

## Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: February 6, 2020

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)

**HON 370**      **History of Ideas:** This course meets all criteria.

From MCCCCD: (none)

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

---

From ASU:

From MCCCCD: (none)

### **Recommend for Rejection**

---

From ASU:

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

**Rationale:** The instructor should be commended for the effort to revise the original submission for this designation. For this resubmission, the instructor has clarified that 50% of assignments do involve an individual component, which is required for Criterion 1. However, upon receiving further clarification, the course does not

appear to meet Criterion 3. The group “Case Study” project does not involve substantial individual writing/critical inquiry work. The “In the News” assignment, while substantial, takes the form of a slide show rather than a written or spoken presentation. As a note, the format of this application made assessment challenging. The application lacked the traditional checklist and clearly marked syllabus/assignments that highlight only the elements that met Literacy designation.

**SPE 317 Special Education for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Children and Youth**

Although 55% of assignments require writing and/or speaking (per Criterion 1), several of the written assignments that constitute this 55% are short summaries of the reading materials, reflections, and question/answer and observations. Other writing activities include lesson plans and family/community intervention plans. These do not meet the criteria for Literacy designation as outlined by Criterion 1 and Criterion 3. In addition, based on the prompt provided by the instructor, the ICC Assignment 2 appears to use a questionnaire format and emphasizes “reflection,” which cannot be counted toward L designation criteria. As per Criterion 2, the writing assignments do involve gathering of evidence from student-focused collaborations, lesson plans, and other teaching-related activities and assignments. However, instructions provided about these assignments do not give any indication of expectation about the level of rigorous interpretation and evaluation of materials that extend “beyond opinion and/or reflection.” Additionally, the provided materials do not reflect an emphasis on “critical inquiry” in the reflection phase of the project as required by Criterion 2. The course also fails to meet Criterion 3 as there is no evidence that writing assignments and/or oral presentations are “substantial in depth, quality and quantity.” Finally, per Criterion 4, while the instructor states that “students get feedback throughout the semester,” the provided course calendar does not indicate a sequence of course assignments or the extent and nature of the feedback between each assignment.

*From MCCCD:* (none)

