



ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

**ASU GENERAL STUDIES COUNCIL**

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, October 20, 2016

3:00–5:00 p.m.

**Present:** Katherine Antonucci, Alexandra Aragon, Charlotte Armbruster, Tamiko Azuma, , Jason Bruner, Deepak Chhabra, Alison Essary-Chair, Caroline Harrison, Sean Hawkeswood, Julie Holston, Wendy Hultsman, Phyllis Lucie, Michael Mokwa, Darryl Morrell, Kristen Parrish, Deborah Preach, Janice Pittsley, Brad Ryner, Matt Simonton, Stephen Wirkus, Michelle Zandieh

**Excused:** Heather Bateman, Jessica Early, Hilde Hoogenboom, Bertha Manninen, Helene Ossipov,

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Approval of Minutes—September 22, 2016**

The minutes were approved as written.

**3. Announcements**

**4. Old Business - none**

**5. New Business- none**

**6. Subcommittee Reports**

**A) Literacy & Critical Inquiry**

**From ASU:**

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

HCR 480 Capstone: Practices and Approaches

## **Revise & Resubmit for L designation (new):**

### POS 348 Do You Want to Build a Nation?

Rationale: This course has a strong focus on literacy and critical inquiry. However, it does not satisfy Criterion 1 (at least 50% of the grade does not depend on writing). Two papers count for a total of 20% of the grade, the WikiPage and four policy statements count for 17%, and two policy commentaries count for 8% of the grade. This is a total of 45%. The proposal additionally counts the 10% allocated to “Presentation of State’s Wiki Page or Policy” as a writing assignment; however, according to the section of the syllabus headed “State Wiki Page and Policy Statements and Individual Presentation,” this 10% is based on a PowerPoint *presentation and oral defense* of the WikiPage and Policy Statements, *the actual writing of which is already figured into the 45%*. Additionally, the WikiPage and Policy Statements are group projects, which, according to Criterion 1 can only count toward the minimum 50% of the grade devoted to writing assignments if “each student gathers, interprets, and evaluates evidence, and prepares a summary report.” Because these are collectively written, they do not satisfy the requirement of *each* student preparing a summary report. Please revise accordingly.

### LAS 330 From the Inside: The Latin American Journey

Rationale: It does not seem that the course meets Criteria 1 and 2. At least 50% of the grade should consist of writing assignments that “involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence. They should reflect critical inquiry, extending beyond opinion and/or reflection.” The final paper (20%) does, but that is only one assignment. The description of the “country journal” specifies it consists of “class notes, questions, reflections, and discoveries made” (which do not extend beyond reflection) “as well as research items,” (which might -- though it is unclear what these “research items” are). This course relies heavily on writing, critical thinking, and timely feedback on the journal. While this is an effective writing and pedagogical tool, it is an example of reflective, impromptu writing that does not meet the spirit and letter of Literacy criteria. The “written homework assignments” are not specified and so cannot be judged. The course does not meet Criterion 3 (“minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”) as only the final paper meets the requirement of being “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity.” Perhaps a shorter paper earlier would provide students with skills and feedback to write longer paper of critical inquiry?

### PAX 230 Introduction to Peace Studies

Rationale: This course does not meet Criterion 1, which specifies that “at least 50% of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments” and that “In-class

essay exams may not be used for [L] designation.” Excluding the essay exams, the graded writing consists of 15% for one “documented essay” and 20% that includes both “journals and quizzes” (of which only the journals would count toward the 50% mark). Additionally, while the “documented essay” counts as one of Criterion 3’s “minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity,” the “journals” do not seem to satisfy the requirement of being “substantial in depth, quality, and quantity” and there is no timely feedback on these writing assignments.

### POS 294 Politically Speaking

Rationale: This course does not meet Criterion 1 (“at least 50% of the grade in the course should depend upon writing assignments.”) The course is focused on effectively delivering speeches and combines speechwriting and public speaking in interesting ways. 30% of the grade is based on speeches and 20% on debate. Although speeches are generally written in advance, these cannot in good faith be counted as “writing assignments” (note that Criterion 3 when meaning to include “speaking assignments” specifies “writing assignments and/or speaking assignments” whereas Criterion 1 restricts to “writing assignments”). That leaves only 17% of the grade based on writing (peer evaluation and external speech evaluation). Even if one were to count the speeches as a writing assignment, given their brevity (2-3 min, 3-4 min, and 4-6 min) they would fail to meet Criterion 3 (“a minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”). It is also unclear that the assignments significantly “involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence” (Criterion 2) -- the “Committee Testimony” speech specifies researching and issue, but the other two are focused on “selling” a candidate.

### CHI/REL 338 The Daoist Bible: The Daode jing

Rationale: The course does not meet Criterion 3 (“minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity” as the course’s only writing assignments are weekly two-page essays. The course does not meet Criterion 4 (“These substantial writing or speaking assignments should be arranged so that the students will get timely feedback from the instructor on each assignment in time to help them do better on subsequent assignments.”) The writing assignments, as currently scheduled, are weekly and the feedback seems to be largely peer feedback instead of instructor based. Students turn in weekly two-page essays each week before receiving instructor feedback on their previous essay, so they do not have ample time to receive feedback to do better on subsequent assignments.

### **Deny for L designation (new):**

### HCR 301 Research Methods for the Health Care Professional

Rationale: [Note that the criteria to qualify for the [L] designation listed on the form submitted differ in substantial ways from the set criteria. Is this an outdated form? Or, was this course submitted to the Literacy subcommittee by mistake?] It does not seem the course meets Criteria 1, 2, or 3. “At least 50% of the grade should consist of writing assignments that “involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence.” The two-page paper (14%), the qualitative critique (7%), and the quantitative critique (7%) involve “gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence,” certainly involve writing. However, the writing assignments consist of one two-page paper, two written critiques of unspecified length, and a poster presentation of unspecified length. None of these address depth, quality, or quantity (Criterion 3). The “Research Poster Presentation” does not because the students are tasked to “write a research question, identify an applicable theoretical or conceptual framework, conduct a literature search, evaluate the literature,” and “determine the methodological approach for the faux study” but not actually carry out the study. Therefore, although the literature review must involve some evaluation, the goal of the poster project is study design, not analysis of actual data. Additionally, because the poster project is the only substantial assignment, the course does not meet Criterion 3 (“minimum of two writing and/or speaking assignments that are substantial in depth, quality, and quantity”). Furthermore, the assignments are not arranged to build on each other as writing assignments but are set up, instead, as tasks (Criterion 4).

**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 Fall 2017 (new):**

CHI/REL 338 The Daoist Bible: The Daode jing

IAP 301 Energetic Systems of Art

LAS 205 Deep Roots: Latin America

LAS 330 From the Inside: The Latin American Journey

LAS 480 Current Trends in Theatre and New Media in Latin America and Spain

PHI 415 Philosophy and Film  
THE 430 History of Fashion

**From MCCC:**

None

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

**From ASU:**

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

AMS 334 Class in America  
JHR 305 Theory and Practice of Social Justice and Human Rights  
WST 385 Psychology of Gender

**Revise & Resubmit for SB designation (new):**

HRC 200 Introduction to Social and Cultural Analysis

Rationale: The proposal and materials do not clearly demonstrate that social behavioral themes, knowledge and work are dominant in the course and learning experience. A “cultural analytics” perspective appears dominant with some attention to social behavioral foundations. At this time, the committee actually leans toward denying this proposal but would entertain a resubmission.

**Deny for SB designation (new):**

HRC 310 Social and Cultural Studies: Method and Theory

Rationale: This courses does not have a compelling proposal demonstrating social behavioral foundations and content throughout the course experience. The dominant themes of the course appear to be disciplinary issues and methods. Social behavioral themes appear in a supporting role.

HST/LAS 419 Twentieth Century Chicana/o Studies

Rationale: The proposal is marginally developed. There is no compelling evidence demonstrating that social behavioral knowledge and themes are the dominant focus of this course.

**From MCCCDC:**

None

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

**From ASU:**

None

**From MCCCDC:**

None

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

**From ASU:**

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

AMS 201 Introduction to American Studies  
HRC 200 Introduction to Social and Cultural Analysis  
HRC 310 Social and Cultural Studies: Method and Theory  
HST/LAS 419 Twentieth Century Chicana/o Studies  
WST/AMS 276 U.S. Women's Movement

**Revise and resubmit for C designation (new):**

CHI/REL 338 The Daoist Bible: The Daode jing

Rationale: The committee would like to see more clarification/details regarding how American culture is influenced by the assignments. It is not evident in the syllabus. Also, American authors are only covered 3-4 weeks.

JHR 100 Introduction to Social Justice and Human Rights

Rationale: The application indicates that over 50% of the course is devoted to focus on the US. However that is not evident in the syllabus.

**Deny for C designation (new):**

AMS 334 Class in America

Rationale: Need cultural specific settings for application and for comparative purpose.

WST 385 Psychology of Gender

Rationale: The topic is fine. There is no visible evidence of connection of the material to the US.

**From MCCCDCD:**

None

**G) Global Awareness (G)**

**From ASU:**

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

JHR 305 Theory and Practice of Social Justice and Human Rights

LAS 205 Deep Roots: Latin America

PAX 230 Introduction to Peace Studies

**From MCCCDCD:**

None

**H) Historical Awareness (H)**

**From ASU:**

None

**From MCCCDCD:**

None

**6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Submitted by Phyllis Lucie