Module 5: Audience

In this module, we will work to explicitly consider and write for different audiences and to communicate scientific information broadly. You have already considered and written for one audience in this course: your professor. This process involved making assumptions (either consciously or unconsciously) about her needs, values, and perspectives. In general, these types of assumptions inform the decisions we make as writers and communicators: what information we include, what we explain, what we leave unsaid, how we organize and format, and the language that we use.

We intuitively consider our audience all the time. Think about how you would explain what a disease ecologist does to your best friend vs. a 4-year-old vs. someone next to you on the bus vs. a doctor. The ability to change how we communicate based on our audience is a key skill, both socially and professionally. As we move through our careers, we'll be asked to communicate our area of expertise to a diverse set of audiences: peers, mentors, professors, collaborators, coworkers, employers, employees, students, funding agencies, etc., etc.

We will work with one text in this module: yours! You will be re-working the content of your argument essay for either a general audience (e.g., blog post, news brief, pamphlet, podcast) or a younger audience (e.g. children's book, comic, curriculum, exhibit). We will use in-class activities to consider the needs, values, and perspectives of a new audience, and you will tailor the presentation of your argument essay to that audience. As part of the revision process for this module, *you will need to solicit feedback from a member of your target audience*, either in person or online. Please keep this in mind when choosing your audience.

To help you conceptualize the ways in which we tailor our presentation to specific audiences, here are a few examples. The unlinked example and the original piece of writing these examples aim to communicate are posted on Sakai>Resources>Module 5: Audience>Examples:

http://www.biodiverseperspectives.com/2013/10/31/biodiversity-challenge-lawn-of-the-dead/

http://vimeo.com/44969225

Hopland_project_description_middle_school.doc (on Sakai)

This blog post (top link), video (middle link), and middle-school curriculum (bottom document) all aim to communicate Miranda's dissertation research to either a general audience (top and middle link) or a younger audience (bottom document). This research was originally described to a scientific audience in the introduction to a grant proposal: "NSF_proposal_2009_intro_only.pdf" (on Sakai).

Style

Like the examples above, your style will depend on your audience. In class, we will work to tailor our language and tone to our chosen audience.

Format, submission and grading of Audience Project

The format of your final product should resonate with your chosen audience, but other than that there are no formal formatting requirements for this project. In addition to written formats, video and audio

formats are acceptable, as long as you can share and submit them digitally and the file format is generally accessible across platforms (Mac/PC).

To receive full credit, you must submit, with the final version of your audience product, the feedback you received from a member of your target audience, the peer-review worksheet you received from your peer reviewer during our workshop AND a short description of how you revised your audience product in response to the feedback you received. This description can be in paragraph or bullet-point form, and should focus on the 2-3 revisions that you feel most improved your summary.

Your audience product will be worth 15% of your total course grade and will be graded out of 15 points. The final product will be worth 12% and evidence of revision (audience member and peer feedback, revision description) will be worth 3%. When grading your audience product, I will pay particular attention to the appropriateness of your format, language, and tone. I will also consider whether your product accurately conveys the content of your argument essay.

I have included the rubric I will use to grade your summaries at the end of this assignment.

Timeline for Module 5: Audience

Mon. Apr. 17	*Before class*: **read** Module 5: Audience and examples therein; **read** Reynolds (2009) "Communicating with diverse audiences" (all on Sakai) *In class*: guided writing activity: considering and engaging a new audience
Wed. Apr. 19	*Before class*: **complete an outline or partial first draft** of your Audience Product *In class*: open work on audience product, chance to discuss form and content
Mon. Apr. 24	*Before class*: **complete a final first draft** of your audience product**, get feedback** from a member of your target audience *In class*: guided peer review, small-group editing workshop
Wed. Apr. 26	*Before class*: **revise** and **complete a final draft** of your Audience Product, compile revision statement and audience/peer feedback for in-class submission *In class*: **final draft of Audience Product DUE** along with evidence of revision and revision description; share audience products with peers

Audience Grading Rubric

Criteria	Evaluation				Multiplier	Points
Audience						
Accuracy	1 Context and content of argument essay unclear	2 Context of argument essay represented accurately, content unclear	3 Content of argument essay represented accurately, context unclear	4 Context and content of argument essay represented accurately	1	/4
Format and Presentation	1 Format and organization could be more accessible	2 Format accessible, organization could be more accessible	3 Organization accessible, format could be more accessible	4 Format and organization of information accessible to audience	1	/4
Language	1 Several inappropriate terms and sentence structures	2 Sentence structure appropriate to audience, some terminology inappropriate	3 Terminology appropriate to audience, some sentence structures inappropriate	4 Terminology and sentence structure appropriate to audience	0.5	/2
Tone	1 Unengaged, some problems with trustworthiness, respectfulness, or condescension	2 Engaged, some problems with trustworthiness, respectfulness, or condescension	3 Mostly engaged, trustworthy, respectful, and never condescending	4 Engaged and trustworthy, respectful, and never condescending	0.5	/2
Revision	0 Missing all evidence of revision	1 Missing some evidence of revision	2 Feedback and description indicate partial revision	3 Feedback and description indicate thorough revision	1	/3
TOTAL					**Out of 15:**	