UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

UCLA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

HONORS PROGRAMS
DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
A311 MURPHY HALL
405 HILGARD AVE.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1414

November 13, 2013
Scott Chandler, Chair
General Education Governance Committee
A265 Murphy Hall
157101

Attention: Myrna Dee F. Castillo, Program Representative

Dear Professor Chandler:

Please review the course *Science, Rhetoric, and Social Influence,* taught by Lecturer Dana Cairns Watson, for two general education foundations: Foundations of the Arts and Humanities, and/or Foundations of Society and Culture. The course has been approved by the all appropriate committees, and we will be offering it in Winter 2014.

Sincerely,

G. Jennifer Wilson, Ph.D.
Assist. Vice Provost for Honors
UCLA
gjwilson@college.ucla.edu
(310) 825-1752

HONORS COLLEGIUM*HONORS COLLEGIUM***

General Education Course Information Sheet
Please submit this sheet for each proposed course

Department & Course Number HONORS COLLEGIUM 43W
Course Title Science, Rhetoric, and Social Influence
Indicate if Seminar and/or Writing II course Seminar and Writing II course

1 Check the recommended GE foundation area(s) and subgroups(s) for this course

Foundations of the Arts and Humanities	X
• Literary and Cultural Analysis	X
• Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis	X
• Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice	
Foundations of Society and Culture	X
• Historical Analysis	X
• Social Analysis	X
Foundations of Scientific Inquiry	
• Physical Science	
With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)	
• Life Science	
With Laboratory or Demonstration Component must be 5 units (or more)	

2. Briefly describe the rationale for assignment to foundation area(s) and subgroup(s) chosen.

This is an interdisciplinary Honors seminar that examines the relationship between scientific arguments and policy by examining the rhetoric used to communicate these scientific arguments to and influence large groups of people's beliefs.

3. "List faculty member(s) who will serve as instructor (give academic rank):
Dana Cairns Watson, Lecturer

Do you intend to use graduate student instructors (TAs) in this course? Yes ____ No X

If yes, please indicate the number of TAs ____

4. Indicate when do you anticipate teaching this course over the next three years:

2013-2014	Fall		Winter	X	Spring	
	Enrollment		Enrollment	20	Enrollment	
2014-2015	Fall		Winter	X	Spring	
	Enrollment		Enrollment	20	Enrollment	
2015-2016	Fall		Winter	X	Spring	
	Enrollment		Enrollment	20	Enrollment	

5. GE Course Units
Is this an ***existing*** course that has been modified for inclusion in the new GE? Yes ____ No X
If yes, provide a brief explanation of what has changed.

Present Number of Units: ____ Proposed Number of Units: 5

6. Please present concise arguments for the GE principles applicable to this course.

X General Knowledge	This is a course that includes a discursive look at how different reading and writing approaches impact the brain in a way that enhances general knowledge of the cognition and literacy as instruments for discovery and catalysts for new ideas.
X Integrative Learning	The course is interdisciplinary including literary studies, psychology, neuroscience, biology, mathematics, history, political science.
X Ethical Implications	Some parts of the course examine ways people, as individuals and as a society, react to the dangers and joys of heightened perception and crises of cognition.
X Cultural Diversity	Many cultural viewpoints addressing these scientific issues (i.e. environment, food, international carbon trading) and often looked-over factors are addressed. Historical and present rhetoric affecting these scientific issues are also used
X Critical Thinking	Students are required to think critically about current scientific issues (healthcare, environmentalism, government and industry regulation, food), how policies regarding these issues affect how we think of the issues, and how that dialogue and rhetoric modify existing policies.
X Rhetorical Effectiveness	Writing required and assessed
X Problem-solving	Course raises issues of "how?" (i.e. How can policy deal with these issues in the most uniting way? How are people who have played a part in these issues largely blind to ramifications as they also affect people across the globe? How can we ameliorate this?)
X Library & Information Literacy	Course requires library/web research

(A) STUDENT CONTACT PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

1. Lecture:	4	(hours)
2. Discussion Section:		(hours)
3. Labs:		(hours)
4. Experiential (service learning, internships, other):		(hours)
5. Field Trips:		(hours)
(A) TOTAL Student Contact Per Week	4	**(HOURS)**

(B) OUT-OF-CLASS HOURS PER WEEK (if not applicable write N/A)

1. General Review & Preparation:	1	(hours)
2. Reading	2	(hours)
3. Group Projects:	1	(hours)
4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams: **(Amortized)**	1	(hours)
5. Information Literacy Exercises:	1	(hours)
6. Written Assignments: **(Amortized)**	3	(hours)
7. Research Activity: **(Amortized)**	2	(hours)
(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week	11	**(HOURS)**

GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal at least 15 hours/week | 15 | **(HOURS)**

Dana Cairns Watson (Revision of Proposal submitted last year)

Lecturer/Engineering/Writing Programs

Title: Science, Rhetoric, and Social Influence

Description of the Course:

Building off of HC50W, "Public Science Writing," which I taught Spring '05, Spring '06, Spring 07, and Fall '07, this course takes the desire to communicate science beyond clarity, interest, and education, to the next step: understanding how techniques of communicating scientific arguments affect outcomes in policy. In that previous course, we did, indeed, identify, discuss, practice, and even try to further develop rhetorical methods of influencing readers, but the focus was on education and personal motivations (e.g. teaching people about their own illnesses, helping them decide what kind of milk to buy, influencing their personal views on evolution or cloning) rather than broader influence. When students wanted to write about coelacanths or dinosaur eggs, they had to develop methods that satisfied their own intellectual interests while appealing to various imagined audiences, usually by linking the topic to something of more obvious contemporary significance or offering information that was conceivably useful to those audiences. Public policy arose when we discussed scientific ethics and how people vote (usually quite indirectly) among policy choices. But I feel that, by tenth week, we had usually led ourselves up to a door through which we did not have the time to step.

That next step is exploring ways that rhetoric is used to communicate to and influence large groups of people's beliefs and behavior. What is it about certain scientific texts that they reached so many people and changed the ways we live? Successful (or mainly successful) examples of these texts are Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, and Michael Pollan's *The Omnivore's Dilemma*. Pollan's book is especially interesting in the ways that it has changed individual behavior and started an important national conversation leading to light policy change (e.g. healthier personal behavior is encouraged by Michelle Obama's anti-obesity campaign, city councils have banned new fast-food franchises in some places), but it has not yet led to big national or even state policy changes that directly affect large food corporations and farm subsidies. Is this just timing (big change takes time) or a shortcoming that Pollan could have avoided? The issue of climate change has been written about for a general audience for three decades, however, and these texts have (up to now) failed to lead to the kind of big policy changes that they argue are necessary and that they intended to bring about. These include Bill McKibben's *End of Nature*, Mark Lynas' *Six Degrees: Our Future on a Hotter Planet* (2008), and even the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Dr. James Hansen has recently stated that "the climate contrarians" "have been winning the argument for several years, even though the science has become clearer. . . . There's been a very strong campaign by those who want to continue fossil fuel 'business as usual,' and the scientific story has not been powerful enough to offset that push." *The Independent* reports, "Part of the problem, he said, was that the climate skeptic lobby employed communications professionals, whereas 'scientists are just barely competent at communicating with the public and don't have the wherewithal to do it.'" (I would also argue that scientists are usually trained to communicate quite cautiously.) And thus, Hanson says, "a gap has opened between what is understood about global warming by the relevant scientific community, and what's known by the people who need to know—and that's the public."

While it seems to be true that the naysayers have thus far won the policy wars, Hansen does not take into account issues other than the words themselves. First, public opinion is not the same as effective governmental policy, so the fact that these policies have not uniformly been put into place does not mean that people disbelieve the climate scientists. Second, our seemingly natural "confirmation bias" means that it's much more difficult to convince people to change than to convince them to do nothing, so jeremiads about global climate change have a much more difficult job than advocacy for the status quo. Third, corporations have money and political influence in active circulation already, while scientists and environmentalists do not start with the enabling infrastructure of a corporate flow chart, organized lobbyists, and full bank accounts. In short, while we will be exploring the rhetorical moves of all sides in this issue, we have to acknowledge that some voices begin with large advantages.

Other complicating issues are implemental and almost philosophical. What's the best way to deal with the problem? Cutting back emissions? Limiting the energy we use? Taxing carbon? International carbon trading? Other international agreements or pressure? Destroying the fossil fuel corporations? Engineering our way out of a warmer planet? Better disaster relief? Evolving?? And who's the enemy? What are their interests? Are we all in this together or not? Is growing the economy the only way we can be wealthy? Might the people who have caused and might be able to ameliorate the problem be largely blind to its disastrous ramifications as they affect other people across the globe? In other words, the problem is also one of inertia, lack of imagination (or different imaginings), stubbornness, greed, and complexity.

Hansen is partly right, however--that the science is in and that the problem is one of communication. And so I propose that this course study the rhetoric of climate science, the arguments and communication methods of the scientists and their detractors, and even try to invent new forms of communication that might make a difference, start us across a bridge to solving the problem.

Writing skills are important, and they will be emphasized in this course, but we will also pay some attention to how to get read and how to be influential. In short, we will work to move "from bench to bedside." This is not an advocacy or activism course, but it could provide some valuable tools for those who choose to advocate action on whatever causes their scientific knowledge and their ethical consciences choose.

Weekly Schedule and Proposed texts

Weeks 1-3: Public science writing

(Topics: healthcare, evolution)

Week 1:
Atul Gawande "The Checklist," *New Yorker*, 10 Dec 2007; "Getting There from Here," 26 Jan 2009; "The Cost Conundrum," 1 June 2009

Week 2:
Charles Darwin, selections from *On the Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*.
Thomas Henry Huxley, 1859 *Time* review of *Origin* and 1860 lecture, both in favor of Darwin's theory

Week 3:
Richard Dawkins, article TBA (he has a very different way of talking about evolution than Quammen, largely because of he writes to a broad British audience rather than a substantial but limited American audience).
David Quammen, "Was Darwin Wrong?" *National Geographic,* Nov 2004; selections from *The Reluctant Mr. Darwin: An Intimate Portrait of Charles Darwin and the Making of his Theory of Evolution*

Weeks 4-6: The changing contexts of modern science writing

(Topics: environmentalism, food, toxins, manufacturing, government and industry regulation)

Week 4:
Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (1962)

Week 5:
Michael Pollan, *The Omnivore's Dilemma* and a few other articles by Pollan in periodicals (one that summarizes individual eating habits one might

change, one that may undermine his position somewhat by leaving him open to charges to elitism)

Week 6:
Dennis Meredith, selections from *Explaining Research*
David Michaels, selections from *Doubt is their Product*

Weeks 7-10: Climate change: 25 years of arguing, experimenting with attitudes and rhetoric, and re-evaluating tactics

(Except for Week 7, these texts will be assigned in approximately chronological order, so we can see the evolution of the conversation, its rhetoric, and changes of approach over time Also, instead of introducing dozens of writers, I've emphasized the changing voices of a few such as McKibben, Lomborg, and Lynas.)

Week 7: One person, a quarter century

Bill McKibben, *The End of Nature* (1989). Beautifully written and philosophical. Science and nature writing combined.
---. Recent article in *Rolling Stone*, "Global Warming's Terrifying New Math" (7/19/2012). Quite a contrast!

Week 8: Debates

Jared Diamond, "Easter's End," *Discover*, 1995. A precursor to *Collapse* (2005). Some quotations from negative reviews of *Collapse* will be introduced in class.
Bjorn Lomborg, short selections from *The Skeptical Environmentalist* (2001) about climate change. Just to get the idea.
Stephen Schneider. "Global Warming: Neglecting the Complexities." *Scientific American*, Jan. 2002. A very short but angry response to Lomborg.
Michael Crichton, *State of Fear* (2004). A fast-paced best-selling novel that questions the idea of "global warming," is dubious about the all-encompassing phrase "climate change," and makes environmentalists look pretty bad. It's also got graphs, footnotes, and commentary from the author. Another generic mash-up, which is always interesting.

Note: the main reading is Crichton this week. The other readings are just a few pages each. It's only last because I tried to list the readings in chronological order by publication date.

Week 9: Three very different approaches.

IPPC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) report (2007, Nobel prize winner). A genre of its own: official science.

Mark Lynas' selections from *Six Degrees: Our Future on a Hotter Planet* (2007; recipient of 2008 Royal Society Science Books Prize). Quite graphic, dramatic, scientific but also appealing to the fairly raw emotions).

Lomborg, *Cool It* (2007). Engineering solutions recommended.

Week 10: Different visions, different plans of action

McKibben, selections from *Eaarth* (2011). Argues that it's time to accept that our planet has changed; offers new ways of dealing with it (and trying to prevent further change).

Mark Lynas, selections from *The God Species: How the Planet Can Survive the Age of Humans* (2011). A radically different way of approaching the issue.

Lomborg, recent articles "Climate Course Correction" and "The Moral of Sandy." (Lomborg is still a contrarian voice in the argument—he might say "realistic" but McKibben would not. He's dubious about long-term problems and focused on economical ways of dealing with potential problems.)

Assignments and Grading

This intensive writing course will ask students to write **microthemes** (reading responses, summaries, evaluations; topics will be suggested but left open-ended) approximately once per week (10%).

As a course on communication of all types, and because speaking is a useful kind of drafting, it will also require students to **start discussion with a performance of a 2-page paper** (10%), as well as **give a short presentation on their main assignment** (10%).

Since efficient summary of information is important in most situations, students will be asked to **write a synopsis** of David Michael's ideas on how corporate scientists cheat (and perhaps some other option will be given from the readings), plus **offer some amendments to or evaluation** of Michael's ideas based on further assigned readings and/or their **(required) conversation with a current working scientist, science writer, activist, or policy maker** (20%).

Finally, students will be working on a **main assignment that either evaluates a science campaign (350.org, the Union of Concerned Scientists, etc.) or offers a plan for (including important text for) a campaign of their own**; it can be from **any ideological perspective**, as long as it is scientifically grounded. The **proposal and review of literature** for this assignment will count for 10% of the total grade, and the main assignment itself will count for 30% of the course grade.

Workshop participation (discussion mediation, peer responses, preparation for and participation in class discussions, work in journal teams, and on-time attendance) will count for 10% of the grade.

Who would want to take this course?

The course should appeal to students in the physical and life sciences, as well as those from other disciplines who are interested in environmental issues. The course will probably be especially valuable to Honors Students trying to fulfill a third writing requirement for their medical school applications. Students interested in exploring ways to engage with the "real world" might also be interested in this exploration of some attempts to bridge the divide between academic research and social engagement, and might relish the opportunity to try out a new mixture of rhetorical tactics or kinds of argument in their own writing. Previous courses on public science writing (HC50w and Writing Programs 100w) have also been of interest to students who want to become writers; at least two previous students have gone on to journalism programs.

Proposed number of units: 6

Proposed enrollment

The class should enroll 15 students, leaving some leeway to go to 17. Since it will be an intensive writing course, and also requires student presentations, it is difficult to accommodate more than this number of students. If you note the above work requirements, you can probably imagine the kind of attention each student's work will require. Even more important than teacher workload, however, is the desired sense that we are working together around a table in a cooperative and communicative environment; students will get good practice talking extemporaneously, too.

Preferred Quarter

For 2012-13. Spring.

For 2013-14. Winter, although I could probably work it out to do any quarter. I do not know my other teaching commitments next year (they would be in Writing Programs and/or Electrical Engineering, if I had them).

Proposed class meeting schedule

Seminar meeting twice a week, 2 hours per meeting. Anytime between 9 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. I'd prefer Tuesday/Thursday mornings (but am not adamant about this).

If the course is offered in Spring 2013, it could not take place on Tuesdays 9-1, which is when my EE 295 course will be offered.

I'd also be willing to schedule a "discussion" or "lab" for a third (1-hour) meeting. I envision welcoming all students to this lab every week, but only requiring them to attend every other week. (Spending at year at Cambridge University has opened my eyes to all sorts of unusual ways of ordering a course; they work on a 2-week schedule with even and odd weeks.) This lab would not be in place of office hours, but it might offer students a third kind of interaction with me and with each other.

Suggestion of whether the course should be upper or lower division

Since HC50W was a 6-unit, lower division course, I expect that this should be, too. (I can adjust the assignments if the committee thinks the course needs to be 5 units.) I very much like to work with transfer students, so if you think there's some change that needs to be made to the course that would allow it to be upper division and appropriate for those students, please pass that information along. (I assume that few students transfer into the science majors, but perhaps that assumption is outdated.)

Dana Cairns Watson

dcwatson@ucla.edu

EDUCATION

1996 Ph.D., English, University of California, Los Angeles

1989 B.A., English, UCLA

EMPLOYMENT

Lecturer, Dept of Electrical Engineering, HSSEAS, UCLA (2006-2011, 2012-2013)

Lecturer, Writing Programs, UCLA (2001-2002, 2005-2010, Summer 2012)

Lecturer, Honors, UCLA (2005-2007)

Lecturer, Center for Academic Research Excellence, UCLA (2005-2006)

Adjunct Instructor, Dept of English, Santa Monica College (2001)

Lecturer, Dept of English, UCLA (1997-2001)

Visiting Lecturer, Dept of English, Middlebury College (Winter, Spring 1997)

Teaching Assistant, Dept of English, UCLA (1991-1995)

Administrator, UCLA Orientation Program (1988-1990)

Counselor, UCLA Orientation Program (1986-1987)

Assistant Engineer, Technical Writer, Hughes Aircraft, Radar Systems Group (1986)

PUBLICATIONS

"The Cambridge Museum of Technology." Museum publication, 24-pages (forthcoming 2013).

"Building a Better Reader: *The Gertrude Stein First Reader and Three Plays*." *The Lion and the Unicorn*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 35.3 (Sept. 2011).

"Stop Making Sense." *The Reader*. Liverpool, UK: U. of Liverpool. Spring 2006.

Gertrude Stein and the Essence of What Happens. Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.

"Alice Munro." *World Writers in English*. New York: Scribner's, 2004. Pp. 343-365.

"Paule Marshall." *American Writers Supplement XI*. New York: Scribner's, 2002. Pp. 275-292.

"Barbara Kingsolver." *American Writers: Supplement VII*. New York: Scribner's, 2001. Pp. 197-214.

"Tim O'Brien." *American Writers: Supplement V.* New York: Scribner's, 1999. Pp. 237-255.

AWARDS

2007-2008 UCLA Non-Senate Faculty Professional Development Award

COURSES TAUGHT IN THE LAST TEN YEARS

Approaches to University Writing (English Composition 2)

English Composition, Rhetoric, and Language (English Composition 3)

Literature, Culture and Critical Inquiry: Food in Fields and Genres (English Composition 5w)

Writing Science (Honors Collegium 50W)

Interdisciplinary Academic Writing: Science, Public Science Writing, and Scientific Ethics (English Composition 100W)

Academic Technical Writing for Electrical Engineers (Electrical Engineering 295, once 298)

UCLA Course Inventory Management System

Main Menu | Inventory | Reports | Help | Exit

New Course Proposal

	Honors Collegium 43W **Science, Rhetoric, and Social Influence**
Course Number	**Honors Collegium 43W**
Title	**Science, Rhetoric, and Social Influence**
Short Title	**SCI&RHETORIC&INFLNC**
Units	Fixed: **6**
Grading Basis	**Letter grade only**
Instructional Format	**Seminar - 4 hours per week**
TIE Code	**SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]**
GE Requirement	**Yes**
Major or Minor Requirement	**No**
Requisites	**Enforced requisite: English Composition 3 or 3H or English as a Second Language 36.**
Course Description	**Seminar, four hours. Enforced requisite: English Composition 3 or 3H or English as a Second Language 36. Science writing, particularly scientific texts, both contemporary and historical, that have been used to communicate science to and influence large groups of people's beliefs and behavior. What is it about certain scientific texts that change way we think and have potential to affect social policy? Texts cover variety of topics from evolution to nutrition and food industry to current debates about climate change. Students encouraged to practice science writing themselves. Satisfies Writing II requirement. Letter grading.**
Justification	**This course is part of the interdisciplilnary series in the Honors Collegium and is designed for students in College Honors. It is suitable for all majors and will be put forward to the GE and Writing II committees. At the advice of the Honors Faculty Advisory Committe, whose members come from a variety of disciplines, it has been revised to achieve a greater balance in the readings. It has been approved by all members of the committee and by its Chair.**
Syllabus	File *013DanaWatsonHonorsProposal1.doc* was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.
Supplemental Information	
Grading Structure	**Weekly small papers 1-2 pages: 10%** **Oral performance of a 2 page paper: 10%** **Oral presentation of final essay proposal: 10%** **Synopsis and evaluation paper of a critical text: 20%** **Proposal and review of literature for main essay assignment: 10%** **Main assignment product: 30%** **Paritcpation and discussion: 10%**
Effective Date	**Spring 2013**
Instructor	Name: **Dana Cairns Watson** Title: **Lecturer**
Quarters Taught	☐ Fall ☐ Winter ☑ Spring ☐ Summer
Department	**Honors Collegium**

	Name	E-mail
Contact	G JENNIFER WILSON	gjwilson@college.ucla.edu
Routing Help		

ROUTING STATUS

Role:	Registrar's Office
Status:	Processing Completed

Role:	Registrar's Publications Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (LHENNIG@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 56704
Status:	Added to SRS on 5/12/2013 11:24:19 PM
Changes:	Grading Basis, Requisites, Description
Comments:	Edited course description into official version; corrected grading basis; added requisite.

Role:	Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (DTHOMSON@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 51441
Status:	Added to SRS on 2/22/2013 10:39:15 AM
Changes:	Short Title
Comments:	No Comments

Role:	L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040
Status:	Approved on 2/22/2013 8:19:03 AM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Writing II approval granted. Memo sent 02/21/13. Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office

Role:	Registrar's Office - Hennig, Leann Jean (LHENNIG@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 56704
Status:	Returned for Additional Info on 1/31/2013 2:03:45 PM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Reroute back to Myrna for Writing II approval!

Role:	L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040
Status:	Returned for Additional Info on 1/31/2013 9:03:42 AM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office

Role:	FEC Chair or Designee - Palmer, Christina (CPALMER@MEDNET.UCLA.EDU) - 44796
Status:	Approved on 1/30/2013 6:13:33 PM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Please ask the instructor to remove her resume from the bottom of the syllabus

Role:	L&S FEC Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040
Status:	Returned for Additional Info on 1/30/2013 4:20:36 PM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Routing to Christina Palmer for FEC approval

Role:	Dean College/School or Designee - Friedmann, Manuela Christin (MFRIEDMANN@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 58510
Status:	Approved on 1/30/2013 4:03:23 PM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	This approval is being forwarded on behalf of Patricia A. Turner, Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education.

Role:	FEC School Coordinator - Castillo, Myrna Dee Figurac (MCASTILLO@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040
Status:	Returned for Additional Info on 1/24/2013 12:41:49 PM

Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	Routing to Manuela Friedmann for Dean Turner's approval

Role:	Department Chair or Designee - Gurval, Robert A (GURVAL@HUMNET.UCLA.EDU) - 56744
Status:	Approved on 1/17/2013 6:46:47 PM
Changes:	No Changes Made
Comments:	No Comments

Role:	Initiator/Submitter - Wilson, G Jennifer (GJWILSON@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 51752
Status:	Submitted on 1/17/2013 6:31:10 PM
Comments:	Initiated a New Course Proposal

Back to Course List

Comments or questions? Contact the Registrar's Office at
cims@registrar.ucla.edu or (310) 206-7045