

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ASSESSMENT OF THE ONE-UNIT SEMINARS

PERSPECTIVES ON SEPTEMBER 11

Offered Fall Quarter 2001 & Winter Quarter 2002

Prepared by

**Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research
Division of Honors and Undergraduate Programs
College of Letters and Science**

July 2002

Acknowledgements

Many individuals in the College of Letters and Science contributed to this assessment. Brian Copenhaver, Provost, and Judith Smith, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, assisted in identifying the key assessment questions. Eric Splaver and Boyne Chin of the College Information Services assisted in developing student and faculty web-based surveys and directing participants to the surveys via e-mail and *MyUCLA*. Jodi Anderson, a research analyst in the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research and doctoral student in Education, assisted in administering and analyzing the student and faculty surveys and wrote the first draft the report. Arianne Walker, a postdoctoral fellow in the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research, Lucy Blackmar, Director of Undergraduate Initiatives, and Sally Gibbons, Cluster Coordinator, helped edit the report. Angie Hamner, of the GE administrative team, helped format the report. The Office of Instructional Development provided funding for the assessment. The students and faculty who participated in the assessment were very responsive and their input allowed us to assess the one-unit seminars.

Marc R. Levis, Director
Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research

INTRODUCTION

On the morning of September 11, 2001, several academic leaders assembled in the Chancellor's Conference Room to determine how they might help the campus community deal with the aftermath of the tragic events that had just occurred. Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Judith Smith, suggested offering a series of one-unit seminars during Fall Quarter to help students examine the tragic events from a variety of perspectives and to foster informal interactions among faculty and students during a period of crisis and uncertainty. The idea was enthusiastically endorsed by those present, led by Chancellor Albert Carnesale, who indicated an interest in personally participating.

Vice Provost Smith engaged others to determine the feasibility of creating such a program before classes began on September 25. With the assistance of Vice Provost Geoffrey Garrett (International Studies and Overseas Programs), College Faculty Chair Karen Rowe, and College Honors Chair Robert Watson, she established a seminar series entitled *Perspectives on September 11* that was offered through the Honors Collegium. Senate Chair John Edmond emailed a call-to-action to all Academic Senate members on September 17 that referred faculty to a web-based submission form created by College Information Services. For the first time, faculty members were able to submit course proposals online; this accelerated the submission and approval processes.

To provide an intimate learning environment and direct student-faculty interaction, seminars were limited to 15 students. All undergraduates were eligible to enroll, but enrollment preference was given to freshmen and sophomores. Two seminar series were offered: one in the Fall 2001, *Perspectives on September 11*, and then a second series in the Winter 2002, *Perspectives Post 9/11*. All seminars focused on topics related to the events of September 11, and collectively they offered a wide variety of perspectives. Some seminars focused on particular aspects of the event, such as exploring the Taliban or understanding terrorism; others examined broad-based policies such as national security and civil rights in a terrorist environment. Still others focused on more personal issues such as understanding post-traumatic stress and promoting tolerance. A complete list of seminars is appended to this report.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES AND RESPONDENTS

The purpose of this two-quarter evaluation was to document the experience of students and faculty participating in the one-unit seminars. First, the evaluation focused on the role of the seminars in helping students understand events that preceded and followed the tragic events of September 11. Second, both faculty and students were asked about the level of interaction fostered by the seminar format. Third, both groups were asked why they had elected to participate and whether or not they would participate in other one-unit seminars in the future.

Both students and faculty were given an opportunity to complete a web-based survey. This marks the first time at UCLA that students and faculty were asked to evaluate courses on the web. The Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research worked closely with staff from College Information Services to create and implement the web surveys. All communication with faculty and students concerning the evaluation occurred through email and over the web. Standard course evaluations typically used by the Office of Instructional Development were not employed.

Student Participants and Survey Respondents. A total of 559 students participated in the 49 seminars in the Fall and another 424 students participated in 37 seminars in the Winter. All student participants received a *MyUCLA* notification requesting their participation in the evaluation and assuring them that all responses would be confidential. Students who did not respond after two notifications were sent a final email request to complete the survey during the last week of the quarter or during finals week. In

both the Fall and the Winter, there was a 42% response rate to the web-based survey. The survey respondents were broadly representative of the student participants.

In the Fall approximately three-fourths of student respondents had entered UCLA in the past two years while that number was a slightly higher in the Winter (Table 1a). One-third (36%) were enrolled in College Honors in the Fall with that number rising to 47% in the Winter. In both quarters, approximately 10% of respondents had entered UCLA as transfer students. The majority were female in the Fall (72%) and Winter (63%). The largest racial/ethnic group represented was Caucasian (48% and 42%), followed by Asian American (23.5% and 23%), Chicano/Latino (10.5% and 11%), and African American (2.5% and 2%). In the Fall survey, Caucasian students were slightly overrepresented among respondents, constituting 41% of students enrolled in the seminars but 48% of the respondents. Conversely, Chicano/Latino students were slightly underrepresented among respondents at 10.5% versus their enrollment rate of 14%. In the Winter, respondents were representative of the enrolled student population.

Table 1a. Student Participants and Respondents

Cohorts of Students*	Fall		Winter	
	No. of Participants (%)	No. of Respondents (%)	No. of Participants (%)	No. of Respondents (%)
Students entering 2001	209 (37%)	99 (42%)	243 (57%)	119 (66%)
Students entering 2000	190 (34%)	76 (32%)	97 (23%)	35 (20%)
Students entering 1999 or before	160 (29%)	61 (26%)	84 (20%)	25 (14%)
Total	559	236	424	179

*Reflects students entering in Fall, Winter, or Spring of that academic year.

Faculty Participants and Survey Respondents. In the Fall, a total of 53 faculty participated in teaching the 49 seminars and in the Winter, a total of 40 faculty taught 37 seminars; thirty-three percent of the faculty who taught a Fall seminar, chose to teach again in the Winter quarter. Four seminars were team-taught by two faculty members in the Fall with that number falling to three in the Winter. In the Fall (mid-November), faculty members received an email requesting their participation in the evaluation. Non-respondents received a second email soliciting their participation. The response rate was 62% with 33 instructors responding. In the Winter, the evaluations were sent out later in the quarter and resulted in a response rate of 80% with 32 instructors responding. Table 1b provides comparisons of the teaching faculty and the cohort of respondents. In both quarters, more than 55% of the responding instructors were faculty members from the College of Letters and Science with the remainder distributed between faculty in the professional schools and staff/administrators who did not have faculty appointments.

Table 1b. Instructors and Respondents*

Unit	Fall		Winter	
	No. of Instructors (%)	No. of Respondents (%)	No. of Instructors (%)	No. of Respondents (%)
College Faculty	35 (66%)	19 (58%)	26 (65%)	24 (75%)
Professional School Faculty	9 (17%)	7 (21%)	9 (23%)	7 (22%)
Others	9 (17%)	7 (21%)	5 (12%)	1 (3%)
Total	53	33	40	32

* Professional School Faculty included faculty from: Arts and Architecture, Education and Information Studies, Law, Medicine, Nursing, Public Policy and Social Research. Others included administrators and staff without faculty appointments.

RESULTS: THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Overall, the student responses were very positive. Over 80% of respondents in both quarters reported that they would take another one-unit seminar in the future (Table 2a).

Table 2a. One-unit courses are not very common in the curriculum. If more such courses were offered in the future, would you consider enrolling in them?

Percent Response	Fall	Winter
Yes	82	84
Maybe	15	13
No	3	3

Of those students who responded affirmatively, many commented that the seminar allowed them to explore a new topic of interest, to diversify their schedule by taking courses outside their major area of study, and to gain insight on current events. Some students reported that they appreciated the relaxed seminar structure and enjoyed the intellectually stimulating environment without being overburdened by the workload of a four-unit course (Table 2b).

Of those who selected “maybe” in responding to whether they would take a seminar again (15%), the most frequent comment was that their decision would be based upon whether or not they found the topic interesting. Only 3% of the students said that they would not take a seminar again; some commented that the seminar was too much work for one unit of credit.

Table 2b. Selected Student Responses to the Question: One-unit courses are not very common in the curriculum. If more such courses were offered in the future, would you consider enrolling in them?*

Yes	
◆	It allows a student to study a topic of interest purely for the learning experience.
◆	This allowed me to take an interesting course and fill out my schedule a little better when any other course would have put me over my approved unit limit. This was such an incredible learning experience and gave me new perspectives - it was fabulous...
◆	It introduces you to topics you might not otherwise have learned about.
◆	They are interesting and a good forum for intelligent discussion...
◆	The greatest thing I've found is the information and small group discussions.
□	Meeting only once a week and having a minimal workload enables students to fit in another class and still be able to focus on their core classes. I've taken two seminars and have taken so much from them.
□	They provide an ideal opportunity for students and professors to interact in a way not possible in a large class especially at a large university like UCLA.
□	It gave me a chance to broaden my ideas and views on certain subjects that are not commonly offered.
□	Because of the new minimum unit rule, it may be necessary to take a 1 unit course to maintain minimum units.
□	I like the topic based seminars, if I was interested in the topic I might enroll just to participate in active discussions about certain issues.
Maybe	
◆	If new one unit classes other than September 11 perspectives were offered, it would increase my chances of taking it.
◆	It would depend on the material of the class.
□	If it is something that is relevant and current, than yes, I think I might consider taking another one.
□	Only if the need for more units arises.
No	
◆	It took up too much precious time without accomplishing anything.

* Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

Almost all student respondents (94% and 92%) reported that the seminar had greater student-faculty interaction than their lecture courses (Table 3a).

Table 3a. Seminars normally have greater student-faculty interaction than lecture courses. Was this true in your course?

Percent Response	Fall	Winter
Yes	94	92
Maybe	2	6
No	4	2

Students commented that student-faculty interaction was valuable. In general, students reported that faculty were approachable in class, available outside of class, and responsive to student opinions. Many students reported appreciating the fact that professors facilitated meaningful class discussions and knew student names. Students also reported positive feelings about experiencing a greater level of peer interaction compared to that experienced in other courses (Table 3b).

Table 3b. Selected Student Responses to the Question: Seminars normally have greater student-faculty interaction than lecture courses. Was this true in your course?*

Yes	
◆	Student-faculty interaction was amazing.
◆	I enjoyed the seminar because the student/professor relationship was more personal.
◆	Refreshing to have one-on-one time with professors!
◆	Since all my other classes are huge, it was very nice to have a class with so few students. It was very easy to ask a question during class, and have it answered immediately.
◆	Due to the fact that there were only about fifteen students in the class, it was nice to be able to share opinions and actually look the professor in the face, and have him know who you are, as opposed to the usual blurry masses.
□	Very interactive. With such a small group, the professor could get to know the students.
□	It was really neat being able to work so closely with [the instructor]. Before this class, I had never spoken to any of my professors personally, because they are classes of two to three hundred.
□	It was wonderful. Everyone knew each other by name, and [the instructors] seemed so much more interested in what they were talking about.
□	I thoroughly enjoyed being able to talk one on one with the professor and other students...I felt it helped me learn in many different ways.
□	Because of the small setting, I felt there was much more interaction between the professors and students. This interaction was higher quality because it was discussing issues, ideas, etc...
No	
◆	It was a lecture more than a discussion. I feel this is a professor-specific problem, not a course specific one.
◆	My instructor didn't ask for our input or opinions.
□	It was basically a lecture with less people. We could ask questions but there was never a planned discussion and we usually just listened.

*Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

A majority of the student respondents said that their seminar helped them, to varying degrees, understand the events arising from the September 11 tragedy (Table 4a).

Table 4a. How much did this course help you to understand the events arising from the September 11 tragedy?

Response	Percent	
	Fall	Winter
Very Much	40	28
Fair Amount	35	30
Somewhat	22	32
Not At All	3	10

Among the students who responded positively, there was a strong feeling of having developed new perspectives and/or having learned important historical background in an academic environment. As a consequence of taking a seminar, students reported that they were comfortable posing questions and felt better equipped to understand and process current events. Other students added that the seminar provided a forum in which they were able to consider issues brought up by other students. In the Winter quarter, students were somewhat less likely (28% versus 40%) to have responded that the seminar helped them learn “very much” about the specific events arising from September 11. This

correlates with the shift in student responses that was also observed in the Winter (see Table 5b) as to the key reason they enrolled in the seminar. Those who felt that the seminar did not help them in understanding the events (3% and 10%) typically explained that their seminar topic had little or no focus on events related to September 11.

Table 4b. Selected Student Responses to the Question: How much did this course help you to understand the events arising from the September 11th tragedy?*

Very Much/A Fair Amount
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ It helped me express my feelings to other minds, allowing me to think about other issues that I would not have noticed had it not been for the other students. ◆ This class allowed me to see this tragedy clearly and not to simply believe all the propaganda that I hear on the news or read in the paper. ◆ Although the course was not designed to examine the specific events of September 11, it gave me a deeper understanding of the situation as a whole and introduced me to new perspectives on the situation. ◆ I have a political bent, and the class I took had more to do with culture/religion, so it was good to add that dimension to my understanding of the situation and the region. ◆ I know now that I have a different perspective than when I first began the course in September. □ I saw a different perspective on 9/11. When enrolling for the class I was afraid of my ignorance. Now, I know that there is so much more than the average American citizen hears about. □ I needed this seminar to understand the events. □ Many of the issues I would have never thought about had this class not brought them to my attention. □ This course taught me how much I really did not know about September 11th. I learned so much on such a wide variety of topics...I have a much broader understanding now. □ I have seen and heard the feelings from other diverse people who are different from me, so it helps me see the tragedy in different lights.
Somewhat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ We didn't focus too much on 9-11 after the first couple of weeks. ◆ It helped me understand certain parts of the event, in clarifying myths and rumors that were spreading. However, it did not help me understand the events as well as I would liked to have understood them. ◆ I don't think I can ever understand the events that occurred on Sept 11, but this class did help me to understand the current situation in Afghanistan, and helped me to broaden my knowledge about the motives behinds the events. ◆ It helped us understand the stresses that we were feeling and compared them to other people involved in different aspects of the tragedy. □ The course didn't seem to correlate to Sept. 11 as much as I thought it would. The topics we discussed seemed so far off, but it was still interesting and useful. □ We did very little in relation to actual events in the course, which disappointed me. It was all very abstract. □ My first course did, this one I just finished didn't as much, but I still consider it an excellent learning opportunity. □ I understand our role in the situation more than before and this makes me want to learn how I can help fix the problem.

*Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

When questioned as to why they enrolled in the seminar series, students provided a wide variety of answers. Most commonly, students thought the topic would be interesting, wanted to learn more about September 11 events, and/or had a friend taking it (Table 5a). Interestingly, in the Winter quarter, only 55% responded that wanting to know more about September 11th was a reason for enrollment, as compared to 77% in the Fall.

Table 5a. Why did you choose to enroll in this seminar?

Choices (students could select more than one)	Responses > 20%	
	Fall	Winter
Thought that the topic would be interesting	94	92
Wanted to know more information about September 11th events	77	55
A friend was taking it	54	53
Chance to get to know a faculty member	40	34
Needed unit credit	22	55

When asked to choose the single most important factor in their decision to enroll in the seminar, the most common response (46% and 48%) was interest in the topic (Table 5b). In the Fall quarter, the next most frequent response was that they wanted to learn more about the September 11 events (34%), while in the Winter the next most common response was that they needed unit credit. This may reflect the fact that the events of September 11th, although still important, had become a less powerful stand-alone reason for seminar enrollment. In addition, students in the Winter quarter appeared to be more cognizant of unit requirements and commented more frequently that the one-unit seminars were more helpful in making minimum unit requirements.

Table 5b. Which of the items listed above was most important in your decision to enroll in this seminar?

Response	Percent	
	Fall	Winter
Thought that the topic would be interesting	46	48
Wanted to know more information about September 11th events	34	13
Needed unit credit	8	27
Chance to get to know a faculty member	7	5
Other	3	3
Fit into my schedule	2	3
A friend was taking it	<1	1

RESULTS: THE FACULTY EXPERIENCE

Overall, faculty reported positive feelings about their seminar experience; 73% (Fall) and 69% (Winter) of the faculty respondents said that they would teach a one-unit seminar again. The remaining respondents were not certain whether or not they would (Table 6). Of those who taught a seminar in the Winter, 45% had taught a Fall seminar.

Table 6. Would you teach a one-unit seminar again?

Responses	Percent	
	Fall	Winter
Yes	73	69
No	0	0
Undecided	27	31

Since all seminars were led by faculty or administrators who volunteered to teach a seminar without any additional compensation or reduction in regular workload, it was important to determine how much time they spent in preparation for the seminar each week. The majority (67% and 66%) of the

instructors spent three or fewer hours in preparation for their weekly seminar (Table 7). However, in the Winter, nearly all faculty (94%) spent one hour or more preparing for the seminar, unlike the Fall where only 76% of faculty spent more than one hour per week. During both quarters, approximately one-third spent four or more hours a week preparing for the seminar.

Table 7. In terms of workload, how much time did you spend preparing for the seminar (outside of class time)?

Response	Percent	
	Fall	Winter
Less than 1 hour	24	6
1-3 hours	43	60
4 or more hours	33	34

When faculty were asked to explain why they decided to teach a seminar, the most common response was the desire to help students cope and respond to the September 11 tragedy. Faculty also felt the need to assist students in critically analyzing the many issues that arose in the aftermath. Many faculty members noted that they had a civic responsibility to offer their insights and educate students, and some stated that it was important that they share their expertise to inform students on certain aspects of this event. A desire to support critical inquiry on the part of students was also cited by a number of faculty respondents (Table 8).

Table 8. Selected Faculty Responses to the Question: Why did you decide to teach a Perspectives on September 11 Seminar?*

- ◆ Out of civic duty! -- and a desire to explore some issues in an informal setting that I'd thought about a little bit but hadn't had time to look at thoroughly.
- ◆ The idea was excellent. I happened to have material (related to my research on language of tolerance) that was pertinent to such a course, and I liked the opportunity to contribute to a general issue, something [a scholar in my field] don't often get to do.
- ◆ I wanted to do something to help students respond intelligently.
- ◆ This is an issue of immense importance...considering the influence the US exercises throughout the world. At the same time, it is transparently clear to me that only certain, rather commonplace, perspectives are available in the media and even the scholarly world on the events of the Sept 11 and the larger issues of terrorism, American foreign policy, and global inequities, and I thought that I could make some useful interventions.
- ◆ I suppose primarily because I believe there should always be such opportunities for relatively informal discussion/learning among students and faculty. I hope the College continues to support such one-unit courses. Then of course I felt the need to do something constructive in response to the Sept. 11 events.
- It seemed like an interesting, innovative program.
- Because I wanted to give students an opportunity to discuss the issues on their mind, and to offer them a broader perspective on the events.
- The calls from the administrative side were effective in getting me to think about what a scientist could offer. The course series seemed like a good idea and I realized that talking about issues in life beyond science with undergraduates could be a very stimulating experience for me too.
- First, it was an opportunity for me to combine my areas of research with important current events. Second, it was a way for me to process the 9/11 aftermath in a critical way.

*Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

In general, the faculty believed that the seminar helped students form a better understanding of events leading to, and arising from, the September 11 tragedy. Many commented that their students learned

about broader contextual issues, while others felt their students were introduced to more specific cultural frameworks. Most believed that their students were better able to analyze critically information related to the events of September 11. However, faculty in the Winter seemed to speak more broadly about the development of students' critical thinking skills and less directly about the specific events of September 11th. A small number of faculty felt less confident that their students had become better informed on events related to September 11 and a few felt that students left with little or no better understanding of the events (Table 9).

Table 9. Selected Faculty Responses to the Question: How much do you think that this course helped students to understand better the events arising from the September 11 tragedy?*

-
- ◆ I think that they did appreciate the importance of learning about cultures different from their own, which prepares them better to live in a post-September 11 world.
 - ◆ I do believe that this course helped the students gain a better understanding of how important their role as artists or creative thinkers could be. This was clearly illustrated in their proposals for projects that they have been developing during the seminar.
 - ◆ It has marginally improved their understanding of the values in conflict, of the different ways in which the issues are presented from different perspectives (e.g., Islamist versus "Western"), and of some of the general historical issues involved.
 - ◆ We focused on a particular aspect, and I think we have been successful in thinking about issues such as the balance of security, privacy, and civil liberties, and the interconnection among so many parts of society that rely upon IT (e.g., telecommunications, finance, transportation, energy and water supplies, emergency services).
 - ◆ As one student said during discussion, "I like this class because I feel like I am learning stuff that is relevant to me and my life."
 - Students developed a more advanced understanding of the global environment in which the U.S. and other countries now operate.
 - I believe that this forum for continuing discussion of the events helped the students in two ways: (1) It allowed them to focus on particular elements of the tragedy and to increase their understanding perhaps to different degrees ("somewhat" to "quite a lot") through dialogue and writing, and (2) It provided a mode for addressing critical contemporary issues in an academic context.
 - On a superficial level, not very much; but on a deeper level, I hope it gave them a better idea about the widely different views that can exist about the roles of the U.S. in the world and a greater ability to understand issues from a variety of perspectives.
 - I have had very positive comments from them saying this was one of the best opportunities they've had at UCLA to learn about the rest of the world.
 - Given the feedback we got from the students in the course, it made them re-question and re-evaluate their value system.
-

*Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

Faculty members were enthusiastic about the level of student-faculty interaction in their seminars. Students were frequently described as motivated, engaged, and vocal. As one professor stated, "the group process was terrific..." The majority of faculty were pleased with the high level of student-faculty interaction. Some respondents noted that their students were less engaged than they would have liked, that the seminar ended up being more of a lecture than an interactive discussion, and that having only a one hour session made it difficult to get into very deep conversations.

Table 10. Selected Faculty Responses to Question: Seminars normally have greater student-faculty interaction than lecture courses. Could you comment on the amount and quality of the interaction you had with students in this seminar?*

- ◆ Conversation in the seminar has been constant, serious and productive of insights for the students. The size of the class and its connection to an issue of deep personal interest motivates an unusually high level of engagement.
 - ◆ This was the most intensely interactive class I have had at UCLA in the 3 years I have been here.
 - ◆ Most of our discussions were student driven. Students had ample opportunity to interact with each other. The quality of interaction was excellent. I believe this one unit seminar format should be expanded so many more students can have this opportunity.
 - ◆ I believe that one of the largest drawbacks to receiving an outstanding undergraduate education at UCLA are the large lecture courses. I believe that student learning takes place in small, seminars. In small discussions, students have to be encouraged to explore and must be challenged to go deeper with their ideas. Students are held accountable for their ideas in smaller group discussions. They must come to trust their own minds. Seminars encourage students to think and do.
 - ◆ The interaction among my students and myself has been powerful. In addition to class discussion, the students have email journals in which we have ongoing discussions.
 - ◆ About 40% of the class participated a lot, the rest were largely silent.
 - The interaction in the class was outstanding! Students not only learned from me but they learned from each other. Every student brought different forms of knowledge to the class and was able to share such knowledge.
 - It was a little hard to get them to talk for the first few minutes every week, but once they did they did not seem to want to stop. Frequently, the students stayed well past the 50 minutes of the official class time. I really enjoyed the interactions!
 - The quality of interactions with students was generally higher and of better quality than in a larger lecture course.
 - I think that it is difficult to develop a real rapport with 1 hour per week.
 - The amount and quality were satisfactory, but far less than what I experienced in the fall quarter.
 - We had an extreme amount of interaction.
-

*Diamonds denote Fall comments and boxes denote Winter comments.

CONCLUSIONS

Three broad evaluation statements can be drawn from the assessment evaluation of the Fall and Winter one-unit seminars.

First, the students and faculty reported that the one-unit seminars provided a unique opportunity to help students understand and critically analyze various aspects relating to the events of September 11. Most faculty respondents reported that they believed that the content of their seminar assisted students in critically analyzing and/or understanding the events surrounding the 9/11 tragedy. For instructors, teaching a seminar provided an opportunity to share knowledge about their field and perform what some perceived as their civic responsibility.

Second, students and faculty responded positively to the format of the one-unit seminars. Students valued opportunities for greater student-faculty interaction and enjoyed their discussions with a small group of peers. The faculty appreciated the high levels of student engagement, noting that many discussions were student driven and that students were highly motivated.

Third, most students and faculty who participated in the one-unit seminars indicated that they would do it again. Students felt that the seminars permitted them to explore a topic without overburdening them with the workload of a four-unit course.

In conclusion, UCLA's offering of one-unit seminars was highly praised by students and faculty. For some time, leaders in the College have wanted to increase opportunities for students to interact in small class settings with faculty. The culmination of a two-quarter study suggests that the one-unit seminar model provides an intimate learning environment that engages students, promotes active learning, and facilitates student-faculty interaction.

The success of this initial effort paved the way for UCLA to initiate a permanent seminar program in the Spring quarter, 2002. The program, titled *Fiat Lux* ("Let There Be Light"), will offer approximately 150 one-unit seminars in the 2002-2003 academic year (for course information go to <http://www.college.ucla.edu/fiatlux/default2.htm>). As the Chancellor of UCLA, Albert Carnesale stated in his invitation to the faculty to participate, "The Sept. 11 seminars helped our students comprehend the issues surrounding terrorism and its implications...Now, *Fiat Lux* will continue those critical links between faculty and undergraduates in the energized setting of small seminars, but through a much broader program of courses and topics."

PERSPECTIVES ON SEPTEMBER 11 SEMINARS OFFERED FALL 2001

The number in front of the instructor's name indicates the section number for Honors Collegium course 98. This number was set by the order in which the course proposals were received and approved. For a brief description of each seminar, see <http://www.college.ucla.edu/hnrs98/fallSeminars.htm>.

1. CARNESALE, Albert. *National Security in the 21st Century*
2. MANDEL, Joe. *Understanding, Respecting, and Honoring the First Amendment in a Terrorist Environment*
3. COPENHAVER, Brian. *War, Terror, and Violence: Reflecting on Machiavelli*
4. GARRETT, Geoffrey. *America as Hyperpower*
5. ALPERS, Edward. *Understanding the Unthinkable and Incomprehensible*
6. SABL, Andrew. *Justice and War: The Ethics of International Conflicts*
7. GRAHAM, Kenneth. *Beyond Tears: Evidence, Fact and Crisis*
8. GELVIN, James. *An 'East' and a 'West'? Thinking About the 'Clash of Civilizations'*
9. THOMPSON, Earl. *What the U.S. Should Do to Be Popular in the Third World*
10. Cancelled due to lack of enrollment.
11. PETERSEN, Carol. *Silence, Slogans, and Flags*
12. MANIQUIS, Robert. *Concepts of Terror in Western Culture, from the French Revolution to the Present*
13. YOKOYAMA, Olga. *At War with the Afghans and Chechens: The Russian Experience*
14. SCHABERG, David. *Literature as Mourning: China and Greece*
15. SMITH, Craig. *"Black Hawk Down: A Story of Modern War"*
16. WHEATLEY, Tom. *Perspectives on War and Terror and Responses thereto--through Theater, Art and Music*
17. WILSON, Reed. *Poetry and Loss*
18. DUBOIS, Ellen / APPLEBY, Joyce. *Historical Perspectives on September 11*
19. BURWICK, Frederick. *Fictions of Terror vs. Real Terror*
20. AGNEW, John. *Understanding the Taliban*
21. RAUSTIALA, Kal. *Law and the Use of Force*
22. SANLO, Ronni. *Privilege, Power, and Difference: Is Tolerance Enough?*
23. VESNA, Victoria. *The Role of Art and Technology in Times of War*
24. TOBIN, Alan / HADDA, Janet. *Echoes of Terror in Brain, Mind, and Literature*
25. RUIZ, Teofile. *The Terror of History: A Search for Justice*

26. NAGAMOTO, Alan. *Terror and Its Psychological Impact*
27. BOIME, Albert. *Navigating between Blithesome Optimism and Cultural Despair*
28. MOYA, Jose. *Reflections on Terrorism, Its Origins, and Consequences*
29. KING, Katherine. *"The Map of Love": An Exploration of Islam and the Colonial Experience*
30. THOMAS, Dominic. *International English-Language Newspaper Coverage*
31. DOBY, Winston. *Implications of World Crises for Student Stress and Academic Achievement*
32. GANS, Eric. *Culture and the Deferral of Violence*
33. BODROGLIGETI, Andras. *Bin Laden and Terrorism outside the U.S.: The Case of Uzbekistan*
34. SABAR, Yona. *Responses to National and Personal Tragedies in the Bible (Prophets and Psalms)*
35. WOLFENSTEIN, Victor. *Psychology of Group Identity*
36. HAMMEN, Constance. *Psychological Perspectives: Anxiety, Stress, and Depression*
37. PARHAM, William. *The World Conference against Racism: Illusion, Collusion, and/or Opportunity*
38. HALE, Sondra / HALE, Gerry. *The Search for Identity? Insurgent Islam and the Response of the West—The Sudanese Case*
39. GRIJALVA, Carlos. *Recognizing and Dealing with Stress during a Time of Crisis*
40. LAL, Vinay. *Terrorism and the Politics of Knowledge*
41. MAGEE, Judith. *Women's Participation in Political Violence*
42. BRUBAKER, Rogers. *Making Sense of the New World Disorder*
43. BORGMAN, Christine. *Information Technology and Infrastructure in Times of Crisis*
44. BARTCHY, Scott. *Honor and Shame and the Clash of Civilizations*
45. ROBINSON, Geoffrey/ WANG, Jessica. *Terror and the Dilemmas of American Power*
46. DUNKEL-SCHETTER, Chris. *Stress and Coping in the Aftermath of a National Disaster*
47. ZENTNER, Jules. *Terror and Society in Bergman's Films*
48. COVINGTON, Chandice. *What Do We Tell the Children?: Parenting Issues*
49. BERMEO, Adolfo. *The Struggle to Understand, the Struggle to Respond*
50. ROBINSON, Ralph. *Biological and Chemical Weapons: Assessing the Terrorist Threat*

PERSPECTIVES POST SEPTEMBER 11 SEMINARS OFFERED WINTER 2002

The number in front of the instructor's name indicates the section number for Honors Collegium course 98. This number was set by the order in which the course proposals were received and approved. For a brief description of each seminar, see <http://www.college.ucla.edu/hnrs98/winterSeminars.htm>.

1. CARNESALE, Albert. *Rethinking National Security*
2. GARRETT, Geoffrey. *America as Hyperpower*
3. GELVIN, James. *An 'East' and a 'West'? Thinking about the 'Clash of Civilizations'*
4. MERRIAM, John/CAMPBELL, John. *Utopian Visions about Human Biology*
5. PARHAM, William. *World Conference Against Racism: Illusions, Collusions, and/or Opportunities*
6. SABAR, Yona. *Responses to National and Personal Tragedies in the Bible*
7. SHOAF, Kimberley. *Public Health Responds to Disasters: Bioterrorism and More*
8. ROGOWSKI, Ronald. *Hoffer's "The True Believer": Reflections on a Modern Classic*
9. BODROGLIGETI, Andras. *Bin Laden and Terrorism outside the U.S.: Case of Uzbekistan*
10. YOKOHAMA, Olga. *Viewing the Other: Russia's Muslim Experience*
11. BURWICK, Frederick. *Fictions of Terror vs. Real Terror*
12. JAGER, Eric. *Literature and Violence*
13. PETERSEN, Carol. *Silence, Slogans, and Flags*
14. RHOADS, Robert. *Globalization and Its Discontents*
15. SANLO, Ronni. *Privilege, Power, and Difference: Is Tolerance Enough?*
16. WILSON, David. *Can Religious Fanaticism be Philosophically Justified?*
17. ZENTNER, Jules. *Issues on Campus*
18. GALATEANU, Georgiana. *Politics and Literature*
19. NAGAMOTO, Alan. *Terror and Its Psychological Impact*
20. ROBINSON, Ralph. *Biological and Chemical Weapons: Assessing the Threat*
21. OLSEN, Frances. *Civil Disobedience as an Alternative to Violence in the Middle East and the U.S.*
22. REIFF, Janice. *Remembering 9/11: Creating an Oral Archive*
23. MANIQUIS, Robert. *Terrorism in the Context of Modern Theories of Violence: Literature, Culture, Theory*
24. GANS, Eric. *Culture, Religion, and Deferral of Violence*
25. SALTZBERG, David. *Applications of Nuclear Physics to Counter-Terrorism*
26. POONAWALA, Ismail. *Islam and the West*

27. GOLDBERG, Robert. *Genetic Engineering Bioweapons: Reality or Hype?*
28. SCHWEIZER, Felix/WHITE, Stephanie. *Truth and Persuasion in Science*
29. FRIEND, Colleen. *Helping the Professional Helper*
30. WATSON, Robert. *War Stories*
31. MANDEL, Joseph. *Understanding, Respecting and Honoring the First Amendment in a Terrorist Environment*
32. MAGEE, Judith. *Women, Politics, and Violence*
33. HARRIS, Leigh. *Representations of Afgan Women in the Media*
34. HAKAK, Lev. *Responses to National and Personal Crises in Modern Hebrew Poetry in Translation*
35. BYERS, Nina./YAMAZAKI, James. *War in the Nuclear Age*
36. KERR, Ann. *Perceptions of America Abroad: Discussions with Visiting Fulbright Scholars from Around the World*
37. BARTCHY, Scott. *Honor and Shame in the Clash of World Cultures*