1. Name(s) and Number(s) of Course being assessed for Oral Communication: (e.g. ENGL 4444; Capstone in Literature)

   FOWS 2010, Environmental Interpretation

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

   28 and 28

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.)

   Quizzes are given after each reading. Mid-term exam and final exam ask questions about different techniques and have students apply the techniques in writing as well.

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

   Talk outline and guided talk outline given. Adherence to outline and creative use of techniques taught in class such as; effective theme development, overriding analogy, contrived situation, personification, labeling, self-referencing, metaphors, comparisons, links to human history,

   exaggerated size, exaggerated time, cause and effect, active verbs, etc. I have attached the class talk evaluation for students and the guided talk outline used for evaluation. Final class presentations if interpretative wayside exhibits use best practices from the readings as guidelines I have attached the exams.

   Attachment File Name: Talk outline Evaluation.docx

5. Based on the comprehensive rubric for the appropriate SLO7, indicate the extent of competency of the average student who has completed this course:

   intermediate

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

   The assessment told us that students who were active in class and kept up with the readings did well on their presentations. We also found out that students could easily evaluate others while watching, but had difficulty with understanding how they did or did not use the same techniques.

7. 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)

   As mentioned last year, we still plan to video tape the talks next year so that students can watch themselves. Students will have a self-evaluation in next year's class watching their own presentation. The reason this improvement was not implemented this year was that the video camera was unable to be secured with enough time to test the technology prior to attempting use in the classroom.
8. Additional Comments: (What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?)
   This course has an applied element where the final projects (wayside exhibits) are put up around campus.

9. Committee Comments