

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FORM

REQUEST FOR “AREA D: SOCIAL SCIENCES” DESIGNATION

TO: Elizabeth McNie, Chair, Curriculum Committee

FROM: Sarah Senk, Chair, General Education Committee

DATE: 12/6/22

SUBJECT: Curriculum Change Request: GMA 3-- Strategy

Proposed Course Subject: GMA 3--
Proposed Course Title: Strategy
Submitted by: Chris Chiego
Date Submitted: 11/30/22

GE COMMITTEE SUMMARY

In the space provided, please include the following information: when the committee met, who was in attendance, who was absent (and for what reason), a record of the vote/decision, and a brief summary of the committee discussion (including justifications for decisions and dissenting opinions):

The General Education Committee met on Tuesday, December 6, 2022, to review two GSMA Curriculum Change Request forms and determine whether GMA 3-- (“Strategy”) should be designated as an Area D General Education course. (The course has been taught before as a GMA 395 Special Topics class, and the GSMA department would like to make it a 300-level permanent course.)

In attendance were voting committee members Sarah Senk (Chair), Julie Simons, Cynthia Trevisan, Ryan Wade, Laurie Borchard, and Aparna Sinha, as well as nonvoting members Jordan Taylor and Mike Strange. Also in attendance was course coordinator, Chris Chiego.

Area D Rep and GSMA Chair, Ryan Wade noted for the record that Dr. Chiego is taking the course over from Assis Malaquias.

After reviewing the course description, goals, competencies and list of potential texts, the General Education Committee voted unanimously to designate this course as an Area D General Education course.

When reviewing courses, the GE Committee considers how well a course accords with the description of the subject area in EO1100, and whether or not the course will require that students satisfy the Cal Maritime General Education Learning Outcomes:

EO1100 Description of Area D: Social Sciences	GE Committee Discussion Notes
<p>“Area D requires 12 semester units or 18 quarter units dealing with human social, political and economic institutions and behavior, and their historical background. Students shall complete courses from at least two different disciplines, and one upper-division Area D course is required. Campuses shall not exceed these unit requirements. Students learn from courses in multiple Area D disciplines that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Through fulfillment of the Area D requirement, students will develop an understanding of problems and issues from the respective disciplinary perspectives and will examine issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts. Students will explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D.”</p>	<p>Committee members agreed unanimously that the course aligned with Area D.</p>

Cal Maritime GE Learning Outcomes: Area D	GE Committee Discussion Notes
<p>GELO 10: Identify and explain the links between human social, political and economic institutions and behavior.</p>	<p>Dr. Chiego explained that the course focuses on strategy at different levels (operational/tactical as well as grand strategy); explores how current actions affect people/societies in the long term; and how people learn from the past. The committee agreed unanimously that the course clearly met this learning outcome.</p>
<p>GELO 11: Analyze social problems and issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts.</p>	<p>Course requires analysis of past strategies in multiple cultural contexts. Committee members agreed unanimously that the course clearly met this learning outcome.</p>
<p>GELO 12: Explore the principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry.</p>	<p>The course is an international politics and also includes (as Chiego noted) “a traditional social science approach weighed against psychological aspects, including organizational leadership.”</p>

When reviewing courses, the GE Committee also considers the “IGETC Standards, Policies & Procedures for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, Version 2.0” (updated May 2019) and the “Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers” (updated October 2019) which were “developed based on recommendations from the faculty and staff who review course outlines proposed for lower-division general education credit in the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU).”

IGETC Standard for Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences Courses	GE Committee Discussion Notes
<p><u>10.4 Subject Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences:</u> courses dealing with individual behavior in human social, political, and economic institutions. Students develop understanding of the perspectives and research methods of the social and behavioral sciences. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary, historical, and geographical settings. Students who have completed this requirement shall have been exposed to a pattern of coursework designed to help them gain an understanding and appreciation of the contributions and perspectives of men, women and of ethnic and other minorities and a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies. The material should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects.</p> <p><u>10.4.1 Courses That Do Not Fulfill the Social and Behavioral Sciences Requirement</u> Only courses taught from the perspective of a social or behavioral science are approved. Consequently, courses such as Physical Geography and Statistics do not meet the IGETC specifications for this area and are not approved. Community colleges may resubmit these courses in a more appropriate area. Courses with a practical, personal, or applied focus are not approved. Administration of Justice courses may be approved if the content focuses on core concepts of the social and behavioral sciences.</p>	None.

Social Sciences Description (from the CSU “Guiding Notes for General Education Course Reviewers”)	GE Committee Discussion Notes
<p>Uses social scientific techniques of experimentation and empirical evidence to explore human experience</p> <p>Includes theoretical perspectives and focus on core concepts and methods of the discipline, including quantitative and qualitative analysis</p> <p>Examine groups of people and patterns of behavior and social dynamics</p> <p>Students learn how to practice social science, and not just understand what social scientists have concluded</p> <p>Course leads to a broad understanding of social science, and not just the discipline within it</p> <p>Students are learning more than pre-professional skills</p>	None.

The GE Committee votes on whether or not a course should be classified as “General Education” based on the criteria above. However, the committee should preserve a record of any discussion regarding potential impact across the university, overlaps with existing courses, concerns about assessment (including recommendations regarding learning outcomes, assessment plans, etc.), and anything else the committee deems important for the Curriculum Committee to consider in the space below:

Additional Discussion Notes

Area B Representative Julie Simons included the following suggestions for revisions to the assessment language in the CCR and recommended that the GSMA department clarify the purpose of the CCR.

General comments:

1. It seems like we are seeing these CCRs right now for GE reasons, not for the proposed major, is that correct? I’m confused about whether this should be stated as the purpose for the CCR or not right now? I’m worried that we are submitting CCRs with references to a proposed major and stating that the CCRs are being made for the new major, even though it has not yet been approved.
2. Grading Criteria and Evaluation: right now, it sounds so open-ended that each instructor could do something totally different (i.e. 100% exams, or 100% papers). It should be more explicit. Suggest re-wording to say something like, “A combination of papers, in-class activities, and exams will be used to determine grades in this course. A suggested grading scheme is:”
3. Include the GSMA SLOs in documentation for CC, we don’t need it or GE designation at this point, but we have no idea what the SLOs are (hard to get our hands on these documents online right now!).
4. Course assessment plan. It sounds optional (“can be conducted ... can be assessed using a rubric developed by the instructor ...”), which is not a plan. I would revise the wording to make it more concrete and instructive. (Future instructors should ideally have an idea of how to assess the course based on the CCR.) Assessment is not optional. This is very important for IWAC and GE reports.