

Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: November 6, 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: (none)

From MCCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU:

HCD 400 Interpreting the Scientific Literature

Rationale: While at least 50 percent of the grade in the course is generated from writing assignments (thus meeting Criterion 1), the assignments themselves are not “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity” enough to meet Criterion 2 or reflect substantial “critical inquiry” enough for Criterion 3. The course appears to meet Criteria 1 and 4. Particularly, the opportunities for frequent and timely feedback should be commended. The primary issue to address in a revision is the course’s ability to meet Criteria 3; assignment 2 requires only a minimum of 350 words that would qualify under this criteria, and the Final Letter assignment is still relatively brief at 750-1000 words. Furthermore, both these assignment descriptions could further emphasize “critical inquiry,” as defined under Criterion 2 and in the general guidelines.

IDS 302 Integration Skills

Rationale: This course meets some but not all of the L designation criteria. The committee believes with some adjustments, the course would be able to meet these criteria. While at least 50% of the assignments are writing-based (Criterion 1), several of the assignments do not clearly meet Criteria 2 or 3; the science fiction assignment, for example, does not clearly meet Criterion 2. The elements of “critical inquiry” involved in this assignment should be clarified in the syllabus/assignment prompt. The “Integration Brainstorm Assignment & Articles” assignment also does not clearly indicate that it meets Criteria 2 or 3, especially with regard to reflecting sustained, in-depth critical inquiry. Additionally, the written assignments listed under Criterion 3 are each 4-5 pages, which places them right on the border of being considered “substantial” under the L guidelines. If at least two assignments required greater depth of inquiry, it would make this course a stronger candidate for the L designation. Finally, the course designer(s) should be commended for creating ample opportunity for both feedback and revision (Criterion 4).

LSC 394 The Biology of Sharks, Skates, and Rays

Rationale: This course meets some but not all of the requirements for L designation. The two substantial in-depth writing assignments (report and final exam) for this course do an excellent job in fulfilling Criteria 1, 3, and 4. However, it is unclear from the application how these assignments meet Criterion 2, which calls for both interpretation and critical inquiry, in addition to gathering and evaluating evidence. The assignments, which take the form of in-depth reports, clearly do the latter. It would help the committee in re-assessing this issue if the course designer(s) could explicitly state how these assignments require students to “reason critically” in addition to gathering information.

From MCCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Rejection

From ASU:

(none)

From MCCCD: (none)