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

10/31/2016

Copy of the vetting results for the TMC attached.

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

* # of CCC respondents: **6**
* # of CSU respondents: **4**
* # of UC respondents: **0**
* Total responses: **10**

**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 (local issues with varying general education requirements)**

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

**Yes but survey respondents provided no comment as to their suggested changes to the TMC.**

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

**Yes (local issues, recommended courses can be added at List C)**

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

**No**

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

Many of the recommendations indicated an “unfamiliarity” of the TMC core requirements and purposes and some recommendations would be to address local general education or upper division/lower division issues that are not CSU system wide. In addition, several suggestions offered had to do with adding content to courses which would be addressed in the descriptor review.

### Summary of the FDRG’s recommendations

The FDRG met on October 31, 2016. After a specific review of the vetting results, the FDRG concluded that there was not a need for revising the TMC at this time. As mentioned above, many of the responses for suggested changes were local issues or a misunderstanding of the content of the courses in the TMC. Some suggestions revolved around general education alignment, but it appeared to be unique to one CSU campus. Therefore, once again, the recommendation of the FDRG is to make no changes to the TMC.

## Descriptor 5-Year Review Summary 10/31/2016 Education 200

Copy of the vetting results for the Descriptor attached.

The FDRG requests a slight change to the data report on Q3. There were initially 11 respondents to the survey, however, only 8 responded to Q3, therefore the FDRG recommends that the percentages of similar responses could be 4 of 11 respondents,

2 of 11 respondents and 2 of 11 respondents respectfully and/or 3 non-answering respondents could be counted as “decline to comment”.

Provide a breakdown of the respondents to the survey:

* # of CCC respondents: **7**
* # of CSU respondents: **4**
* # of UC respondents: **0**
* Total responses: **1**

| C-ID Descriptor and Name | Summary of the FDRG 5-Year Review |
| --- | --- |
| **Education 200** | **After a complete review of the descriptor, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the Education 200 descriptor at this time.** |