I. Call to Order
Roll
( ) Erik Hirschman  Mat-Su/UAB  Social Sciences
( ) vacant  UAB
( ) Patricia Fagan  CAS  Humanities
( ) Robert Capuozzo  COE
( ) Jack Pauli  CBPP
( ) Jeane Breinig  CAS  Written Communication
( ) Len Smiley  CAS  Quantitative Skills
( ) Suzanne Forster  CAS/UAB
( ) Robin Wahto  CTC/UAB
( ) Walter Olivares  CAS  Fine Arts
( ) Tom Miller  OAA
( ) Catherine Sullivan  CHSW/UAB
( ) vacant  SOE/ UAB
( ) Doug Parry  CAS  Oral Communication
( ) vacant  CAS  Natural Science
( ) Karl Wing  USUAA

II. Approval of Agenda (pg. 1)

III. Approval of Summary (pg. 2-3)

IV. Report from Assistant Provost Tom Miller

V. Chair’s Report

VI. Course Action Requests
   Add  ENGL A478  Public Science Writing (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 4-12)

VII. Old Business
   A. Capstone Learning Outcomes Assessment Rubric (pg. 13-14)

VIII. New Business

IX. Informational Items and Adjournment
August 29, 2008
ADM 204
12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order
Roll
(x) Erik Hirschman Mat-Su/UAB Social Sciences
( ) vacant
(x) Patricia Fagan CAS Humanities
(x) Robert Capuozzo COE
(x) Jack Pauli CBPP
(x) Jeane Breinig CAS Written Communication
(e) Len Smiley CAS Quantitative Skills
(x) Suzanne Forster CAS/UAB
(x) Robin Wahto CTC/UAB
(x) Walter Olivares CAS Fine Arts
(x) Tom Miller OAA
(x) Catherine Sullivan CHSW/UAB
( ) vacant SOE/UAB
( ) Doug Parry CAS Oral Communication
( ) vacant CAS Natural Science
( ) Karl Wing USUAA

Jeff Miller present for SOE

II. Approval of Agenda (pg. 1)
Approved

III. Approval of Summary (pg. 2)
Kathleen Sullivan was present
Approved

IV. Report from Assistant Provost Tom Miller
Working on hiring process in OAA
Working on Accreditation Efforts
Looking for feedback regarding Accreditation documents

V. Chair’s Report
Need to determine Utpal Dutta’s position in GER and whether or not he is able to represent SOE and UAB

MOTION (Suzanne): Still uses GER templates when reviewing courses, but no longer need to keep written record of GER templates.
2nd (Robin Wahto)
Approved

VI. Course Action Requests
Chg LING A101 The Nature of Language (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 4-10)
Approved

Add ENGL A478 Public Science Writing (3 cr) (3+0)
No revisions received

Chg AKNS A101A Elementary Central Yup’ik Language I (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 11-14)
Chg AKNS A101B Elementary Tlingit Language I (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 15-18)
Chg AKNS A101C Elementary Alaska Native Language I (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 19-23)
Chg AKNS A102A Elementary Central Yup’ik Language II (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 24-27)
Chg AKNS A102B Elementary Tlingit Language II (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 28-31)
Chg AKNS A102C Elementary Alaska Native Language II (4 cr) (4+0) (pg. 32-36)
Approved AKNS A101 ABC and A102 ABC

Chg AKNS A201 Native Perspectives (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 37-42)
Approved

VII. Old Business

VIII. New Business
A. GER Updated List (pg. 43-46)
B. Update from GER summer capstone working group
   Generated draft rubric and Tom in trying to integrate it into a single master model
   Trying to come up with new model of institutional outcomes
   Found that committee was not clear enough about what materials needed to be submitted
   For the first year, everyone should be involved in Capstone assessment
   Would not need to see samples from each section if taught by the same instructor
   Student Names- should they be removed?
   Faculty would submit an example of A paper, B paper, C paper
   Possibly use percentages in template

C. GERC language in faculty handbook and membership list (pg. 47-49)

IX. Informational Items and Adjournment
**Curriculum Action Request**  
*University of Alaska Anchorage*  
Proposal to Initiate, Add, Change, or Delete a Course or Program of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a. School or College</th>
<th>1b. Division</th>
<th>1c. Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS CAS</td>
<td>AHUM Division of Humanities</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Course Prefix</th>
<th>3. Course Number</th>
<th>4. Previous Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>5a. Credits/CEU</th>
<th>5b. Contact Hours (Lecture + Lab)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>A478</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>(3+0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Complete Course/Program Title
**Public Science Writing**

**Abbreviated Title for Transcript (30 character)**

### 7. Type of Course
- Academic
- Non-credit
- CEU
- Professional Development

### 8. Type of Action
- Add
- Change
- Delete

### 10. Grading Basis
- A-F
- P/NP
- NG

### 11. Implementation Date
**From:** Spring/2009  
**To:** 9999/9999

### 12. Cross Listed with
- Stacked

### 13. List any programs or college requirements that require this course
- [ENGL A211 or ENGL A212 or ENGL A213 or ENGL A214]

### 14. Coordinate with Affected Units:
- Philosophy, Geography and Environmental Studies, UAA Faculty Listserv
- Department, School, or College

### 15. General Education Requirement
- Oral Communication
- Written Communication
- Quantitative Skills
- Humanities
- Fine Arts
- Social Sciences
- Natural Sciences
- Integrative Capstone

### 16. Course Description
Focuses on rhetorical issues at the intersections of discourse, science, and citizenry, issues involving citizens’ understanding, awareness, and participation in science-based public policy. Traces historical efforts to define and develop scientific literacy and concentrates on the increasing dialogue and debate among scientists, the public, and policymakers.

### 17a. Course Prerequisite(s) (list prefix and number)
- [ENGL A211 or ENGL A212 or ENGL A213 or ENGL A214]

### 17b. Test Score(s)

### 17c. Co-requisite(s) (concurrent enrollment required)

### 17d. Other Restriction(s)
- College
- Major
- Class
- Level

### 17e. Registration Restriction(s) (non-codable)
Completion of GER Tier 1 (basic college-level skills), junior standing, and 4 credits of Natural Science GER, including one lab credit (see attachment)

### 18. Mark if course has fees

### 19. Justification for Action
Response to a call from GER committee to develop additional general purpose capstone courses

---

**Initiator (faculty only)**  
Date

**Initiator (PRINT NAME)**  
Date

**Approved**  
Dean/Director of School/College  
Date

**Disapproved**  
Date

**Approved**  
Department Chairperson  
Date

**Disapproved**  
Date

**Approved**  
Undergraduate or Graduate  
Date

**Disapproved**  
Academic Board Chairperson  
Date

**Approved**  
Provost or Designee  
Date

**Disapproved**  
Date
Courses that will satisfy 4 credits of the Natural Science GER requirement include the following:

- ASTR A103/L
- ASTR A104/L
- BIOL A102/A103L
- BIOL A111/L
- BIOL A112/L
- BIOL A115/L
- BIOL A116/L
- BIOL A178/A179L
- CHEM A103/L
- CHEM A104/L
- CHEM A105/L
- CHEM A106/L
- GEOG A205/L
- GEOL A111
- GEOL A115/L
- GEOL A178/A179L
- GEOL A221
- LSIS A102
- LSIS A201
- LSIS A202
- PHYS A123/L
- PHYS A124/L
- PHYS A211/L
- PHYS A212/L

---

1. When the “L” accompanies a single course number, students need to register concurrently in two corequisite courses, same number, one with an “L” to designate the lab section.
2. When two course numbers are listed, the second with an “L”, the lecture course serves as a prerequisite to the lab. Students may take these courses concurrently or consecutively.
3. When a single course number appears, students register in a single course that includes a lab.
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE
COURSE CONTENT GUIDE

I. Initiation Date: February 2008

II. Course Information
A. College: College of Arts and Sciences
B. Course Title: Public Science Writing
C. Course Subject/Number: ENGL A478
D. Credit Hours: 3.0 Credits
E. Contact Time: 3 hours per week
F. Grading Information: A-F
G. Course Description: Focuses on rhetorical issues at the intersections of discourse, science, and citizenry, issues involving citizens’ understanding, awareness, and participation in science-based public policy. Traces historical efforts to define and develop scientific literacy and concentrates on the increasing dialogue and debate among scientists, the public, and policymakers.
H. Integrative Capstone GER
I. Lab Fees: Yes
J. Coordination: Philosophy, Geography and Environmental Studies, UAA Faculty Listserv
K. Prerequisites: [ENGL 211 or ENGL 212 or ENGL 213 or ENGL 214]
L. Registration Restrictions: Completion of GER Tier 1 (basic college-level skills); junior standing; and 4 credits of the Natural Science GER, including one lab credit (see attachment).

III. Course Activities
A. Lectures
B. Reading Discussions (small and large groups)
C. In-class debate
D. Collaborative problem-solving
E. Writing, peer response, and revision
F. Guest panelists
G. Participation in online media
H. Student presentations

IV. Evaluation
Evaluation based on exams, discussion participation; a science essay; and a rhetorical analysis project. Project evaluation will assess knowledge integration, effective communication, critical thinking, and information literacy.

V. Course Level Justification
The interdisciplinary nature of public science writing, reinforced by guest speakers, invites students from different fields to analyze and debate perspectives of major
contemporary importance at both local and global levels by using methods of rhetorical analysis. It provides students with an historical perspective on the increasing significance of scientific literacy and scientific communications for democratic participation in public policy issues. A major research project completed by each student integrates concepts and perspectives, and further develops critical thinking, research, and communication skills.

VI. Outline
A. The Two Cultures Debate between the Sciences and Humanities in Higher Education
   1. 19th Century: Arnold and Huxley
   2. 20th Century: Leavis and Snow
   3. 21st Century: The Third Culture

B. The Public Understanding of Science Movement (PUS)
   1. Public: many publics
   2. Understanding: defining and measuring scientific literacy
   3. Science: how science works in deliberative forums

C. Branches of Oratory
   1. forensic
      a. perceptions of risk
      b. levels of certainty
      c. hedging language
   2. epideictic
   3. deliberative

D. Persuasive Appeals
   1. ethos
   2. pathos
   3. logos
   4. visual ethos, pathos, and logos

E. Models of Public Science Communication
   1. deficiency model—top-down communication
   2. rational choice model—what citizens need to know
   3. context model—what citizens want to know in particular circumstances
   4. webbed model—bottom-up and lateral communication

F. Rhetors, Audiences, and Issues of Authority
   1. journalists and science information specialists
   2. scientist experts
   3. lay publics, lay experts
   4. indigenous people and traditional knowledge

G. The Literature of Science
   1. primary
   2. secondary
   3. tertiary
      a. science narratives
      b. writing style
c. publishing outlets

H. Science and the Media
   1. priming
   2. agenda setting
   3. issue framing

I. Case Studies
   1. Environment: climate change, mining, alternative energy
   2. Health: biotechnology, genetic testing, stem cell research

VII. Instructional Goals and Defined Outcomes
A. Instructional Goals, Student Outcomes, and Assessment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture on the two cultures debate and the public understanding of science movement</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of the historical two cultures debate as a framework for the ways that humanities and science scholars differ on the nature and value of language.</td>
<td>Exam/s In-class debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present rhetorical concepts and methods necessary to investigate the rhetoric of public science and the ways in which it is adapted for different audiences and contexts; and invite guest speakers with a wide range of disciplinary expertise on current policy issues</td>
<td>Access, evaluate, and compare a variety of readings and case studies; engage in questioning and discussion with invited speakers; and evaluate critically their own views in relation to these different fields of knowledge.</td>
<td>Discussion participation Exam/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate communication skills, critical thinking and analysis, and information literacy in assignments and classroom activities</td>
<td>Integrate information literacy skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills by composing a science essay for a public audience.</td>
<td>Science essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate how rhetorical methods can be used to analyze and write about public science controversies</td>
<td>Evaluate the communication strategies used in a contemporary public policy controversy</td>
<td>Discussion participation Rhetorical Analysis project involving a science-based public policy controversy Classroom presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the differences between primary, secondary, and tertiary scientific literature, and present a variety of media outlets that allow public access to scientific information and the historical context for the increase in such access.</td>
<td>Analyze scientific communication models and distinguish logical and appropriate uses of information from specious and fallacious uses of information in various media.</td>
<td>Annotated bibliography Lay abstract of a primary research article Cognitive map of science communication Discussion participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Suggested Texts


IX. Bibliography


Draft Capstone Assessment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to access, judge, and compare two or more fields of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates critically their own views regarding these different fields of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates communication skills necessary to function professionally in the twenty-first century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines issues clearly, identifies problems accurately, and/or describes situations precisely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies material of appropriate relevance, depth, and breadth to issues, problems and situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes logically and conceptualizes reasoned solutions to issues, problems, and situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices the responsible legal and ethical uses of information and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the issues surrounding plagiarism and the canons of academic honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishes logical and appropriate uses of information from specious and fallacious uses of information in various media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Perspectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performs original and/or critiques published studies using the scientific method or standardized statistical practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues Identified Associated with Capstone Assessment

1. Levels: Is it adequate to identify evidence of learning outcomes in student artifacts as above, or should the rubric indicate three or more levels of accomplishment?

2. Student Privacy: Should student names and instructor comments be removed from student work to protect student privacy? Discussion favored leaving it up to individual instructors as to removal of student names. Assistant Provost Miller indicated that FERPA does not require the removal of student names for assessment purposes.
3. **Assessors:** Should individual faculty complete the rubric or should assessment artifacts be evaluated by a separate committee? And who should that committee consist of? If we agree that faculty should submit samples of graded work.

4. **Sample size:** How large a sample size is necessary to effectively assess student work in a given class? Should the work be graded? Is it sufficient to require a single example of work at the A, B, C, and D level? (Initially, we seem to agree on 3 samples, one each of A, B, and C-level work).

   An alternate model would be to identify the percentage of students who achieve at each level.

5. If multiple teachers are teaching the same course, should assessment artifacts be gathered from each instructor? We have agreed that faculty teaching more than one section of a capstone course can submit a single sampling from multiple courses.

6. **Frequency:** Do artifacts need to be assessed every semester, once per year, or on a two or three-year rotation?