

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 101 Area F Classification

Proposed Course Subject: HIS 101  
Proposed Course Title: “Survey of American History from 1877: Civil War through Civil Rights”  
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.**

*Chair’s Note: Please see the memo for HIS 100 for a complete background of the university-wide discussions and general meeting commentary.*

*As with HIS 100, this CCR represents a formalization of Metz’s “version” of “Survey of American History from 1877.” I am including here the same statement I included in the HIS 100 memo: 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.*

The committee unanimously agreed that the course *clearly* meets Outcomes 1-3 and therefore meets the requirement for Area F classification. We also discussed outcome 5 and Metz coherently explained how the course “actively [engages] with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues.”

HIS 101 focuses on African American, Asian American, and Latinx American communities (while HIS 100 focuses primarily on Native American and African 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.

As for HIS 100, the committee praised Metz’s thorough syllabus and explanation. One committee member noted that “the reading list looks really exciting” and commented that the syllabus was “a great what to capture the interest of students and cover the topic in a compelling way.” While the student representative was unable to attend the meeting or cast a vote, he emailed the chair to say he “really liked the History proposals” and “they have “[his] strong support.”

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 Area F outcomes.

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>Senk asked Metz how she envisioned the course meeting outcome 4 – the outcome on racial and social justice. Metz explained that the course “looked at competing/contrasting models of civil rights movements” and contrasted them with other modes of liberation and self-expression, including black nationalism and the work of Malcolm X and Stokely Carmichael. She said that the course did not use a “monolithic definition of social justice but emphasizes historical context.”</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>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

**Chair’s Note: This summary is identical to the one included in the HIS 100 memo:**

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 101 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.”