



ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY  
**ASU GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL**

MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, March 30, 2017  
3:00–5:00 p.m.

**Present:** Katherine Antonucci, Tamiko Azuma, Jason Bruner, Deepak Chhabra, Jessica Early, Alison Essary, Chair, Caroline Harrison, Sean Hawkeswood, Julie Holston, Hilde Hoogenboom, Wendy Hultsman, Phyllis Lucie, Fran Matera, Darryl Morrell, Helene Ossipov, Kristen Parrish, Deborah Preach, Brad Ryner, Matt Simonton,

**Excused:** Alexandra Aragon, Heather Bateman, Bertha Manninen, Michael Mokwa, Janice Pittsley, Stephen Wirkus, Michelle Zandieh

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes—March 2, 2017**

The minutes were approved as written.

**3. Announcements**

**4. Old Business** – discussion continued as it relates to the review/updating of criteria check-sheets. GSC cover sheet needs to be updated, as well as the addition of FAQ's regarding general studies course submissions e.g., (include special topics three semester approval, and notification that each college scheduler needs to send this information to [courses@asu.edu](mailto:courses@asu.edu) ).

**5. New Business**

**6. Subcommittee Reports**

**A) Literacy & Critical Inquiry**

**From ASU:**

**Approved for L designation, effective retroactive Fall 2017 (new):**

SLC/GRK/LAT 394 Tales of Troy (new- revised)

**Recommend to Revise and Resubmit:**

SLC 425 What is Globalization? A History of Contact and Conflict

*Rationale:* The committee is in agreement that this seems like a great course. However, it does not seem to meet criterion 3 “a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.” The final assignment (50%), due on the last day of class, is substantial (2,000-2,500 words) and includes an abstract and annotated bibliography of 8-10 sources for critical inquiry, due 4 and 2 weeks before the final paper. While the feedback in this process is good, the L criteria requires a process of timely feedback that connects all the writing assignments, which are usually all critical inquiry. The other 3 writing assignments (30%), one per month, are short (500-600) words to “respond to specific aspects of the readings.” Sample questions would clarify whether these response papers go beyond opinion and reflection to weigh evidence, etc. The Term paper that constitutes 50% of the grade certainly counts for one. The three short (500-600 word) papers are too short. The application makes the argument that the “term paper has two main components: 1. An abstract and an annotated bibliography and [2.] the actual term paper.” The abstract and bibliography don’t seem to be sufficient enough to count as “substantial.”

**From MCCC:**

None

**B) Mathematical Studies (MA)/(CS)**

**From ASU:**

None

**From MCCC:**

None

**C) Humanities, Arts & Design (HU)**

**From ASU:**

**Approved for HU designation, effective retroactive Fall 2017 (new):**

SLC 194 Gods and Monsters: Comparative Mythology  
SLC 194 Introduction to Zen Buddhism  
SLC 425 What is Globalization? A History of Contact and Conflict

**Recommend to Revise and Resubmit:**

**From ASU:**

FIS 294 The Moviegoer's Guide to the Future

*Rationale:* The proposal does not provide evidence that the assignments are more than summaries, or reflections on the assignments without critical analysis. This could be acceptable for some of the assignments, but it appears to be the case for all of them. The series of 500-word assignments is termed a “reflection” and does not necessarily involve any interpretation or critical analysis of the material. We have the same concern regarding the weekly two questions from the readings. We recommend resubmit with clarification regarding interpretation/analysis in the assignments.

We have questions regarding “Class Attendance and Participation”, which qualifies for 40% of the grade. As participation is described on the syllabus, it is not clearly measurable. (We note that SLC 194 was careful to make the distinction between attendance and participation in the grading policy, and provided measures to qualify for 20% of the grade.) It is difficult for us to determine how “experiencing the movie together and the following group discussion” qualifies for 3 in the checklist. We recommend resubmit with clarification regarding “Class Attendance and Participation” and the measures for grading. This should help with our questions regarding the viewing of in-class movies and how this activity relates to 3 on the checklist.

RUS 494 Post- Soviet Cinema: Art, Dissent, and Social Justice

*Rationale:* The section of the checklist in which evidence of how the course meets HU criteria is missing. Please complete and resubmit.

**From MCCC:**

None

**D) Social - Behavioral Sciences (SB)**

**From ASU:**

**Approved for SB designation, effective retroactive Fall 2017 (new):**

CAP 120 Introduction to Counseling

**Recommend to Deny:**

**From ASU:**

ACT 301 Risk Management and Insurance

*Rationale:* The proposal is developed effectively. Risk as a “technical,” rather than behavioral, construct is the foundation for the course. While many facets and dimensions of risk are addressed and some relate to human interactions, socio-behavioral perspectives and theories are a marginal feature of the coursework. Moreover, there is a strong focus on professional skills and training.

**From MCCCDC:**

None

**E) Natural Sciences (SQ/SG)**

**From ASU:**

None

**From MCCCDC:**

None

**F) Cultural Diversity in the United States (C)**

**From ASU:**

**Recommend to Revise and Resubmit:**

CAP 220 Exploring Cultural Diversity in Counseling

*Rationale:* It is not easily evident in the syllabus how US perspectives on cultural diversity are being met in the content of the course. The course description relates to US as do the readings, but the course outline does not reflect US.

CAP 340 Multicultural Counseling Theory and Practice

*Rationale:* This course proposal is vague in its use of the term ‘counseling.’ As well as how US perspectives are incorporated. The context/setting to practice cultural diversity initiatives is not clearly stated. The cultural diversity part is clear and well explained and meets criteria 1, 2b. It does not clearly meet criteria 2c. More examples of minority groups of focus will help.

**From MCCCDC:**

**Approved for C designation, effective Fall 2017 (new):**

SLG 212 Deaf Culture (revised)

**G) Global Awareness (G)**

**From ASU:**

**Approved for G designation, effective retroactive Fall 2017 (new):**

RUS 494 Post-soviet Cinema: Art, Dissent, and Social Justice

SLC 194 Gods and Monsters: Comparative Mythology

SLC 394 Culture and Society Transformation

SLG 425 What is Globalization? A History of Contact and Conflict

**From MCCCDC:**

None

**H) Historical Awareness (H)**

**From ASU:**

None

**From MCCCDC:**

**Recommend to Deny:**

WST 209 Women and Film (mandatory review)

*Rationale:* The course overall does not demonstrate that systematic historical analysis is embedded in the core of the syllabus, as the guidelines for Historical Awareness state. Rather, the course seems to focus on becoming familiar with feminist film theory and analyzing certain sociological and gender issues present in the film industry. Historical background information is included intermittently and primarily for contextual reasons, rather than being “a major focus of the course” as Criterion 1 states. Course content is not consistent across all versions of the syllabus, and some syllabi do not mention history or historical analysis at all in their objectives. The course also falls under the exclusionary criterion of being “exclusively the history of a field of artistic endeavor”—in this case a specific type of film identified in multiple syllabi as films written/directed by women, starring women, or containing certain representative images of women. Because of this, the course would need to show both how these types of films are affected by political, social, economic, and/or cultural

conditions and how political, social, economic, and/or cultural conditions are affected by these types of films, and the course does not sufficiently demonstrate this.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by Phyllis Lucie