**Transfer Model Curriculum 5-Year Review Summary**

**Completed Fall 2019**

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: 32
* # of CSU respondents: 1
* # of UC respondents: 0
* Total responses: 33

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

2. Were there any changes suggested to the CORE of the TMC?

* No changes suggested. Majority of comments from respondents were to keep as-is.

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

* No changes suggested. Majority of comments from respondents were to keep as-is.

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

* Respondents comments were taken into consideration and discussed.
* Overall, proposed section remains well-written as-is

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

n/a

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

* Concerns that not all articulate NUTRI 120 to CSU; However, there are other articulated courses that could replace it; students can work with local colleges to work-out any lab/lecture split when transferring to a CSU

**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**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| C-ID Descriptor and Name | Summary of the FDRG 5-Year Review |
| **NUTRI 110 Nutrition** | 77.78% of the respondents agreed that “the descriptor is appropriate the way it is”  Respondents comments:   * “Course Objective #6: Remove ""personal": Students who struggle with food insecurity, eating disorders, etc. are challenged with assessing a personal dietary analysis; Removal of "personal" provides more latitude for analysis such as a family member, a close friend, etc.” * “Current descriptor does not account for lifecycle nutrition in unit#5.” Would respectfully suggest to reconsider adding the following or similar to the current descriptor:. . . during the changing life cycles. Interrelationship of dietary components are evaluated for promotion of optimum health.” * “The number 110 implies that there is a 100, or even a 109. Nutrition 1 implies the first (basic) introductory course to nutrition. I understand "100-level", but I do not understand the "10". Where is Nutrition 109, or 108, or 107, etc?” * “Life cycle nutrition is a very important application of basic principles. Basic consumer information/application of nutrition principles should also be included.”   FDRG’s comments/recommendation:   * Descriptions are worded in a way that they are covering the main topics well for most course syllabi * After a complete review of the descriptor, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the descriptor at this time. |
| **NUTRI 120 Principles of Food with Lab** | 85.19% of the respondents agreed that “the descriptor is appropriate the way it is”  Respondents comments:   * “Would recommend to cross-check with articulated courses (e.g. include the word 'selection' and or 'meal management')” * “Very good course.”   FDRG’s comments/recommendation:   * Most of the descriptors to the articulation agreement are acceptable; “…*will the student be able to finish in 2-years? …yes it is possible as long as they get the science courses completed*” * After a complete review of the descriptor, the FDRG does not propose any changes to the descriptor at this time. |