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:
   30/30

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.)
   The entire class is dedicated to teaching effective oral and written communication. Quizzes were given after each reading. Mid-term and final exams ask questions about specific presentation techniques and have students apply/provide examples using the techniques. Outlines for best practices for interpretative talks (5-8 minutes) and guided talks (10-12 minutes) are provided to students. Topics for their talks utilize information from other NRM courses and personal experience. Faculty and peer students evaluate the student presentations. Evaluation is based on 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. The class talk evaluation for students and the guided talk outline used for evaluation are attached. Final class team presentations (5 minutes) of interpretative wayside exhibits use best practices from the readings as guidelines. SFWS faculty are invited to the final interpretation presentations and to review the wayside exhibits. Exams are attached. Each year updates to the best practices in interpretation provided by the National Park Service and the National Association of Interpreters are accessed for inclusion to the class.

4. If the Assessment methods differ from those initially proposed to the CCGEC, identify the differences and explain the rationale for those changes:
   The public speaking/oral communication methodologies follow best practices developed by the by the National Park Service and the National Association of Interpreters. These are the highest standards in the field and will continue to be followed. A new SFWS instructor with expertise in Interpretation, Dr. Miriam Wyman, evaluated all talks and presentations throughout the Fall of 2013.

   Attachment File Name: Evaluating a good talk Presentations.pdf

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 review and assessment of best practices as presented by the National Park Service and the National Association of Interpreters informed us that the information we were providing students was the most relevant and up-to-date. The in-class 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. Peer faculty
evaluation (Dr. Miriam Wyman) of the course and of individual student oral presentations was provided throughout the semester. Best practices and solid use of class and guided talks were confirmed.

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 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 used for static interpretation (a permanent sign in the field) in the SFWS Forest Ecology Preserve and the USFS Research Station in Auburn.

9. Committee Comments