



FORM 1

WORK REPORT CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

BUILDING A TALENT TRUST

EMPLOYER REQUEST:

Date: _____

The employer considers the information in the following work report to be sensitive or proprietary and requests that the University of Waterloo treat the report as **CONFIDENTIAL**.

Employer: _____

Address: _____

The employer requests that the report be evaluated, in confidence, by only one faculty member. The work report will be deleted in LEARN once it has been marked and the term is finished.

Signed (student's supervisor): _____ Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone Number: _____

REPORT & STUDENT DATA:

Work Report Title: _____

_____ Report Dated: _____

Prepared by: _____ UW ID # _____
(student's name)

UNIVERSITY CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT:

The Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering Department and the faculty member responsible for grading the report agree to maintain the confidentiality of the above-named report for a period of not less than three years from the date of grading. No copies of the report will be made. The report will be read only by the faculty member named below.

Signed: _____

Prof. Derek Wright
Director, Mechatronics
MME Department
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1

Date: _____

Signed: _____

Name (print): _____
Faculty Member
MME Department
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1

Date: _____

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