

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FORM

REQUEST FOR “AREA F: ETHNIC STUDIES” DESIGNATION

TO: Amy Parsons, Chair, Curriculum Committee
FROM: Sarah Senk, Chair, General Education Committee
DATE: 12/15/20
SUBJECT: Curriculum Change Request: HIS 100 Area F Classification

Proposed Course Subject: HIS 100
Proposed Course Title: “Survey of American History to 1877: Precontact through the Civil War”
Submitted by: Jennifer Metz
Date Submitted: December 10, 2020

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 15, 2020 to determine whether or not HIS 101 should be designated as an Area F General Education course.

In attendance were voting committee members Sarah Senk (Chair), Katherine Luce, Kathryn Marocchino, Elizabeth McNie, Tom Oppenheim, Josh Shackman, Julie Simons, Mike Strange, Cynthia Trevisan, and Ryan Wade and non-voting members Graham Benton and Julia Odom. Student representative Josh Barlas was absent. Jennifer Metz attended as a guest to answer questions about the course.

After reviewing the course description, goals, competencies and list of potential texts, the General Education Committee voted 9-0-1 (9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention) to designate this course as an Area F General Education course.

Background: Shortly after AB 1460 passed (earlier this semester) the Deans, Department Chairs, and GE Committee Chair met to identify potential courses that would satisfy the General Education outcomes. The MTLM and Engineering Deans expressed concern that their third lower division D course was already “spoken for” since many of their majors were required to take Economics in addition to American Institutions History and Government courses and could not feasibly add a standalone Ethnic Studies elective into their curriculum without additional units to the curriculum.

It was suggested that Jennifer Metz’s American Institutions classes, which Metz teaches through an Ethnic Studies lens, would be a natural fit. An FAQ released by the Chancellor’s Office on 9/29/2020 <<https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/diversity/advancement-of-ethnic-studies/Documents/FAQ-on-Ethnic-Studies.pdf>> confirmed that “a course could meet both the “Area F” ethnic studies requirement and the United States History requirement by fulfilling the learning outcomes for both. However, if United States History meets an “Area D” requirement, the student would need to choose the GE area for credit (either F or D). The requirement in American history would be complete no matter

which GE area the student selects.” (In practice, the majority of Cal Maritime students will take the course to satisfy the Area F requirement but keeping Area D classification means that transfer students who may come to Cal Maritime already having fulfilled Area F elsewhere may still take the course for Area D credit.)

This CCR represents a formalization of Metz’s “version” of “Survey of American History from 1877.” While not much is changing materially about the way Metz has taught the course for years at Cal Maritime, she has updated the course description and outcomes to guarantee that anyone teaching the course in the future must meet the same standard and therefore meet the Area F learning outcomes. The course will also retain its Area D designation and, as indicated in the FAQ document mentioned above, students will need to choose the GE are for which they receive credit.

GSMA Department Chair Assis Malaquias did not attend the meeting but indicated to Metz in an email his strong support for the proposal.

GSMA Department Representative Ryan Dudley Wade confirmed that GSMA is also developing a standalone course in Ethnic Studies as an option for transfer students who have taken American Institutions at other institutions, and L&S students who have more flexibility in their curricula to take electives. Wade reports he will work with Metz, drawing on her “deep knowledge,” to develop the course, and should demand increase for a second offering, either he or Metz could teach it. But for Fall 2021, Metz’s American Institutions History class will be the only Area F course in our catalog.

The General Education Committee was unanimous in its praise for Metz’s course proposal. Trevisan (who is also an ASCSU representative) noted that Area F courses are only required to meet 3 of the 5 outcomes but Marocchino pointed out that the committee can note if the proposal meets all five.

The committee unanimously agreed that the course *clearly* meets Outcomes 1-3. Metz added that she believes 1-3 are the primary outcomes for her course but that there are “threads” from outcomes 4 and 5.

The committee also reviewed Metz’s CCR for HIS 101 and compared the two. (Details about the discussion of HIS 101 are included in a separate memo.) HIS 100 also focuses primarily on Native American and African American communities, while HIS 101 focuses on African American, Asian American, and Latinx American communities. But since Outcome 1 notes that the course must focus on “one or more” of these groups, the committee determined that both courses are compliant.

When reviewing courses, the GE Committee typically considers how well a course accords with the description of the subject area in EO1100. Area F is unusual in that outcomes are included in the CSU General Education Breadth Requirements and courses must meet a minimum of 3 out of 5 of those outcomes. We do not currently have Ethnic Studies learning outcomes in the Cal Maritime GELOs, so the committee only reviews whether or not the proposed courses meet that CSU-wide learning outcomes for Area F.

CSU Area F Learning Outcomes	GE Committee Discussion Notes
<p>Outcome 1: Analyze and articulate concepts such as race and racism, racialization, ethnicity, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation, decolonization, sovereignty, imperialism, settler colonialism, and anti-racism as analyzed in any one or more of the following: Native American Studies, African American Studies, Asian American Studies, and Latina and Latino American Studies.</p>	<p>Committee unanimously agreed the course <i>clearly</i> met this outcome.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Apply theory and knowledge produced by Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities to describe the critical events, histories, cultures, intellectual traditions, contributions, lived-experiences and social struggles of those groups with a particular emphasis on agency and group-affirmation.</p>	<p>Committee unanimously agreed the course <i>clearly</i> met this outcome.</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Critically analyze the intersection of race and racism as they relate to class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, tribal citizenship, sovereignty, language, and/or age in Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities.</p>	<p>Committee unanimously agreed the course <i>clearly</i> met this outcome.</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Critically review how struggle, resistance, racial and social justice, solidarity, and liberation, as experienced and enacted by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans are relevant to current and structural issues such as communal, national, international, and transnational politics as, for example, in immigration, reparations, settler-colonialism, multiculturalism, language policies.</p>	<p>During the discussion of Outcome 4, the committee asked how Metz envisioned the course dealing with social justice and liberation. Metz talked in detail about how she gives “considerable emphasis to the abolitionist movement and contrasts it with similar movements,” which she described at length. She also alluded to Outcome 5 when she described how her coverage of the abolitionist movement focuses on the production of anti-racist discourse.</p> <p>Committee agreed the course meets this outcome.</p>
<p>Outcome 5: Describe and actively engage with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues and the practices and movements in Native American, African American, Asian American and/or Latina and Latino communities and a just and equitable society.</p>	<p>Senk noted that regarding outcome 5 HIS 100 seems to focus more on “anti-colonial issues” while HIS 101 seems to focus more on “anti-racist” issues. Committee agreed the course meets this outcome.</p>

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

The revised CSU General Education Breadth Requirements (effective 12/3/2020) [formerly known as EO1100] state that “to be approved for this requirement, courses shall have the following course prefixes: African American, Asian American, Latina/o American or Native American Studies. Similar course prefixes (e.g., Pan-African Studies, American Indian Studies, Chicana/o Studies, Ethnic Studies) shall also meet this requirement. Courses without ethnic studies prefixes may meet this requirement if cross-listed with a course with an ethnic studies prefix. Courses that are approved to meet this requirement shall meet at least 3 of the 5 the following core competencies.”

Cal Maritime does not have courses (nor departments) with those prefixes. GE Chair Sarah Senk and AVP Graham Benton met with Associate Vice Chancellor Alison Wrynn over Zoom on Wednesday, December 9. Wrynn recommended creating an ES prefix for HIS 100 and cross-listing the course.

Registrar Julia Odom confirmed later that day that “there is not problem to create a course prefix of ES.” She also clarified that, “[t]here is a difference between cross-listing and equating courses. If we cross-list a course (we haven't used this feature), there is a section HIS 100 and a section of ES 100. Enrollment is allocated between the classes. Students choose the appropriate version of the course to fulfill their requirements. If the courses are equated, this allows the academic advising report (degree audit), to slot either version of the course into the correct requirement. The system sees HIS 100 and ES 100 as the same course.”

Odom confirmed on December 14 and again in our meeting that the campus can “work out the logistics of the course allocation to GE requirements.” She noted, “I believe it is true that we have not cross-listed or used equate codes for courses but I am sure Peoplesoft can handle either option.”