1. **Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication:**

   FORY 5230 Silviculture and FORY 4980 Senior Capstone Project

2. **Number of Students enrolled per year AND number of those students whose work was assessed for oral communication (SLO 7) competency:**

   36 and 36 respectively

3. **Assessment Method(s): Explain how assessment for this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole-was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method.**

   Students in their senior year of the Forestry curriculum take Silviculture during the fall semester and Senior Project as a Capstone during the spring semester. A major portion of the Silviculture laboratory is a group project requiring the development of a management plan. At the end of the term, this plan is presented to the class and invited faculty from within the School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences. A more in-depth management plan is produced the following semester for Senior Project. In this case, the student crews work on a real project for a local forest landowner. The plans both include an introduction, a literature review, an analysis of the existing vegetation, and recommendations for the landowner for managing their resources.

   In Silviculture, the group presentation (typically 4 students per crew) lasts 20 minutes with a question and answer period of up to 30 minutes following. In Senior Project, the presentations are of the same format, but more detailed lasting 30 to 45 minutes. There are opportunities for practice presentations prior to the final presentation; the first is required, and the course coordinator and faculty adviser provide feedback to the crew. A second practice presentation is optional and approximately half of the crews took advantage of this opportunity.

   Faculty members, as well as the landowner, are invited to the final presentation. The faculty members present are asked to evaluate the presentation using the same rubric used in Silviculture the previous semester. The faculty also ask questions of the students and suggest further improvements. The evaluation form covers 5 broad categories: (a) logical flow of presentation (b) presentation style (c) expertise of presenters (d) thoroughness of approach and e) workability of the solution. Several faculty members, in addition to their evaluation, commented to the coordinator that the quality of the presentations this semester was better than previous years.

4. **If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:**

   The presentations were developed to be as similar as possible to the sort of communication that land managers will be expected to give to both employer and client. The information required and format of the presentation draw from information in each of the core courses in the professional forestry curriculum.

5. **Findings: (what add assessment data tell you about student proficiency in this outcome?)**

   The average scores (10 point scale) for the six groups making presentations in 2012 are given below:
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical flow</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?** (What questions/issues/concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department/program take as a result of this analysis?)

   The repetition seems sufficient (2 group presentations with opportunity for 2 practice presentations prior to the capstone presentation). All crews were technically proficient in making a management plan presentation to a professional audience. The practice presentations were included as a result of past observations that there was not sufficient improvement between the two assessed courses. The practice presentations seem to have improved student confidence and scores, but pre/post-test comparisons will be made in the future to confirm this. The instructors of the two courses have begun working together to identify areas of concern with particular classes that can be addressed in the Capstone course.

7. **Additional Comments:** (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)

8. **Committee Comments**

   3.11/4- The method seems to be appropriate for evaluating the measures. A downloadable rubric would have been helpful for the committee to see what is deemed an "acceptable job". The plans for improvement are appropriate.