DATE: November 6, 2020

TO: Dr. Ken Machoian

FROM: James Hernandez

SUBJECT: Evaluation of the Formal Report “Study of Wildwood Creek, Winslow, Georgia”

**INTRODUCTION**

In this evaluation I will be discussing the three criteria that we were tasked with: (1) Evaluate the likely audience for each section of the report, (2) Discuss ways that the writer did or did not address the needs of specific audience types, and (3) Offer suggestions for improving the manner in which the report meets the needs of its intended audience. Before going into detail with my findings and inferences based on how the report was structured, the sections I will be reviewing are from page three of the report under section ‘REPORT FORMAT.’

**EVALUATING THE LIKELY AUDIENCE**

Throughout reading the report, the sections that the writer broke up the material was in three main sections, as stated in the Introduction of the report, which are:

1. Field Investigation: A complete discussion of all the tests that were performed for the project
2. Test Comparison: Charts of the test results and comparisons
3. Conclusions and Recommendations

Now looking at who the intended audience was for the report which was comprised of members with technical and nontechnical backgrounds with some being full-time professionals hired by the city, whereas others are part-time, unpaid citizens appointed by the mayor to explore environmental problems.

**Section One – Field Investigations**

Included in this section is a complete discussion of all the tests that were performed for the project. The tests were comprised of two categories: Physical and Chemical. Each categorical test was comprised of serval individual test that the writer listed and gave brief details of what each test was for. The writer provided data when appropriate for the specific test and for other provided a figure to help visualize the reasoning. Taking these into consideration I would have to state that the intended audience of this section would be those with a **nontechnical background** who would understand the mechanics of the tests by the definitions provided such as *Operators* or *General Readers* with a *Second-Level Audience: Advisors*.

**Section Two – Test Comparison**

In this section you will find charts of the test results and comparisons among them. The charts in this section comprise of the findings from both Physical and Chemical Tests spanned over the testing dates. To briefly state it, this section is intended for those with a **technical background** who could look at these tables and infer the actions needed based on the results such as *Mangers* or *Experts* with a *First – Second Level Audience*.

**Section Three – Conclusions and Recommendations**

In this section you will find the writers conclusion on the project stating their findings briefly with some observations that they made. Following this are the recommendations that the writer gives on follow up actions for the creek. Judging these sections together I would state that the intended audience for this section is for **both nontechnical and technical backgrounds** to read, however with *Mangers* or *Experts* with *First Level Audience: Decision Makers* because the writer is having a call to actions in the recommendations section.

**ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF SPECIFIC AUDIENCE NEEDS**

As stated above, the intended audience of this report were members of both technical and nontechnical backgrounds which I believe the writer tried to communicate to both effectively succeeded in some areas but fell short in others.

**Addressing the Needs**

**Point One** – In the one of the first areas the writer does address the needs for those with nontechnical backgrounds would be in the explanation of the tests the writer’s organization conducted. In the listed tests, the writer gives a brief definition of what the test is and how it applied to the creek. The writer also provided data and figures when appropriate for tests and it can go with without stating but if a nontechnical reader can understand the test than a technical reader should be able to as well.

**Point Two** – In section two going over the test comparisons, the data is placed into two tables that are well labeled, which is perfect for Experts to understand since it is one of the criteria of what makes a qualified Expert.

**Point Three** – In section three, looking at the recommendations is a perfect example for what managers are looking for because it gives clear statements about what is supposed to happen next in the research for the creek

**Not Addressing the Needs**

**Point One** – In section one of the report going over Chemical test, the writer does briefly explain the tests, however still uses terms that a general reader would have trouble understanding but could infer what the writer meant by it. An expert or manager could understand it but not any other group, for example when writer brings up phosphates and other such chemicals without much explanation.

**Point Two** – The entirety of section two test comparison would be difficult for a general reader but not an expert. The data table has useful information but only if you could understand what it was saying.

**SUGGESTIONS**

**Section One**

* I would like to ask the writer to remove some technical jargon that an Expert would already know and a general reader would not have to know, such as in the phosphate section “for example, orthophosphates and organically bound phosphates”
* Possible include techniques used for conducting the tests, such as equipment used.

**Section Two**

* To include a sidebar or an extra paragraph that explains the findings again, just something brief about what is in the realm of good and concerning.

**Section Three**

* I believe for section three of the report the writer did well for letting all groups understand the material.