



Transfer Model Curriculum Template for History

Approval Dates: May 17, 2011; January 4, 2013;
November 8, 2023 (Cal-GETC Compliance)

CCC Associate Degree for Transfer Major or Area of Emphasis: History

CSU Majors deemed similar: History

Degree Type: AA-T

Total Minimum Semester Units for Major or Area of Emphasis: 18

COURSES

Required Core (6 units minimum):

Title	C-ID Designation or other Justification	C-ID Units (or sample units)	Proposed Cal-GETC Area for double counting
United States History to 1877	HIST 130	3	4
United States History from 1865	HIST 140	3	4

List A – Select 2 courses (6 units minimum):

Title	C-ID Designation or other Justification	C-ID Units (or sample units)	Proposed Cal-GETC Area for double counting
World History to 1500	HIST 150	3	3B or 4
OR Western Civilization I	HIST 170	3	3B or 4
World History Since 1500	HIST 160	3	3B or 4
OR Western Civilization II	HIST 180	3	3B or 4

List B – Select 1 course from each area (6 units minimum):

Title	C-ID Designation or other Justification	C-ID Units (or sample units)	Proposed Cal-GETC Area for double counting
Area 1 World History to 1500 (if not used in List A) OR World History Since 1500 (if not used in List OR A non-western history course (any history course not pertaining to the US or Europe) articulated as fulfilling Cal-GETC Area 3B or 4 OR Any course from the humanities or social sciences (including history) that addresses any historically under-represented group or non-western subject articulated as fulfilling Cal-GETC Area 3B or 4 OR A language other than English which is articulated as fulfilling Cal-GETC Area 3B	HIST 150 HIST 160 GECC GECC GECC	3 3 3 3 3	3B or 4 3B or 4 3B or 4 3B or 4 3B
Area 2 Any history course (including List A courses, if not used above) OR Any non-history course from the humanities or social sciences related to history articulated as fulfilling Cal-GETC Area 3B or 4 OR Any introductory level social sciences course articulated as fulfilling Cal-GETC Area 4	BCT GECC GECC	3 3 3	3B or 4 3B or 4 4

TOTAL MAJOR UNITS	18*
Cal-GETC Requirements	34
Double Counting GE	-
Elective	-
Total Units	60

** All units are based on the semester and indicated minimum units. The major must be a minimum of 18 semester units.*

NOTES AND HISTORY

**All courses must be CSU transferable. Local degrees aligned with the TMC must be constructed such that no more than one course can be taken that is not articulated as either major preparation or general education.*

Sample Course Titles

“Any diversity course”

African American History or Literature

Latin American History or Literature

Women in U.S. History or Literature

Asian History or Literature

Intro to Race and Ethnicity (C-ID SOCI 150 – 3 units)

Women's Studies

Intercultural Communication (C-ID COMM 150 – 3 units)

Women in Film

History of Asian Art (C-ID ARTH 130 – 3 units) Comparative Government (C-ID POLS 130 – 3 units)

International Relations (C-ID POLS 140 – 3 units)

“Any non-history course from the humanities or social sciences related to history”

History of Jazz

Economic History

Art Histories (various)

“Any introductory level social sciences course” (Descriptors to be added as appropriate)

Introduction to Sociology (C-ID SOCI 110 – 3 units)

Introductory Psychology (C-ID PSY 110 – 3 units)

Introduction to Political Science (C-ID POLS 150 – 3 units)

Introduction to Economics

Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (C-ID ANTH 120 – 3 units)

Introduction to Human Geography (C-ID GEOG 120 – 3 units)

SUMMARY FOR HISTORY TMC.

Changes to TMC after vetting

There are two changes made to the TMC after vetting. The first change made to the TMC after vetting is in response to criticism made by CSU Fresno respondents. Rather than keeping the flexibility of allowing students to choose which two of the four classes (World Civ. I, II, Western Civ. I, II), it now stipulates that students must choose one from World I, West Civ. I, and one from World II, West Civ. II). This allowed for the possibility for students to use either of the World Civ. Options for List B, Area 1: diversity requirement. It also requires students to cover both early and late periods in their survey of either World or Western Civ. The second change is a clarification of course articulation in List B. This change was made to comply with required criteria (checklist #6). This change was made after the FDRG voted on the TMC, but members have been notified of the changes and we are waiting on their responses. It is anticipated that there will be no problems regarding this clarification in language.

Summary of survey feedback

A good majority of the CCC respondents were positive and supported the TMC as it stood. A significant minority were negative in their response. But in part it appeared to be due to misunderstanding how the TMC would work. It seemed that some believed that they would have to adopt the TMC as it stands, and didn't understand that they could restrict at the local level. Some were also under the misunderstanding that the example courses were exhaustive. A few in the additional comments didn't like US I and II as the core curriculum and wanted to broaden that requirement to allow for other history courses that overlapped in US History (African American or Women's U.S. History, for example).

Q1 CCC: Only one respondent deviated from the 'no' answers to why they thought the curriculum wasn't appropriate for the degree. Overwhelmingly, these 'no' answers believed that either all requirements should be history, or that non-history courses should be removed, or that more specialized history courses should be added. (All answers listed below in red fall in this category). However, as the TMC is written, any and all of these respondents can do what they asked for at the local level. The TMC is flexible enough to accommodate all of their requests at the local level and still satisfy the TMC. In other words, there were faculty who were unhappy with the TMC, despite being able to develop the degree that they believed to be appropriate within the parameters of the TMC.

Q2 CCC: Of all the respondents, only one seem to be a valid statement. **Most respondents were under the misunderstanding that they had to adopt the TMC as it stood** (not create a TMC-aligned degree). They thought that the options provided in the TMC would be forced on them, not that they could create a more strict transfer requirement. The only problem would be for once college that apparently doesn't offer either World or Western Civ. in its curriculum.

Q3: Same situation as Question 1. The vast majority of 'no' respondents are under the impression that they have to adopt the TMC as written, not that this TMC allows for local flexibility. They want more history courses required, more specialized history courses, and the removal of non-history courses, especially a second language.

The vast majority of the CSU respondents were negative. One area of concern (although upon closer scrutiny, the vast majority of this concern was expressed by one CSU) is how List A was worded. That has been negotiated at the FDRG meeting and is no longer a problem. But it is clear that the CSU respondents do not want CCC history faculty to teach history transfer students beyond the three main survey courses (US, World, Western Civ.). There was an overwhelming CSU perspective that they would not accept any history course beyond three listed to count towards the major for a transfer student. Currently as it stands, all history courses other than the three listed survey sequences will not count towards to major, but rather count

towards other GE requirements according to CSU representatives on the FDRG and in the responses. This is where the disconnect is greatest between CCC and CSU history faculty. CCC generally want to offer a greater variety of history so long as it's in the lower division area, and the CSU faculty do not want to accept history courses other than the three main surveys to count towards the major. It has been expressed during meetings, for example, that all diversity classes should be taught at the upper division level. Because previous meetings had been difficult and rancorous and CCC members were offended by unfiltered remarks made by individuals, the elephant in the room for the last meeting was this disconnect that was not adequately addressed. But at least we got an agreement on the TMC.

CCC Questions:

T: Is this model curriculum appropriate as a major or area of emphasis for your discipline – does it allow for the development of a degree that consists of the courses your faculty view as critical for the major?

No: 15; Yes: 22

U: If No, why not? Please be specific. **(see below: #1)**

V: Is it likely that your department/college would choose to offer a transfer degree based on this TMC?

No: 15; Yes: 23

W: If No, why not? Please be specific. **(see below: #2)**

X: Would this model curriculum provide appropriate preparation for transfer?

No: 12; Yes: 26

Y: If No, why not? Please be specific. **(see below: #3)**

Z: Any additional comments? **(see below: #4)**

CSU Questions:

AA: The proposed curriculum delineates the required 18 units of a major or area of emphasis that is a component of community college degrees. It is intended to be an appropriate focused area of study for a community college degree and to well-prepare students for transfer. Please select one of the following:

No: 36: This curriculum would not appropriately prepare students for transfer.

Yes: 4: The model curriculum would ensure that community college students were well-prepared for transfer into the indicated major.

Yes (make it work): 6: While the courses do not align with the lower division preparation that is required by our faculty, we would be able to make it work.

Total: No: 36; Yes: 10

AB: Please explain your answer above. **(see below: #5)**

AC: Would this model curriculum provide appropriate preparation for transfer?

No: 37; Yes: 9

AD: If no, please specify. **(see below: #6)**

AE: If a student completed a degree aligned with this TMC, would the student be able to complete a degree in the major within 60 units? **No: 17; Yes: 28**

AF: If no, please specify. **(see below: #7)**

AG: What CSU major(s) at your institution would this TMC be preparation for? Please list name and/or CSU degree code. **(see below: #8)**

#1 Is this model curriculum appropriate as a major or area of emphasis for your discipline – does it allow for the development of a degree that consists of the courses your faculty view as critical for the major?

There were 15 no votes and 22 yes votes.

Below are the explanations for no vote:

1. A significant shortcoming of the current draft of the History TMC is that there is no requirement for a historiography/methods course. A student starting down
2. All 18 units of the major should be history courses.
3. Unfortunately, this model curriculum is much too narrow and rigid. The reduction in specialized courses and the top-down emphasis on a very limited pool of survey courses will lead to fewer, not more, history majors. There are numerous history courses, such as Chicano, African American, Women, and California, that engage and excite students at a much higher level than a US or World Survey. I love teaching the survey courses and there certainly are students who become history majors after taking a traditional US, Western Civ or World History survey, but these general courses do not engage and 'recruit' potential history majors like specialized courses. This model restricts this college's history faculty from offering specialized courses that are critical for the history major. We would lose a great deal of opportunities for intellectual growth and exploration if only two or three survey courses were to be the majority of the department's course offerings.
4. Several faculty in my department don't see why a foreign language class should count. They also want California History to be one of the List B options.
5. In summary, because it offers non-history options to complete an area of emphasis or major in history. As a department we believe that all 18 units must be
6. Area B Concerns: recommendation for Area B1 is that it only include wording such as "any diversity course in the discipline of History that addresses any
7. Not as it stands now. We strongly disagree with allowing students in a HISTORY emphasis to take non-history courses to satisfy the program.
8. This TMC only requires that students take 4 history courses, and that those be drawn from two very narrowly-defined lists. Both faculty and students in the history department at Cabrillo revel in a much broader range of courses than is reflected in the TMC. Many students take a US history survey course or a World or Western Civ survey course, are then intrigued about the historical approach, and take a more specific course, like Chinese history, British history or Mexican history. This makes them not only generally familiar with, but in a sense "fluent in" the historical method. It is after taking one or more of these courses that many of our students choose to declare history majors. If our students are not encouraged to take more specialized courses, I am concerned that fewer will become history majors and transfer. This TMC would put a lot of pressure on our department to reduce our course offerings to multiple sections of the US survey and World and Western Civ. While I love teaching World History and do it every semester, both my students and I would lose a great deal of opportunities for intellectual growth and exploration if these courses were to be the majority of the department's course offerings.
9. It is close, but I have some serious concerns and reservations. Most importantly, this draft TMC does not require sufficient "History" coursework for a lower division major preparation program. The TMC only requires four "History" courses. Our college (Cabrillo) currently requires between 7

and 9 "History" courses for our two-year History major. I support the idea of the 18-unit total in the History TMC. If it helps students to transfer for a four-year degree, then that is the direction we need to go. However, there ought to be a heavier "History" emphasis in the TMC. My suggestions call for a reconsideration of List B. Specifically, List B, #2 should (in my opinion) be changed to read: "Any history course not used in List A." We should edit out the part of B2 that reads "or any non-history course from the humanities or social sciences related to history or any introductory level social science course." Obviously, taking an intro level social science course can be beneficial for our history students, but not at the extraordinarily high price of cutting one-sixth of the history courses required for a "History" AA-T or AS-T degree. Also, List B #1b. should be cut out of this TMC. Of course, it is desirable to have history majors learn a foreign language, but not at the price of cutting out one-sixth of the history courses required for a "History" AA-T or AS-T degree. Both of these requirements in List B seem to me as if the History TMC is designed to serve the graduation requirements of the four-year system and to sacrifice the depth and vitality of community college History programs. It seems to me that requiring five or six History course - as opposed to the proposed minimum of four - can be easily implemented, even for the smallest community colleges in the state.

10. Foreign language should not be a requirement for the transfer pattern; while certain social science classes are appropriate for the history major (women's studies, ethnic studies, etc), others (psych, sociology) do not. These units should be predominantly history; it would be possible for a student to transfer with an AA-T in history having taken only 12 units of history.
11. Laney College doesn't offer any History courses from List A.
12. History of the Vietnam War is not listed. California History is not listed. I think one or both of these courses should be at least part of transfer degree.
13. I consider History of Jazz, Art or Music history to be appropriate, Sociology & Psychology are their own disciplines so they do not belong either
14. In List A, I would like it to say "Either Western Civ I or World Civ I and either Western Civ II or World Civ II. Honors sections may be substituted for the regular sections." The reason for this change is that Western and World Civ overlap to a large degree, and if a student takes Western Civ I and World Civ I, that student is getting quite a bit of the same material. Also, in general, I would like all 18 units for the AA degree to be selected from history courses or from the three courses listed as "non-history course...related to history." Therefore, I would like List B to be modified as follows: 1) a) Eliminate "any course from the humanities or social sciences...that addresses any historically under-represented group" 1) b) Eliminate "a language..." 2) Eliminate "Any introductory level social sciences course"
15. Too many options are from courses that are not specifically historical.