



ASSESSMENT

*of the*

*FIAT LUX*

FRESHMAN SEMINAR PROGRAM

Inaugural Year 2002-2003

**U C L A**

Undergraduate Education Initiatives  
Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research

October 15, 2003

## **A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S**

As with all of our efforts to improve undergraduate education at UCLA, the *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program has been collaborative effort. We owe a debt of gratitude to the faculty who stepped forward to offer the one-unit seminars in 2002-03 and to the dedicated efforts of the program coordinators, Judith Lacertosa and Beserat Hagos. This assessment report was a collaborative effort by individuals from several groups in the new Undergraduate Education Initiatives unit, which is headed by Assistant Vice Provost Lucy Blackmar. I am grateful to Dr. Marc Levis-Fitzgerald, the Director of the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER), and to Eric Splaver, Chief Information Officer-College Computing, for designing and administering the student and faculty surveys that are at the heart of the assessment. Dr. Levis-Fitzgerald was assisted by Dr. Kristen McKinney, an OUER post-doctoral fellow, who worked the initial surveys, and by Elaine Kuo and Carla Harclerod, OUER graduate student researchers, who analyzed the survey results and produced the quarterly reports. Data reported here were summarized by Ms. Kuo and Dr. Levis-Fitzgerald. Interpretation of the results benefited from the insights and writing of Dr. Sally Gibbons, Adjunct Assistant Professor-Philosophy and Freshman Cluster Program Instructional Coordinator.

Judith L. Smith  
Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education  
September 2003

## INTRODUCTION

The *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program was born out of the tragedy of September 11, when UCLA administrators and faculty recognized the urgent need to offer the UCLA community a way to come together to grapple with the complex issues and challenges—emotional, intellectual, social, and political—thrust upon the country and the world by those events. While it is always challenging for new freshmen to leave their homes and high schools to enter the world of the university, it was surely harder to do so for those who entered UCLA in 2001, two weeks after 9/11. With this in mind, UCLA created a series of one-unit seminars that invited faculty members to share their diverse knowledge and perspectives in a dialogue aimed especially at freshman students, thereby fostering both the sense of community and the understanding so sorely needed in those difficult times. By encouraging faculty and students to come together in small seminars to learn together how to understand the post-9/11 world, UCLA emphasized the vital importance of engagement as an antidote to fear and confusion. Indeed, engagement can be understood as being at the heart of much of higher education. Preserving the spirit of these original "September 11" seminars, the *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program continues to promote the notion that UCLA is a community of scholars and learners who engage together to shape new knowledge and understanding.

As the faculty members at a research university such as UCLA continually engage in discovering and creating new knowledge, they are themselves learners, in addition to being teachers and experts in their fields. The conversations that these faculty members have with freshman students foster a mutual engagement that, at its best, possesses at least three key elements. First, the seminar students and leader engage together intellectually to learn how to think about a specific idea, problem, text, or body of knowledge. Second, the seminar students discover how to learn through dialogue—that is, through conversation with the seminar leader, rather than through lecture. Finally, the seminar students learn how to learn from each other and discover that the interaction with their peers contributes as much to the learning of the course as does the student-faculty interaction. The ability to learn through dialogue in these ways is a specific and valuable skill that the pass/no-pass, one-unit seminar format is intended to promote.

This report assesses the *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program's inaugural year (2002-03) in order to understand the extent to which the program achieved these broad aims. The report reviews the reasons why both students and faculty chose to participate in these seminars and explores what both groups felt they gained from the experience. Comments from survey respondents about course design shed additional light upon those elements of the experience that were most successful in shaping the intellectual and interpersonal engagement that the program seeks to advance.

## METHODOLOGY

The Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER) worked closely with staff from College Information Services (CIS) to create and implement surveys that would provide data about student and faculty experiences in the *Fiat Lux* freshman seminars. Two different web-based surveys were created, one for student feedback and the other for faculty input (see Appendix B for copies of both surveys). Both surveys contained a combination of closed-ended and open-ended questions and explored participants' reasons for enrolling in or teaching a seminar, their perceptions of the academic atmosphere, and the amount and nature of interaction among students and faculty. Finally, students and faculty were asked if they would be interested in participating in another seminar.

The evaluation relied on the voluntary participation of students and faculty who participated in the 126 *Fiat Lux* seminars offered during each of three academic quarters in 2002-2003. During the eighth week of each quarter, all enrolled students received an email notification requesting their participation in the evaluation and reassuring them of anonymity in their responses. At the same time, faculty members received an email invitation that directed them to an on-line survey asking them about their experiences. Additional email reminders were sent to students and faculty to further increase the response rates. Faculty were also asked to make a class announcement encouraging student participation in the survey effort.

## PARTICIPANT PROFILE

A total of 1643 students and 127 faculty participated in 126 seminars during the 2002-2003 academic year.<sup>1</sup> The survey response rates were high, with 46% of the student participants and 66% of the faculty completing the on-line surveys (Table 1).

**Table 1. Survey Response Rates**

	Seminar Participants	Survey Respondents	Response Rate (%)
Students	1643	762	46
Faculty	127	84	66

<sup>1</sup> One seminar was taught jointly by two faculty members. In other cases, students and faculty enrolled in or taught in more than one seminar. Discounting repeat participants, there were 1447 students and 116 faculty involved. Students and faculty were given the opportunity to complete a separate survey for each seminar in which they took part. Therefore, the larger of these two numbers – the potential number of completed surveys – is used as a basis for descriptive calculations in this report.

## Student Profile

The students who responded to the survey were representative of the seminar participants along four key dimensions – gender, ethnicity, entry year, and divisional affiliation (Table 2). Females represented both a majority of those who enrolled in seminars (63%) and of those who responded to the survey (70%). A comparison of the reported ethnicity of student participants and respondents indicates a close match in ethnic breakdown.

The representative nature of the response rates is also reflected in the student participants' year of entry to UCLA, with over half of the participants and respondents being first-year students. Finally, the divisional affiliations of the survey respondents reflect the student participant population. The largest group of enrolled students was undeclared (29%) and these students composed 30% of survey respondents.

**Table 2. Comparison Profile of Student Participants and Survey Respondents**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>% of Student Participants (n=1643)</b>	<b>% of Survey Respondents (n=762)</b>
Female	63	70
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Caucasian/White	38	38
Asian American/Pacific Islander	36	37
Latino/Chicano	12	10
African American/Black	3	3
American Indian/Alaskan Native	<1	1
Other	2	2
Decline to State	9	9
<b>Academic Year Enrolled</b>		
2002-2003	65	68
2001-2002	22	21
2000-2001 or earlier	13	11
<b>Affiliation</b>		
Undeclared	29	30
Life Sciences	28	27
Social Sciences	22	22
Physical Sciences	9	9
Humanities	8	7
Professional Schools*	3	4
International Institute	1	1

\*Includes professional degree programs from the School of Arts & Architecture, the Henry Samueli School of Engineering & Applied Science, and the School of Theater, Film, and Television.

## Faculty Profile

All active ladder faculty were encouraged to participate in the *Fiat Lux* program and were offered a financial incentive (\$1500) to teach a seminar as an overload teaching assignment. Participants represented a wide range of academic disciplines and held a variety of positions across campus, including College faculty (61%), professional school faculty (17%), and administrators and staff without ladder faculty appointments (22%). Of the 127 faculty participants, there were eight instructors who taught more than one seminar. Half of these eight faculty participants offered the same topic over multiple quarters, while the other half changed their course focus.<sup>2</sup>

Faculty survey respondents were relatively representative of the participants (Table 3). Sixty-four percent of the respondents were College faculty, while professional school faculty represented 14% of the response rate, and others represented 22%. The seminar topics were grouped into three broad topical categories with the number of seminars in each indicated in parentheses: Arts & Humanities (52), Culture & Society (44), Science & Technology (30). More faculty who taught in the Arts & Humanities category (45%) responded to the survey than did those who taught in Culture & Society (28%) or Science & Technology (27%) seminars.

**Table 3. Comparison Profile of Faculty Participants and Survey Respondents**

Characteristics	% of Faculty Participants (n=127)	% of Survey Respondents (n=84)***
Unit Affiliation		
College Ladder Faculty	59	64
Professional School Ladder Faculty*	17 24	14 22
Others**		
Course Offered		
Arts & Humanities	41	45
Culture & Society	35	28
Science & Technology	24	27

\* Professional school ladder faculty represented the School of the Arts and Architecture, the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, the School of Law, the Geffen School of Medicine, the School of Public Health, the School of Public Policy and Social Research, and the School of Theater, Film and Television.

\*\*Others include administrators, emeriti, lecturers, and staff without faculty appointments.

\*\*\*Three respondents did not identify their unit affiliation.

<sup>2</sup> A full listing of the 2002-2003 Fiat Lux Freshman Seminars is included in Appendix A. For a description of each seminar, see <http://www.college.ucla.edu/fiatlux0203/>.

## RESULTS

The student and faculty surveys provided rich insights into both groups' experiences in the *Fiat Lux* program: survey respondents discussed why they chose to participate, the features of the course design that both promoted and limited their engagement with each other and the material, and the benefits they felt they received from participating. The most significant of these findings are presented below.

### Motivation for Participating

Both students and faculty viewed the opportunity to participate in *Fiat Lux* freshman seminars as a chance to be involved in a new curricular initiative, broadening their academic experiences. Students attributed their primary interest in enrollment to topic interest. Faculty, on the other hand, wanted to work with undergraduates in a more intimate environment and to impart information on a specific topic, while facilitating students' ability to learn through engagement in the seminar format.

Table 4 summarizes the top reasons for student enrollment. The majority (60%) selected interest in the course topic as their primary motivation while only a quarter (25%) indicated the more pragmatic concern with earning unit credit as their primary reason. Other motivations were far less common. Top secondary reasons, in addition to course topic interest (29%), included the fact that the course fit into their schedule (23%) and gave them the chance to get to know a faculty member (21%).

**Table 4. Student Reasons for Enrollment**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Primary Reason (%) (n=695)</b>	<b>Secondary Reason (%) (n=529)</b>
Thought that the topic would be interesting	60	29
Needed unit credit	25	13
Wanted honors units	8	11
Chance to get to know a faculty member	3	21
Fit into my schedule	2	23
Wanted honors transcript notation	1	2
Other	1	1

At least some of the students who enrolled in a *Fiat Lux* seminar for reasons other than academic interest seemed to be less engaged. As one student commented, “The class just filled an opening in my schedule and gave me enough units for Minimum Progress. I didn’t take it that seriously.” Another student noted, “I took this seminar in order to fulfill an extra [unit]. So far, the class has been interesting, but I don’t seem to be as enthusiastic about the subject matter as [others].”

On the other hand, the appeal of the course topic and availability of courses of interest positively affected student involvement and perception. A student who selected a course due to the topic offered explained, “This course gave me an excuse to explore a topic that I am interested in. I enjoyed the readings but even more, I enjoyed being involved in the class discussions.” Another student remarked:

I opted for a seminar course because I was tired of only learning about hard sciences. I selected this course because it fit into my schedule and was both interesting and relevant to my life. The course gave me a wider perspective on how others think on the basis of their private background and encouraged me to understand other prejudices that exist beyond the ones I am currently aware of. This course increased my understanding and tolerance of all people.

Given that interest in the course topic was the top reason for enrollment, it is not surprising that this factor had an impact on student perceptions of their seminar. The student comments reveal that these one-unit seminars allowed them to stretch their intellectual range, offering them insight and understanding in areas beyond their core academic interests.

Responding to the open question, “Why did you decide to teach in a *Fiat Lux* seminar?” faculty indicated a variety of reasons for participating. Their rationale included their interest in teaching a specific topic, the financial incentive (\$1500), the opportunity for course development/teaching experience, recruitment efforts by other faculty or administrators, the chance to work closely with first-year students, the desire to support this curricular effort, and previous experience with one-unit seminars. One faculty member identified a popular reason: “I was curious to learn a bit more about how some first-year students see the world.” Another expressed enthusiasm for creating a more intimate learning environment for first-year students while acknowledging the benefits of the incentive funds:

Because much of my interaction with first-year undergraduates is through the medium of a 105-person lecture course that is both

a requirement for our own majors and a GE class for non-majors, I wanted to teach a freshmen seminar that the students had chosen freely and genuinely wished to attend, and one in which we could have in-depth small group discussions of focused issues. The offer of some research funding was also a great bonus for a faculty member in the arts/humanities.

The interest in promoting an enriching academic experience for new UCLA students also led to opportunities for professional development. Faculty were able to challenge themselves in their own pedagogy and course development so that they could assist students in becoming more effective as learners. One instructor observed:

I've been struggling with a growing tension in my teaching. I want the students to do a fair amount of reading but they seem not to know how to read the materials very effectively, a phenomenon that leads them to do even less reading. The *Fiat Lux* provided a good opportunity to work in depth with one book and one set of sources so I could understand better how to help them understand issues of evidence, argument, and narrative.

Both students and faculty were asked whether, based on their experiences, they would consider taking part in another *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar (Table 5). This question served as a rough estimate of the success of these one-unit seminars by determining how many would be interested in being involved again. Of course, there may be reasons that individuals might choose not to participate again that do not reflect the success of the seminar experience, but instead have to do with issues such as scheduling, availability, and unit value. However, the fact that a substantial majority of students (78%) and faculty (86%) indicated that they would be willing to enroll in or teach another *Fiat Lux* seminar suggests that both groups viewed their experiences as rewarding.

**Table 5. Based on your experiences, would you participate in another one-unit seminar?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>% of Students (n=759)</b>	<b>% of Faculty (n=84)</b>
Yes	78	86
Maybe	19	3
No	3	11

## Course Design

Since *Fiat Lux* seminars are one-unit, pass/no-pass courses, faculty need to choose course topics suited to this format. Most faculty selected topics based on perceived accessibility of, personal familiarity with, or interest in the topic, or a desire to impart specific information or skills to students. As one faculty member noted, “I thought the students would find [the topic] meaningful.” Another saw the opportunity to expose students to the academic culture:

I chose the topic because it was within my realm of expertise and I thought it could provide stimulating discussion among students. And [I thought it] would provide a good framework for introducing undergraduate students to the process of academic research and discovery.

These aims were shared by other faculty members, not all of whom felt their chosen topic worked as well. One faculty member said, “I’m not sure how to encourage discussion on a scientific topic. Fifteen to seventeen students is a lot, and 50 minutes is very short, and the students have no background, so there’s much less discussion...” Other faculty members addressed this problem by trying to help students make connections between academic disciplines and current events. This instructor explained:

I know from experience that very few undergraduates, even in the life sciences, are informed about important environmental issues, or have been exposed to discussion of current important matters relating to these issues. The topic I selected and the new book I used as a text both dealt with such matters.

Another faculty member echoed this viewpoint, “I selected the subject because it is ... topical for the freshmen and ... causes them to view an aspect of popular culture from a fresh angle, in which ethical and representational issues they may not have previously considered loom large.”

As noted earlier in this report, most *Fiat Lux* seminars were offered as one-hour courses on a weekly basis or two-hour courses that met biweekly to a capped enrollment of 20 students per seminar. Some students found this structure to be helpful in promoting learning; others felt the time constraints to be restrictive. For example, one student explained, “It was a very interesting course that the professor tried to involve everyone in. I think the biggest drawback is that it is only one hour, for ten weeks, which does not leave much time for in-depth study.” These students believed the time limitation affected the amount of material covered as well as the ability to have fuller discussions. On the other hand, there were many students who felt they benefited from the abbreviated course structure. One

student commented, “This course allowed me to learn about poetry without having to write lengthy papers or do extensive work. I learned a lot and was exposed to different poets.” Another student said:

I really enjoyed the small class size and the fact that the seminars were often question-answer based in that students could actually come up with interesting questions to ask of the professors. The interaction is amazing and allows for a completely different learning style than “normal” lecture halls (especially when you are a science major with classes ranging from 150-400).

Some faculty members noted the frustration they felt with the one-hour time frame, explaining that they believed this limitation affected the quality of interaction and the amount of material that could be covered. Here is one faculty perspective:

I have mixed feelings about how this seminar has gone. I would identify the following problem areas: 1) my difficulty adjusting to the one hour a week format, 2) the wide variation in investment in the course on the part of students, 3) the format itself.

Others supported this comment, noting that the pass/no-pass feature could lead to inconsistent class attendance and students’ failure to keep up with assigned readings. Those who felt successful in working with the time constraints and grading scheme selected topics that were lively or controversial, promoted open discussion and questioning, and required brief assignments that encouraged student interaction (e.g., class discussion board or 10-minute class presentations).

## **Benefits of Participating**

### ***Intellectual Engagement***

Student responses reveal that roughly three-fourths of the students felt the *Fiat Lux* seminar experience had increased their academic understanding and interest in the course topic “very much” or “quite a bit” (Table 6). Similarly, about two-thirds of the respondents felt that their seminar challenged them to think critically about the material. These results suggest that most students were academically engaged with the intellectual content of their seminar.

**Table 6. Student Perceptions of Course Content**

	% of Student Responses		
	Very Much/ Quite a Bit	Some/ Very Little	Not at All
To what extent did this seminar increase your understanding of the subject area? (n=762)	77	22	1
How would you rate your interest in the course content now compared to when you started the course? (n=762)	73	26	1
To what extent do you feel this seminar challenged you to think critically about the subject area? (n=760)	66	32	2

Students tended to feel that the more successful seminars avoided covering too much material in order to emphasize student discussion. This was especially pertinent, given that these seminars usually met only one hour per week. One student commented, “I think that the professor did a good job at doing a few poems in depth instead of trying to fit too much into too short a time.” Another student also appreciated a more focused approach that played down grades and assignments:

The content of the course was very instructive. Not only was the course very simple, but it made you learn a lot if you chose to take it seriously. I loved the course and I felt that it emphasized the fact that education should not be based on extremely difficult assignments and constant grading.

A third student agreed that focusing the seminar on discussion and debate about the topic during the seminar session, rather than on out-of-class assignments, was effective:

The format of our course was discussion. Our professor did not require any written papers or proposals. I feel like I was asked some difficult questions during discussion and I had to think hard to respond. ...[T]he professor really did a good job proving [sic] issues and pushing us students to think about things critically. She really challenged us to look at issues from different perspectives and consider them in different ways.

In contrast, when the professor was anxious to convey a large amount of information and privileged this activity over discussion, students felt they got less out of the class. As one student explained, “[The] professor talked a lot and we were so focused on doing all the required assignments that I think we forgot to look at the interesting aspects of the readings.”

Faculty enthusiasm and encouragement served to foster student interest in the course content. In many cases, students believed they learned more about the topic when the faculty member was engaged and interested in the course and students. One student commented, “The professor was very passionate about the subject and that passion transferred itself onto [the] students.” Another student provided a fuller account of the value of the instructor’s enthusiasm:

The class seemed like it could be very boring given its topic and my lack of interest and knowledge in that topic. To my complete surprise, the class turned out to be extremely interesting and a discussion I looked forward to every week. I know this is mainly due to the wonderful, exciting, and engaging professor we had leading the discussion, who seemed thoroughly interested in his topic as well as the students in the classroom.

Conveying interest in one’s topic is clearly vital to any teaching enterprise, but in the seminar context, the need to do so while avoiding lecturing presents an additional challenge. Because lower division undergraduates are typically unfamiliar with their responsibilities as discussants in a seminar, and because most students who enrolled in these seminars were covering unfamiliar subjects, some instructors did fall back on lecturing to fill both the silence and the holes in knowledge. As indicated above, the lecture approach was not well received by students. One student noted, “I had hoped for more of an equal exchange between the students and the professor, but the format of the course was similar to my lecture courses except smaller.” Another said, “Most of class has been spent listening to our professor talk. He is a very interesting person to listen to, but he doesn’t really encourage us to talk. He does say that he doesn’t like how quiet the class is, but I don’t know if he realizes he doesn’t really give us a chance to speak.”

Despite some complaints about course design and delivery, many students felt they learned a great deal from their seminars—including ideas and ways of thinking that they would benefit from in years to come. As this student remarked:

Our class got into heated debate about the implications human genetics will have in the future. The most important part of the class is that it did not tell us how to think, it was more of a forum to present all of the different opinions so we would discuss them. The insight I gained by my seminar course

influences the way I perceive our place in history, in this beginning of the genetic revolution.

In some cases, this new awareness affected students' personal and academic development. One student commented:

I was very interested in the course to start and even more interested now that it's almost over. I have never thought that critically about movies I have watched. I have learned a new technique to use when watching movies. I loved the class. I also feel more comfortable about discussing, a trait I was not able or encouraged to use in my science classes.

Another student concluded, "I really enjoyed this course. It tied in directly to the material I am learning in my other courses and it was a good opportunity to ask questions and clarify things from those other classes."

These kinds of experiences helped students appreciate that academic learning could be integrated and integrating—across fields and across academic and personal aspects of life. The possibility to effect this broad and meaningful kind of intellectual engagement was something some faculty aimed explicitly to achieve. As one faculty member reflected, "Students said they were surprised and encouraged to find such a class available to them here at UCLA. They found immediate connections between our subject and their own lives, cultures, histories, and values."

What many of these comments suggest is that in the one-unit seminar, students engage most successfully with the intellectual substance of the course when it is presented not so much as material to master but as ideas with which to engage through critical dialogue. This underscores the importance of student-faculty interaction to the success of these seminars.

### ***Student-Faculty Interaction***

Student survey respondents indicated that, compared to their experience in lectures, the *Fiat Lux* seminars provided a higher interaction rate with faculty (86%) and with their fellow classmates (60%). Seventy percent of the student respondents also reported that they felt the seminar encouraged discussion "very much" or "quite a bit."

Although it is not surprising that a seminar would involve more student-faculty interaction than would a lecture course, the *Fiat Lux* seminars invited a specific kind of interaction—informal and unthreatening—in those instances where

faculty chose to encourage it. One faculty member explained the effects of this strategy: “Since my teaching style in this seminar has been informal and minimally directive, I think the students have been engaged; they have certainly talked more.” A student noted, “The professor encouraged us to speak critically about our readings, [which] were interesting and related to our everyday life. He never thought our discussions were irrelevant to the course.” Another student reflected:

I feel that it is a difficult subject to talk about but the professor created a safe and open environment for discussion. I feel that I got a little about everything but there is so much more to learn. It brought to question some of my beliefs.

As discussed in the previous section, faculty who received the most positive feedback were those who were less focused on the amount or range of material covered and more focused on providing students with opportunities to connect the slice of information presented with their own lives and current understandings.

Some seminar instructors recognized that the students were not initially prepared for a course conducted on the basis of class discussion, and they described strategies for promoting this form of learning. One said, “It took two to three sessions before the undergraduates caught on to how a seminar differs from a lecture course. Most of them had never had a seminar before, and we spent some time discussing this during the first two sessions.” Another effectively used a field trip to ground discussion:

Without exception, the students initially lacked the background for discussion purposes...the field trip served to open many eyes to evidence that they have only heard about, but which is very much a part of their broader environment.

Another described a more pragmatic approach: “The students gained confidence and comfort with discussions as the course developed. The course was held late afternoon, and they often seemed very tired. I found that bringing cookies helped raise their blood sugar and the level of discourse.” Yet another instructor said, “I have them prepare questions for each session, which I think helps them in discussion.” One instructor helped students prepare for the seminar slightly differently:

For each of the weekly reading assignments, two students gave oral reports. Because the topic was thus introduced by students, it was easy to engage student discussion. By delegating the reports, I could function more as a facilitator or mediator. If I felt that the ideas presented by students needed amplification or revision, I called upon other students to provide suggestions.

The students themselves recognized that their discussion in the seminar was often the product of the instructor's helping them prepare in advance for their contribution:

Everyone had to lead a discussion, and before leading a discussion, the professor had ask[ed] us to meet with him to discuss the topic beforehand. People were usually paired to lead discussion so it allowed for students to work together. Also, during discussion, students were better able to interact and voice their opinion and be able to be heard.

A second student commented, "We had weekly email assignments to which the professor would reply back. Also, since it was a small group, the professor knew all our names and it was a lot more personal than other classes."

While most of the instructors enjoyed the opportunity to interact with a small group of undergraduates, some felt they did not achieve high quality discussions about their topics. One faculty member said:

The interaction is pleasant but not particularly intellectual or deep. The students are essentially still high school pupils and "feel" more readily than they think. Intellectually, senior and graduate seminars have MUCH more academic and intellectual substance. Frosh are immediate, spontaneous, and delightful but one unit, once a week, with limited amounts of reading results in enjoyable but limited thoughtful analysis.

Although this faculty member may accurately capture the unfamiliarity of freshmen with discussion-oriented learning, the limits of the one-unit format, and the consequent limits on the level of sophistication freshmen can achieve in this context, these comments also suggest the value of introducing freshmen to this kind of learning.

For many students, the *Fiat Lux* seminar provided an opportunity to develop a richer relationship with faculty. The following student emphasized the value of having a faculty member display concern for the whole person and how this support enhanced the course by encouraging students to participate in discussion:

[The] professor began every session by inquiring as to how we were doing in the quarter, if we were stressed, and how we were getting along in general. He took a genuine interest in our well-being and was very reassuring. When we had discussions, he often reaffirm[ed] our statements with his own knowledge and asked us to give our own thoughts on various topics.

Students enjoyed the familiarity between faculty and students, the availability of professors during and outside of class hours, and the opportunity to express their

opinions and engage in dialogue with a faculty member. One student explained, “Interaction with other students can happen in almost any discussion section. It is the interaction with the professor that REALLY mattered here. To have a person with such a high-level faculty position know my name was phenomenal.” This comment suggests the importance for first-year students to feel a sense of belonging within the academic culture.

### ***Peer Interaction***

As discussed above, students felt they interacted more with faculty members than with their peers in the seminars. Among survey respondents, the lower rate of peer interaction was often attributed to student reticence and unfamiliarity with the discussion environment, rather than a lack of faculty effort and initiative. One student explained:

The professor encouraged discussion a lot, and at first no one spoke up. But eventually we started discussion and the quality was usually pretty good, [largely] due to the fact that the professor was earnest in having us discuss, since we were all pretty nervous and felt like we weren’t knowledgeable about the subject.

Several students noted that the atmosphere became more comfortable toward the end of the quarter. For example, one student said, “There was never enough time to talk about everything and by the time people started to get comfortable enough it was Week Seven. Longer classes or more frequent [meetings] would have been better.” Other students drew connections between their interactions with the instructor and those among students. One student said, “I felt able to approach the professor and when I did, I was rewarded with friendly, interesting discussion. I also felt free to talk to the other students about the course and other activities on and off-campus.” Another student noted, “I have never had so much interaction between faculty and students as I have had in this course. It’s been one of the rare occasions when I’ve actually gotten the chance to learn everyone’s name.”

Faculty feedback echoed student perceptions about student hesitation regarding class participation. One faculty member stated, “Students were shy about doing work with each other in class; I had to press them to.” Another concurred, “A couple [students] expressed that they were uncomfortable saying things that might be offensive to others—they just seemed way too uncomfortable with risking engagement.” Other instructors, however, noticed a progression in students’ interest in their peers, “There was initially less student-student interaction than I am accustomed to seeing in [similar] classes. Only two of the students knew each

other before the quarter started and most [students] came from many different majors. Seeing them get to know each other has been very satisfying.”

Many faculty members discussed their desire to work harder in future seminars to increase the level of student-student interaction. One faculty member commented:

It was difficult to engage the students in a discussion; this group was particularly passive. I tried to keep the workload for the students low, but next time I would give more readings and provoke reactions by giving them more responsibility for the class discussion.

Another remarked, “There was much less student-student interaction in this session. Next time around, I’ll structure the class in such a way as to provide more interaction among the students themselves.” Other instructors suggested strategies to encourage student-student interaction such as covering less material, selecting a more accessible topic, establishing clear seminar expectations, and encouraging more class dialogue.

In some cases, the lack of success in promoting student interaction had more to do with the physical environment than the actual course. Certain classrooms were more suited to a lecture course than a seminar discussion. For example, one faculty member noted, “The classroom setting with chairs attached to the floor turned out to be detrimental to discussion. The atmosphere improved when in the third week I asked the participants to sit only on the chairs that are around the border of the room and to twist their bodies to face the group.” While this faculty member was successful in coping with the classroom restrictions, her solution could not have been a completely comfortable one. Clearly, the emphasis on interaction needs to be supported by the physical space.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

A majority of students felt they benefited tremendously from the *Fiat Lux* freshman seminar experience. This report demonstrates that these benefits took a variety of forms. For some students, the course stimulated interest in keeping up with world events. For others, the course helped them become more attuned to the values and beliefs of their families, communities, and cultures. Still others found their voices in comfortable settings for discussion. All these experiences indicate that the *Fiat Lux* seminars provided a dynamic and supportive classroom experience that often led to fruitful intellectual exchanges and academic growth. The opportunity to learn through dialogue and debate rather than lecture was the most significant feature of the experience for many students.

Faculty indicated that the *Fiat Lux* seminars prompted them to think about teaching differently in order to achieve the kind of engaged learning the program seeks to foster while accommodating both the course structure and the inexperience and self-consciousness of first-year students. As discussed above, faculty reported using a variety of pedagogical techniques to facilitate student engagement, including student presentations, field trips, class discussion boards and email postings, and debates.

In those seminars that were less successful in engaging students in learning through dialogue, student and faculty respondents pointed to a number of problems. Perhaps the primary problem was the tendency of faculty to lecture at the expense of promoting discussion. Since this approach may have been prompted by the inexperience of the students both with discussion and with the topic, future *Fiat Lux* seminar leaders might consider a number of remedies. First, the instructor might employ some of the techniques listed above to facilitate discussion. Second, the instructor might tailor the topic to increase discussion by limiting its scope and, where appropriate, emphasizing its connections to students' lives and contemporary issues. Finally, the instructor can approach the class armed with the knowledge that these students are new to the seminar experience. This might allow the faculty member to be patient with silence while helping students acquire the comfort with and skills for discussion-based learning.

These efforts to encourage discussion and limit lecture could also serve the goal of increasing student-student interaction. Students felt there was less of this than student-faculty interaction, and faculty noted its absence, as well. Given that students are primed to respond to the instructor, not each other, this outcome is not surprising. But given the goals of the program, faculty need to make an extra

effort to encourage students to treat each other not just as individuals interacting in separate dyadic relations with the instructor, but as peers from whom to learn and with whom to interact. Many of the suggestions above about how to facilitate discussion are pertinent here. Explicit comments from instructors on the value of student-student interaction might also raise students' consciousness about this aim of the program.

In summary, student and faculty reflections on the inaugural year of the *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program yields evidence that this curricular opportunity has provided opportunities for engaged learning. Participants were involved in a unique class format in which undergraduates—primarily first-year students—were encouraged to engage directly with faculty and peers. This offered students another, more dialogical way of learning than that which is available in standard lecture courses. As a result, students were challenged to learn through engagement and dialogue. Student comments consistently emphasized that they recognized the benefits of participating in small discussion-oriented classes that helped them develop their critical thinking and argumentation skills while engaging intellectually and socially with students and faculty. The *Fiat Lux* Freshman Seminar Program inaugural year has thus clearly achieved significant success in promoting the engaged learning it seeks to provide first year students at UCLA.

## APPENDIX A

### FIAT LUX SEMINARS OFFERED 2002-2003

For a brief description of each seminar, see <http://www.college.ucla.edu/flatlux/>.

#### ARTS & HUMANITIES

Name/Affiliation	Title	Quarter Offered
Lyle Bachman, Applied Linguistics/TESL	<i>Language Tests: Gatekeepers or Door Openers?</i>	Sp03
Carol Bakhos, Near Eastern Languages & Cultures	<i>In the Beginning: Reading the Book of Genesis</i>	W03
Charles Lynn Batten, English	<i>Reading William Hogarth's Art</i>	W03
David Blank, Classics	<i>The Emperor and the Slave: The Stoic Philosophy of Life According to Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius</i>	Sp03
Andras Bodrogligeti, Near Eastern Languages & Cultures	<i>Fundamentalism or Restoration of Eroded Islamic Values</i>	F02
Roger Bourland, Music	<i>Mysticism in Classical Music</i>	Sp03
Fred Burwick, English	<i>Ghost Stories and the Rise of Experimental Psychology</i>	F02; W03; Sp03
Linda Duke, Hammer Museum	<i>Looking, Thinking, and Communicating through Art</i>	F02
Eric Gans, French & Francophone Studies	<i>Anti-Semitism: Old, New, and Right this Minute</i>	F02, W03
Georgiana Galateanu, Slavic Languages & Literature	<i>Politics and Literature</i>	W03
Sander M. Goldberg, Classics	<i>Families under Glass</i>	F02
Robert Gurval, Classics	<i>Representing Cleopatra: History, Drama, and Film</i>	W03
Thomas Harrison, Italian	<i>Cinema and Conscience: Italian Neorealism</i>	W03
Barbara Herman, Philosophy	<i>Ethics in the Movies</i>	Sp03
Laurie H. Hutzler, Film & Television	<i>Growing up at the Movies</i>	Sp03

<b>Robert Israel, School of Arts &amp; Architecture; Theater</b>	<i>Design Process: The Premiere of Nicholas and Alexandra for the Los Angeles Opera</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Eric Jager, English</b>	<i>Literature and Violence</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Sharon King, Medieval &amp; Renaissance Studies Center</b>	<i>City Tragedy: Los Angeles, New York and Their Predecessors</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Sharon King, Medieval &amp; Renaissance Studies Center</b>	<i>Farce: The Medieval Sitcom</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Raymond Knapp, Musicology</b>	<i>Staging Race in the American Musical</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Kathleen L. Komar, Comparative Literature</b>	<i>Kafka's Short Fiction--or How Does the Modern World Work?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Robert Maniquis, English</b>	<i>Historical Violence and Literature</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Pamela Munro, Linguistics</b>	<i>Words: Can Never Hurt Me?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Vincent Pecora, English</b>	<i>So, What is a Religion Anyway?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Carol Petersen, Academic Affirmative Action Office</b>	<i>"The Biography of Mexican Painting": A Mural by Raul Anguiano</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Carol Petersen, Academic Affirmative Action Office</b>	<i>Transparencies: Films by UCLA Students</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Ismail Poonawala, Near Eastern Languages &amp; Cultures</b>	<i>The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Donald Preziosi, Art History</b>	<i>Museums &amp; the Fabrication of Identity: A Critical Investigation</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Helen Rees, Ethnomusicology</b>	<i>World Musics on the Move</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Kenneth Reinhard, English</b>	<i>Jewish American Short Fiction: Particular, Universal, and Individual</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Karen Rowe, English</b>	<i>Origins of Identity: History and Memory</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>David Schaberg, East Asian Languages &amp; Cultures</b>	<i>Chinese Strategies</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Ross Shideler, Comparative Literature/Scandinavian</b>	<i>Poets and Desire</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Carol Sorgenfrei, Theater</b>	<i>Performing Nuclear Holocaust: Japanese Theater after Hiroshima</i>	<b>Sp03</b>

<b>Timothy Tangherlini, Scandinavian</b>	<i>Urban Legends: The Politics of Narrative</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Dominic Thomas, French &amp; Francophone Studies</b>	<i>Africa in a Global Context</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Jesús Torrecilla, Spanish &amp; Portuguese</b>	<i>From Colonial Power to Exotic Land: The Change of Spanish Identity in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Edward F. Tuttle, Italian</b>	<i>Language and Ethnicity</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Robert Walser, Musicology</b>	<i>Louis Armstrong and the Ascent of Jazz</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Willeke Wendrich, Near Eastern Languages &amp; Cultures</b>	<i>Foreigners in Ancient Egypt</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Tom Wheatley, Theater</b>	<i>Tours to and Discussions of Free Campus and Near Campus Artistic Venues</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Thomas Wortham, English</b>	<i>The Public Huck Finn: Why We Misread Mark Twain</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Richard Yarborough, English</b>	<i>Word Up: The Oral Tradition in African American Poetry</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Olga T. Yokoyama, Slavic Languages &amp; Literature</b>	<i>The Language of Advertising</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Olga T. Yokoyama, Slavic Languages &amp; Literature</b>	<i>Superstitions around You</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Jules Zentner, Scandinavian</b>	<i>“The Hobbit”: Tolkien’s View of Good &amp; Evil in the Community</i>	<b>F02; Sp03</b>
<b>Jules Zentner, Scandinavian</b>	<i>“The Fellowship of the Ring”: Tolkien’s View of Good and Evil in the Community</i>	<b>W03; Sp03</b>

---

## CULTURE & SOCIETY

Name/Affiliation	Title	Quarter Offered
Edward Alpers, History	<i>Where Do You Come From? Diversity and Identity in America?</i>	F02
S. Scott Bartchy, History	<i>Honor &amp; Shame in the Clash of World Cultures &amp; Religions</i>	W03
Kathleen Bawn, Political Science	<i>The Logic of Political Strategy: Making and Breaking Coalitions</i>	Sp03
David A. Binder, Law	<i>Legal Disputes and Arguments</i>	W03
Cameron Campbell, Sociology	<i>The Traditional Chinese Family: Myth and Reality</i>	F02
Albert Carnesale, Chancellor	<i>Rethinking National Security</i>	W03
Denis Cosgrove, Geography	<i>Remembering through Landscape – Place and Memory in Los Angeles</i>	W03
Randall Crane, Urban Planning	<i>Sprawl: The American Dream, or Nightmare?</i>	Sp03
Robert Emerson, Sociology	<i>Rehabilitation and the Crisis of Contemporary Juvenile Justice</i>	F02
Esther Grassian, College Library	<i>How I Learned to Stop Just Googling... and Find the Really Good Stuff!</i>	Sp03
Gail Kennedy, Anthropology	<i>The Origin of Modern Humans: Who Are We and Why Are We the Dominant Species on This Planet?</i>	W03
Ann Kerr, Visiting Fulbright Coordinator	<i>Perceptions of American from Abroad: Discussions with Visiting Fulbright Scholars</i>	W03
Kenneth Klee, Law	<i>Debt and Forgiveness: United States Consumer Bankruptcy Policy</i>	F02
Mark Kleiman, Policy Studies	<i>Drugs, Drug Abuse, and Drug Policy</i>	W03
Mark Kleiman, Policy Studies	<i>When to Throw Away the Key: "Three Strikes and You're Out" and Crime Control Policy</i>	Sp03
Paul Kroskrity, Anthropology	<i>Endangered Languages and You</i>	F02
Vinay Lal, History	<i>Knowledge and Its Categories: Terrorism and Invisible Holocausts in the Twenty-first Century</i>	W03

<b>Larry Loehrer, Office of Instructional Development</b>	<i>Creating Identity from Traditional Culture</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Karl James Lorenzen, Undergraduate Research Center for Life &amp; Physical Sciences</b>	<i>Unearthing Maya History: Archaeology of Ancient Maya Ritual and Religion</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Judith Magee, Urban Planning</b>	<i>Women Rebuilding Los Angeles: Creating an Alternative Vision of Urban Development in the Post-April 1992 Environment</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Glen McDonald, Geography</b>	<i>Los Angeles: Environment and the Architecture and the Form of the City</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>David McFarland, Sociology</b>	<i>Slide Rules, Punch Cards, and Relatives: How Computing Used to be Done</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Barbara J. Nelson, Public Policy &amp; Social Research</b>	<i>Democracy and Representation: Who Represents Us in Congress?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Kathy O'Byrne, Center for Experiential Education &amp; Service Learning</b>	<i>After-School Movement in L.A. Public Schools: Challenges and Controversy</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Frances Olsen, Law</b>	<i>Legal Recognition of Race and Ethnicity: A Critical Appraisal Using U.S. and African Examples</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Antony Orme, Geography</b>	<i>Living on the Edge: Earthquake Hazard in Southern California</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Theodore Porter, History</b>	<i>Scientific Revolutions</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Janice Reiff, History</b>	<i>Race, Religion, and Region: The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>William Roy, Sociology</b>	<i>Music and Social Identity</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Robert Rhoads, Education</b>	<i>Student Activism and Social Change in the Academy</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Teofilo Ruiz, History</b>	<i>Utopias and Dystopias in the Western Tradition</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Catherine Sammons, Social Welfare and Jayne Spencer, History</b>	<i>Deconstructing Our Reactions to Disability and Difference: Brain, Body, and Society</i>	<b>F02</b>

<b>Ronni Sanlo, Center for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, &amp; Transgender Studies</b>	<i>LGBT is Not a Sandwich, or Straight Talk about Gay Issues in America</i>	<b>W03; Sp03</b>
<b>Chaim Seidler-Feller, Sociology &amp; Near Eastern Languages &amp; Cultures</b>	<i>Isaac Encounters Ishmael: On the Relationship between Islam and Judaism</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Monica L. Smith, Anthropology</b>	<i>Archaeology and Identity: Ancient Ruins as Points of Consensus and Flashpoints for Conflict</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Kirk J. Stark, Law</b>	<i>How Much Do We Deserve?-- Inequality and U.S. Tax Policy</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>William R. Summerhill, History</b>	<i>Conflict and International Peacekeeping in the 1990s</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Stanley Trimble, Geography</b>	<i>American Rivers: History of Environmental Change</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Lynn Vavreck-Lewis, Political Science</b>	<i>Campaign Advertising -- What Works and Why?</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Eugene Volokh, Law</b>	<i>Gun Control</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Hartmut Walter, Geography</b>	<i>Biogeography of S. Cruz Island: Field Analysis of Critical Conservation Issues</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Virginia Walter, Information Studies</b>	<i>Images of War in Literature for Children</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Scott L. Waugh, History</b>	<i>The Black Death</i>	<b>Sp03</b>

---

## SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Name/Affiliation	Title	Quarter Offered
Kirby A. Baker, Mathematics	<i>Mystery of the Primes</i>	Sp03
Aaron Blaisdell, Psychology	<i>Perceiving Our Visual World: A Bird's Eye View</i>	F02
Don Blasius, Mathematics	<i>Cryptography Today</i>	W03
Ken Bradley, Microbiology, Immunology & Molecular Genetics	<i>Biology of Anthrax and Other Biological Warfare Agents</i>	Sp03
Lisa Carroll, Biomedical Library	<i>How I Learned to Stop Just Googling... and Find the Really Good Stuff!</i>	Sp03
Susan Cochran, Epidemiology	<i>Keeping Safe, Staying Sane: Sexual Orientation and Health</i>	F02
Audrey Cramer, Undergraduate Research Center for Life & Physical Sciences	<i>Advanced Life Support Systems for Space Travel</i>	F02
Robert Fovell, Atmospheric Sciences	<i>Severe Weather</i>	W03
Ralph R. Frerichs, Epidemiology	<i>Deadly Terror</i>	W03
Robert B. Goldberg, Molecular, Cell & Developmental Biology	<i>Ethical Implications of Genetic Engineering</i>	Sp03
Malcolm Gordon, Organismic Biology, Ecology, & Evolution	<i>Does the Biosphere Have a Future? If It Does Not, Do We?</i>	W03
Carlos Grijalva, Psychology	<i>Stress! Causes, Symptoms, and Remedies</i>	F02
Thomas C. Harmon, Civil & Environmental Engineering	<i>You Are What You Drink: How Safe Is Your Water?</i>	Sp03
Eric Hurwitz, Epidemiology	<i>Shots for Tots: Science and Ethics of U.S. and Global Childhood Immunization Programs</i>	W03
Herbert Kaesz, Chemistry & Biochemistry	<i>Serendipity in Science</i>	F02
Kent L. Hill, Microbiology, Immunology & Molecular Genetics	<i>Malaria, Dengue Fever, African Sleeping Sickness: Reemergent Vector-borne Disease</i>	Sp03
Patricia Keating, Linguistics	<i>The Science of the Singing Voice</i>	Sp03

<b>Traci Mann, Psychology</b>	<i>The Psychology of Eating</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Steven Margulis, Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</b>	<i>Great Projects: The Building of America</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Edward R.B. McCabe, Medicine, Pediatrics &amp; Human Genetics</b>	<i>Storefront Genome</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Michel Melkanoff, Computer Science</b>	<i>Language, Community, and Thought</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>John Merriam, Molecular, Cell, &amp; Developmental Biology</b>	<i>Utopian Visions of Human Biology</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Anthony F. Mills, Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering</b>	<i>Energy and the Environment</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Mark Moldwin, Earth &amp; Space Sciences</b>	<i>The Perils of Living in Space: An Introduction to the Earth's Space Environment</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Kenneth Nagy, Organismic Biology, Ecology, &amp; Evolution</b>	<i>Animal Adaptations to Deserts</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Peter Nonacs, Organismic Biology, Ecology, &amp; Evolution</b>	<i>Darwinian Medicine: How Natural Selection Helps Us Understand Why We Get Sick</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Ann Peplau, Psychology</b>	<i>The Psychology of Loneliness and Love</i>	<b>W03</b>
<b>Philip Rundel, Molecular Medicine &amp; Organismic Biology, Ecology, &amp; Evolution</b>	<i>Preserving Biodiversity: Public Policy and Science</i>	<b>F02</b>
<b>Juana Sanchez, Statistics</b>	<i>Playing with Chance</i>	<b>Sp03</b>
<b>Ashwin Vasavada, Earth &amp; Space Sciences</b>	<i>How Science and Scientists Serve Society</i>	<b>F02</b>

---

## APPENDIX B

### FIAT LUX SEMINAR: STUDENT SURVEY

#### Content of the Course

- 1) Why did you choose to enroll in this seminar? Of the six reasons that follow, specify two, in order of importance.
- |                                                 |                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| A: needed unit credit                           | D: wanted honors transcript notation      |
| B: thought that the topic would be interesting; | E: wanted honors units                    |
| C: fit into my schedule                         | F: chance to get to know a faculty member |
- 2) To what extent did this seminar increase your understanding of the subject area?
- |           |             |      |             |            |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
| Very much | Quite a bit | Some | Very little | Not at all |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
- 3) How would you rate your interest in the course content now compared to when you started the course?
- |           |             |      |             |            |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
| Very much | Quite a bit | Some | Very little | Not at all |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
- 4) To what extent do you feel this seminar encouraged discussion?
- |           |             |      |             |            |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
| Very much | Quite a bit | Some | Very little | Not at all |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
- 5) To what extent do you feel this seminar challenged you to think critically about the subject area?
- |           |             |      |             |            |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
| Very much | Quite a bit | Some | Very little | Not at all |
|-----------|-------------|------|-------------|------------|
- 6) Please comment on your answers to questions 3-6, reflecting on both the content and the format of the course.

#### Interaction in the Course

- 7) Seminars normally have greater student-faculty interaction than lecture courses. Was this true in your course?
- |     |       |    |
|-----|-------|----|
| Yes | Maybe | No |
|-----|-------|----|
- 8) Seminars also normally have greater student-student interaction than lecture courses. Was this true in your course?
- |     |       |    |
|-----|-------|----|
| Yes | Maybe | No |
|-----|-------|----|
- 9) Please comment on the amount and quality of the interaction you had with both the faculty and the other students in the course.
- 10) In terms of workload, how many hours per week did you spend preparing for the seminar (outside of class time)?
- |                  |           |                 |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| One hour or less | 2-3 hours | 4 or more hours |
|------------------|-----------|-----------------|
- 11) Based on your experiences, would you enroll in another one-unit seminar in the future?
- |     |       |    |
|-----|-------|----|
| Yes | Maybe | No |
|-----|-------|----|

## FIAT LUX SEMINAR: FACULTY SURVEY

- 1) Why did you decide to teach a Fiat Lux seminar and how did you select the topic?
- 2) In terms of workload, how many hours per week did you spend preparing for the seminar (outside of class time)?  

One hour or less	2-3 hours	4 or more hours
---------------------	--------------	--------------------
- 3) The goals of the *Fiat Lux* seminars are to challenge students to think critically about the subject area and encourage discussion. Please comment on the extent to which you feel your seminar achieved these goals.
- 4) How would you compare the faculty-student and student-student interaction in this seminar to other seminars you have taught? Please comment on both the amount and quality of the interaction you had with students and that which you observed among the students.
- 5) Would you teach a one-unit seminar again?  

Yes	Maybe	No
-----	-------	----