

General Education Course Information Sheet

Please submit this sheet for each proposed course

<i>Department & Course Number</i>	Undergraduate Law 98T
<i>Course Title</i>	First Amendment: Big Thinkers and Controversial Speakers
<i>Indicate if Seminar and/or Writing II course</i>	Seminar

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

Foundations of the Arts and Humanities

- Literary and Cultural Analysis _____
- Philosophic and Linguistic Analysis _____
- Visual and Performance Arts Analysis and Practice _____

Foundations of Society and Culture

- Historical Analysis _____ X _____
- Social Analysis _____

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 course will introduce students to the ways in which the various philosophical theories of the First Amendment—which have evolved over time—can be used to critique our current free speech doctrine. Students will also become familiar with and critique the arguments used by lawyers, judges, and scholars to argue in favor of and against free speech protections.

3. List faculty member(s) who will serve as instructor (give academic rank):

Ryan Azad, Teaching Fellow; Professor Adam Winkler, Faculty Mentor

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:

2016-2017	Fall	Winter	Spring
	Enrollment _____	Enrollment <u>X</u>	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.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Knowledge | Students will become familiar with several of the major theories behind the First Amendment, and understand how they have evolved over time. Students will also read Supreme Court cases on the First Amendment, thereby understanding how our current doctrine has incorporated or rejected these theories of free speech. |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrative Learning | Over time, students will compare the strengths and weaknesses of the various free speech theories they study, and critique the ways in which the Supreme Court relies on and rejects the theories in their opinions. |
|---|--|

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ethical Implications | Students will critique the value of the free speech theories they study, and in latter half of the course, compare the First Amendment to the free speech laws of other countries around the world. |
|---|---|

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Diversity | Students will study and engage in discussions about how parts of our free speech jurisprudence—such as hate speech, corporate campaign spending, and the rejection of the heckler’s veto—negatively affect certain populations more than others. |
|---|--|

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Critical Thinking | Students will have to critically evaluate the ways in which the various theories studied relate to and contrast from one another. |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rhetorical Effectiveness | In their final term paper, students will be asked to make a rhetorically sophisticated argument that advocates for why certain theories of free speech should be adopted or rejected. |
|---|---|

- | | |
|--|----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Problem-solving |

 |
|--|----------|

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Library & Information Literacy | Students will need to conduct research for their final paper, and will learn how to do so throughout the course of the quarter. Special attention will be paid to case law and scholarly research. |
|---|--|

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

- | | | |
|---|----------|---------|
| 1. Lecture: | _____ | (hours) |
| 2. Discussion Section: | 3 | (hours) |
| 3. Labs: | _____ | (hours) |
| 4. Experiential (service learning, internships, other): | _____ | (hours) |
| 5. Field Trips: | _____ | (hours) |

(A) TOTAL Student Contact Per Week **3** (HOURS)

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------|
| 1. General Review & Preparation: | 2 | (hours) |
| 2. Reading | 6 | (hours) |
| 3. Group Projects: | _____ | (hours) |
| 4. Preparation for Quizzes & Exams: | _____ | (hours) |
| 5. Information Literacy Exercises: | _____ | (hours) |
| 6. Written Assignments: | 3 | (hours) |
| 7. Research Activity: | 2 | (hours) |

(B) TOTAL Out-of-class time per week **13** (HOURS)

GRAND TOTAL (A) + (B) must equal at least 15 hours/week **16** (HOURS)

Undergraduate Law 98T
First Amendment: Big Thinkers and Controversial Speakers
Syllabus – Winter 2017
Instructor: Ryan Azad

Class Location: TBA

Class Schedule: TBA

Office Hours: TBA

Office: TBA

Phone: (408) 310-7686

Email: Azad2017@lawnet.ucla.edu

Course Description: To make sense out of the First Amendment, we need to understand the values that animate the law and which therefore influence the decided cases. This course is a historical, philosophical, and doctrinal survey of the First Amendment, with a particular focus on the freedom of speech. The majority of our time will be devoted to studying the theoretical and practical considerations surrounding the First Amendment, as well as a basic study of what the First Amendment does and does not cover. We will examine historically important and rhetorically sophisticated arguments that have developed a rationale for and vision of the freedom of speech. These will include works by: James Madison, John Stuart Mill, Learned Hand, Louis Brandeis, and Alexander Meiklejohn. A central theme in our discussions will be the relationship between tolerating offensive ideas and creating social welfare.

Each week, we will also apply these ideas to some of the most controversial areas of the First Amendment, such as: offensive speech, regulation of pornography, targeted protests at funerals, flag burning, advocacy of revolution, discriminatory membership practices by expressive associations, campaign spending by corporations, aiding foreign terrorist organizations, and violent video games. After reading Supreme Court decisions on these issues, we will analyze and critique them with reference to the theories of free speech that we study. We will also briefly study how other countries in the world regulate speech, and examine the various explanations for and consequences of this difference in jurisprudence.

Required Text: Vincent Blasi, *Freedom of Speech in the History of Ideas* (West, 1st ed. 2016).

Course Requirements:

- Attendance: Regular and on-time attendance is important, especially in a seminar. If you must miss a class due to illness, a religious holiday, or other reason, please contact me in advance by email.
- Class Participation: In a seminar, class participation is central to the educational mission. Without lectures, the value of our meetings will be largely dependent upon you: your

insight, your opinion, your expertise, and your analysis. The best students come prepared to discuss the readings, to ask questions, and to engage constructively with others' views. After completing the readings, try to spend some time thinking about the arguments and developing your own insights. I hope that you all will be eager to talk about the material, but I will also call on everyone to participate (not to torture you, but because I believe this is the best way for you to learn the material and get the most out of the course). There is no shame in, or penalty for, being wrong, but I don't think it's a good use of our time when students who did not read or read superficially try to fake their way through an answer.

- Respect for the Views of Others: Cases in First Amendment classes often involve bad people saying and doing bad things. They may also involve classmates making arguments that you think are wrong or even immoral. Just like the real lawyers in these cases, we can't be fazed by such arguments or such fact patterns; we need to be able to articulate our own counterarguments, and do that politely and persuasively. Remember: Any substantive arguments you want to express will almost always be more effective, at least in the courtroom and in the classroom, when they are framed calmly and without visible personal animosity to your adversaries.
- Weekly Reaction Papers: All students will be expected to write short reaction papers (1-2 pages) in preparation for our class meetings. These papers are short, so I expect their substance to not be fluff; please engage with the arguments that we read; discuss what appealed or didn't appeal to you; note any ideas that the reading inspired in you; and raise any questions that you want to discuss in our seminar. Reaction papers should be submitted to me via email 24 hours before each of our class meetings.
- Final Paper: In lieu of a traditional examination, a final paper of substantial length will be required. Students are allowed freedom to choose their paper topic, but should critique one area of modern First Amendment law through the various theories of freedom of speech that we will study. All paper topics must be approved in advance. The length of your paper will vary based on the nature of your arguments and your topic, but should be somewhere around 3,000-3,600 words (approximately 13-15 double-spaced pages). Each student will also provide feedback on another student's rough draft. The following deadlines for the paper will apply:
 - By 6 pm on Friday, February 10, you must submit via email a brief statement that describes: (1) a tentative topic for your seminar paper; (2) what interests you about the topic; (3) any research that you plan to do. I will get back to each of you with feedback and let you know if your topic is approved.
 - By 6 pm on Monday, February 27, you must email me an outline of your paper.
 - By 6 pm on Monday, March 13, you must email me and your assigned peer review partner a rough draft of your paper. Your peer review partner will then have until Friday, March 17 to reply to you with feedback.
 - By noon on Friday, March 24, you must submit the final version of your paper by hard copy and via email.

Grading: Grading in this course will be based: 15% on your weekly responses; roughly 35% on your class participation; and roughly 50% on your final paper. However, I reserve the right to adjust your grade (up or down) based on exceptional or unenthusiastic participation in class.

Lunches: In an effort to get to know you all on a more personal level, I would love to go to lunch with you. You are welcome to sign up individually, or, if I seem too intimidating, sign up in groups of 2-3 people. To sign up, please send me an email so we can find a mutually convenient time during the quarter. Of course, I will gladly pick up the tab.

Topics and Readings: Below are the reading assignments for each class. I have also included a set of questions to get you thinking critically about the material. However, our class discussions will not be confined to the questions I've listed, so please bring your own creative thoughts and ideas as well.

"CB" refers to the required textbook, and * denotes an item from the supplementary materials that you will find on our course webpage.

Week One: INTRODUCTION AND JAMES MADISON, PART I

*Ryan Azad, *Overview to the First Amendment*

CB, pp. xxix (Amendment One); 1-3 (*Chaplinsky*); 18-29 (Age of Federalism, Seven Questions, Memorial and Remonstrance); 29-32 (American Compact); 35-43 (Federalist Ten, Federalist Fifty-One); 48-50 (Original Amendment, Speech, Empire of Liberty)

1. Is there any basis in the text of the First Amendment for marking out a class of utterances to which the protections of the constitutional provision categorically do not apply?
2. How do James Madison's arguments in *A Memorial and Remonstrance* about religious liberty relate to the freedom of speech? More broadly, how do the freedom of speech and freedom of religion relate to one another?
3. How do the sources shed light on whether the First Amendment was designed to be about protecting individual liberty related to self-development and personal autonomy, or rather about creating a system of checks and balances designed to facilitate government accountability?

Week Two: JAMES MADISON, PART II

CB, pp. 53 (Public Opinion); 56-75 (Spirit of Self-Government, Make No Law, Sedition Act, Report); 78-79 (Revolutionary Characters); 83-90 (*Sullivan*, Note); 117-139 (*Buckley*, *Citizens United*)

*Anne Tucker, *Flawed Assumptions*, 61 CASE WESTERN L. REV. 495 (2011) (excerpt)

1. What kind of argument is Madison making for the freedom of speech? Does it involve: consequences, authority of the constitutional text, lessons of experience, and/or design of the American government?
2. Why do you think *New York Times v. Sullivan* gives greatest protection to false statements made about the government? Should all false statements against the government enjoy absolute immunity from prosecution?
3. Does the majority or dissent in *Citizens United* gain the most support from Madison's views regarding fair elections, limited and accountable government, and freedoms of speech and press?
4. Which of Anne Tucker's arguments about the fallacy of corporate political speech do you find most convincing? Least convincing?

Week Three: JOHN STUART MILL, PART I

CB, pp. 147-158 (Introduction, Why Read Mill, Utilitarianism); 159-209 (On Liberty)

1. How, if at all, does Mill's argument differ from Madison's in terms of (a) what he takes to be the chief threat to the liberty he defends; (b) his assumptions about human nature; and (c) why he believes that dissenting speech is socially valuable?
2. Does Mill's case for the liberty of thought and discussion depend on the premise that opinions have some sort of objective truth value? Do you agree or disagree with his argument?
3. Does Mill believe that expressions of opinion never cause harm? Or does he believe that even though expressions of opinion sometimes cause harm, the absolute freedom to express opinions should still be protected? How does modern First Amendment doctrine treat view this issue?
4. What is Mill's position regarding the relationship between liberty and harm? What is your own view? Do you think there is such a thing as too much liberty, particularly with the freedom of speech?
5. Do you think Mill presupposes a higher degree of responsibility, patience, attentiveness, and integrity in argument on the part of the average person than actually obtains? How do you think people can acquire these virtues?

Week Four: JOHN STUART MILL, PART II

CB, pp. 213-216 (Shouting Fire, Mill on Liberty); 217-242 (Philosophical Inquiry, JSM and Pornography, Philosophical Inquiry 2, *Hudnut*, Only Words, Freedom's Law, Value of Moral Distress); 255-267 (Racist Speech on Campus, Dignity and Defamation, Riley, Regulation of Hate Speech, Worthless and Harmful Speech, JSM and Ends of Life)

*Conor Friedersdorf, *The Anti-Free-Speech Movement at UCLA*, THE ATLANTIC (Oct. 15, 2015)

1. What do you think of Mill's argument that censorship would require us to assume that the person or institution censoring the speech is infallible? How might one admit to fallibility and still legitimately assume control over the speech of others?
2. Does Judge Easterbrook assume in his *Hudnut* opinion that all communications which fall within the ambit of the First Amendment coverage are thereby immune from regulation no matter how much harm they cause? If not, what kinds of regulation of pornographic materials would he allow?
3. In *Only Words*, Professor MacKinnon can be said to advance two arguments: (a) that pornography falls outside the ambit of First Amendment coverage, or rather (b) that even though the materials fall within the coverage of the Amendment they can be regulated due to the harm they cause. What is Mill's position regarding the relationship between coverage and harm? What is the First Amendment's position? Your position?
4. How would Mill respond to the argument that hate speech is a threat to free speech because it silences its targets?
5. How would Mill respond to the argument that the more effective response to racist attitudes and practices is community condemnation?

Week Five: LEARNED HAND

CB, pp. 273-285 (Forgotten Years, Examined Life, Man and the Judge, Speech of Justice); 299-305 (Letter from Birmingham, Origins of First Amendment, Letters); 308-317 (Sources of Tolerance, *Brandenburg*, *Johnson*)

1. How does Hand's test differ from Mill's? Is there any difference between "direct advocacy of violence" and "positive instigation to a mischievous act?"
2. In *Masses Publishing Co. v. Patten*, Judge Hand wrote that if a citizen "stops short of urging upon others that it is their duty or their interest to resist the law," then he or she is protected by the First Amendment. Under this test, could Martin Luther King be punished for his "Letter from Birmingham Jail?"
3. In his letters, Judge Hand writes that "any State which professes to be controlled by public opinion, cannot take sides against any opinion except that which must express itself in the violation of the law. On the contrary, it must regard all other expression of opinion as tolerable, if not good. As soon as it does not, it inevitably assumes that one opinion may control in spite of what may become an opposite opinion. It becomes a State based upon some opinion. . . ." This passage may constitute the first important effect to provide a theoretical foundation for what has become the dominant feature of modern First Amendment law—the principle that as a general matter, "viewpoint discrimination" is almost always unconstitutional. Does this doctrinal principle necessarily follow from the premise of popular sovereignty, as Hand claims?
4. Does the *Johnson* majority or dissent derive more support from Hand's view of the sources and limits of freedom of speech?

Week Six: OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, PART I
 CB, pp. 319-322 (Holmes's Shadow); 323-332 (Common Law, Path of Law, *Lochner*, Natural Law, Worthy Tradition); 333-335 (Fighting Faiths); 337-346 (*Abrams*); 349-350 (*Gitlow*); 355-363 (Legal Pragmatism, Speech Truth Freedom)
 *Erik Eckholm, *ISIS Influence on Web Prompts Second Thoughts on First Amendment*, NEW YORK TIMES (Dec. 27, 2015)

1. What is the connection between the theory spelled out in the last paragraph of the Holmes's *Abrams* dissent and his adoption of the clear-and-imminent-danger test? How does this theory differ, if at all, than Hand's theory?
2. The clear and present danger test is no longer used by the Court today. As the New York Times article points out, however, some have advocated its return to confront the recent threats by terrorist organizations. Should the test be adopted? And does the clear-and-present danger test proposed in the New York Times article differ from that proposed by Holmes?
3. Irene Ten Cate writes that Holmes views on the relationship between individuals and society in the context of freedom of expression "appear to be radically different from Mill's." Do you agree? If so, how are the views different? And which do you think is more correct?

Week Seven: OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, PART II
 CB, pp. 363-371 (Self-Government, Contested Commodities, Marketplace of Ideas); 404-418 (Defense of Categories, *Christian Legal Society*)
 *Seana Valentine Shiffrin, *What Is Really Wrong with Compelled Association?* 99 NW. U. L. REV. 839 (2005) (excerpt)

1. Proponents of free markets for goods and services point to many different advantages: low barriers to entry for producers; the nonprescriptive honoring of the revealed preferences of consumers; responsiveness to changing conditions; reduced opportunities of corruption; recognition of the central importance of the phenomenon of scarcity; the rewarding of innovation, initiative, and risk-taking; the stability associated with the concept of equilibrium. Do these advantages have analogies in the realm of ideas?
2. Do the reasons for valuing a free marketplace of ideas also support the need for a free marketplace of subject matters, speakers, verbal means, and communicative functions? Or, is the only reason to worry about regulatory distinctions relating to subject matter, speaker type, verbal means, and communicative function that they can be employed for the purpose of viewpoint discrimination?
3. Do the reasons for making viewpoint discrimination the most disfavored of First Amendment transgressions support the majority's assertion in *Christian Legal Society* that it is "hard to imagine a more viewpoint-neutral policy than one requiring all student groups to accept all comers"? Does Holmes offer a reason to embrace the principle against viewpoint discrimination that can help us to evaluate this claim by the majority? Does Hand?

4. Professor Shiffrin writes that “The things one finds oneself regularly doing and saying will have an understandable impact on what subjects one thinks about. . .Further, these statements may have an influence on what one thinks about and how. Commonly heard sentiments may become comfortable sentiments.” She then goes on to argue that compelled association undermines individual autonomy by distorting one's views and, more importantly, one's thought processes. How does this mesh with the idea that viewpoint discrimination is wrong under the First Amendment? Why should associations be able to discriminate against members and their views when the government cannot?

Week Eight: LOUIS BRANDEIS

CB, pp. 429-437 (American Freedom, Beyond Progressivism); 442-451 (Letter, *Whitney*); 456-457 (Worthy Tradition); 458-461 (*Liebmann, Lee*); 480-494 (Concept of Public Discourse, *Snyder*, Brandeis Opinion in *Whitney*)

1. What kind of argument is Brandeis making? Does his invocation of the views of “those who won our independence by revolution” suggest an argument by authority? Does his declension from “fear breeds repression” to “hate menaces stable government” indicate an argument from consequences? Does all his talk about “courageous, self-reliant men” and the menace of “an inert people” signal an argument from character? Or, does his opening premise “the final end of the state [is] to make men free develop their faculties” introduce an argument from autonomy?
2. Madison, Hand, and Brandeis all emphasize the role that free speech plays in democratic governance. How do they differ regarding what they take that role to be?
3. Do Brandeis’s arguments in *Whitney* cast doubt on the validity of Justice Alito’s contention in *Snyder* that such phenomena as personal targeting of private figures, exploitation of a family’s grief in order to attract publicity, outrageousness, and proximity to a vulnerable captive audience provide good reasons to limit the freedom of speech?
4. What does Brandeis’s philosophy of free speech imply about the constitutionality of campaign spending limits? Does Brandeis’s philosophy of “civic courage” require that we not fear the power of high-spending candidates and private interests to “buy” elections because an independent citizenry can always resist their message? Or is the modern practice of saturation attack advertising regulable under the First Amendment on the theory that it contributes to political cynicism and disengagement?

Week Nine: ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN

CB, pp. 500-533 (Teacher and Citizen, Relation to Self-Government, Testimony, First Amendment is Absolute); 547-566 (*Holder*); 574-576 (Digital Age)

1. Meiklejohn seems to embrace notions of autonomy and truth-seeking as justifications for free speech. What is the relationship he envisions between these ideas and the self-government rationale?

2. Meiklejohn differentiates the “private right of speech” from the “freedom of public discussion” and asserts that only the latter is absolutely protected under the First Amendment. He asserts that “private speech,” like other personal liberties, receives qualified protection under the Fifth Amendment. Is this distinction defensible in theory? In practice?
3. Like Madison, Hand, and Brandeis, Meiklejohn derives his understanding of the freedom of speech from the basic American agreement to be self-governed. How do these four thinkers differ in the way they view freedom of speech as an integral feature of the form of government that has been adopted by the US? Which thinker provides the most persuasive argument for linking free speech with popular sovereignty and accountable government?
4. Does Meiklejohn’s theory of the First Amendment imply that self-governing voters must be free not only to join and actively participate in the peaceful activities of a subversive organization so long as they don’t have the specific intent to advance its violent objectives, but also to provide such an organization with material support (the claim rejected in *Holder*)? How might Chief Justice Roberts defend his distinction between joining and training/advising, so far as the requisites of self-government are concerned?

Week Ten: A MODERN COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH
 CB, 586-593 (From Milton to Brandeis); 644-648 (Liberalism Skepticism
 Democracy); 661-669 (*Brown* majority)
 *Robert A. Kahn, *Why Do Europeans Ban Hate Speech?* 41 HOFSTRA L. REV. 545
 (2013) (excerpt)
 *Bernhard Jurgen Bleise, *Freedom of Speech and Flag Desecration: A Comparative
 Study of German, European, and United States Laws*, 20 DEN. J. INT’L L. & POL’Y
 471 (1992) (excerpt)

1. Should it be the legitimate business of the state to promote good character? Is it more appropriate—or less dangerous—for a regime to promote good character by declining to regulate speech than by enforcing morals by means of legal sanctions?
2. Does Justice Scalia’s majority opinion in *Brown* gain any support from Joseph Raz’s autonomy theory of free speech? How might his theory lead to the conclusion that playing violent video games is a First Amendment activity?
3. Upon reflection on all that we’ve studied and a brief look at the free speech laws of other nations, does the United States have it right? What are the pros and cons of the First Amendment?



New Course Proposal

Law Undergraduate 98T	
First Amendment: Big Thinkers and Controversial Speakers	
Course Number	Law Undergraduate 98T
Title	First Amendment: Big Thinkers and Controversial Speakers
Short Title	CONTROVRSL SPEAKERS
Units	Fixed: 5
Grading Basis	Letter grade only
Instructional Format	Seminar - 3 hours per week
TIE Code	SEMT - Seminar (Topical) [T]
GE Requirement	Yes
Major or Minor Requirement	No
Requisites	Enforced: Satisfaction of entry-level Writing requirement. Freshman and sophomores preferred.
Course Description	Survey of historically important and rhetorically sophisticated arguments that serve as rationale for First Amendment. Students will analyze and critique Supreme Court decisions on issues such as corporate campaign spending and offensive speech with reference to these theories of free speech.
Justification	Part of the series of seminars offered through the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows
Syllabus	File UG-LAW 98T Syllabus.pdf was previously uploaded. You may view the file by clicking on the file name.
Supplemental Information	Professor Adam Winkler is the faculty mentor for this course.
Grading Structure	15% weekly responses; 35% participation; 50% final paper
Effective Date	Winter 2017
Discontinue Date	Summer 1 2017
Instructor	Name: Ryan Azad Title: Teaching Fellow
Quarters Taught	<input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Winter <input type="checkbox"/> Spring <input type="checkbox"/> Summer
Department	Law
Contact	Name: MICHELLE CHEN E-mail: mchen@oid.ucla.edu
Routing Help	

ROUTING STATUS

Role: Registrar's Publications Office

Status: Pending Action

Role: Registrar's Scheduling Office - Thomson, Douglas N (DTHOMSON@REGISTRAR.UCLA.EDU) - 51441

Status: Added to SRS on 8/12/2016 12:36:03 PM

Changes: Short Title

Comments: No Comments

Role: FEC School Coordinator - Kikuchi, Myrna Dee Castillo (MKIKUCHI@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040**Status:** Approved on 8/11/2016 3:48:01 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** Routing to Doug Thomson in the Registrar's Office.**Role:** FEC Chair or Designee - Bristow, Joseph E (JBRISTOW@HUMNET.UCLA.EDU) - 54173**Status:** Approved on 7/28/2016 9:13:05 AM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** Nicely detailed syllabus**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Kikuchi, Myrna Dee Castillo (MKIKUCHI@COLLEGE.UCLA.EDU) - 45040**Status:** Returned for Additional Info on 7/27/2016 4:06:21 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** Routing to Joe Bristow for FEC approval.**Role:** CUTF Coordinator - Chen, Michelle L. (MCHEN@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 53042**Status:** Approved on 7/13/2016 4:04:15 PM**Changes:** No Changes Made**Comments:** on behalf of Professor Kathleen L. Komar, Chair, CUTF Faculty Advisory Committee**Role:** Initiator/Submitter - Chen, Michelle L. (MCHEN@OID.UCLA.EDU) - 53042**Status:** Submitted on 7/13/2016 3:57:34 PM**Comments:** Initiated a New Course Proposal[Back to Course List](#)

[Main Menu](#) [Inventory](#) [Reports](#) [Help](#) [Exit](#)
[Registrar's Office](#) [MyUCLA](#) [SRWeb](#)

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