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

**December 19, 2016**

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: 46
* # of CSU respondents: 1
* # of UC respondents: 0
* Total responses: 47

**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?

Yes, there were suggested changes to the CORE of the TMC. The FDRG discussed the responses provided by our colleagues across the State and it was clear to the group that folks were suggesting changes the TMC mainly because they didn't understand the pre-requisite challenge process. Many felt that the TMC was written to prevent Heritage Speakers of Spanish from enrolling in a higher-level class, when it really doesn't. The TMC is flexible enough that it allows for local control regarding the level at which to start students.

The FDRG believes that faculty in general could benefit from a better explanation regarding the prerequisite challenge process locally in order to fully understand how to apply it to the TMC.

1. Were there any changes suggested to the List A section of the TMC?

Sixty-six percent of the respondents felt that List A was appropriate, therefore, no changes were recommended to List A of the TMC by the FDRG. None of the concerns or recommendations by the respondents demonstrated a pattern of dissatisfaction. Instead, they were isolated questions/concerns that the FDRG didn’t feel were going to significantly improve the TMC, but rather, may affect it negatively. That is, the suggested changes may impact programs that have already designed their ADTs and received C-ID approval, and could also restrict the flexibility of the TMC as it exists today. The FDRG feels very strongly that the TMC is as flexible as it can be and that significant changes would limit its flexibility.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

**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.**

## 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 |
| --- | --- |
| ***Example***  **COMM 140**  **\*Small Group Communication** | *Example Response*  88.5% of respondents agreed proposed changes were appropriate.  Several comments were about issues not being reviewed at this point (see general comment #4 above). One comment said that oral presentations should not be required in a small group class but it was noted in the FDRG discussion that oral presentations are necessary for articulation in the “Oral Communication” area.  Recommendation: Implement proposed changes. |
| **SPAN 100** | 43.6% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  41% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  15.4% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 100 descriptor. The main concern brought up was the removal of reflexive verbs from the SPAN 100 descriptor; however, the FDRG felt that reflexive verbs don’t have to be introduced formally and if reflexive verbs were not included, then students wouldn’t be able to learn why in Spanish they express their names in the way that they do (in reflexive form). At this time, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the descriptor. |
| **SPAN 110** | 43.6% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  43.6% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  15.4% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 110 descriptor and noted that none of the concerns or recommendations by the respondents demonstrated a pattern of dissatisfaction. At this time, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the descriptor. |
| **SPAN 200** | 59% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  25.6% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  15.4% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 200 descriptor. Overall, the FDRG felt that the feedback didn’t reflect strong concerns that compromise the integrity of the process of the descriptor. The FDRG is proposing a change to SPAN 200’s prerequisite:  Change “Second Semester…” to Elementary Spanish II or equivalent.  This would alleviate concerns raised by colleagues during the vetting process for consistency, clarity, and accuracy. |
| **SPAN 210** | 51.3% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  25.6% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  23.1% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 210 descriptor. Overall, the FDRG felt that the feedback didn’t reflect strong concerns that compromise the integrity of the process of the descriptor.  The FDRG is proposing a change to SPAN 210’s prerequisite:  Change “Third Semester…” to Intermediate Spanish I or equivalent.  This would alleviate concerns raised by colleagues during the vetting process for consistency, clarity, and accuracy. |
| **SPAN 220** | 41% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  43.6% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  17.9% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 220 descriptor. Overall, the FDRG felt that the feedback didn’t reflect strong concerns that compromise the integrity of the process of the descriptor. The main concern expressed was that SPAN 220 has a prerequisite however the FDRG felt strongly that it should continue to have a prerequisite. The FDRG felt that comments related to the prerequisite stemmed mostly from faculty’s lack of understanding that, at the local level, they can establish their own prerequisite challenge process to allow students who are at the level commensurate with 220 to enroll in class without having to take the prerequisite.  However, the FDRG is proposing a change to the label of SPAN 220’s prerequisite:  Change “Second Semester…” to Elementary Spanish II or equivalent.  This would alleviate concerns raised by colleagues during the vetting process for consistency, clarity, and accuracy. |
| **SPAN 230** | 46.2% of respondents stated the descriptor is appropriate the way it is.  25.6% of respondents indicated they would like to see a change in the descriptor.  28.2% of respondents declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor.  The FDRG reviewed the vetting feedback given for the SPAN 230 descriptor. Overall, the FDRG felt that the feedback didn’t reflect strong concerns that compromise the integrity of the process of the descriptor.  The FDRG is proposing a change to SPAN 230’s prerequisite:  Heritage Spanish I or equivalent.  This would alleviate concerns raised by colleagues during the vetting process for consistency, clarity, and accuracy. |

## Summary:

As a result of the feedback, the FDRG felt that it might be important for the C-ID office along with articulation officers at the community colleges to continue to contact the faculty, especially the new faculty, to better inform them about the purpose of the descriptors, and the c-id approval process. Some of the feedback revealed a lack of understanding about what the CORs must contain in order for them to receive approval/c-id designation. In particular, the feedback showed that there might be a misunderstanding about the colleges' ability and right to establish their own "equivalency" process/requirements when it comes to meeting pre-requisites. We felt very strongly that discussion of the TMC, descriptors, etc. needs to take place locally with AOs and faculty experts.

Overall, we felt that the feedback didn't reflect strong concerns that compromise the integrity of the process or the descriptors we have established to review CORs submitted by our colleagues across the State.