

Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: March 29, 2018

To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy & Critical Inquiry, Subcommittee
Jessica Early, Chair
Bradley Ryner

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

Recommend for Approval

From ASU:

ENG 494 **Literature of Human Rights**

FMS 394 **Star Wars Universe**

SPA 475 **Approaches to Religion**

From MCCCDC: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU: (none)

From MCCCDC: (none)

Recommend to Deny

From ASU:

ENG 287: **Professional Sills in Sustainability**

Rationale: The syllabus does not breakdown the percentage of the grade that each assignment accounts for. 100% of the grade is based on writing of some sort, but most of this writing is creative, rather than analytical. In addition to poems, students are asked to write book responses and one-page evaluations of their experiences as students of poetry. These seem to fall into the category of "reflection" and so do not meet Criterion 2; they certainly do not meet Criterion 3 that at least two of the analytical writing assignments must be "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity."

ENG 288: Rationale: 70% of the grade is based on writing; however, the majority of this writing is creative, rather than analytic and so does not satisfy Criterion 2. The response to peers

(10%) and c. 3-page response to craft (15%) might satisfy Criterion 2, but they are not long enough to satisfy Criterion 3, that at least two of the analytical writing assignments must be “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.”

FSH 204: Meets all criteria, save Criterion #, that at least two of the analytical writing assignments must be “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.” The final 1,500-1,800 word paper certainly counts, but the 2-page (double-space) Fashion Exhibition of Event Review is too brief to fulfill the requirement.

From MCCCD: (none)