# Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) logo.Transfer Model Curriculum 5-Year Review Summary -Economics

**January 9, 2020**

Please attach a copy of the vetting results for the TMC to the document.

1. Provide a breakdown of the respondents to the survey:

* # of CCC respondents: 33
* # of CSU respondents: 9
* # of UC respondents: 1
* Total responses: 43

**Provide a written summary of the feedback from the survey to the question below:**

1. Were there any changes suggested to the CORE of the TMC? There were no suggested changes to the CORE.
2. Were there any changes suggested to the List A section of the TMC?

There were five comments regarding changes to List A. Two suggested adding data analysis or computer science courses as an option given the rise in big data. The other three were more personal preferences of the college program they represent.

1. If appropriate, were there any changes suggested to the List B section of the TMC?

There were about six comments for List B and most were a repeat of the suggested changes to List A. The suggestions regarding adding History or Political Science is already remedied by the new and revised List B.

1. If appropriate, were there any changes suggested to the List C section of the TMC?
2. Not applicable.

Please provide any general recommendations from the feedback received from the vetting.

Overall, the response seemed favorable to the changes made to the TMC. There were no general or consistent recommendations in the comments.

**Provide a written summary of the FDRG’s recommendations and attach a copy of the revised TMC, including the date of completion of the 5-year review.**

The FDRG recommends implementing the TMC with the proposed change to List B, as the feedback was unanimously favorable to the change. No other further changes are recommended based on this feedback.

## Descriptor 5-Year Review Summary

*Please provide a written summary of the FDRG’s recommendations for each of the descriptors in the table below. If there are no changes to the descriptors, you can note this by stating “After a complete review of the descriptor, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the descriptor at this time.”*

| C-ID Descriptor and Name | Summary of the FDRG 5-Year Review |
| --- | --- |
| ***Econ 201 – Principles of Microeconomics*** | There were only five suggested changes to the revised Econ 201, and four of them were regarding adding content to the course outline. Since the course outline represents a minimum of what should be covered in the course, the FDRG felt that additional content or different names of the content is already provided by the descriptor.  The fifth comment requested removing Basic Algebra as the prerequisite, especially given AB705.  The FDRG discussed this topic considerably and struggled between having a prerequisite that adequately informs the level of math needed to do the coursework, versus having a prerequisite that is college-level, such as College Algebra. Given Title 5, community colleges cannot merely add computational prerequisites on their courses because the C-ID has that prerequisite. Community colleges must prove that the course requires the skills from the prerequisite, or that students are statistically less successful without the prerequisite class. The math involved in Econ 201 does not require the completion of a College Algebra class, nor would the completion of statistics be helpful. The math done in Econ 201 is clearly algebra-based, but not at a level higher than Basic Algebra.  **Recommendation: Implement proposed changes with no further changes as a result of feedback.** |
| ***Econ 202 – Principles of Macroeconomics*** | As with Econ 201, the majority of respondents stated the descriptor was appropriate as is. There were only a couple of requests for adding content or revising titles of content to the outline. There was similar discussion as for Econ 201 regarding the Basic Algebra prerequisite.  **Recommendation: Implement proposed changes with not further changes as a result of feedback.** |