Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee Report

Date: August 31, 2018
To: General Studies Council

From: Literacy & Critical Inquiry Subcommittee
Jessica Early, Chair
Julia Himberg, Member
Patience Akpan, Member

Re: Recommendations for Course Proposals (L, G, HU etc. designation)

Recommend for Approval

From ASU:

From MCCCD:
CRE 201: Critical Reading and Writing in a Global Society

This course meets all criteria.

Recommend for Revise/Resubmit

From ASU:
NUR 318

The course meets some, but not all, of the criteria for L designation. 50% or more of the class assignments are writing-based, namely from a set of essays. The descriptions supplied in the submission proposal outline these essays thoroughly. Based on review of the syllabus and assignment prompts, it is not clear that evidence-based practice (EBP) itself and the essays required students to, "reflect critically" (Criterion 2)." The essays do go beyond "opinion and/or reflection" as the designation requires, however, the language in the prompts – i.e. "identify," "describe the setting," "summarize," "document" – do not demonstrate the gathering, interpreting, and evaluating of evidence required to meet Criterion 2. This may be remedied by further clarification of the assignments. The group portion of the assignment appears to have individual elements to it – "Each student

has to provide scholarly feedback to another student's scenario" – yet, on the whole, it is group-focused and therefore does not count toward the L designation. In addition, the video project should not be included in the proposal as it does not qualify for Criterion 3, and is "not considered substantial writing/speaking assignments."

From MCCCD: (none)

Recommend for Rejection

From ASU:

TWC 443: The submission materials for this course list "all assignments" as writing assignments (Criterion 1). However, for the purposes of the L designation, a portion of assignments do not meet Criterion 2 or 3 because they do not include "sustained, in-depth written inquiry that reflects engagement with the material." The course has a total of 310 possible points (including the weekly posts).

From the assignment descriptions, it is also unclear whether the following assignments meet Criterion 2 and 3: "Draft Problem Statement and Goal," "Problem Statement Peer Reviews," "Problem/Needs Worksheet," "Revised Goals and Objectives," "Budget Worksheet," "Draft Budget and Evaluation Plan," and "Budget Peer Reviews." Without these, it still appears the "Funder/organizational analysis report" (worth 50 points), the "Full draft" (worth 20 points), and the "Final proposal" (worth 100 points for a total of 170) meet Criterion 1 (54% of the grade comes from these three written assignments). In addition, the weekly discussion posts/responses do not meet Criterion 2 or 3, as they are not "substantial in depth, quality, and quantity." Because grant writing is a specific genre of writing and the written assignments in this course are geared toward this genre in a specific and unique way, the committee would like to more clearly understand how the assignments meet Criterion 2, which "should involve gathering, interpreting, and evaluating evidence." All and all, the committee would like more clarity on the assignments to see that they meet the Criterion 2 and 3 and this is why we are not accepting the proposal at this time.