

General Studies Gold Request Form

Consult the [General Studies Request FAQ](#) for more information and quick answers.

New permanent numbered courses must be submitted to the workflow in [Kuali CM](#) before a General Studies request is submitted here. The General Studies Council will not review requests ahead of a new course proposal being sent to the Senate.

Submission Information

College/School	Department/School
New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (CAS)	School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (CSOC&BEH)

Submission Type

New Request

Requested Effective Date

Summer 2025

ASU Request

Is this request for a permanent course or a topic?

Permanent Course

Subject Code	Course Number	Units/Credit Hours
COM	423	3

Course Information

Enter the course catalog information, found in the [web course catalog](#) or [Kuali CM](#).

Course Title

Facilitating Collaboration and Dialogue

Course Catalog Description

Explores processes of collaboration, dialogue, deliberation and participative decision making. Examination of both philosophical and scientific perspectives on to these processes as they relate to communication in various settings (community relations, dispute resolution, social work, policing and politics) and in personal relationships and family life.

Enrollment Requirements (Prerequisites, Corequisites, and/or Antirequisites)

Prerequisite(s): minimum 2.00 GPA; Credit is allowed for only CMN 598 (Facilitating Collaboration and Dialogue) or COM 423 or COM 494 (Facilitating Collaboration and Dialogue) OR Visiting University Student

Is this a crosslisted course?

No

Is this course offered by (shared with) another academic unit?

No

If this course or topic already carries a different General Studies Gold (not Maroon) designation than the one being requested, please check this box.

General Studies Gold Designation Request

Requested Designation

Social and Behavioral Sciences (SOBE)

Attach a representative syllabus for the course, including course learning outcomes and descriptions of assignments and assessments.

[COM 423 Syllabus \(Waldron\).pdf](#)

Social and Behavioral Sciences (SOBE)

Courses in social sciences and behavioral sciences expose students to the systematic investigation of human institutions, relationships, social structures, behavior, emotions, communication, and health. Students will learn about evidence, methods, and approaches that social and behavioral scientists use to analyze, understand, and describe human activities, experiences, and systems. They will learn how social scientists and behavioral scientists conduct research, how they disseminate their findings, and how the findings from social and behavioral science can be used in the pursuit of individual, societal, and policy goals.

Most of the course content should align with the Gold category learning outcomes.

Instructions: In the fields below, state the assignment, project, or assessment that will measure each learning outcome, and provide a description. The description should provide enough detail to show how it measures the learning outcome. If needed, more than one can be identified.

The proposal does not need to include all course assessments that measure a given learning outcome. The provided assessment should include sufficient detail to allow the subcommittee to make their evaluation. When appropriate, the same assessment can be listed for more than one learning outcome (e.g., a culminating project).

You may provide links to a document (Google Drive or Dropbox) that includes the relevant details for the assessment. **Do not provide links to Canvas shells.**

SOBE Learning Outcome 1: Utilize behavioral or social science approaches, qualitative or quantitative, to examine aspects of human experiences or explain social or behavioral phenomena.

Bi-Weekly Synthesis (6 X 10 pts = 60 points): At the beginning of our **Thursday** class on **every other week** you will submit a 1 1/2 to 2 page (typed, double spaced, 12 pt. font) synthesis of what you learned from the readings and resources assigned for that week. Your reflection should identify 2-3 key themes (big ideas) drawing from all assigned readings, resources, and class activities. Make sure your **themes connect across** the various readings/resources. Use **all** of the readings/resources and cite them explicitly (e.g., "on page 41 of the textbook" or "in the Ted Talk on collaboration"). You **do not** need to cite each reading/resource in each theme, but you do need to cite all of them at some point in your paper.

Summaries are graded "strong" (10 points), "meets requirements" (7 points); "partially acceptable" (5 points) , "weak" (3 points) or "missing" (0 points).

Your synthesis is due by class time on Thursday. Be ready to discuss your themes. Late syntheses will not be accepted. To receive a high grade your synthesis should (1) be carefully written and edited, (2) identify themes that cut across the readings, (3) be concretely applied to real-life events or circumstances. **See the Assignments module for detailed grading criteria and sample papers.**

Your syntheses should be helpful as you answer essay exam questions and you are **encouraged** to use them for that purpose.

Additional Information:

Students participate in thematic analysis, a qualitative approach to social scientific research, to identify themes across sources.

Student example:

Language is multifaceted and must be handled with care. Using language to communicate and create dialogue often requires facilitation, preparation, and involvement – three themes that will be overviewed throughout this synthesis paper. Crafting language is a responsibility that should be respected and valued especially by those organizing civil discourse.

Makau and Marty explain that civil dialogue, "yearns for a means of communication that promotes both individual interest and the common good" (p.63). These concepts can be difficult to unite without the help of a facilitator. Bridging these worlds together can be accomplished through the use of the World Café Model. This model encourages meaningful conversation focused on a particular subject within a comfortable environment (Carson, 2011). The purpose of this model is to bridge the, "everyday citizens to participate in conversations that matter, thereby enabling governments and NGOs to generate interest and discussion in relation to difficult and intractable problems" (Carson, 2011, p. 13). Facilitating group dialogue through the use of the World Café model is just one way to advocate for meaningful change.

Preceding facilitating a large event like the one mentioned above, thoughtful preparation must be had. Makau and Marty discuss the importance of credible facts and sources influencing deliberation. For example, voting polls can be difficult to read but understanding what makes a poll credible might create more ease when casting a vote (Enten, 2016). This illustration of deliberation takes preparation and research which is important in any case of decision making or civil discussion. Likewise, Fetsch and Jacobson (n.d) discuss tips for engaging in family meetings which emphasize the importance of scheduling time for the entire family to be present. The extra time a person or organization takes to prepare before engaging in discourse can increase satisfaction in relationships or an organization. Preparation is crucial for large

facilitations such as the World Café and difficult conversation as experienced by medical personnel practicing palliative care. Strategies are given to physicians to, “develop an agenda ahead of time, and gather necessary medical information to convey to the patient and family” (Sharma & Dy, 2011, p. 438). Physicians must be prepared and practice careful communication.

Finally, without the involvement of participants, civil dialogue would be impossible. Therefore, involving oneself into discussion, question asking, and conversations, especially with those who hold to opposing viewpoints, will lead to social unity. Scattered throughout chapter four in the textbook, Makau and Marty (2011) provide ample amount of examples, such as the San Francisco coffee house fiasco or the civility pledge within the political arena, where individuals decided to participate or not participate in communication behaviors. The difference between the coffee house fiasco and the civility pledge is that the participants in the former were willing to involve themselves in interpersonal dialogue whereas the political leaders were standoffish and disconnected to involving themselves in civil dialogue. As I have learned from a previous class, community resilience requires civil democracy. Democracy necessarily means that people have to be involved. Involvement does not have to be difficult and when paired with the preparation of facilitation involvement can even be enjoyable, as seen in the World Café model. Similarly, the 1000 Journals Project involves people over decades and cultures by, “foregrounding that the art here [in the journals] is also and intrinsically a personal self-representation by the contributor” (p. 547). This unique project created its own community and gave a voice to thousands of people all over the world and has even been therapeutic to some.

All in all, facilitation, preparation, and involvement are key themes found within the readings and necessary for civil discourse. The responsibility human beings carry to use our words for good and not for evil, to better our communities and ourselves, must be grounded upon the common knowledge that language is valuable and should be treated with respect.

SOBE Learning Outcome 2: Describe the strengths and limitations of behavioral or social science methods in predicting or understanding human behavior.

Event Analysis Assignment

(5-6 pages, 80 points) and Presentation (5 minutes, 20 pts):

Overview

Students will attend an event that includes public deliberation and/or participation, such as a school board meeting, community planning meeting, a town hall, or a political debate. The written analysis will (1) describe the purpose, setting, audience, procedures, and roles; (2) *analyze* the processes of participation, dialogue, collaboration, and/or deliberation using class concepts; (3) *critique* the quality of the proceedings using standards developed in class, and (4) *propose* process improvements.

As you *analyze*, make sure you draw from class readings and resources. For example, you might consider the principles and skills of dialogue as presented in class or discussed in Chapter 2 (or 5 or 6) of your book. Did the event incorporate any of these ideas? You might think about what you learned about involving the community in planning processes (unit 10), civil discourse (chapter 4) or

about promoting deliberative thinking (Chapters 8, 9, or 10). Were any of those ideas evident in the process that you observed? In short, **use the language of our class** to analyze the event.

To *critique* means to offer your informed evaluation about the *quality* of the proceedings. Discuss what you consider to be the merits of the event and what you think were its shortcoming. Identify the *standards* you are using to make these judgments. Those standards should clearly come from our course materials. Thinks about such standards as receptiveness to disagreement, credibility, the extent to which the event helped the participants think deeply and critically, and/or the degree to which the proceedings fostered respectful relationships. Were certain kinds of participants advantaged or disadvantaged by this process? These standards should be linked to course materials. Go well beyond the examples I provided here.

Propose alternatives by drawing on the many types of facilitation exercises we conducted in class (on Thursdays) and our readings on such processes as World Café, Nominal Group Technique, or Brainstorming. Be concrete and justify your suggestions.

Grading criteria	
Clear and detailed description of the event	20%
Ample and accurate use of course concepts	30%
Well-justified critique and evaluation:	20%
Concrete, sensible alternatives proposed:	20%
Ownership of material (depth, creativity, personalization)	10%

SOBE Learning Outcome 3: Communicate coherent arguments using evidence drawn from qualitative or quantitative sources.

Event Analysis Assignment

(5-6 pages, 80 points) and Presentation (5 minutes, 20 pts):

Overview

Students will attend an event that includes public deliberation and/or participation, such as a school board meeting, community planning meeting, a town hall, or a political debate. The written analysis will (1) *describe* the purpose, setting, audience, procedures, and roles; (2) *analyze* the processes of participation, dialogue, collaboration, and/or deliberation using class concepts; (3) *critique* the quality of the proceedings using standards developed in class, and (4) *propose* process improvements.

As you *analyze*, makes sure you draw from class readings and resources. For example, you might consider the principles and skills of dialogue as presented in class or discussed in Chapter 2 (or 5 or 6) of your book. Did the event incorporate any of these ideas? You might think about what you learned about involving the community in planning processes (unit 10), civil discourse (chapter 4) or about promoting deliberative thinking (Chapters 8, 9, or 10). Were any of those ideas evident in the process that you observed? In short, **use the language of our class** to analyze the event.

To *critique* means to offer your informed evaluation about the *quality* of the proceedings. Discuss what you consider to be the merits of the event and what you think were its shortcoming. Identify the *standards* you are using to make these judgments. Those standards should clearly come from our course materials. Thinks about such standards as receptiveness to disagreement, credibility,

the extent to which the event helped the participants think deeply and critically, and/or the degree to which the proceedings fostered respectful relationships. Were certain kinds of participants advantaged or disadvantaged by this process? These standards should be linked to course materials. Go well beyond the examples I provided here.

Propose alternatives by drawing on the many types of facilitation exercises we conducted in class (on Thursdays) and our readings on such processes as World Café, Nominal Group Technique, or Brainstorming. Be concrete and justify your suggestions.

Grading criteria	
Clear and detailed description of the event	20%
Ample and accurate use of course concepts	30%
Well-justified critique and evaluation:	20%
Concrete, sensible alternatives proposed:	20%
Ownership of material (depth, creativity, personalization)	10%

List all course-specific learning outcomes. Where appropriate, identify the associated SOBE learning outcome(s) in brackets (see below for example). Note: It is expected that a majority of course-specific learning outcomes will be associated with a SOBE learning outcome.

Students will be:	
1. able to locate, understand, and critique scholarly literature on collaboration	(SOBE L02)
2. knowledgeable about models and processes of collaboration	(SOBE L01)
3. familiar with examples of collaborative practices in work and community settings	(SOBE L02)
4. able to engage other persons in meaningful dialogue	(SOBE L03)
5. capable of applying course concepts in work, volunteer, and personal settings	(SOBE L03)

Provost Use Only

Backmapped Maroon Approval

No Response

Form Submission - Proposer

Submitted for Approval | Proposer

Bethney Michaels - February 24, 2025 at 4:20 PM (America/Phoenix)

Department Approval

Approved

Morgan Johnson

James Corbeille - February 25, 2025 at 11:40 AM (America/Phoenix)

GSC Coordinator Review

Approved

TJ Robedeau - February 25, 2025 at 1:57 PM (America/Phoenix)

April Randall

Assistant Vice Provost Review

Sent Back

Tamiko Azuma - February 25, 2025 at 2:03 PM (America/Phoenix)

For Learning Outcome 1, please provide examples of topics or student work that demonstrate how the specific learning outcome is measured. You can link to a Google doc with the information if that is easier. This information is needed so the General Studies Council can determine if the learning outcome is being appropriately assessed. If you have any questions, please email me (Tamiko Azuma) at azuma@asu.edu.

Form Submission - Proposer

Submitted for Approval | Proposer

Bethney Michaels - February 28, 2025 at 4:27 PM (America/Phoenix)

Department Approval

Approved

Morgan Johnson

James Corbeille - March 3, 2025 at 10:36 AM (America/Phoenix)

GSC Coordinator Review

Approved

TJ Robedeau - March 3, 2025 at 1:47 PM (America/Phoenix)

April Randall

Assistant Vice Provost Review

Approved

Tamiko Azuma - March 3, 2025 at 1:52 PM (America/Phoenix)

All required components confirmed.

Pre-GSC Meeting

Approved

TJ Robedeau - March 3, 2025 at 2:54 PM (America/Phoenix)

April Randall

Social and Behavioral Sciences (SOBE) Subcommittee

Acknowledgement Requested

Dawn DeLay

Cara McDaniel

Jen Eden

Emily Mertz - March 25, 2025 at 8:52 AM (America/Phoenix)

Revise and Resubmit: Thank you for the submission. The SOBE subcommittee recommends revise and resubmit based on the following feedback. For LO1, please provide elaboration on what the essay is focused on - What aspects of human experiences or social or behavioral phenomena are students examining? Please provide clear assignment instructions rather than a sample paper. Thank you.

General Studies Council Meeting

Waiting for Approval

TJ Robedeau

April Randall

Registrar Notification

Notification

Courses Implementation

Implementation

Approval

Rebecca Flores

Lauren Bates

Alisha Von Kampen

Proposer Notification

Notification

Bethney Michaels

College Notification

Notification

James Corbeille

Morgan Johnson

ATCS Notification - ASU Course

Notification

Bryan Tinlin

Jessica Burns

Michele Devine

DARS Notification

Notification

Leticia Mayer

Peggy Boivin

EdPlus Notification

Notification

Sarah Shipp

Bronson Cudgel
