

ANSLS Candidate Project Evaluation Guide					
	Satisfactory 75 % or higher	Needs Improvement 60% to 75 %	Unsatisfactory 60 % or lower	Rating	Comments (use separate sheet if necessary, refer to subject heading)
Report of Survey					
Cost quotation	Candidate developed a cost estimate/quotation that accounts for all expected costs and demonstrates an understanding of the cost components of a survey project.	Candidate shows an understanding of only a portion of the cost components of a survey project.	Candidate quotes a price with no evidence of how that price is constructed		
Invoice	Client provided with detailed invoice. Candidate addressed how actual costs compared to the original estimate. Candidate provided evidence of immediate notification and detailed explanation to client of any extra costs.	Final invoice information is available but not complete. Client not immediately notified of any reasons for cost increases.	Final invoice contains no details just a cost. No evidence of contact with client to explain reasons if final cost is higher than estimate.		
Project Planning	Candidate developed a project plan that addresses the steps involved in the project and identified hazards and ways to mitigate those hazards. Plan includes Traffic Control if necessary.	Candidate's planning is incomplete and misses some hazard control.	Candidate proceeds with project with little or no evidence of any planning or hazard control.		
Research	Research is complete and demonstrates a sound understanding of the issues involved for this project. Research includes information sources and significant findings that affect the project (i.e. parole evidence). Candidate addressed why any typical source was not used for this project. Candidate indicates extents of search for evidence that was unable to be located.	Candidate shows evidence of research but it is incomplete or not relevant. Available evidence (plans etc.) not included in research.	Candidate does not show clear evidence of research and that relevant sources are searched. Candidate misses key component(s) of background research		
Survey Methodology	Candidate demonstrated sound field techniques and technology for the survey project. The report indicates the logical progression of fieldwork and what field checks were performed. Candidate recognizes what standards and requirements are necessary for the survey project and ensures they are met.	Candidate did not demonstrate an understanding of sound field techniques. Work appears rushed and/or incomplete. Evidence of missed/incomplete field checks.	Data is incomplete, disorganized and/or inaccurate. No evidence or record of field checks		
Field Notes	Field notes are legible, complete including detailed sketch and generally meet the Standards of the Association	Field notes are mostly complete but are missing some key elements included in the Standards of the Association	Field notes are sloppy and incomplete and are generally not in compliance with the Standards of the Association.		
Field Data Processing	Candidate demonstrates the use of a systematic procedure for checking field returns for quality and completeness. The report describes how field data is processed and analyzed to prepare it for use in the survey product. Candidate briefly addresses how data is stored and protected.	Candidate shows understanding of the basics of how to assure quality in fieldwork and office procedures but evidence of this is not always clear. Report is unclear how the field data is analyzed and processed for use in the survey project. Unclear how data is stored and protected.	The report does not address how field data is checked, analyzed or processed. Inadequate storage and protection of data.		
Project Management	Candidate includes details on the level of client contact, demonstrates understanding of clients expectations and how the project met their expectations. The report addresses any difficulties encountered and overcome through the project. Interaction with others demonstrates adherence to the Code of Ethics. The report demonstrates sound professional judgement and advice to the client	Difficulties encountered during the project appear to be unaddressed or unresolved. Little recognition of the level of service expected of a professional land surveyor.	Candidate demonstrates little understanding of clients expectations. Failed to provide sound advice to client on how to meet their expectations,		
Writing Mechanics, style and formatting	Language is clear and concise. There are no significant errors in spelling, grammar and usage. The report is clearly laid out and easy to follow and is professional, consistent and suitable for submissions to client. Supporting materials are clearly referred to and provided as appendices.	Overall the report is clearly laid out but at times the style is inconsistent. Report contains rare spelling, grammar and usage errors. The language used is not concise and tends to be wordy. The style is not consistent and at times is casual rather than professional. Reference to supporting materials is inadequate. Some supporting material is missing.	The report is poorly organized and difficult to navigate and understand. Report suffers from a significant level of spelling, grammar and usage errors. Does not demonstrate strong written communication skills. Most supporting materials are missing.		
Boundary Decision(s)	Report of Survey Rating			0.0	

	Candidate includes clear and unambiguous discussion on the location of every boundary retraced or established complete with rationale and evidence. Candidate refers to relevant case law, legal principles and statutes to justify decisions. Boundary decisions reflect impartiality and duty to the cadastre.	Candidate includes discussion on some boundaries retraced or established but not all or incomplete discussion. Candidate refers to some relevant case law, legal principles and statutes but needs to expand on the decision making process.	No clear explanation of boundary decisions, discussion is too brief to evaluate the candidates understanding of the process. Candidate defaulted to a mathematical reconstruction when evidence points to a superior solution.		
			Boundary Decision(s) Rating	0.0	
Plan					
	Plan must meet the Standards of the Association. If the plan is prepared for regulatory approval it must contain all details necessary for such approval. The plan must be neat and aesthetically pleasing and prepared at a scale and on a paper size that allows for complete depiction of all information without appearing crowded or cluttered. Proper Use of details as necessary but do not overuse. Elements on the plan should be consistent. Demonstrates familiarity with "industry standards and practices". There should be no spelling and grammatical errors. Documentary evidence should be referenced complete with source. Plan must have a thorough check including mathematical closure of all figures and candidate must show use of a plan checklist	Some requirements of the Standards of the Association are missing or misplaced on the the plan. Plan is prepared on improper size of paper for the project, i.e. too crowded or too much unnecessary surrounding linework to fill page. Details not used when they would present information more clearly. Improper drafting techniques, i.e. inconsistent lettering font, lines through lettering, etc.. Plan generally appears cluttered and/or hard to read. Little attention to "industry standards and practices"	Serious deficiencies with the requirements of the Standards of the Association. Parcels on plan misclose or are missing boundary information. Demonstrates no awareness of "industry standards and practices".		
			Plan Rating	0.0	
Legal Description					
	Legal Description(s) meet the Standards of the Association. Candidates legal description(s) are clear, concise and consistent. Legal description(s) contain all necessary elements to enable closure of parcel under description. If the description(s) reference the monumentation at the corners it is not the principal call.	Candidates description(s) meet most of the Standards of the association and contain necessary elements but are wordy and tend to be confusing. Candidate references the corner monument as the principal call in the description(s)	Candidates Legal Descriptions lacking in many elements of the Standards of the Association. Legal Description(s) missing courses and/or have errors in directions and/or distances.		
			Legal Description Rating	0.0	
Candidate Interview					
	Candidate on time with all necessary documents. Well prepared to explain/defend the survey project. Candidate is polite and participates in discussion and is willing to consider suggestions from examiners.	Candidate is on time and has all necessary documents but is not well prepared to explain/defend the survey project, it is obvious that they have not recently reviewed the project.	Candidate is late for interview without a valid reason. Does not have all documentation required and is ill prepared to explain/defend the survey project. Candidate does not participate in discussion and tends to flippantly reject examiners suggestions.		
			Candidate Interview Rating	0.0	