

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: February 25, 2004

Present:	Dennis Nettiksimmons	Tom Rust
	Pat Holman	Brian Gurney
	James Nowlin	Tim Urbaniak
	Karen Everett	

Absent:	Tom Hinthorne – <i>excused</i>	Vern Gagnon
	Rachel Schaffer – <i>excused</i>	Dixie Metheny – <i>excused</i>
	Susan Gregory – <i>excused</i>	Bruce Brumley – <i>excused</i>

Guests:	Lonnie Schrag	John Staley
	Craig McKenzie	Victor Valgenti
	John Cech	



Tim Urbaniak called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m. on Wednesday, February 25, 2004, in room B001 at the College of Technology.

The February 18, 2004, meeting minutes were accepted as presented.

A document has been circulated at the COT. It is entered into the record below.

January 29, 2004

COT Discussion Document regarding AS Plans of Study for all programs and the addition of an AAS Self-Design Option

AS Plans of Study for all programs

Our current catalog contains an option for a student to create a self-designed AS degree. The recent addition of AS plans of study in Fire Science and Human Resources, combined with student inquiries regarding AS possibilities in other content areas, has generated discussion and articulation possibilities for all programs. While the option currently exists for a student to pursue an AS in all content areas (or even to create an option that involves more than one content area), the option is not well known or oft advised.

Why is this of interest to us?

By far, most students that come to our College are interested in the terminal AAS degrees. However, as we transition into our role as a Community College, many more students will come to us seeking a technical foundation combined with the ability to complete their general education requirements prior to continuing their four-year degree. Discussions regarding advisement indicate that this has already begun.

An AAS Degree prepares the student for discipline-specific employment far better than an AS. Why would students want an AS Degree instead of an AAS?

Some students are place-bound in Billings and want to fulfill as many of their intended degree requirements as possible before moving elsewhere to complete.

Tuition is cheaper at the COT. It is a financial advantage to enroll in as many credits at the COT prior to continuing into upper-division classes.

Students may arrive on our campus with many general education classes completed from other institutions. Having an AS option accelerates their ability to reach an academic milestone.

What perils lurk in the shadows?

Quality Academic Advisement is an absolute must. We must be quite clear as to the differences between an AS Degree plan of study and an AAS Degree when advising students. Students must not be advised into the AS Degree if they intend to seek employment in those fields as competitors to students graduating with an AAS. This is also potentially confusing to employers.

With a limited amount of seats available for classes we need to monitor closely the composition of AS vs. AAS students in some areas. There are staffing issues that potentially may need to be addressed.

What needs to be done in order to offer these AS Degrees?

Again, these options currently exist, but are not well known or generally discussed during admission advisement. The current proposal is to 1) Further clarify and emphasize the option through additional catalog language and 2) Route suggested plans of study through the on-campus approval process for inclusion into the next catalog.

It has been suggested that an all-encompassing statement be forwarded through the process to accompany the suggested plans. The plans would then be published in the next catalog along with existing plans of study.

We have been advised that the Board of Regents does not need to grant approval in this endeavor.

AAS –Self-Design Option

Currently we have an AA or AS in “general studies” and we have the BAS/BSLS for degree completion for either the AAS or the AA/AS degree.

Consider a proposal to offer an “**AAS –Self-Design Option**”---for these reasons: Adults heading back to school do not want all the general education courses of the AA/AS generic degree but want specific skill sets that may cross current degree lines. For instance, we have a student graduating with a BSBA in MIS but she is going to attend the COT after graduation to get courses that cross between the networking and desktop support degrees in order to earn a certification she needs. She will have done the general education courses with her BSBA, but she wants one AAS, not two. Currently, she just plans to take a set of courses since we don’t offer a “self-design AAS” degree.

What about students in HR who have prior learning credits or ACE-approved credits that will assist them in “leapfrogging through” that program but who wish to take additional computer courses as well to enhance their skills? Again, they can do the generic AA/AS degree, but if they don’t want all 37 credits of general education, they are stuck.

We can never create enough tracks fast enough with specific degree titles that will allow students the flexibility to earn what they need. We would be better having a “generic” AAS that with an advisor’s consultation can meet the needs of the student.

Further, the technical areas change quickly—a “self-design” option would allow us to rapidly respond to students’ needs and community requests.

Plan of study would be something like this (to correspond to those available for AA/AS or BAS/BSLS degrees):

I. General Education Coursework or Equivalents:

Courses chosen with advisor in general categories:

- English course to correspond to technical area of expertise or equivalent (testing out, transfer credit)
- Math course to correspond to the technical area of expertise or equivalent
- Speech or interpersonal relations class appropriate to technical area
- Computer literacy (demonstrated by course or test)
- Sample plan of study could include the following:

- o CTCM 109 or COMT 130
- o CMP 105
- o CTMA 104 or above
- o CTCM 202 or equivalent
- o 12-credit co-op ed or internship opportunity

II. Thematic Concentration:

Courses chosen with advisor in technical categories:

Minimum of 30 credits from one technical area

Minimum of 20 credits from supporting technical area(s)

Minimum of 20 credits total in 200-level courses (to demonstrate a proficiency in one technical area*)

Written and/or oral presentation to dean/advisor of self-designed core with justification/rationale

Presentation to dean/advisor of career research with justification/rationale for this plan of study

TOTAL: Minimum of 60 and a maximum of 72 credits required for the degree**

*When I was going through existing AAS degree plans of study, I was surprised at the range of 200-level coursework required---some have very little. As we progress with curricular revision, doesn't it make sense to have 200-level numbers for the second year courses? It would seem to be a measure of progression in the degree area.

** BOR policy 301.12

Summary

Combined, these proposals would broadly redefine options available for students while enhancing the potential for graduates in the Montana University System. With a minimum of process we can achieve a maximum of return and continue with the transition into the role of a Community College.

(This document created by Tim Urbaniak with much of the AAS text by Karen Everett – with contributions and thanks to Craig McKenzie and Victor Valgenti for their taking the lead with paperwork and discussions)

I. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 37 AS Degree Program of Study in Networking Technology. New program of study.

Craig McKenzie stated that students in this AS program (60 credits) will basically take the General Education requirements and the first year of the Networking Certificate. This will not give them as much information as the AAS degree (72 credits), but it will give them a good basis to move on to a four-year degree.

It was noted that doing a degree such as an AS in Networking as self-designed usually proves to be a problem. Students could be all over the map in their courses, and still get a degree, but that degree would not prepare them for the job they are going to do.

It was noted that the COT already has an AA/AS self designed option. Basically, students can create an AS in anything, if they want to. This does not mean, however, that the students are prepared for a given job. It was further cited that there are no required approvals for AS self-design students.

- Motion by Tom Rust, seconded by Dennis Nettiksimmons to **approve Item 37.**

- Motion carried.

- Motion by Tom Rust, seconded by James Nowlin to **waive second reading of Item 37.**

- Motion carried.

It was noted that **Items 32, 32.a, 32.b, and 32.c** were pulled from the agenda for modification.

Item 36 AS Degree Program of Study in Fire Science. Modify an existing program.

Item 36.a FIRE 210 Building Construction for Firefighters. Delete course.

Item 36.b FIRE 212 Origin and Cause. New course.

Item 36.c FIRE 214 Inspection Codes and Practice. Change title and catalog description.

John Staley noted that adding the new building code course added one too many credits to the program, so the computers course was dropped. He did not want to see it removed. This change is just a matter of getting the needed courses in a 60 credit program.

It was also noted that locally, there are almost no students taking the AS in Fire Science and then going on to a four-year degree. However, nationally, about 18% of graduates go on to a four-year degree.

It was decided that corrected paperwork adding the computers course back in and removing one credit from the Hazmat course will be submitted at the next meeting for approval.

II. ITEMS – SECOND READING

Item 34 HLTH 104 Introduction to Nursing Skills. New course.

It was cited that as per the Committee's request, the course description was verified with the Missoula program, and it is almost exactly the same. Missoula is pleased with the content of the course (This course is part of the Surgical Tech program, which is Missoula's program run through the MSU-B College of Technology).

- Motion by Pat Holman, seconded by James Nowlin to **approve Item 34 on second reading.**

- Motion carried.

III. OTHER ITEMS

It was noted that there is an error on Item 35, which was approved last week. It has the wrong math class listed. The proposal will be pulled from the Academic Senate agenda and returned to the UCC for correction.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

rjrm