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

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: 20
* # of CSU respondents: 1
* # of UC respondents: 3
* Total responses: 24

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

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

FDRG recommends: No changes

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

 FDRG recommends: No changes

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

FDRG recommends: No changes

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

FDRG recommends: No changes

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

We discussed the survey results. We noted that the respondents answering “No” constituted a majority on every question about potential changes to the TMC. In fact, on all those questions save one, the respondents answering “No” constituted a supermajority (greater than 66%).

We agreed that we should take the survey results seriously. They indicate that the vast majority of respondents believe the TMC is working as designed and achieving its purpose. They also indicate that the vast majority of respondents do not want to see the TMC changed.

We discussed the individual responses to the fill-in questions. We noted that some of those responses were contradictory (e.g., a call to increase the number of required core courses in the TMC and a call to reduce the number of required core courses in the TMC). More importantly, we noted that many of the specific things individuals suggested are things that are already allowed under the TMC and/or the course descriptors. That is, because they specify only minimum necessary requirements, the TMC and the course descriptors allow individual philosophy departments to include additional course requirements in their AA-T degrees and/or additional topics in their course outlines of record (CORs).

In view of the foregoing points, the FDRG recommended that no changes be made to the TMC in Philosophy.

We subsequently received two questions from the AO Subgroup:

1. *Please contact the Philosophy FDRG chair to get clarity on the AO Subgroup question regarding the Social and Political Philosophy and Philosophy of Religion µ GE requirement (GECC).  In other words, there can be no more than one BCT course in the TMC.*
2. *(2) The CCCCO template currently lists the Social and Political Philosophy and the Philosophy of Religion courses as AAM, so colleges must submit documentation that their local course meets a lower-division major requirement at a CSU. Is that the intention of the TMC? Or would the TMC allow a Social and Political Philosophy or Philosophy of Religion course that meets CSU GE area C or D to meet that requirement? If the latter, then we need to work with the CCCCO to change the TMC template so that those courses are listed as GECC rather than AAM.*

Regarding item (1) above, the FDRG agrees that the direction contained in the final comment on the TMC (forbidding more than one BCT course) was actually irrelevant, since the rationales for all the courses listed in the TMC have always required either C-ID match, AAM, or GECC as justification for inclusion of a course in the ADT degree. So BCT was never even an option. We have thus removed that last comment from the TMC. This renders the issue moot.

Regarding item (2) above, the FDRG agrees that the CCCCO template should be revised so that the rationale (in the column headed “C-ID Descriptor”) for both the Philosophy of Religion course and the Social and Political Philosophy course says “GECC” instead of “AAM”. The listing of “AAM” next to those two courses seems to have been an error in the template itself, since the TMC has always identified the rationale for those two courses as “May satisfy area C or D”—i.e., the TMC has always considered the rationale for those two courses to be “GECC”. The FDRG thus urges the AO Subgroup to work with the CCCCO to bring about this change in the CCCCO template.