

Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: November 1, 2017

To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee

Jessica Early, Chair

Bradley Ryner, Member

Re: Recommendations for Course Proposals (L, G, HU etc. designation)

Recommend for Approval

From ASU:

SPA 405: This course meets all criteria.

SPA 494: This course meets all criteria.

SPE 430: This course meets all criteria; however, for slightly different reason than the application outlines. In support of Criterion 1, the applicant states that 300/375 points are from “Assignments related to literacy and inquiry,” but what Criterion 1 actually requires is 50% from writing. Therefore, we do not consider the “Professional Development Workshop” (as the applicant does). Instead, we do count the “IEP Analysis & Reflection” and “Classroom Observations” (which the applicant does not) because these assignments require writing. Similarly, the applicant counts the “Professional Development Workshop” and “Professional Lesson Development Plan” as the substitution assignments to satisfy Criterion 3, whereas we count the “Critical Review of Research Paper” and the “Professional Lesson Development Plan.” We want to include these clarifications to make sure the applicant understands the criteria in relation to their requirements and expectations for the course.

From MCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU: (none)

From MCCCDC: (none)

Recommend for Rejection

COM 428: The course meets Criterion 1 with “at least 50% of the grade in the course depending upon writing assignments,” with “Three Critique Papers” counting for 25% and a “Final Project” counting for 30%. However, the syllabus states that the final project may be either a traditional research paper or a “creative option” of a graphic novel script. For students taking the creative option, the course would not fulfill Criterion 2, that the writing assignment “should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence” (i.e. be analytical writing, rather than creative writing). The research paper would satisfy Criterion 3 of “two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity,” but it is not clear that the 10-minute “Oral Report” counts as a substantial writing/and or speaking assignment. The prompt for this oral report is vague, instructing student to “research and present information” on a topic from a list of topics such as “auteurs,” “Genres of comics and how they influence popular culture,” and “International works and what they tell us about other cultures.” It is unclear if these presentations should consist of original arguments about the topics, a general introduction to them, or something in between.

FIS 394: The course does not meet Criterion 1 that “at least 50% of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments.” The Narrative Assignment (broken down as Assignments 1a, 1b, and 1c) counts for 20%. While writing is required for Assignment 2 (Podcast), Assignment 3 (Video), and the Final Project involve writing, what is being graded in these assignment is not specifically the writing. To meet Criterion 1, the applicant would need to demonstrate that at least an additional 31% of the course grade is based on writing. Additionally, the assignments do not fulfill Criteria 2 and 3, that the writing assignments “should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence”, “two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.” The assignments for this course are more journalistic than analytic. That is to say, appropriate to the topic of the course, they focus on writing as a tool for communicating knowledge already formed within scientific communities to a more general public, not on writing as a tool for creating new knowledge.

SER 416: From the information provided, the course does not seem to meet the letter and spirit of Criteria 1, 2, and 3. The project constitutes 50% of the grade, and the exercises 20%, but it is not clear that writing as a tool for critical inquiry is what is primarily being evaluated in these assignments. The objective of the sample project is designing and building a prototype, not producing a written analysis. Even if an “analysis of written and spoken evidence” were central to the project, that would only be on substantial assignment, but criterion 3 requires two substantial assignments. Without a calendar, it is impossible to judge whether Criterion 4, timely feedback, is met.