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

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: 44
* # of CSU respondents: 7
* # of UC respondents: 0
* Total responses: 51

**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?

The FDRG proposed to revise the manner in which some courses are included on the Studio Arts TMC as follows:

CORE Courses: No Changes

A majority of the respondents, 80.4% or 41 responses, stated that the CORE is appropriate the way it is.

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

The FDRG proposed to revise the manner in which some courses are included on the Studio Arts TMC as follows:

List A Courses: No Changes

A majority of the respondents, 78.4% or 40 responses, stated that the List A section is appropriate the way it is.

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

The FDRG proposed to revise the manner in which some courses are included on the Studio Arts TMC as follows:

List B: To include “Articulation Agreement in the Major” (AAM) as an option for the following descriptors:

* ARTS 220: Printmaking
* ARTS 230: Ceramics
* ARTS 240: Sculpture
* ARTS 260: Photography
* ARTS 280: Introduction to Crafts
* ARTS 281: Introduction to Jewelry or Metalsmithing
* ARTS 282: Introduction to Fiber Arts

The responses to the proposed changes overwhelmingly favored not removing these courses from the TMC, but supported allowing them to be included through the AAM mechanism. A few respondents were concerned that the AAM option was less rigorous than the review for C-ID designation, but understood that this was a necessity at this point in time. Otherwise, the majority of respondents felt that the TMC was otherwise satisfactory. A couple of respondents felt that the TMC was inadequate preparation for upper division work, but offered no solutions that would work within the limitations of the TMC unit limitations.

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.

The FDRG recommends that C-ID turn off submissions for C-ID designation for the descriptors listed above and remove all courses submitted for these descriptors from the C-ID review queue for studio arts. And that C-ID work with the ICW to establish a policy for archiving / de-archiving descriptors. For studio arts, suggested that submission for each of these descriptors will only be reopened when there is a minimum of 1 CSU reviewer for every 40 submitted courses.

**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. |
| **ARTS 100** | 87 responses were received. Of the 87:   * 56 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 10 responded that they would like to see changes made * 21 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 101** | 87 responses were received. Of the 87:   * 55 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 7 responded that they would like to see changes made * 26 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 110** | 87 responses were received. Of the 87:   * 57 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 10 responded that they would like to see changes made * 20 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 200** | 69 responses were received. Of the 69:   * 46 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 6 responded that they would like to see changes made * 17 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 205** | 70 responses were received. Of the 70:   * 48 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 4 responded that they would like to see changes made * 18 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 210** | 69 responses were received. Of the 69:   * 48 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 3 responded that they would like to see changes made * 18 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 250** | 69 responses were received. Of the 69:   * 38 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 5 responded that they would like to see changes made * 26 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |
| **ARTS 270** | 69 responses were received. Of the 69:   * 46 people responded that the descriptor is appropriate the way it is * 5 responded that they would like to see changes made * 18 declined to comment or were not qualified to assess the descriptor   Recommendation: After reviewing this descriptor and the comments made in faculty review, the FDRG does not recommend making changes to this descriptor at this time. |