



EMPLOYER EVALUATION REQUEST

FORM 2

EMPLOYER REQUEST:

Date: _____

The employer considers the information in the following work report to be confidential or proprietary and requires the report to be evaluated by individuals inside the company. The report has been evaluated by an Engineer, and the employer requests that the work term student named below be given credit as author of the report. The employer and student acknowledge that this report is not eligible for a work report award.

REPORT & STUDENT DATA:

Work Report Title: _____

Report Dated: _____ No. of Pages: _____

Prepared by: _____ UW ID # _____

Employer: _____

Address: _____

EVALUATION:

The undersigned Engineer has read the above report and confirms that the employer requested evaluation within the company because of confidentiality. Using the University of Waterloo work report standards, the undersigned has evaluated the report as (select one):

- A (Excellent) B (Very Good) C (Satisfactory) F (Unacceptable)

Signature of Evaluator: _____

Name & Title (please print or type): _____

P.Eng. Licence # and Province _____ **OR** Attach copy of Engineering Degree

Phone No: _____

NOTE: Please attach the completed copy of the "Evaluation of Work Term Report Marked by Employer" to this form and mail or email to:

Liz Skibicki, Mechatronics Undergraduate Advisor
Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
eskibicki@uwaterloo.ca

University of Waterloo
Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering
Evaluation of Work Term Report

Report Title:

Report Number:

Student Name / ID:

Employer:

Marker:

The work report examines a student's abilities to display sound engineering judgement on a topic of analysis or design, and to produce a written report which is clear, concise, and convincing. Constructive comments by evaluators are given to guide the student towards improved skills in communicating engineering ideas.

Structure and Flow: The topic is clearly introduced and discussed, with conclusions drawn and recommendations made at appropriate points in the report body. The topic, major conclusions and recommendations are restated in the front matter. Sectioning effectively guides the reader through the report. Complex details are relegated to figures, tables, glossaries, appendices, or cited references.

Yes Mostly Marginally Slightly No

Detail Presentation: Low-level explanations are clear, concise, and direct. Paragraph and sentence structures are appropriate to the student's academic level. Standards techniques are used to refer to mathematics, figures, tables, code fragments, appendices, glossaries, references, etc. Acronyms and Jargon are defined.

Yes Mostly Marginally Slightly No

Writing and Formatting: Spelling and grammar are correct, consistent, and appropriate to the student's academic level. The report is formatted in a consistent and visually pleasing way which adheres to MME guidelines. Material from other sources is properly cited.

Yes Mostly Marginally Slightly No

Technical Communication Critical Feedback:

Technical Content: The topic has sufficient scope and depth to justify a report. The writing displays evidence of sound engineering judgement, analysis, and insight appropriate to the student's academic level. The technical details appear to be correct, and form a coherent whole.

Yes Mostly Marginally Slightly No

Technical Content Critical Feedback:

Grade: __Outstanding __Excellent __Very Good __Satisfactory __Resubmit
 __Unacceptable

__Recommend that this report be submitted to Waterloo Cases in Design Engineering at www.design.uwaterloo.ca