence of research - Candidate does not address the relevance of sources - Candidate misses a key component of background research

Performing the field survey and preparing all field returns	- Candidate directed the use of suitable field techniques and technology for the survey - The report includes all field return summaries and sketches as appendices - The report indicates the logical progression of fieldwork and what field checks were performed - Candidate recognizes what standards are applicable to the field survey and ensures they are met - Field returns are complete and stand on their own as a record of the survey - Candidate shows planning for safe work and executing according to the plan	- There is evidence of progression of fieldwork, but it flows weakly and/or appears rushed - Field returns are mostly complete - The field survey ends up mostly complete, but little indication of a systematic & methodical approach to the work	- Information is too brief, disorganized and/or is inaccurate - Candidate does not address why they performed the survey in this way - The report leaves one wondering if the candidate understands the technology or survey methodology - Candidate failed to identify and comply with applicable survey standards - Safety is not addressed in the report
Assesses the field evidence	- The report contains discussion on what field evidence the candidate included for the survey, its condition, and how it corroborates or conflicts with other evidence - Candidate identifies and complies with applicable land surveying standards for evidence - The report strongly indicates a systematic	- Candidate highlights only some of the evidence, instead of considering all available evidence - Haphazard, not methodical, approach to evidence assessment	- Candidate only briefly mentions this and fails to discuss or elaborate on the evidence assessment - Candidate ignores primary or highly influential evidence - Candidate defaults to a mathematical reconstruction of

	approach to assessing the survey evidence		the boundary without reason
Assures quality of all field returns	- Candidate shows the use of a systematic procedure for checking field returns for quality (this may include both checks done in the field and in the office setting) - Candidate identifies and complies with applicable land surveying standards for field returns	- Candidate understands the basics of how to assure quality. The report shows some evidence of this but it is not always clear	- There is very little evidence of steps to assure quality
Field data processing	- The report briefly describes what is done with field information to prepare it for use on the survey product - Candidate briefly addresses how data is stored and protected	- The report briefly describes what is done with field information to prepare it for use on the survey product but leaves out important details	- The report does not address how field returns are processed
Plan preparation	- The report addresses how the survey product is prepared - The report includes reference to specific Survey and Plan Rules, local government requirements, and LTSA standards where applicable - Candidate shows evidence of a systematic approach that sets up the project for quality	- The report glosses over how the survey product is prepared - The report includes reference to some specific Survey and Plan rules, local government requirements, and LTSA standards but misses significant requirements	- Little evidence indicating the candidate performed plan preparation - Large gaps in the description and understanding of the process
Boundary decisions	- Candidate includes clear and unambiguous discussion on the nature and location of every	- Candidate includes discussion on the nature and location of some boundaries	- No clear evidence of this process - The discussion is much too brief to

	boundary established/re-established for the project - Candidate refers to relevant case law, legal principles, and statutes to justify the decisions - The boundary decisions reflect impartiality and duty to the cadastre	established/re-established for the project - Candidate refers to some relevant case law, legal principles, and statutes but needs to expand on the decision-making process	show the candidate's understanding - Candidate defaults to a mathematical reconstruction when evidence points to a superior solution - Insufficient boundary complexity in project to evaluate competence.
Final plan processing and checklist preparation	- The report includes an overview of the final steps of plan preparation and submission to the client, authority, and/or registry - If the survey product is part of a further approval process, the candidate describes the main steps	- The report briefly includes an overview of the final steps of plan preparation and submission to the client, authority, and/or registry	- Final steps are not clearly laid out in the report and/or essential information is missing - Little understanding of what happens after a plan is created
Project management and client contact	- Candidate includes details on the level of contact with the client and how the project met their expectations - The report addresses any difficulties encountered and overcome through the project - Interactions with the client demonstrate adherence to the Code of Ethics	- Candidate includes some brief details on the level of contact with the client - Problems encountered during the project appear unanswered - Little recognition of the level of service expected of a professional land surveyor	- Little or no understanding of the client contact and advice on the project - Candidate failed to explore client needs & satisfaction

	- The report addresses sound professional advice given to the client		
Deliverables delivery and invoicing	- Candidate describes how the results of the work delivered value to their customer - The report addresses all deliverables for the project - The report describes how the final invoice for the client is prepared, checked, and delivered to the client - Candidate addressed how actual costs compared to the original estimate	- Candidate starts to mention how the customer received their work but needs to elaborate on the value brought - The report addresses most of the deliverables for the project - The final invoice information is available but not complete - Candidate starts to address how actual costs compare to the original estimate but fails to explore the reasons fully	- There is no evidence of the deliverables or complete invoices - Candidate did not convey an understanding of the final stages of the project
Writing Mechanics and Style	- Language is clear and concise - There are no significant errors in spelling, grammar, or usage - The style is professional	- The report contains rare errors in spelling, grammar, or usage - The language used is not concise and can be wordy - The style is not consistent and can at times be casual, rather than professional	- The report suffers from significant spelling, grammar, or usage errors - The language is unclear and hard to understand
Formatting	- The report is clearly laid out and easy to follow - The style is consistent, professional, and	- Overall, the report is laid out consistently but at times the style changes	- The report is poorly organized and difficult to navigate

	suitable for submission to a client - Supporting materials are provided as appendices to the report	- Most supporting materials are provided in appendices	- Appendices are not used and do not follow logical formatting