

To: ASU General Studies Council
From: Julie Holston, MCCCDC General Studies Faculty Representative
CC: Molly Baird, Rose Rojas
Date: 9/25/19
Re: Concerns about the impact on general studies values from a course equivalency evaluation

In August 2018, MCCCDC modified the title of our HIS 212 History of Religion course and sent it through ACETS for re-evaluation of equivalency. (Previous title was "Historical Foundations of Religion".)

The prior equivalency was: HST Dept Elective/REL Dept Elective [HU, H] (*Both designations previously approved through GSC.*)

The new equivalency came back as: REL 200 or HST Dept Elective [(L or HU) & G]

When we asked if we would also be keeping the prior [H] value, this was ASU's reply:

"...Since it received a direct equivalency to ASU REL 200 and that course has (L or HU) & G that's what the HIS 212 will obtain.

I noted a couple of concerns with this new equivalency:

1. MCCCDC's HIS 212 History of Religion does not have a prerequisite of ENG 101, 107 or ENG 105, which is a requirement for the [L] designation; therefore, our course should be ineligible to receive this designation. The curriculum, as written, was not intended to be an intensive writing course, and MCCCDC faculty do not wish to add the required prerequisite or modify the curriculum to meet the L criteria. When looking further into the matter, we discovered that ASU's REL 200 course does not have the ENG 101 prerequisite either. This could be why ASU's faculty wasn't concerned with the fact that MCCCDC's course doesn't have the prerequisite, but it does raise the question of how ASU's REL 200 obtained an [L] designation without having the ENG 101 prerequisite. Perhaps it gained the designation before the [L] designation began requiring the ENG 101 prerequisite? Or perhaps exceptions can be made to the prerequisite which we are not aware of?
2. Receiving a direct equivalent in one prefix (REL), which comes with inherited values, while also receiving a departmental elective equivalent in another prefix (HST), which **does not** come with inherited values, creates an inconsistency in

transfer for the student. Our understanding is that a Department Elective does not automatically receive any designations unless they are approved by the GSC. Previously, the designations approved for MCCC'D's HIS 212 course were HU and H. According to the new equivalency, the course, even as a Department Elective, would no longer receive the H but would gain a G, which was never applied for by MCCC'D. I don't believe there is any precedent of a course having a direct equivalent in one prefix while having a departmental elective in another. Usually when courses are approved for multiple prefixes, they are department electives in all of them, so the general studies values can be obtained through the GSC and remain consistent regardless of prefix.

For these reasons, MCCC'D's faculty and I requested that HIS 212 be re-evaluated for equivalency. The course was put back into ACETS in September 2018 with our concerns outlined, and MCCC'D requested that the course keep the prior equivalency of HST/REL Dept Elective [HU, H], instead of accepting the Spring 2019 and beyond equivalency of REL 200, HST Dept Elective, Literacy & Critical Inquiry (L), Humanities, Arts & Design (HU), Global Awareness [G].

When the re-evaluation was completed in September 2019, the reply was as follows:

HIS 212 has been reviewed by faculty to receive the following equivalency based on the content of the course –

REL 200 (L or HU) & G or HST DEC (HU & H & G)

We also contacted faculty directly to discuss the ENG 101 pre-req concern and they maintained the REL 200 equivalency.

And the CEG currently shows the new equivalency as:

REL 200, HST Dept Elective, Literacy & Critical Inquiry (L), Humanities, Arts & Design (HU), Global Awareness (G), Historical Awareness (H)

We (MCCC'D) are still not comfortable with that, as our HIS 212 course does not meet the criteria for an [L] designation. At this point, I believe this needs to be brought to the attention of the ASU General Studies Council—especially the [L] subcommittee—to weigh in on this issue.