

Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: April 1, 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)

ENG 333 **Meets all criteria**

ENG 378 **Meets all criteria**

From MCCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU:

HEP 454 **Health Promotion Program Planning & Implementation**

There are two major writing assignments for the course, totaling fifty-four percent of the course grade, which meets Criterion 1. The instructor should also be commended for providing timely feedback and scaffolding assignments to allow students to improve their work. However, based on the materials submitted, it is unclear what exactly is being asked of students for their “plan” project. Specifically, the materials do not make clear how much of the assignment involves “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence” or how much the assignment reflects “critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.” The “needs assessment” supplement provided also does not indicate that “critical inquiry” and its components are central to the project. Rather, the assignment asks students to “list,” “explain,” and “describe,” which do not require the evaluation and interpretation of evidence required for L designation. It is possible that the design of a health education/promotion program plan will involve the necessary components; if that is the case, the

syllabus should specify the process to demonstrate that the assignments evidently meet Criteria 2 and 3. In addition, a detailed prompt or grading rubric for the “plan” assignment would be useful in re-evaluating the course.

From MCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Rejection

From ASU: (none)

From MCCCD: (none)