

Grading Policies & Information

The University of Toronto regulates grading according to the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy available here:

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/grading.pdf>

Rotman implements the University Policy through the following standard procedures.

- 1) The grading methodology is determined by the course instructor and described in the syllabus. Students must read the syllabus before the course begins. If students have any questions about the grading methodology for a course, they must discuss this with the instructor at the beginning of the course.
- 2) Rotman assigns letter grades for overall course performance. Interim and component grades on deliverables are given in any scale determined by the instructor as appropriate for the deliverable. Feedback about grades is given by the instructor after each graded deliverable and students are encouraged to ask for such feedback. The interpretation of the overall course letter grade at the end of the course is as follows:

Table 1: Rotman Internal Grade Scale Interpretations

Grade	Interpretation
A+	Outstanding Performance. Very strong evidence of original thinking. Outstanding grasp of the subject matter with a corresponding capacity for critical evaluation.
A	Superior Performance. Strong evidence of original thinking. Good organization and presentation. Evidence of superior grasp of the subject matter and a corresponding capacity to analyze and synthesize.
A-	Excellent Performance. Some evidence of original thinking. Good critical capacity and analytical skills that have been well developed. Solid understanding of the issues under examination and very good familiarity with the relevant literature.
B+	Good Performance. Good understanding of the subject matter. Evidence that critical and analytical skills have been well developed. Good understanding of the issues under examination and good familiarity with the literature.
B	Acceptable Performance. Good grasp of the subject matter. Some evidence that critical and analytical skills have been developed. Reasonable understanding of the issues under examination and evidence of a more than minimal familiarity with the literature.
B-	Minimum Acceptable Performance. Some evidence of a grasp of the subject matter. Some development of critical capacity and analytical ability. Some familiarity with the literature.
FZ(fail)	Inadequate Performance. Almost no evidence of familiarity with or understanding of the subject matter. Evident weakness in critical and analytical skills and unfamiliarity and/or irrelevant use of the literature.

University of Toronto Non-Grade Course Reports

The following non-grade course reports may appear on transcripts:

IPR	In Progress
SDF	Standing Deferred
WDR	Withdrawal without Academic Penalty