

SCAP Questions about ISS Proposal and Responses

December 2013

1. Demand

a) How many of the 1 million Washington state residents with some college but no undergraduate degree will meet the requirements for admission, desire such a degree, and have the time and financial ability to pursue it at this time? Is a first-year cohort of 300 students a reasonable figure? Please provide additional info about the demand by prospective students

Some suggestive and encouraging answers to these questions are offered in the two UWEO reports we have now received (see below). In addition, we believe that our plan to open the degree with an initial 300 FTE cohort of students is a much more reasonable target than the 1000+ numbers that were initially put forward by EO. The fact that other online social science programs at Washington State University and Portland State University already exist, and that PSU graduated 998 online social science students last year alone, is a further indication that our expectations are reasonable. We believe that our program will be of a considerably higher quality, and that, coming with the strong reputation of UW, will provide a very competitive option for students in this area.

b) Re: the market study by UWEO (page 8). How far off are its results?

We list the key findings below, but please see the separate study reports entitled:

1) "Social Sciences Online Degree Completion Demand Study of Former Students of UW Arts & Sciences"

2) Survey Results from Selected Washington State Community Colleges

Key findings of surveys so far:

1) The main findings of the first report on the survey of former UW students are as follows:

- The majority of former students haven't completed a baccalaureate degree since dropping out (90.8%). Among those, just 10% are currently enrolled with other institutions to complete a degree program.
- 82% showed interest in the UW online degree completion proposal. Two-thirds (66.7%) were "very interested." Among those interested, almost everyone (97.1%) wants to start in 2014, or sooner.
- What motivated those students the most to complete a college degree is the sense of accomplishment – completing a college degree (55%). All other motivations are career or job related: requirement for pursuing a professional or higher degree (22.2%), basic job requirement (12%), seeking major career change (7.8%), seeking promotion or change of responsibility or required by current job (2.4%). Almost all would embrace the option of completing baccalaureate degree online (95.2%).
- NO ONE said they do not plan to complete their college degree. Almost 70% indicated that they plan to return to the UW or go elsewhere to finish at some point in future, around 30% were unsure. As expected, most would consider returning to where they dropped to complete their degree – the UW (90%), the second choice is an out – of-state institution (25%) rather than any other state institution (none of the other WA state institutions listed was mentioned by more than 15% of respondents).
- Regarding financing the degree completion endeavor, almost 70% indicated they would use personal funds or savings, rather than taking-out loans. Half of respondents (what is actual percentage?)

suggested that they could afford \$8,000 or more per year. 15.8% indicated that their employers would reimburse all or part of their tuition.

- Around 10% are currently enrolled with other institutions for college courses. Even though this is a very small group, survey results show 3 noticeable features regarding those students:
 - At least half of them (actual percentage?) are currently taking classes online
 - 100% have taken online classes to earn college credits in the past, and
 - 80% of them completed the online courses they started
- Those interested students indicated that they would take, on average, 24 credits for the first year, 21 credits for the second year, and 19 credits for the third year, if they were to pursue the degree.
- Regarding marketing this option to students: almost all (96.4%) would prefer that the UW communicate with them via email, 40% also suggested Web or the Internet, 30.2% mentioned direct mail, followed by social media (18.7%), printed material such as catalog (12.9%) and other channels.
- Almost two-thirds of respondents (64.6%) last enrolled with the UW in 2008 or later. Matching this enrollment pattern, over half of respondents (56.1%) are in the age bracket of 25 to 34, and an additional 18% are in the younger age group (18-24). These are useful when determining which segments of the former students we may want to focus on for marketing purposes.
- Less than half of respondents (actual percentage) live or work in the Seattle area, but over two thirds of them (actual percentage) do work or live in King County.
- Respondents are widely distributed in many A&S majors and pre-majors (sample size may not be sufficient to warrant by major

analysis). Political Science, English, Anthropology, Psychology, Jackson School International Studies, and History are majors that have a higher number of respondents than others.

2) Key findings of the second report on the survey of current (selected) WA-state community college students are as follows:

a) How interested are you in the UW online degree completion option? Please indicate your level of interest on a 1 to 5 point scale where “1” means “Definitely not interested” and 5 means “very interested”.

Extremely interested	25.0%
Somewhat interested	22.9%
Neither interested nor disinterested	27.1%
Not very interested	12.5%
Definitely not interested	12.5%

b) Which of the following universities or colleges have you considered or would you consider? Select all that apply.

University of Washington	83.3%
Central Washington University	45.2%
Washington State University	42.9%
Western Washington University	38.1%
Out-of-State institutions	28.6%
Eastern Washington University	21.4%
Other Washington state colleges or universities	21.4%
Evergreen State College	19.0%
Other	14.3%

c) Can you demonstrate any demand by future employers for graduates with a degree in ISS?

Recent trends in employer outlooks are very favorable for liberal arts graduates, including those with social science backgrounds. Two surveys completed in spring of 2013 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and by the Chronicle of Higher Education strongly suggest that employers, dissatisfied with vocationally educated new workers, are seeking a skill set that correlates strongly with the learning outcomes of ISS.

<http://chronicle.com/article/Employers-Want-Broadly/138453/>

Employers surveyed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities stated that they prioritize employees with the ability to:

- innovate
- think critically
- communicate clearly
- solve complex problems
- research and use evidence-based analysis

Employers also said they valued workers who “demonstrated ethical judgment and integrity, intercultural skills, and the capacity for continued new learning” (It Takes More Than a Major: Employer Priorities for Education and Student Success, Association of American Colleges and Universities).

<http://www.aacu.org/leap/presidentstrust/compact/2013SurveySummary.cfm>

A 2012 survey of 225 employers conducted by Millennial Branding and Experience Inc. echoes the same themes: “Thirty percent of surveyed employers said they were recruiting liberal arts types, second only to the 34

percent who said they were going after engineering and computer information systems majors. Trailing were finance and accounting majors, as only 18 percent of employers said they were recruiting targets” (Revenge of the Liberal Arts Major, Upstart Business Journal).

<http://upstart.bizjournals.com/news/wire/2012/05/14/survey-on-millennial-hiring-highlights-power-of-liberal-arts.html?page=all>

These findings continue to hold true when the conversation shifts from liberal arts majors in general to social sciences graduates in particular. A very encouraging report from the United Kingdom has just emerged which shows that social sciences graduates are experiencing better employment prospects than ever before. In late October of 2013, the Campaign for Social Science released a new study showing that a greater proportion of social science graduates are employed shortly after leaving university than STEM or arts graduates. “Some 84.2% of social science graduates were employed three years after graduating, compared with 79% of arts and humanities graduates and 78% of graduates with science degrees, the figures suggest” (Social science graduates ‘have best job prospects,’ BBC News).

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-2470750>

Although this research was conducted in the UK, it is reasonable to think that US employers are as likely to find value in the experiences and skills that social science graduates bring to the table.

We anticipate that some students will also have pre-professional interests in teaching, and the ISS curriculum provides a rich platform from which to pursue a secondary Social Studies teaching endorsement. The current ISS curriculum provides all but two areas for this endorsement and expect to offer the remaining courses in Pacific Northwest History and the Ancient World (after year 2 of online course development) to meet Washington

State endorsement requirements. With further development of two Western Civilization courses and two sequential U.S. History courses, the ISS program will also be able to offer a pathway for a secondary History teaching endorsement.

2. Thematic areas

How are courses assigned to areas? What are the criteria? Who makes the decision? What about courses that are taught in different ways, with content varying by instructor? Please make explicit the criteria used to sort current and future courses into thematic areas.

Let us respond here first on the question of criteria, before turning to the ways in which the governance structure for ISS shapes the assignment and assignment review process. We will then conclude with some comments about the low possibilities of content variation in ISS.

The criteria for course assignments to the thematic areas lists are themselves listed on pages 11-12 of the proposal (just ahead of the 7 pointed star diagram). The process of applying these involves evaluating the course syllabus to determine to which area each course contributes most. Some courses are inherently broader in their scope and contribute to learning goals in more than one area, but in response to earlier feedback from SCAP we have attempted to narrow the lists as much as possible so as to ensure that our breadth requirement works effectively. This leaves some of the 7 lists (notably 'health and risk') in the first year with fewer than the ideal number of courses, but, so long as we win approval, our plan is to keep adding courses, focusing as much as possible on development in areas where our lists are shorter.

The way we have set up the governance structure for the degree ensures that the process for assigning courses to areas (and annually reassessing

such assignments) will involve a formal review by the steering committee. This will in turn ensure participation from all 13 social science units, as well as the faculty teaching the courses, the ISS director, the director of student services, and divisional dean for social sciences. At the end of each year, the steering committee will consider the ideas and evidence presented by all these parties and review the lists of new courses (as well as the existing courses) to make sure that the assignments of courses to lists are as accurate as possible.

Finally, on the topic of course variation from one instructor to the next, we should note that this will be *less* of an issue than it is in oncampus social science instruction at UW. Key gateway courses in some of our most popular oncampus degrees (e.g. JSIS and English) are taught in quite radically varied ways from one quarter to the next (e.g. SIS 201 as offered by Professors Bachman, Migdal and Lucero) and there is some important and ongoing debate amongst faculty in such units about how this shapes the meaning of their degrees (some faculty appreciate the intellectual diversity this makes possible, others prefer a more standardized approach). In any case, this is much *less* likely to be a feature of ISS teaching, and there are 3 reasons why. First, the time investment taken to create an online course, combined with all the course content and infrastructure that is thereby put in place, means that there will be considerable content stability from one quarter to the next. Courses will still be revised over time, and there is support for this in the budget. But the creation of the online materials itself ensures a certain degree of replicability from one offering to the next. Second, for all of our courses the faculty involved in developing the courses will remain our primary instructors. The only exception that seems likely (and probably not that often) will involve these same faculty inviting senior PhC students to teach the courses. Due to the fact that these PhC instructors would use the online materials already prepared by the faculty developing the courses, and given the strong likelihood of their sharing their

advisors' outlook and approach, course variation seems unlikely. Third, ISS, unlike most oncampus social science degrees, does not include any of the sorts of upper division 'Special Topics' courses that are most subject to frequent variation in content.

3. Bothell faculty

On page 35, you state that "one faculty member from UWB will be participating in the initial course offerings." What is the involvement of that faculty member? There is no UWB course listed. Will they teach a UW Seattle course? Which campus will own this course?

Dr Karam Dana from UW Bothell is our instructor for POL S 432 / JSIS B 406, Political Islam and Islamic Fundamentalism. He has taught this course for UW Seattle before at the invitation of the Jackson School - a good sign of respect for the quality of his teaching - and he will be offering it in ISS with the full knowledge of both Bruce Burgett (his Dean) and Susan Jeffords at UWB. Given that ISS has a governance structure based in UW Seattle's College of Arts and Sciences, the responsibility for assessing quality and making sure courses are taught well is owned by the Seattle campus where the ISS steering committee currently has no representation from UWB or UWT. In the relatively low likelihood that we enlist other Bothell and Tacoma faculty in future course development, it may (as we note in the proposal) become important to add representation from these other branches of UW. But we have so much interest now from UW Seattle faculty in developing online courses that we are unlikely to need to reach out to UWB and UWT on any kind of broad-based tri-campus recruitment effort. Meanwhile, as the faculty owner of the course Dr Dana remains an accountable party too, and, in turn, his course development contract with EO - as with all our other courses - spells out what the online course components will look like, when they will be delivered, and how they will be used. It should be noted in this respect that the Faculty Senate Committee

on IP and Copyright and the President's office continue to deliberate the ideal future rules over 'ownership' for UW as they relate to teaching materials created on development contracts. For now, ISS course development contracts already make clear that EO cannot re-use the courses without the permission of the home department of the faculty member who created them.

4. Shared experience

There's very little "shared experience" among majors. With no specific courses required for admission, students take 20 credits of ISS courses in common. Is this enough? Does this make a coherent major? Are there other programs like this on campus? In the recently adopted degree in Integrated Science, for example, there are 23 credits of Integrated Science but many more credits in common are required for admission to the major.

We will be offering a particularly coherent approach to fostering shared academic experience in this BA with our unique eportfolio based core (as well as a suite of courses amongst which certain student favorites will no doubt emerge over time). For all the reasons outlined at length in the proposal, the 3 elements of the ISS portfolio experience - introspection, scaffolding, and show-casing - will not only structure shared experiences, but also allow students to learn from them both individually *and* collectively. Our strong model of advising utilizes assigned groupings of students that regularly interact as intellectual peers throughout the program. The associated use of webinars will help contribute to this community learning experience too. And, the emphasis in the degree on developing digital media literacy and communication skills will also provide for overall consistency in the experience of learning. But, at the same time, like many oncampus degrees we are not interested in stamping out students based on a single mold. We want to cultivate and support personalized learning plans

that effectively prepare students for the individual adaptability they need as 21st century citizens.

5. Course level

ISS 301 seems like a 200-level intro course that most disciplines of social science have as prerequisites for their upper-division courses, e.g., COM 201/210/220/233, ECON 200/201/235, GWSS 200, GEOG 200/205. These courses are typically large lectures with sections, which is similar to the format of ISS 301. What makes ISS 301 a 300-level course?

The student population for whom we have designed this degree will be coming in with 2 years or more of coursework already behind them. They will also on average be older than the typical 18 year old freshmen students arriving each Fall on the Seattle campus. They will probably be more akin to some of the working parents and returning students more common at UWB and UWT, and for the same reason they will include many students with already developed life skills and experiences. As a result, we will not need to offer the sort of entry level, introduction to university behavior and expectations found in many 100 and 200 level courses on campus. That said, on campus there are also a number of degrees that also themselves use 300 level courses as their degree gateways (e.g. English), and which show that the model works very well. Finally, it should also be noted that the admissions process will be providing us with a way of making sure we only accept students prepared to begin the ISS degree at the 300 level in ISS 301.

What makes this 301 course 300 level is the way it combines an introduction to the social sciences (which could certainly be pitched at a 100 or 200 level) with an introduction to the meta-cognitive practices and social theories of social scientific reflexivity. For some this extra demand may even make the

course worthy of a higher number still (something that was actually mentioned in his feedback by the chair of the philosophy department), but we believe that supported by the ISS 350 and 355 courses, and all the work students will be doing on their portfolios, the reflexivity piece will be manageable for our students.

6. Course restrictions

**Will the courses listed on pages 13 through 17 be restricted to ISS students?
Will ISS students receive priority registration for these on-line sections with on-site students adding during a later registration period?**

These are big important questions the answers to which remain subject to ongoing deliberations by multiple university committees, including the new Online Education Joint Task Force chaired by Jim Gregory and Betsy Wilson. Our institutional commitment in ISS is to make sure that everything we do avoids undermining oncampus programs at UW. We therefore obviously want to respect the firewalls created to contain online degrees with limited admission. All oncampus courses reserved for matriculated students paying regular tuition will NOT be available to ISS students. The latter will only be admitted to graduate with a degree in integrated social sciences.

The above noted, we are already getting questions from faculty about whether oncampus students will be able to access ISS courses, and/or the online instructional materials they include. In principle we think that providing access to oncampus students in these ways is a good way for ISS to contribute to the wider UW teaching mission beyond the access it expands online to specific space-bound and time-bound students. While ISS students will not be able to register in regular campus courses or physically attend campus, this should not prevent campus students from benefiting from all the work our faculty have put into developing high quality online

instructional materials. This seems particularly important when oncampus innovations with Canvas and initiatives such as the Provost's Technology Teaching Fellows program are inspiring and enabling faculty to experiment with the use of more online pedagogic practices in ways that complement classroom work. We also think that technically it will be possible to create oncampus sections and ISS sections of courses so that students will be able to enter via distinct registration windows. So ultimately our hope is to be able to answer in the affirmative on these questions, with access to on campus students being based on just space availability in a later registration period. But we do not want to presume anything at this stage, and look forward to working with the senate committees and other parties to develop the best possible access policies for all.

7. Advisory groups

Are the advisory groups that "continue throughout the students' life in the program" described on page 52 the same as the sections for ISS 350 and 355? Are these cohorts?

Each advisor is assigned to 150 students whom they work with over the students' span of the program. This is the advisory group. Sections of ISS 355 will be drawn from the same advisory group. Although students will participate in new groupings of 25 max each quarter (owing to the fulltime/part time student mix) they will still interact as part of a larger 150-student community in concert with their advisor, thereby providing valuable community coherence for each student.

8. Part-time students

Students are required to take ISS 355 four times. What if part-time students take it during their first several quarters? Is it OK to have a large time gap between the last credits of 355 and the capstone? Would you require them to take more credits of 355 closer to graduation?

In consultation with ISS academic advisors, student degree plans for both part time and full time students will plot out when they will be taking credits in 355 so as to maximize an even spread across the whole extent of the degree. This will then become enforceable because any departure from the learning plan that is not adequately justified by changed circumstances will constitute a violation of the ISS continuation policy.

9. Review

For the review described on page 38, please give specific targets for the various metrics that will be reviewed. For example, is it the expectation that graduation rates for the ISS program will be the same as campus-based social science programs? Will you include faculty satisfaction, promotion, and research productivity metrics? Such targets must be established now rather than later---what are acceptable outcomes in each of the categories?

We welcome further advice on this target setting effort, but provisionally let us respond with the following comments.

Graduation rates: Since our ISS students will be starting the degree with at least 2 years of credits, time to graduation should be shorter for **full-time** ISS students than for oncampus students. But there is an obvious flip side to this too. Precisely because this is a degree completion program, our typical ISS students will have also already experienced a halt in their BA studies at least once before. For all the complex reasons accounting for such incomplete degrees, we expect our graduation rates to be lower than those for UW oncampus degrees. Moreover, because about half of our students will be part-time, **average** time to degree across ISS will inevitably be longer. Our aspirational goal is still to achieve retention rates comparable to oncampus programs in the social sciences. We think that setting numerical targets at this stage is premature, but in the spirit of having markers against

which to measure our movement towards our aspirations, let us offer the following provisional adaptation of campus graduation rates.

2 YEARS 40%

3 YEARS 50%

4 YEARS 60%

5 YEARS 70%

These will remain rough and also challenging goals for the first years of the program, and our strategies will no doubt change as we gain experience with our students over time. Nonetheless, we remain committed to ensuring that students can complete this program, and are investing resources to do so.

Faculty participation: We will administer a survey of faculty satisfaction every year and report all related data, including whether and how involvement in the program contributed to development as an oncampus instructor and any related accomplishments, awards and/or promotions.

10. Clarification needed

a) On page 9: What do you mean by "and so ensuring educational engagement in 5 areas should not become a roadblock to degree completion?"

HAVE CHANGED TO: "We are developing a sufficient number of courses to ensure that engagement in 5 areas should not become a roadblock to degree completion."

b) On page 18: Why are these courses listed as "Group Start Pilot Courses?"

These are courses that are already being offered to matriculated on campus students through collaboration between the college of Arts and Sciences

and EO. "Group Start Pilot Courses" is the official name under which they have been developed and taught for the last 3-5 years.

c) On page 33: "must meet" means virtually, not necessarily face-to-face?

HAVE CHANGED "meet" to "communicate" to accommodate online process

d) On page 43: Under the head of "Career Relevance and Employability," this is a description of the program of the OU program, yes? Please clarify.

YES it is a description of the program of the OU program, and have now noted this in 2 places instead of just one.

11. Course offering details

a) The prerequisites for ECON 382 and JSIS B 331 are such that it is unlikely that many ISS students will be able to take these courses. Are these good courses for development for this program?

The prerequisites for JSIS B 331 will be available in the program (although GEOG 123/ SIS 123 will likely be replaced by GEOG 323/ JSIS 323).

Meanwhile, we will work with the instructor of ECON 382 and the Economics department to restructure the course so that it both fits more effectively into the ISS Major and meanwhile does not require unavailable pre-reqs.

b) Is PHIL 362, listed under thematic areas vi and vii on page 17 supposed to be PHIL 360?

Dr. Lynn Hankinson who is developing this course reports that 362 is the new number. Her email of 11/5 states: "When I originally submitted an application, I did use 360 which is a regular course that we teach. But I was

advised by members of the department that as it wasn't going to be precisely what 360 is (topics change by quarter and instructor), I would need to submit a proposal for a new course. As I worked with UWEO this quarter, I used 362 (a course number not already taken) and the course is, in fact, quite different and its content won't change by quarter. I have submitted the building template and syllabus to UWEO (I just finished for the deadline 10/25) and now need to submit a new course proposal."

c) AFRAM 337 is listed in the course catalog as Music and Social Change in the Sixties Era. GWSS 454 is Women, Words, Music, and Change. What is this Rock the Archive course?

It is a new hybrid course that mixes the two noted above and which is going to be jointly developed by the two faculty.

d) COM 468 is listed as Journalism Ethics on page 13 but is listed as Media Ethics in the course catalog.

Actually, the course blueprint available through UWEO lists the course as "Communications Ethics." A note on the blueprint reads: "Course name (currently *Journalism Ethics*) will probably change in Spring 2013 to *Communications Ethics*."

e) Check for joint listing of courses: JSIS A 435 with POLI S 435, JSIS 454 with HSTAS 454, JSIS B 436 with POLI S 436. (Are there others?)

Checked and changed these in Appendix B ; didn't find others. Please note that JSIS 323 Globalization and You should now be listed as JSIS D Globalization and You.

f) Have all existing courses been through curriculum review to establish DL as the delivery method?

The answer is no. Some have, but we are now working with the faculty of all the other to make sure such approval is secured in the upcoming Winter quarter.

g) How far in advance will students be able to plan for courses? When might you have a draft of a teaching schedule?

We now have a draft teaching schedule course forecast based on the teaching preferences of the faculty and the estimated numbers of virtual seats needed each quarter. We attach here as an excel spread sheet.

12. Changes needed to Catalog Entry, pages 1 and 2

a) There is no "Online Degree Completion Program." Two references should be removed or replaced.

We have now deleted these.

b) Clarify credits for ISS 355. We see "8 total credits" on page 1, "at least 8 credits" on pages 20 and 21, and "2, max 20" on page 25.

We have now changed the wording to say a minimum of 8 total credits in 355, while changing the course credits maximum allowed (in the course description) so students can only take up to a maximum of 14 credits in 355.

c) In Graduation Requirements: "40 additional credits of coursework from the disciplines in the ISS program" --- please list these disciplines or point students to such a list.

These are now all listed alphabetically as follows: American Ethnic Studies; American Indian Studies; Anthropology; Communication; Economics; Gender Women and Sexuality Studies, Geography; History; Jackson School of International Studies; Law, Societies, and Justice; Philosophy; Political Science; and Sociology

d) Consider adding language regarding the need for courses to be approved by an advisor prior to registration or requiring students to adhere to an approved academic plan.

We feel this is an enforcement issue, and as such it is something which we already address in our continuation policy. It seems inappropriate to us to add it as a degree requirement.

e) Page 59 states that students need a 2.5 in ISS 401 to graduate. This should be listed in the catalog.

We have removed this 2.5 requirement in 401 altogether (it being a legacy of very early discussions), but we are retaining our minimum 2.0 requirement for the overall Major.

Responses to additional questions sent separately by Patricia Kramer after recent FCTP meeting:

First, will prisoners be eligible to take these courses and participate in this degree?

No, we will be unable to serve prisoners with ISS. This is not because of us, but because of online access being so constrained in prison.

Did you intend to allow non-US citizens who are not resident in the US to participate in this degree?

No, non-resident non-citizens will not be able to participate both because of legal barriers, and also because without access to US college systems they will not even meet our admission reqs. However, resident non-citizens with CC associate degrees will be able to apply and participate, and roughly on the same ratios that they populate CC colleges.

Who "owns" courses that are prefixed ISS? If this is the ISS program, then will the program have a curriculum committee that reviews course additions and changes just like happens in departments now?

ISS will own the 4 ISS courses, and the ISS steering committee will serve to review curriculum and courses.

Which department will the ISS 350, 355, and 401 course lecturers be part of? Will they be in whichever social science discipline with which they are most comfortable?

The lecturers will be housed in the unit(s) that fit them best, and which can best assess their quality as faculty. We will also work hard to foster a team spirit amongst the lecturers in ISS, mentor them, and seek as much as possible to provide prompt feedback to both them and any other parties involved in assessing their teaching in the program.

Will there be a tri-campus presence in this degree?

At present the precedent set by employing just one UWB faculty member indicates some very limited inter-campus labor sharing, but nothing more significant than that represented by other ongoing initiatives such as TTF, Humanities Center projects, and possible shared work on new Big Data projects etc. Thus 'Tri-campus presence' suggests a much broader and deeper form of integration than we anticipate.