

## Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: November 26, 2018

To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee

*Jessica Early, Chair*

*Julia Himberg, Member*

*Patience Akpan, Member*

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

### Recommend for Approval

---

From ASU:

**HST 482 Writing and the History of Science, Ideas, and Technology**

**Rationale:** This course meets all criteria.

From MCCCDC: (none)

### Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

---

From ASU:

**FIS 394 Humans and the Environment**

**Rationale:** The course meets all criteria, with the exception of Criterion 3 (“a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”). The research paper certainly counts, but at 500 words (less than two double-spaced pages), the first essay cannot be deemed substantial. Please revise.

**OGL 482 ProSeminar II**

**Rationale:** This course meets Criterion 1 (100% of the grade is writing-based: six written assignments and responses to discussion topic questions) and Criterion 2 (writing assignments and

participation in the discussion forum require the gathering, interpretation and evaluation of evidence); however, the nature of the writing assignments is not clear. As such, this course cannot be fully evaluated for the L-designation. The submission does not provide specific information or prompts for the writing assignments. There are assessment guidelines but they are general rather than written for each assignment specifically so it is unknown whether they, in fact, require “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence” and whether they are “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.” According to the syllabus, “Details on the above assignments / discussion topics are in the Weekly Learning Module areas (Week 1 through Week 6) of course website.” Those details however are not provided in the submission materials. It is especially problematic for the committee to review this course without detailed writing prompts because C-2 requires that writing assignments “should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.” However, the course description reads: “In Pro-Seminar II, students draw on their personal background, individual differences, knowledge and skills to assess career choices that maximize your strengths, values, and passions. Students will explore their own balance between work and the other important elements in your life, and develop strategies for living a meaningful and fulfilling life, at least through your work.” This premise for the course suggests it not does meet C-2.

*From MCCCDCD:* (none)

## **Recommend for Rejection**

---

*From ASU:*

### **IDS 302      Interdisciplinary Inquiry**

**Rationale:** This course, as presented, meets Criterion 1 (partially) and Criteria 3 and 4; however, it fails to meet Criterion 2. This course is an omnibus/special topics course number. The committee may review it as such and on its own merit with the understanding that classes offered under this course number will be designed in the same format as the syllabus in this submission. It is not clear, however, that the course as currently proposed and representative

of courses to follow, meets the criteria for the L designation. While writing assignments constitute at least 50% of the grade (C1), the expectations do not seem rigorous enough to meet Criterion 2. The literature review (both draft and final version) constitute 17% of the coursework; a science fiction assignment (draft, final paper and presentation) make up 15% of the course grade. A major writing assignment, the white paper, is worth 20%. None of the writing assignments involve significant “gathering, interpretation, and evaluation of evidence” to meet Criterion 2. As currently proposed, the committee decided that, as a special topics course, it is not possible to grant this course L-designation. While the primary objectives may remain the same, the assignments invariably change with each topic. As a result, the committee does not have a guarantee that the course will meet L-designation criteria each time it is offered. The submission syllabus is also vague such that the committee cannot discern what elements of the course are permanent across topics.

From MCCCD: (none)