

Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: March 3, 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)

From MCCC: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU:

IDS 302 Interdisciplinary Forecasting

The instructor should be commended for integrating the goals of the L designation into the syllabus. Although the course meets Criterion 1 based on the descriptions provided in the worksheet and syllabus, several of the assignments counted under Criterion 1 (including the Brainstorm Assignment, Newell's Seven Steps, Black Mirror Questions) do not appear to meet Criterion 2. For instance, in the annotated syllabus, those assignments are not marked as evidence of Criterion 2. In addition, the literature review depends on research and "gathering evidence" on a particular topic. However, the assignment description does not indicate how much of this assignment will "reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection." With regard to Criterion 3, while the total of 20 pages of writing is substantive in quantity, given that they constitute four unique writing assignments (including the use of a template for one of them), they do not fully meet the Criterion 3 in terms of "depth" and "quality." By addressing these issues, this course should be appropriate for L designation.

From MCCC: (none)

Recommend for Rejection

From ASU:

SER 416

Although “Labs” (35% of final grade) involve a writing component, that component is not the entirety of the assignment (affecting the course’s ability to meet Criterion 1). Moreover, it is explicitly described as a “reflection” exercise, which does not qualify under Criterion 2. (As an additional note, the term “reflection” is also used explicitly in the worksheet). In terms of Criterion 4, the use of a rubric is not enough on its own to qualify as regular and timely feedback, and the “metacognitive” process for “rapid feedback” is unclear in terms of meeting this requirement. Finally, the assignments are largely data driven and lack of the type of critical inquiry required to meet Criteria 2 and 3.

From MCCC: (none)