

## Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: September 10, 2019

To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee

*Julia Himberg, Chair*

*Patience Akpan, Member*

*Brian Goodman, Member*

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

### **Recommend for Approval**

---

From ASU:

#### **SPA 404 Spanish in US Professional Communities**

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

From MCCCDCD: (none)

### **Recommend for Revise/Resubmit**

---

From ASU:

#### **CEL 494 Great American Leaders**

**Rationale:** The course clearly meets both Criterion 1 and 4. However, further elaboration is required in order to understand how the three “Profiles in Virtue” assignments satisfy Criteria 2 and 3. Specifically, Criterion 2 suggests that qualifying assignments should emphasize “critical inquiry” through the “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating” of evidence. Greater detail is required to understand how students will be expected to critically engage with the material covered in course readings rather than

select subjects that they find “particularly interesting” or “think exemplifies greatness,” both of which are highly subjective in nature. This clarification would also avoid the possibility of students relying on their own opinions and reflections, a key factor for meeting Criterion 3. The fact that students are expected to “write a paper defending your analysis” suggests the assignments go beyond opinion and/or reflection. However, the committee needs to see the full prompts to make this determination.

**SPA 317 Introduction to Spanish for the Professions**

**Rationale:** It is clear from the materials provided and instructor comments that the course meets Criterion 1 (50% of the assignment involves writing) and Criterion 2 (the two research papers require substantive gathering, interpretation and evaluating of information about the “judicial systems in the U.S. and the Latin American world,” and “issues related to the work and social reality of security forces in the U.S. and in Latin America”). It is less clear whether the course meets criteria 3 and 4. It appears each paper is expected to be four to five pages in length, which for two research papers and a final project, totals 15 pages. This does not meet the criteria for L-designation, specifically Criterion 3: “a minimum of two writing assignments that are substantial in quantity.” In addition, the materials submitted do not provide a clear understanding of how feedback, Criterion 4, works. It appears that two versions of each of the research papers are submitted on different dates. It is not clear whether the second version is a revision of the first based on instructor feedback. It would be helpful for the committee to see a description of how feedback is provided and at what stages of the process to be sure it meets Criterion 4.

*From MCCCDC:* (none)

**Recommend for Rejection**

---

*From ASU:*

## **NTR 355    Eating for Lifelong Health**

**Rationale:** While the “In the News” project and potentially the “Case Studies” meet the requirements for the criteria of the L designation, the remaining assignments do not qualify for L-designation. Based on close review of the assignment prompts and evaluation rubrics, the committee has determined that the reflective assignments that emphasize “self-assessment,” including the “Introduction” and “Personal Wellness Plan,” do not meet the requirement for “critical inquiry” as defined in Criterion 2 and “in-depth engagement” with course texts as defined in Criterion 3. In addition, group projects are only acceptable if each student is involved and “prepares a summary report.” While the assignment description provided says that the goal is for all students to actively participate in the project, it appears they only submit a peer evaluation of the project individually, which does not meet L-designation criteria.

*From MCCCD:* (none)