

Date: April 25, 2018

To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy Subcommittee
Jessica Early, Chair
Bradley Ryner, Member

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

Recommend for Approval

From ASU:

- CEL 294** **Women in Political Thought and Leadership**
Rationale: This course meets all requirement for the designation.
- CEL 394** **Democracies in Crisis**
Rationale: This course meets the criteria and cogently presents evidence to do so. CEL might look to this as a model when (re)submitting applications.
- CEL 394:** **Tocqueville on Liberty, Equality, and Democracy**
Rationale: This course meets all requirement for the designation.
- CHI 294:** **Chinese Ghost Stories**
Rationale: This course meets all requirement for the designation.
- SOS 330:** **Sustaining the Commons**
Rationale: The presentation of the information in this application makes it hard to judge whether the course meets Criteria 3's requirement of two assignments that are "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity." However, the application indicates that writing assignments become "more substantial" in the last two weeks and offers on assignment as an example. Including full assignment sheets for all writing assignments and indicating which two satisfy Criteria 3 would have helped greatly. Because the other assignment that the applicant includes as evidence for Criteria 2 also seems substantial in terms of the critical use of sources to examine a local question (although the page count is on low end of what I would think necessary to accomplish such an examination), we approve the L designation.

From MCCC: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU: (none)

From MCCCCD: (none)

Recommend to Deny

From ASU:

CEL 100

Great Ideas of Politics and Ethics

Rationale: The course does not meet Criterion 1, that 50% of the grade should depend on writing. There is a requirement of a take-home final essay worth 40% of the grade. The other writing assignment is a précis, but its weight on the final grade is not separated from the 30% assigned to the in-class presentation. The committee determined that the writing assignments might fulfill Criterion 2, involving “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence,” but no supporting documentation is included in the application (i.e. assignment sheets, more detailed descriptions, and/or grading rubrics). Likewise, it is difficult to assess whether the paper and presentation meet Criterion 3 (that they should be “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”). Because the paper is a take-home exam, it very likely does not. Without due dates marked on the syllabus, it is impossible to assess Criterion 4’s requirement that the substantial assignments be “arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.” The application notes that a written précis is due one week before the presentation, but does not indicate the time between the précis/presentation and the paper – the assignment sequence must ensure that students complete one substantial assignment early enough in the course to benefit from feedback on it before the next substantial assignment is due.

CEL 300:

Capitalism and Great Economic Debates

Rationale: Criterion 1 for this designation requires 50% of the grade for the course depend on writing. The application for this course claims that 60% of the grade depends on writing, counting one 8-page paper as 30% and two 4-page papers at 15% each. However, the grade for the 4-page papers includes “a ten-minute oral report” on the paper – the syllabus needs to clarify how much of the grade depends on writing and how much depends on the oral report. Based on the short description of the writing assignments in the application, Criterion 2 that they involve “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence” is satisfied. However, it is not clear that the shorter papers meet Criterion 3 (that they should be “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”). The committee requests assignment sheets with more detailed descriptions and/or grading rubrics be included in the future to help assess this.

- CEL 394: Entrepreneurialism and Innovation**
Rationale: This application does not make it clear which assignments are meant to satisfy Criterion 3's assignments that are "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity." The syllabus highlights the Short Paper, the Long Paper, and the final take-home exam, while the discursive justification seems to indicate the Long Paper and the take-home exam. Of these three, only the long paper seems to count (detailed assignment sheets would allow us to assess this better). Without a reading/assignment schedule on the syllabus, we cannot evaluate whether the course meets Criterion 4.
- CEL 394: Liberalism and Conservatism in America**
Rationale: The application counts the short essays and the Final Paper toward Criterion 3's requirement that at least two assignments be "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity." The Final 10-15-page paper, in which students "develop an argument for [their] own political philosophy" certainly counts. The shorter essays on "Why I am / Why I am not / Why I'm not sure" seem like very useful exploratory work toward the final paper; however, do not on their own reach the threshold of "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity."
- CEL 394: Ideological Origins of Anglo-American Liberty**
Rationale: The application offers no supporting documentation to show the course meets Criteria 2, 3, or 4. Assignment sheets, more detailed descriptions, and/or grading rubrics would be necessary for the committee to judge Criteria 2 and 3. Criterion 4 cannot be judged without due dates marked in the syllabus calendar.
- CEL 494: Political Thought of Islam, Hinduism, Confucianism**
Rationale: To determine if the course meets Criteria 2 and 3, the application needs more supporting documentation, such as assignment sheets, more detailed descriptions, and/or grading rubrics.
- PHI 107: Introduction to Philosophy of Sex and Love**
Rationale: The application argues that the short papers satisfy Criteria 3 because they "go beyond merely giving a reaction to building an argument through engaging with objections." This suggests that they meet Criteria 2 ("gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence"), but Criteria 3 requires two assignments that are "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity." At 1-2 pages each, the short assignments cannot count as "substantial." Therefore, this course does not meet the criteria for this designation.

From MCCCD: (none)