UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
UCLA

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · MERCED · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA ·
SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
149 HUMANITIES BUILDING
BOX 951530
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095·1530
(310) 825·4173

March 5, 2007

Professor Robin Garrell
Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
A-265 Murphy Hall
Campus

Dear Robin,

I am writing to request approval from the College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) to continue the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE) Program for the next five years. Please find attached 1) the proposal, which includes a summary of the program and its accomplishments to date, and 2) a comprehensive evaluation of the program's first year, prepared by the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research in the Division of Undergraduate Education.

A summary of the evaluation findings will be presented to FEC members at the meeting on Friday, March 9, 2007. I will attend to present our request for the approval of your committee to extend the program over the next five years and to answer any questions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Watson

Professor of English
Associate Vice Provost for Educational Innovation

**Recommendation to Approve the Continuation of the Program for
Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE)**

Prepared for the College Faculty Executive Committee, March 5, 2007

Proposal to Approve the USIE Program through 2011-12

The USIE Advisory Committee, Chaired by Robert Watson (English) recommends the College
FEC approve USIE to offer its program for five years, beginning Fall 2007 through the 2011-12
Academic Year, at which time there will be a comprehensive program review. The Committee's
recommendation, endorsed by Vice Provost Judith L. Smith, is based on the success of the
program in its inaugural year, which has been detailed in a comprehensive assessment completed
by the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research appended to this summary.

If approved, the program will continue at about the same scale (i.e. up to 18 seminars a year,
which is based on the number of students who can enroll in one pedagogy seminar). Staff support
will continue to be provided through the Undergraduate Education Initiatives unit of the Division
of Undergraduate Education, and the pedagogy seminar will be offered by an academic
administrator through the Office of Instructional Development (OID). The faculty-student
advisory committee will be re-appointed by the Vice Provost annually and will be responsible for
the selection of facilitators and the final approval of seminars. A brief summary of USIE follows.

Background and Goals of USIE

In 2005 the College embarked on an innovative two-year pilot called Undergraduate Student
Initiated Education (USIE). USIE is designed to provide a select group of College juniors and
seniors with the opportunity to develop and facilitate, under close faculty supervision, a lower
division seminar for their peers. The proposal for this pilot was developed by a joint faculty-
student committee appointed by Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Judith L. Smith and
was approved by both the College FEC and the Undergraduate Council.

The goals of USIE are fourfold:
- Provide advanced undergraduates the opportunity to work closely with faculty members of
  their choosing to design one-unit seminars around topics that advance their knowledge in a
  specific discipline;
- Train undergraduates to prepare for and lead a seminar in which group discussion is central to
  learning, which will deepen their engagement with higher education as well as with the topic;
- Increase the number of one-unit lower-division seminars, giving undergraduates more options
  to enroll in small classes designed to encourage discussion and critical thinking around a
  topic of interest to them; and
- Give the facilitators and the enrolled students a heightened awareness of their stake in their
  own education, preparing them to take more initiatives as learners and connect their personal
  interests with the methods of scholarly inquiry.

Program Overview

The USIE Program runs under the direction and guidance of a faculty-student advisory committee
chaired by Professor and Associate Vice Provost Robert Watson (See Attachment 1). The
application and selection period occurs during the fall quarter. During the winter quarter, selected
student facilitators work closely with their faculty mentors through a two-unit independent study
focused on the content-area and disciplinary methods of their proposed seminars; concurrently,
they participate in a two-unit pedagogy seminar with other student facilitators. Through the

independent study and the pedagogy seminar, student facilitators develop for review and approval a formal syllabus for their spring seminars. Mentorship with the faculty sponsors continues during the spring quarter as the students lead their seminars (see Table 1).

Table 1. Courses Taken by Student Facilitators to Prepare and Facilitate a USIE Seminar

Winter	Spring
Honors 101E *Leading Undergraduate Seminars* (Two-unit pedagogy seminar) **188SA** *Individual Studies for USIE* (Two-unit tutorial with faculty mentor to develop a USIE 88S seminar. Subject area is dependent upon department of faculty mentor.)	**188SB** *Individual Studies for USIE* (Two-unit tutorial with faculty mentor while facilitating a USIE 88S seminar. Subject area is dependent upon department of faculty mentor.)

The two-unit pedagogy seminar is taught by Dr. Kumiko Haas, Associate Director of the Office of Instructional Development. The goal of this seminar is for facilitators to learn about and explore issues that are integral to course design and to develop skills to become effective facilitators. The seminar covers practical teaching strategies and techniques as well as pedagogical, organizational, and technological issues confronted by new instructors. Instruction includes a mixture of discussion, guest lecturers, and micro-teaching presentations.

Two-Year Summary

During each year of the pilot, the faculty-student committee was charged with review and selection of the USIE facilitators. In order for a USIE seminar to be officially approved as a course, the faculty-student committee reviews the completed syllabi late in winter quarter. As part of the faculty oversight for this program, seminars also need to be approved by the faculty mentor, the mentor's department chair, and the College FEC Chair (see Table 2). A complete description of seminars, facilitators, and mentors for both years is attached (see Attachment 2).

Table 2. Breakdown of Applicants, Facilitators, Seminars, and Enrollment – Pilot years

	Applicants	Facilitators	Seminars Offered	Enrollment
2005-2006	36	16	15*	182
2006-2007	30	16	16	240**

* One seminar was co-facilitated.
** Projected enrollment

Over the course of the pilot, disciplines from the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Life Sciences were represented by USIE seminars. Participating departments included:

- Anthropology
- Art
- Art History *
- Chicano Studies
- Economics
- English *
- Environment
- History *
- Neuroscience
- Pathology & Lab Med
- Political Science *
- Psychology
- Social Welfare
- Sociology

* denotes participation during both years of the pilot.

To recognize the efforts of the facilitators and the mentors, a reception was held at the end of the 2005-2006 inaugural year. Mentors and facilitators were given certificates and encouraged to compare their experiences in the USIE program.

Comprehensive Evaluation of USIE

A comprehensive evaluation of the inaugural year of USIE was conducted by the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research to help determine whether the benefits of USIE program participation justify the program's continuation, and if so, what can be learned from this assessment to refine and enhance the program for those who are involved. In addition to providing personal background information, interview and survey participants responded to questions regarding their (a) motivations for engaging in the USIE program and related expectations; (b) experiences within the USIE program; and (c) overall USIE Program perspectives and recommendations (see Appendix 1).

Attachment 1 – USIE Faculty Student Advisory Committee: 2005-07

Elizabeth Bjork
Department of Psychology

Cindy Fang
Undergraduate Student Representative

Kay D'Sousa
Undergraduate Student Representative 2006-2007

Michelle Sassounian
Undergraduate Student Representative 2005-2006

Robert N. Watson, *Chair*
Associate Vice Provost for Educational Innovations
Department of English

Ex Officio
Lucy Blackmar
Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives

Kumiko Haas
Associate Director, Office of Instructional Development

Attachment 2 – USIE Seminars 2005-2006 through 2006-2007

The most recent year's seminars are listed first.

USIE Seminars — Spring 2007

Anthropology 88SA. Forget CSI: The Reality of Forensic Anthropology
Student Facilitator: Melinda Munroe – Faculty Mentor: Jeffrey Brantingham
This course focuses on the application of the science of physical anthropology and the study of the human skeleton in a legal setting, most often in criminal cases where the remains are more or less skeletonized. This class will study the methods of determining the sex and age of a skeleton, and use those methods with real bones.

Anthropology 88SB. From Spain to UCLA: The Culture of Flamenco Music
Student Facilitator: Juben Rabbani – Faculty Mentor: Mariko Tamanoi
In a world filled with different and distinctive cultures, these cultures are often related to one another through common musical structures. Sometimes the musical features of several cultures- the same cultures that have at times been divided by war and prejudice- are joined in a single genre. This seminar explores one such genre: Flamenco music from Spain.

Anthropology 88SC. Shamans, Spirits, and Soul Stealing: The Anthropology of Spiritual Medicine
Student Facilitator: Kristine Van Hamersveld – Faculty Mentor: Gail Kennedy
Rather than using biomedicine, some cultures look at healing and ailment as spiritually-rooted. This course will introduce students to different ways of looking at health and medicine around the globe, including the United States.

Anthropology 88SD. Emergence from the Secret War: The Hmong-American Experience
Student Facilitator: Eric Yang – Faculty Mentor: Sharon Bays
Who are the Hmong and what is their Secret War? What is their past, present, and future? The answer to these questions will not be found in textbooks at elementary schools, junior high schools, or high schools across the country. This unique course will focus on the Hmong-American experience.

Art 88S. Art and Feminisms: Theory and Studio
Student Facilitator: Mahyar Nili – Faculty Mentor: Hirsch Perlman
An exploration of the intersection of art and feminisms, with a focus on making art, and the dialogue around intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and religion. Seminar will examine the history of art informed by a plurality of feminisms.

Art History 88S. Contemporary Chinese Photography
Student Facilitator: Julia Wai – Faculty Mentor: Hui-Shu Lee
This seminar examines issues of contemporary art in China through the medium of photography. By using photography, this course identifies and analyzes the various tensions of contemporary art in China, its definitions, terms, and driving forces.

Chicano Studies 88S. 'Yo Soy El Army': Chicanos/as and the U.S. Military
Student Facilitator: Elvira Rodriguez – Faculty Mentor: Alicia Gaspar de Alba
The Spanish counterpart to the famous slogan, "Be All That You Can Be" seems to be on urban radio stations in Los Angeles every hour. This course focuses specifically on the relationship between the Chicano population and the United States military, as it intersects with education, socioeconomic status, immigration, family, gender, and the media.

Economics 88S. Innovations Against Poverty
Student Facilitator: Nafis Atiqullah – Faculty Mentor: Peirre-Olivier Weill
This seminar explores microfinance, a growing field that seeks to provide lending, banking, and insurance services to the poor. This course examines institutions of microfinance and their varied impacts across Asia, South America, Africa, and the United States.

English 88S. From Anansi to Captain Jack Sparrow: Tales of the Trickster
Student Facilitator: Peter Aoun – Faculty Mentor: Joseph Nagy
What do Captain Jack Sparrow, Anansi the Spider, and a mischievous monkey have in common? They are all tricksters- the archetypal character found in stories from numerous cultures and time periods. This seminar will look at the trickster as presented in stories from diverse cultures. Examination of how each version of the trickster reflects its culture of origin.

History 88S. Cultural History of Oakland
Student Facilitator: Joseph De Wolk – Faculty Mentor: Mary Corey
The city of Oakland as a case study of broader national and statewide cultural histories, urban development and urban issues, race relations, minority and countercultures, popular sports, and music history. Exploration of the cultural roots of Oakland and how earlier cultural developments helped lay the foundation for more recent developments.

Neurobiology 88S. Brain Fever: Bridging the Gap Between Neuroscience and Psychology
Student Facilitator: Anthony Eskander – Faculty Mentor: Arnold Scheibel
A seminar to introduce students to the fundamentals of the human brain, starting from embryology, and all the way through to various disorders. Course will bridge the gap between the two major schools of thought of how to approach the study of the brain.

Political Science 88SA. Never Again, *Again*: Looking at the Rwanda and Darfur Genocide
Student Facilitator: Karina Garcia – Faculty Mentor: Edmond Keller
After the Holocaust, the international community clamored that "Never Again" would it let such a horrifying event occur without taking action. Then came Cambodia, Bosnia, Rwanda, and now the Sudan. This seminar focuses specifically on the 1994 Rwandan genocide and its current effects, and the ongoing genocide in the Darfur region of Sudan.

Political Science 88SB. Aid to Africa: Effects from the Outside
Student Facilitator: Dana Huber – Faculty Mentor: Michael Lofchie
This course will examine the economic situation in Africa, specifically from the perspective of those contributing to the development of the continent. Through case studies, academic readings, and film, students will be able to understand the allocation of aid to Africa, and determine what has brought about change.

Psychology 88S. Psychology of Body Image
Student Facilitator: Lisa Connolly – Faculty Mentor: Traci Mann
This course will explore the creation of norms in American society that place high emphasis on appearance and body image, with note to how these standards have evolved. An examination of how norms are internalized in the individual, their variance between the sexes, among different ethnicities, and age groups.

Social Welfare 88S. Student Voice, Student Action: UCLA Takes a Stand
Student Facilitator: Michael Soh – Faculty Mentor: Duncan Lindsey
From the shooting at Campbell Hall involving the Black Panthers and US and the Chicano-Studies movement, to Unicamp and Dance Marathon @ UCLA, students at this university have taken it upon themselves to ensure that their voices be heard. This course looks at the opportunities, risks, victories, and defeats of students who decided to take what they learned in the classroom and apply it to the global community.

Sociology 88S. Social Feast: An Introduction to Food and Society
Student Facilitator: Crystal Cheung – Faculty Mentor: Terri Anderson
This seminar uses food as a point of departure to explore the field of sociology. Exploration of food as it relates to our personal identities and to the society at large- What is food? How does it relate to you personally, and how does it relate to the world around you?

USIE Seminars — Spring 2006

Art History 88S. Outsider Art
Student Facilitator: Whiney Mercer – Faculty Mentor: Steven Nelson
Outsider art is name given to a genre that incorporates a large spectrum of picture/object/environment makers that are largely untrained. This seminar is a discussion of the history of outsider art, paying close attention to issues of gender, class, and ethnicity to examine how these issues function in relation to the art world.

English 88SA. American Short Story Today
Student Facilitator: Aaron Fai – Faculty Mentor: Stephen Dickey
What is the state of the form today and what value does contemporary fiction hold for readers, if any? Discussion of a myriad of fiction writers working today who may be passing under the reading radar of the general public to make some sense of what is happening in short fiction in the 21st century.

English 88SB. Comic Books as Literature
Student Facilitator: Holly Schwarz – Faculty Mentor: Katherine Hayles
Comics are more than just pictures with words; they employ the same literary and artistic techniques as novels and great works of art to create captivating and enriching stories. Seminar examines a limited number of comics, breaking down stereotypes of comic books to see them as an art form worthy of critical analysis.

English 88SC. Resurrecting Philosophers and Victorians from the Dead with "The Matrix"
Student Facilitator: Cindy Tran – Faculty Mentor: Mark McGurl
Making canonical works easier to understand with the context of contemporary culture. Use of "The Matrix" movie (and other media) to gain a unique introduction to antiquated texts, namely those written by philosophers and Victorians. Asking and analyzing what it takes to provide a framework for all of our knowledge and beliefs.

Environment 88S. Peak Oil: Understanding the Problem, Creating Solutions
Student Facilitator: Christopher Crump – Faculty Mentor: Stephanie Pincetl
Peak oil is point in time when extraction of oil from the Earth reaches its highest point and then begins to decline. Most experts believe the event will happen within next few years and is to be unprecedented, because society and our very way of life are dependent on this constantly increasing source of abundant and inexpensive energy. Focus on understanding the issue fully, and using this new information to address potential solutions.

History 88SA. Jewish Mysticism and Kabbalah from Moses De Leon to Madonna
Student Facilitator: Max Spielberg – Faculty Mentor: David Meyers
Discussion of various topics within Jewish mysticism and Kabbalah, with focus on Kabbalistic and Hasidic mysticism. Certain key concepts and themes to be addressed, such as: What is nature of G-d in Kabbalah? Does the Divine live within each person? What is Shevirah (breaking of vessels) and Sefirot (divine emanations through which world was and is perpetually re-created)?

History 88SB. U.S.-Iran Relations: Politics, Rhetoric, and History of Conflict
Student Facilitator: Combiz Abdolrahimi – Faculty Mentor: Michael Morony
Will the U.S. and Iran ever be able to establish formal relations with one another? Examination of origins of conflict between the U.S. and Iran from time of the Pahlavi Monarchy under Reza Shah during World War II to present-day nuclear ambitions of the conservative Ahmadinejad administration.

History 88SC. 1980's Pop Culture
Student Facilitator: Melvin Jimenez – Faculty Mentor: Téofilo Ruiz
An examination of musical and cultural expression thorough analysis of popular trends in the 1980's such as music, film, fashion, political and social movements, and other emblematic features that characterize the 80's. Consideration of social, political, and historical factors that influenced these popular cultural trends, as well as their lasting impressions on current society.

History 88SD. History of Science Fiction
Student Facilitator: Jeffrey David – Faculty Mentor: Damon Woods
Science fiction is one of the most popular genres in media today, and also one of the most scoffed at. It is also arguably the most creative genre, spawning an unparalleled array of vast and varied ideas and visions. Topical review of science fiction as it has evolved over time, its main themes, and its role in society in past and now.

Pathology 88S. Genomic Medicine: Current Progress and Future Implications
Student Facilitator: Henry Lin – Faculty Mentor: William Grody
Though completely restorative gene-therapies have yet to be developed, it is clear that with advent of new sequencing technology and the completion of Human Genome Project comes new era in medicine. Overview of both the progress and goals of genomic medicine. Technological, ethical, and logistical considerations involved in its practice, as well as basic concepts behind widely used techniques.

Political Science 88SA. Internal Conflicts in Developing States: Closer Look at Rwandan Genocide
Student Facilitator: Manal Quota – Faculty Mentor: Edmond Keller
Focus on Rwanda and events that led to 1994 genocide. To understand the origins of genocide, it is first important to look at the history of Rwanda. Examination of origins of ethnicity, identity, and relationship between Tutsi and Hutu in Rwanda. Evaluation of events that led up to genocide. Study of peace and reconciliation that is taking place today in hopes of healing old wounds.

Political Science 88SB. Globalization and Inequality: Why Are Some Countries Poorer than Others?
Student Facilitator: Patrick Lam – Faculty Mentor: Ron Rogowski
What accounts for the enormous difference in wealth across countries? Introduction to topic of globalization and inequality for both political science and nonpolitical science majors alike. Focus on inequality between-countries and of political science and economics literature that attempt to answer this question.

Political Science 88SC. U.S. Education Policy from Capital to Classroom
Student Facilitator: Lindsey Hilde – Faculty Mentor: Michael Chwe
Beginning with the history of U.S. education policy through the current No Child Left Behind Act, an examination of different issues in current U.S. education policy from federal, state, and local perspectives to understand more specific issues that exist in how education policy today is built.

Political Science 88SD. Conservative Political Movements among Youth in the U.S.
Student Facilitators: Faith Christiansen & Alexander Gruenberg –Faculty Mentor: Timothy Groseclose
Examination of conservative political movements of youth in America from 1960s to present day, with a focus on the evolution of the term and how it has been used by young people in second half of 20th century. Analysis of presence and impact of young conservatives in the Republican Party, political think tanks, and media.

Political Science 88SE. Explaining Ethnic Violence
Student Facilitator: Camilla Liou – Faculty Mentor: Daniel Posner
Violence is often described as "ethnic" and participants of violence as "ethnic groups." But what do those terms mean? Examination of the meaning of ethnic violence and related terms such as ethnic group and of the historical origins of the concept of ethnic nationalism. Use of case studies of recent incidents of large-scale ethnic violence to provide foundation for discussion on theoretical causes of such conflicts.

APPENDIX 1
College FEC – March 9, 2007

Inaugural Year Assessment of the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education Program

Perspectives of
Student Facilitators, Faculty Mentors, and Enrolled Students

Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research
Division of Undergraduate Education

UCLA

Prepared by Jennifer A. Lindholm, Ph.D.

with assistance from

Nida Denson, M.A.
Marc Levis-Fitzgerald, Ph.D.

March 2007

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report highlights the perspectives and experiences of students and faculty who participated in the inaugural year of Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE), a program which provides the unique opportunity for advanced undergraduates to teach their peers under the mentorship of a faculty sponsor. The survey and interview data that were collected from the 16 students who facilitated USIE seminars, 15 faculty who mentored them, and 169 students who enrolled offer insight into important questions about the potential educational, personal, and professional benefits of USIE program participation. The report also details student and faculty views on the value of USIE at UCLA and their opinions about the evolution of this two-year pilot program.

Six Primary Findings Related to the Experience of Student Facilitators

1) Student facilitators applied to participate in USIE because they wanted to share their passion for and knowledge of a particular subject with their peers. Several facilitators were also motivated to participate based on their interest in teaching as a possible career and the opportunity that the USIE program provided them to gain teaching experience.

2) One of the primary benefits of the winter quarter pedagogy seminar was its capacity to promote consistent interaction between facilitators. Many facilitators viewed this "support network" as one of the most instrumental and personally valued aspects of the program.

3) Having now experienced the responsibilities, rewards, and challenges of leading a seminar, student facilitators welcomed the idea of more emphasis within the pedagogy seminar on strategies for facilitating discussion, ideas for engaging students actively in classroom activities, and opportunities to work on developing weekly lesson plans. They also endorsed inviting faculty and graduate teaching assistants to seminar meetings to converse about teaching experiences and hear their related advice. Most facilitators also encouraged the expansion of the pedagogy seminar into a two-quarter format.

4) Student facilitators reported generally positive experiences working with their faculty mentors. Some, however, had difficulty finding faculty who were familiar with the program and willing to serve as mentors. Facilitators advocated raising program awareness among the faculty and providing them with clearer explanation about the mentor role and related responsibilities.

5) For most facilitators, teaching was a rewarding experience. It was also generally more challenging than they anticipated it would be. For many, finding creative ways to encourage students' active participation in class discussions was especially difficult.

6) Overall, facilitators praised the USIE program for providing them with opportunities to grow both personally and professionally. Through participating, some refined their career aspirations and gained new insight about the respective roles and responsibilities of faculty and students within the teaching and learning process. While they offered multiple recommendations for improvement on various dimensions, all supported the program's continuation.

Three Primary Findings Related to the Experiences of Faculty Mentors

1) Most who served as inaugural year USIE faculty mentors first heard about the program when they were approached by students who asked them to serve in that capacity. Many had initial, and sometimes very serious, reservations about undergraduates teaching their peers but ultimately agreed to participate because they were impressed by prospective facilitators' academic ability, preparation, and enthusiasm.

ii

2) Reflecting on their experiences this year, faculty expressed positive feelings about their interactions with the students they mentored and identified multiple benefits of program participation for both the students who facilitate USIE seminars and those who enroll in them. Apart from being a good learning experience for facilitators, faculty commonly lauded the program's potential for introducing students to topics that are not otherwise addressed within the undergraduate curriculum, providing them with low stress learning opportunities, and exposing them to the benefits of peer teaching and learning.

3) Despite their favorable overall impressions and unanimous support for the program's continuation, faculty expressed important cautions and considerations as the program evolves. Primary among them was continued diligence in vetting potential student facilitators to ensure high quality learning experiences for students who enroll in USIE seminars. Faculty also implored their colleagues to think carefully about the responsibilities associated with serving as a mentor and encouraged program administrators to make available more information about the program to them, especially with respect to expectations for faculty mentors.

Six Primary Findings Related to the Experience of Enrolled Students

1) USIE seminars provided enrolled students with opportunities to engage actively with their peers in learning about topics that they find to be inherently interesting but that are not routinely addressed within the existing undergraduate curriculum.

2) Enrolled students frequently reported that they voluntarily invested more time outside of class on seminar-related work than they ordinarily would in a one-unit, pass/no pass seminar simply because they enjoyed what they were studying.

3) Many enrolled students believed that they experienced gains in both intellectual and personal development as a result of taking their USIE seminar. Over two-thirds reported improvements in knowledge about and understanding of the subject matter. In addition, more than half reported improvements in their respect for viewpoints that differ from their own while over one-third reported improvements in both their self-understanding and understanding of others.

4) The vast majority of students characterized their seminars as learning environments where they were both highly engaged intellectually and where they felt comfortable voicing their ideas and perspectives. For many, the USIE seminars provided what they described as a "unique" and "highly valued" opportunity to engage in focused dialogue with their peers.

5) Enrolled students expressed high positive regard for their peer facilitators. The most positive ratings overall were on the dimensions of fairness, engagement, enthusiasm, and responsiveness. Ratings on pedagogical skills and content knowledge were generally somewhat lower although were still rated at least "very good" by most enrolled students.

6) Enrolled students were often inspired by the performance of their peer facilitators. Approximately two-thirds expressed interest in the possibility of teaching a USIE seminar. Of these, nearly half were graduating seniors who, in many cases, expressed regret that they were not aware of the program earlier.

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iv

BACKGROUND

This report presents findings from the assessment of the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE) program during its inaugural year, 2005-06. The USIE courses—where advanced undergraduates teach their peers—represent an innovative approach to undergraduate education. Students themselves initially presented the idea to Vice Provost Judith Smith and she appointed a joint committee of students, faculty, and administrators to explore programmatic possibilities. Ultimately, that committee developed a two-year pilot program, housed within UCLA's College of Letters and Science, that was approved by the College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) in the spring of 2005.

The report provides a brief overview of the program's history along with the conceptual and methodological foundations of the assessment. Following a summary of the demographic characteristics of inaugural year student and faculty participants, key findings are presented on the USIE program experiences and perspectives of the students who served as seminar facilitators; faculty who served as program mentors; and students who enrolled.

During academic year 2005-06, 169 undergraduates—freshmen through seniors—enrolled in 15 USIE seminars that were offered in art history, political science, English, history, pathology, and environmental studies. A complete list of the seminars offered, the students who facilitated them, and the faculty who served as mentors is provided in Appendix A. The seminars shared the following characteristics:

- Designed and taught by advanced undergraduates who completed a pedagogy seminar and worked in consultation with faculty mentors;
- Coursework geared toward interdisciplinary themes that are not currently addressed within the existing undergraduate curriculum; and
- Guided, small-group conversations among peers within the context of a one-unit, pass/no pass seminar.

With the assistance of faculty sponsors, advanced undergraduate students submitted proposals to teach self-designed USIE seminars, which were then vetted by a joint student-faculty committee. Those approved by the committee were offered in spring quarter 2006, as one-unit, pass/no pass seminars. For the undergraduate student facilitators and their faculty sponsors, this was a year-long (three-quarter) experience. Following the application process in fall quarter 2005, student facilitators whose proposals were approved worked with their faculty sponsors on curriculum development throughout winter quarter. During this time, they also enrolled in a 10-week pedagogy seminar that was designed to help them refine their syllabus and learn how to effectively lead a seminar. Throughout spring quarter 2006, student facilitators met regularly with their faculty sponsors to discuss how the seminar was progressing and to review course material.

The USIE program is designed to offer the following advantages to undergraduate students:

- Advanced undergraduates have the opportunity to work closely with faculty members of their choosing to design one-unit seminars around topics that advance their knowledge in a specific discipline;
- Advanced undergraduates receive training on how to prepare for and lead a seminar in which group discussion is central to learning; and
- The number of one-unit lower-division seminars (limited to 20 students) is increased, giving undergraduates more options to enroll in small seminars designed to encourage discussion and critical thinking around a topic of interest to them.

1

ASSESSMENT OF THE USIE EXPERIENCE

Recognizing the need to assess the effectiveness of the USIE program, Vice Provost Smith asked the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER) to develop an assessment plan for USIE's inaugural year. Careful evaluation of the pilot program is needed to inform two questions: Do the benefits of USIE program participation justify the program's continuation? If so, what can we learn from this assessment about how to refine the existing program to enhance the experiences and educational outcomes of those who are involved?

The assessment was itself a pilot effort in which different quantitative and qualitative methodologies and instruments were employed. This phase of the assessment was not designed for hypothesis testing and cannot support causal conclusions about the effects of USIE program participation on the students who facilitated USIE seminars, those who enrolled in USIE seminars, or the faculty who served as mentors to the facilitators. It does, however, provide a rich description of the experiences of those who participated in various capacities within the USIE program's inaugural year, the self-perceived effects of their respective engagements, and their associated recommendations for the program's evolution. The inaugural year assessment also offers structured feedback on important questions, with the intent of informing discussion and stimulating improvement. Throughout the report, emphasis is placed on highlighting—in their own words—the experiences and perceptions of the participants.

Conceptual Framework and Assessment Methodology

Conceptually, the assessment is based on the construct of learner-centered education which emphasizes the process of learning, as well as the central role that students' backgrounds, perspectives, experiences, interests, aptitudes, needs, and related characteristics play in that process, with an ultimate goal of developing and supporting programmatic efforts that promote effective learning for all students.

Implementing so-called learner-centered pedagogical methods implies a fundamental shift in the role of teachers, whereby they view themselves as facilitators of student learning rather than as disseminators of knowledge. Use of learner-centered pedagogy, which is designed to promote students' active engagement in the learning process, has been associated with higher grade attainment, enhanced intellectual curiosity, improved critical thinking skills, and the development of superior creativity, drive, and leadership skills relative to those found in students who learn through more traditional pedagogical methods. The extent to which students engage in work that is personally meaningful and learn to take ownership of their actions is also known to impact both their depth of understanding and intrinsic motivation. Although learner-centered approaches to undergraduate education offer numerous advantages, the resulting implementation often presents diverse challenges for faculty, students, and administrators.

This report is based on findings from individual interviews that were conducted with the student facilitators and their faculty sponsors in the spring, summer, and fall of 2006 along with descriptive results from a 190-item survey that was completed at the end of spring quarter by 151 of the students who enrolled in these inaugural year seminars. Insights gleaned via a focus group interview with student facilitators that took place in winter 2006 are also incorporated. In addition to providing personal background information, interview and survey participants responded to questions regarding their: (a) motivations for engaging in the USIE program and related expectations; (b) experiences within the USIE program; and (c) overall USIE Program perspectives and recommendations. Sample surveys and interview protocols are provided in Appendix B.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies) were used to analyze quantitative data (winter 2006 survey of student facilitators and spring 2006 survey of students enrolled in USIE seminars), while simple methods of content analysis were applied to qualitative data (individual interviews with faculty mentors; individual and group interviews with student facilitators; and reflective essays written by student facilitators). In addition to aggregate analyses based on all USIE seminars, data for each USIE seminar were analyzed

2

separately. Not surprisingly, there was notable between-seminar variation in enrolled students' responses to some survey items as well as in student facilitators' preparatory and teaching experiences. Some between-seminar variation in faculty descriptions of their USIE program experiences was also evident.

USIE Participant Characteristics

Table 1 depicts the characteristics of UCLA undergraduates who participated, either by serving as a seminar facilitator or enrolling in a seminar. More men than women served as student facilitators and just over half were Caucasians (56%), followed by Asian Americans (25%) and Chicanos/as (13%). All but one student (a junior) had senior class status. The majority of facilitators were from the Social Sciences (75%), followed by the Humanities (13%), with those from the Life Sciences (6%).

In total, 169 students enrolled in USIE seminars during spring quarter 2006. There were more female than male students and nearly half of the enrolled students were Caucasians (45%); over 52% were seniors. The biggest USIE seminar participant group was from the Social Sciences (38%), followed by Humanities (15%) and Life Sciences (15%), Undeclared (12%), Physical Sciences (9%), majors from outside the College (8%), and those from the International Institute (3%).

Table 1. Student Facilitator and Enrolled Student Characteristics

	% of Participants	
Characteristics	**Student Facilitators (N=16)**	**Enrolled Students (N=169)**
Gender		
Female	44	57
Male	56	43
Ethnicity		
Caucasian/White	56	45
Asian American/Pacific Islander	25	27
Chicano/Latino/a	13	14
African American	0	3
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	1
Other/Did not respond	6	10
Class Standing		
Senior	94	52
Junior	6	22
Sophomore	0	20
Freshman	0	4
Other	0	3
Major		
Social Sciences	75	38
Humanities	13	15
Life Sciences	6	15
Undeclared	0	12
Physical Sciences	0	9
Outside College	6	8
International Institute	0	3

* Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2 depicts the characteristics of the 15 faculty who served as USIE mentors during the 2005-06 academic year. Many more male than female faculty participated and more than three-fourths (80%) were ladder rank faculty; overall, just over half (53%) held the rank of full professor. The largest group of faculty participants was from the social sciences and humanities.

3

Table 2. Faculty Mentor Characteristics

Characteristics	% of Participants (N=15)
Gender	
Female	13
Male	87
Academic Rank	
Professor	53
Associate Professor	20
Assistant Professor	7
Visiting Professor	7
Lecturer	13
Department	
Political Science	33
History	27
English	20
Art History	7
Institute of the Environment	7
Pathology and Laboratory Medicine	7

* Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

FINDINGS

The primary focus of the assessment was to determine student and faculty perspectives on the value of USIE at UCLA and to hear recommendations from both groups regarding how the program can best evolve to enhance undergraduate education at UCLA. The assessment was also designed to understand why participating students and faculty decided to become involved and what their respective experiences as program participants were. This section of the report highlights five sets of findings: 1) Experiences of student facilitators; 2) Experiences of faculty mentors; 3) Experiences of students enrolled in USIE seminars; 4) Views on the value of the USIE program to UCLA; and 5) Thoughts about USIE program evolution.

1. Experiences of Student Facilitators

One of the primary goals in undertaking this inaugural year assessment was to understand what value the USIE program adds to undergraduate education at UCLA. Toward that end, a key set of questions focused on the experiences of student facilitators: What were their experiences? How meaningful to them was their involvement in this program? How might their participation have contributed uniquely to their personal and professional growth?

In response to questions posed to them during individual interviews that were conducted during summer and fall 2006, student facilitators described their program experiences. These conversations, augmented by information that student facilitators shared in the reflective essays they wrote at the end of spring quarter 2006 and in focus group interviews that were conducted at the end of winter quarter 2006, provide insight into their motivations for applying to the USIE program. They also shed light on three critical experiential elements of the USIE program: student facilitator-faculty mentor interactions, pedagogy seminar participation, and peer teaching and learning.

Motivations for Participating
The undergraduates who served as USIE seminar facilitators applied to the program primarily because they were passionate about a topic that wasn't addressed in any depth in the existing undergraduate curriculum, and also they wanted to enhance their personal and professional development while simultaneously "giving back" to UCLA before graduating.

4

Over 90% of the 2005-06 student facilitators indicated that a "desire to share my knowledge of a particular subject" contributed substantially to their decision to apply to become a USIE seminar facilitator. In reflecting on his journey through the inaugural year of the program and describing his reasons for wanting to serve as a USIE seminar facilitator, one student expressed feelings that capture well those of several other of his peers:

> *"It just really interested me to teach something that I liked and that wasn't really available academically on campus. I was interested in finding other people who had the same interests and helping other people understand why I liked [the subject matter] so much and having them in my class. And I've just always kind of been intrigued by teaching. There were just so many things wrapped up in this one opportunity."*

Many student facilitators were also motivated by their feeling that being involved in the USIE program would benefit their personal and professional development. For three-fourths, a desire to "learn more about the subject matter of my seminar" carried substantial weight in their decision to apply. As one student elaborated:

> *"I figured the best way to get me motivated to do more research on topics I'm interested in is if I have to, because the best way to learn something is to have to explain it and go through it yourself."*

For the roughly two-thirds who plan to attend graduate school and who, in a few cases, are considering pursuing academic careers, serving as a student facilitator also offered a chance to "determine what teaching is like" and to "develop teaching skills." For this subset, serving as a student facilitator offered the added benefit of "trying out" teaching as a possible career.

Student Facilitator-Faculty Mentor Interactions
When asked to describe their experiences working with their USIE faculty mentors, one consistent refrain was that, for many would-be seminar facilitators, connecting with faculty who were both interested and available to serve as mentors was often very challenging. One student who felt fortunate to have received immediate and enthusiastic support for her participation in the USIE program from a faculty member whose class she had taken previously explained:

> *"A lot of people last year wanted to do the program but they couldn't find a mentor. I can think of a couple off the top of my head who had really good ideas and would have been great, but they couldn't find a mentor to work with them so they wound up not applying."*

A facilitator who, with the help of other students, was ultimately successful in finding a suitable faculty mentor to endorse his USIE program application explained the challenges he encountered:

> *"A lot of [faculty], I think, didn't really know what the program was about and when I tried to explain it there were several professors who were a little bit…it seemed liked they were outraged. I think it was just a misunderstanding of what the program is and exactly what my responsibility [as a student facilitator] is."*

Another student who concurred that finding a faculty mentor was "definitely the toughest part" of the early stages of the program encountered somewhat different obstacles, including overcoming his own reluctance to approach faculty he did not know about potentially serving as his USIE program mentor:

> *"I didn't really know anyone [in the department where I thought there would be the best fit] and I was a little uncomfortable just kind of going to them blind. In retrospect, I think I could have*

5

because faculty were a lot more…or at least some of the faculty…were a lot more open to the idea of us teaching [than it originally seemed they would be]. But I didn't know that at the time, so I kind of looked for professors [who might be a good match given my topic]. Some said 'No' flat out and others were like, 'Well, this doesn't really belong in our field.' It all turned out okay, but it was a headache and a little worrisome at the time."

Even for students who already had established relationships with faculty who knew their capabilities and were inclined to support their participation in the USIE program, explaining the program's design and objectives resulted in some "startled" responses initially. As one student who had worked closely with her USIE faculty mentor on previous occasions shared:

"I remember when I approached [my mentor] to do this, he was like. 'Wait…what?! What is this program?! Undergraduates teaching undergraduates?!' I'm like, 'Yeah.' And he was supportive. He was like, 'Oh yeah…I know you can do it…I trust you and everything' but it was kind of like, 'Well…what is this?!'"

Once they secured a faculty mentor, students' interactions with them were generally positive. Facilitators often described their mentors as "helpful," "supportive," and, in a few cases, "great." Particularly important to many was their mentor's help in making "good decisions" about seminar scope and content. In retrospect, however, some facilitators lamented the fact that, although not necessarily "unexpected" given their "offbeat" topics, their mentors were not very familiar with their specific subject matter and, as such, were unable to offer as much content-related feedback as might have been desirable.

The nature and consistency of facilitators' interactions with their mentors were also highly variable. Some benefited from working with faculty who readily assisted with whatever topical, pedagogical, or administrative issues arose. As one student facilitator elaborated:

"[My mentor's main] role was to give me a lot of practical advice. He definitely was the one who, if I was thinking of crazy ideas was like, 'No, no, no…how about doing this instead?' He'd bring me back down to earth and explain what actually happens in the classroom. He helped me with grading and how to go about that…with the website…booking a room…just getting things together. He was also very helpful interacting with the department for me. When class started, we met regularly. Mainly, I would just go in and we would talk about what happened in class and he really helped me. My mentor also came to my class once. He loved it…thought it was great. Now he thinks I should be a professor (laughing). He's like, 'You have to [get] a Ph.D.!!'"

Others reported having much more limited interaction with their mentors. In some cases, students attributed this to the fact that their mentor was "very, very busy" and simply not available on a consistent basis. Although they appreciated the multiple, and sometimes conflicting, commitments that faculty often have during the academic year, some described their mentor's lack of availability as "frustrating" and wished there had been more opportunity to discuss with them various pedagogical "issues" and "approaches." As one facilitator described:

"Even though my faculty mentor was great, there were times when I felt like maybe he was a bit busy. It would have been nice [to be able to ask him]…I mean, I was still kind of unsure of things like…how do you structure your lesson plan…how do you go about [various things]. We covered that in the pedagogy seminar, but I felt like sometimes when you're dealing with separate topics, you have to approach each topic differently. I could have used more help for my specific class in that area."

In a few cases—especially for those facilitators who were working with their USIE faculty mentors on other projects or who knew their mentors well based on past associations—the absence of regularly scheduled

6

meetings and more "loosely defined" mentor-facilitator connections was not viewed as being problematic. One student facilitator explained:

> "I was pretty independent. I knew what I wanted to do. My faculty mentor served more as just making sure I did the right things. For the most part, he knew that I knew what I was doing and I knew I knew what I was doing so I just showed him stuff and he approved of it. It was a pretty easy process for me. If I had any problems I would ask him and he would ask how things were going once in a while but, for the most part, it was fairly limited based on whether I needed it or not. He was the one I could turn to if I needed any help but, for the most part, he was there because he had to be [given program requirements]."

However, even for those who did not necessarily engage with their faculty mentor especially regularly or intensively, their mentor's willingness to provide constructive feedback, positive reinforcement, and occasional emotional support when they "freaked out" or momentarily "panicked" about course-related situations was perceived as being invaluable. Facilitators also expressed unified sentiments about the importance of their faculty mentor's attendance at occasional seminar meetings, particularly with respect to the topical input they offered and the pedagogical feedback they occasionally provided. One facilitator detailed his thoughts:

> "[My mentor] attended one of [my] courses during the spring, as he was supposed to. That was really helpful. In fact, I think that was one of our best classes because he was there, mainly as an observer. It was the second or third week of instruction so it was great because we still had most of the term to go, building on his suggestions. I would have also liked to have had him come to one of the last weeks of the quarter. He, unfortunately, was not able to fit that into his schedule. Just the one visit was really nice though."

Facilitators also concurred that faculty "being there is the most important thing." Especially welcomed were clear indicators from faulty that "you know what the program is about" and that "your door is open." While facilitators believed that having a "controlling" mentor would "defeat the purpose" of the program, they repeatedly underscored the importance of mentors taking the initiative to actively demonstrate their interest and support. One student shared his views:

> "I would say to [faculty mentors], 'Do it! Make our lives easier…help us out a little bit.' I think sometimes faculty think, 'I have all these things…I don't want to accept something else.…' But, really, how much work is it? A two-hour luncheon [in spring] quarter and they met with their students maybe 10 hours [in fall] quarter, 5 hours [in winter] quarter. More of them should be willing to do it. Maybe they are willing and we just don't know. My advice for [faculty] would be, 'Find out about [this program] and see if maybe you're interested in doing it.' If you have a close relationship with some students, ask them if they'd like your help…volunteer yourself to them even before you get asked."

Pedagogy Seminar Experiences
For most student facilitators, the winter quarter pedagogy seminar taught by Dr. Kumiko Haas, Associate Director of the Office of Instructional Development, played a central role both in helping prepare them to teach and providing them with a core "support network" that many found to be "invaluable" during their first college teaching experience.

Alternatively characterized as the part of the program that "was crucial to everyone's success," "essential" and "a definite necessity," the pedagogy seminar introduced students to designing a syllabus, leading class discussions, and handling various course preparation and management issues (see syllabus, Appendix C). In the eyes of nearly all facilitators, however, the seminar's most valuable contribution was the opportunity it provided for them to interact regularly with their peers in a structured setting and establish strong connections

7

with each other. By all accounts, the 16 student facilitators quickly became valuable resources for each other, providing substantive ideas and feedback as well as offering reassurance and support when challenges inevitably arose. The comments of several facilitators exemplify this sentiment:

>*"Though we only met once a week, I felt I learned much from my classmates. Seeing how they outlined their class[es], and just associating with their vibrant personalities benefited me greatly. Listening to their different perspectives on how to treat issues that may arise in class helped me think about how I wanted to structure my seminar, and just meeting consistently with a diverse group of people with a common goal helped me develop better teamwork and social skills."*

>*"The camaraderie between the facilitators was actually really, really important to my enthusiasm for the program. I think if it wasn't for them, I wouldn't be as excited to teach the class. I think we just really pumped each other up."*

>*"I'd say [the pedagogy] class was the thing that helped us out the most. We helped each other form the syllabi and we did sample teaching sessions. It was nice to know that you had that whole back-up of people. Whenever you had a problem in your class, [you] would email everybody and [they] would send out their responses so it was really like you had a resource there. It was [also] nice to know that people were going through the exact same thing you were. I have to say [the pedagogy seminar] was one of the best classes I've had here."*

Even students who described themselves as preferring to work independently acknowledged the benefits of having a strong peer support network:

>*"I'm a little more independent than most people in terms of asking for help. When I have a problem, I just kind of deal with it myself. But it was good to see what people think of in terms of teaching a seminar and kind of to shape how I expected to teach my seminar and weave that into how other people teach seminars...what accepted teaching methods are and what good questions are. It just kind of influenced what I was going to do. It definitely calmed me down a little bit."*

Overall, two-thirds or less of the facilitators indicated that the pedagogy seminar had added at least "a lot" to their skills in developing seminar goals and objectives (67%), developing seminar assignments (58%), and facilitating discussion (44%). In part, as one facilitator explained, the sometimes mixed impressions facilitators had about the specific benefits of the pedagogy seminar curriculum may have resulted simply because "there was no substitute for real in-class experience." The overall value of the seminar to the facilitators is perhaps best indicated by the fact that, despite its design as a one-quarter course, they elected to continue meeting voluntarily with the pedagogy instructor on a weekly basis throughout spring quarter.

Teaching Experiences
Without question the most challenging, and powerful, part of the USIE program for most student facilitators was teaching their respective spring quarter seminars. Through confronting "unexpected" circumstances, leading "all different kinds of personality types" in discussion, and managing the often time-intensive weekly preparations for class, many facilitators felt they learned a great deal not only about teaching but also about themselves. By the end of winter quarter, facilitators recalled feeling that they were generally "well prepared" and "ready" to teach. Nonetheless, at the end of spring quarter, they commonly remarked that "teaching is much more difficult than it looks" and that it takes a "certain kind of person" to be able to teach well. A few student facilitators shared impressions of their first-time teaching experiences:

>*"It was [extremely difficult] to be a facilitator. Teaching takes a lot more time than meets the eye. I had my share of both really good and really bad experiences, more so with the former. It was amazing to see how much authority my students gave me without even knowing me."*

8

> *"The most challenging part was just getting over the stage fright and being able to communicate well because I feel like that's what good teachers do."*

> *"When I walked in my first day, I didn't feel like someone threw me in the deep end of the pool or anything and I didn't know how to swim. But it was very different. It was scary for me. I [thought],'Come on, you've performed in front of people before. Why are you nervous?' But you're nervous because they could literally ask you any question, so it's scary. You just want to do well."*

> *"This was basically my first experience teaching. I thought it was terrifying. But, by the end of it, I was feeling like I was really starting to hit my stride. I learned so much from teaching this class that I wish I could do it again and try to do an even better job."*

Some facilitators also talked about how their USIE teaching experience has altered their perceptions of faculty and, in some cases, their own role as students:

> *"I was put in the place of a professor or a T.A. and I definitely understood sometimes why they did what they did. I definitely understood where they were coming from more."*

> *"I can see now how much teachers actually put into it and now, [as a student,] I feel that it's my responsibility to give back as much as they're putting into it. [This experience] kind of added an extra element of responsibility realizing that it's not all just about me and doing what I need to do to pass a test. It's more about learning something valuable that [your professors] are passionate about teaching. I did not realize at all how much work the teachers put into a class. It was just an immense amount of work."*

Facilitators also frequently described their peer interactions within this new dynamic as "rewarding." While they generally concurred that one of the most difficult aspects of teaching was figuring out how best to effectively engage students in thoughtful discussion, some facilitators were "surprised" by the degree of commitment and engagement their students demonstrated, particularly given the one-unit structure of the course and the fact that the seminar was peer-led. As one facilitator commented:

> *"I got told when I started, 'Your kids won't read—it's just one unit, they won't do the work' and 'It's just pass/fail, they won't post online' and 'You'd better be prepared to just talk at them, since you won't be able to get more than one or two to talk.' And I totally expected this to be true. It usually has been true in the classes I've taken, even the small discussion groups. But the fact that this class wasn't [required]...that these students actually wanted to be there and wanted to talk about [the topic] changed all of that."*

Many facilitators—especially those who enjoyed high levels of student engagement within their seminars—attributed the "positive" and "energizing" classroom dynamic, at least in part, to the fact that students generally felt "comfortable" in class and, as a result, were more "uninhibited" to express themselves than they often are in traditional classes. As one noted:

> *"A lot of the students [in my class] were surprised [that I was an undergraduate] because they hadn't heard about the program. When I told them, in a way it changed the way that they spoke out in class. It wasn't as if I'm somebody that doesn't understand what they go through in everyday life. A lot of times people are shy. They don't want to talk to senior members of the faculty because they feel like they won't understand or that they'll get upset if you say the wrong thing in class. So I think that was one of the benefits—that people could speak their minds freely and not worry about saying something 'wrong.'"*

9

One student facilitator who also enrolled in another USIE seminar shared her unique perspective on having experienced the program from two distinctly different student vantage points:

> *"As a student [in one of these seminars] and as a facilitator, I got to watch the program from a special perspective. The whole thing is just totally fascinating. Having played the role of a student in a USIE seminar, I see that it really is all the best parts of learning from graduate students, but better because these facilitator kids are your peers, so it's so less scary. They aren't perfect and you know that from the beginning, so you can really enjoy learning with them and actually see learning taking place, instead of just having information force-fed to you. Plus they're passionate about their topics, or they wouldn't be trying to teach them. I can't say this about some of the professional professors I've had here."*

To be sure, the student facilitators' experiences during their year-long journey through the USIE program were, in the words of one student, "full of both ups and downs." In a few cases, facilitators realized through their USIE involvement that teaching is not a career that they want to pursue. As one of these students remarked, "As for the actual teaching process, I found it exciting at times, but mostly frustrating." Another shared:

> *"Overall, the experience has given me a newfound respect for teaching, but has also made me less excited about the prospect of teaching as a profession. Teaching is undoubtedly one of the hardest things to do, and it was a challenging quarter for me."*

Overall, the student facilitators found teaching to be an "empowering," and "influential" experience; some viewed their participation in the program as a "culmination" of their undergraduate experience at UCLA. All felt "proud" to be part of such a "promising" and "unique" pilot program. In the end, nearly all agreed that they had learned a great deal and that, on the whole, their journey had been both professionally valuable and personally rewarding.

2. Experiences of Faculty Mentors

One of the key elements that distinguishes USIE from similar programs at other colleges and universities is the structured format of the preparatory work that student facilitators are required to engage in prior to teaching their spring quarter seminars. Upon finding a faculty mentor and hearing that their seminar proposal is approved, the USIE facilitators embark on a path that is designed to provide them with information and support in order to enhance their effectiveness as peer instructors. A core component of the program is to connect each student facilitator with a faculty mentor. The individual interviews that were conducted during summer and fall 2006 with the faculty who served as USIE mentors provide additional programmatic insight and perspective.

Faculty most commonly learned about the program when would-be facilitators approached them to inquire whether they would serve as sponsors. Often "skeptical" or "dubious" initially about the idea of undergraduates teaching other undergraduates, most faculty who participated ultimately decided to do so given their past experience working with the particular student who asked for their help and their direct knowledge of his or her ability and work ethic. In cases where they may not have know the student well, if at all, faculty spoke of being swayed to become involved based on the student's clearly apparent knowledge, preparedness, and enthusiasm. As one faculty mentor shared:

> *"My first [feeling] was a bit of trepidation: 'How is this really going to work?' Teaching is no easy. There are very senior faculty who are terrible teachers so my thought was, 'How is a naïve undergraduate going to be able to do it?' But I was relieved that at least there was a faculty mentor and so that reassured me enough that it was worth going ahead with it."*

10

As illustrated by the following comments, other faculty had similar reservations:

> *"I got involved because a student of mine asked me if I would sponsor him. Given that he is a very motivated kid who has actually read in and around the subject he wanted to teach, I said, 'Sure.' I was dubious about [the program] at first [because] what do [undergraduates] know? What could they possibly teach? Could they really impart knowledge or have self-awareness and be self-possessed enough to actually get up there and teach a class?"*

> *"My first thought was, 'What are the tuition implications for students?' I know if I were a parent paying money…or a student working three jobs to put themselves through college…and thought they were going to be getting a professor and it turned out to be a graduate student, I'd be a little miffed. But I'd figure, "Well, it's a research university so that's the way it's going to be sometimes.' But if it were an undergrad…?! So I just hoped that the committee that chooses from among the students who apply does a really good job of making sure that they vet well and that they choose really extraordinary students. Frankly, [the student I mentored] is as good as some of our advanced graduate students. I think for people who are really extraordinary undergrads…who really are as good as graduate students [the program] is fine."*

For the most part, faculty mentors indicated that the time investment associated with their role as a USIE program mentor was "fairly minimal," especially once students' syllabi were prepared. Moreover, nearly all conceived of their roles as being more "reactive" to students' questions and concerns than proactive. They tended to attribute this dynamic, at least in part, to the absence of clearly specified programmatic expectations and, perhaps more importantly, to the fact that student facilitators were "diligent" in preparing for their seminars, "conscientious" in approaching their subject matter and their teaching responsibilities, and "dutiful" in keeping them apprised of what was happening during both the preparation and teaching phases of the program. On the whole, faculty concurred with student facilitators that having "more information" available to them about the program and the associated expectations of them as mentors would be very helpful. In all cases, they expressed positive sentiments about their USIE involvement and commended highly the performance of the individual facilitator(s) with whom they worked.

3. Experiences of Students Enrolled in USIE Seminars

To understand the nature of USIE seminars and enrolled students' perceptions of their characteristics, a course evaluation survey designed by OUER was administered during the last week of spring quarter 2006. In addition to their motivations for enrolling in a USIE seminar, the survey queried students' engagement in different types of seminar activities, the amount of time they devoted to out-of-class seminar work, and their sentiments regarding the appropriateness of the workload given the seminar's one-unit, pass/no pass designation. The survey also asked students to assess various aspects of the seminar, rate the extent to which they felt that their skills/abilities in various realms had been enhanced as a result of their participation, and evaluate both their overall seminar experience and their student facilitator's performance. Student interest in potentially teaching a USIE seminar was also assessed.

Motivations for Participating
For most enrolled students, subject matter was the most compelling impetus for taking a USIE course. Across seminars, more than four-fifths (89%) indicated that the "interesting" nature of the topic was a "very important" reason for enrolling. Roughly half assigned the same level of significance to their belief that taking the course would "enrich" their education (55%) and to the more practical consideration that it "fit well" with their schedule (46%). Overall, more than 70% of those who participated in inaugural year USIE seminars indicated that their "intrigue" with the idea that the seminar was student initiated and taught was at least a "somewhat important" consideration in deciding to enroll. For just over one-third (35%) of these students, it was a "very important" factor. For most (81%), the consideration that a friend was teaching the course was either "not applicable" or "not important." Encouragement to enroll from friends or faculty also had a generally minimal impact on students' participation decisions.

11

Seminar Activities and Time Investment

An important goal of the USIE program is to promote students' active engagement in the learning process. In keeping with that priority, just over three-fourths (76%) of those who enrolled in spring 2006 USIE seminars reported that they had at least "occasionally" offered personal input or feedback on seminar content or activities; nearly one-third (32%) did so "frequently." Another key goal is to expose students to topics that are not generally addressed within the existing undergraduate curriculum at UCLA and to provide them with opportunities to discuss subject matter that is topically relevant in today's society. More than three-fourths (79%) indicated that they had at least "occasionally" been able to apply classroom learning from their USIE seminars to real-life situations. Within that group, nearly half (47%) found that they were "frequently" able to establish such connections.

Overall, roughly two-thirds (65%) reported that they "frequently" participated in intellectually stimulating activities as part of their seminar experience. Students' intellectual engagement is also reflected in the high percentages who reported that they "never" felt bored in seminar meetings (83%) or skipped attending (71%). Only a small minority characterized their course activities as "not at all" intellectually stimulating (5%) or reported that they "frequently" felt bored in, or skipped, class meetings (4% and 5%, respectively).

Nearly half (49%) spent one to two hours per week on the seminar outside of regularly scheduled course meetings; nearly one-third (32%) spent more than two hours per week. While a few students felt that the amount of time they invested was "excessive" given standard expectations for a one-unit course, the overwhelming majority (90%) agreed that the time and effort they put into the seminar was "appropriate." Students' intrinsic motivations for taking these seminars and their willingness to invest time above and beyond standard expectations for one-unit courses based on their genuine interest in the subject matter were clearly evident:

> *"I put much more effort and interest in this class than I did in my regular classes."*

> *"I'd take this class for no units, yet I definitely dedicated more time, thought, and energy to this class than I did to some of my four- and five-unit classes this quarter. Thinking and talking take so much more work than writing a silly paper the night before it's due."*

> *"I feel that the time I put into the class was worth more than one unit, but I think that it was out of my own interest that I put in the extra time that I did. I really did care about what was being covered, and I really wanted to understand and take it all in."*

Intellectual and Personal Development

This study did not attempt to objectively measure or test students' intellectual or personal gains in association with their seminar participation. However, the survey did ask students to indicate the extent to which they believed that their skills and abilities in selected areas had improved as a result of taking their USIE seminar. Table 3 categorizes students' perceptions of their intellectual and personal development.

12

Table 3. Enrolled Students' Ratings of Improved Skills/Abilities As a Result of Taking Their USIE Seminar

	Frequencies (%)* (N=151)		
	To a Great Extent	*To Some Extent*	*Not at All*
Intellectual Development			
Understanding of the topic	75	25	0
Content-related knowledge	64	33	3
Critical thinking skills	37	52	11
Public speaking skills	21	55	24
Analytic/problem solving skills	19	48	33
Writing skills	9	42	49
Library research skills	9	30	61
Personal Development			
Respect for viewpoints that differ from my own	54	37	9
Understanding of others	41	52	8
Self-understanding	36	47	16
Intellectual self-confidence	32	60	8
Interpersonal skills	31	54	15
Social self-confidence	30	49	22
Community-building skills	29	46	25

*Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Enrolled students indicated overwhelmingly that both their content-related knowledge and their understanding of the seminar topic improved as a result of their seminar involvement. Nearly two-thirds felt that their content-related knowledge improved "to a great extent" while fully three-quarters indicated the same degree of self-perceived improvement with respect to their understanding of the topic. All who completed the survey reported that their understanding of the topic improved at least "to some extent."

Three-fourths or more of the enrolled students felt that their participation in a USIE seminar had improved their critical thinking and public speaking skills to at least "some" extent. Just over two-thirds indicated that, to a similar degree, their analytic/problem-solving skills had improved. Perceived writing and library research skills were the least improved overall for most students, with nearly half or more of the students indicating that their skills in these two areas were "not at all" improved.

The majority of students also indicated at least "some" improvement in their personal skills and abilities. The greatest gains were reported in: respect for differing viewpoints, understanding of others, and intellectual self-confidence. In addition, three-fourths of the students or more indicated at least "some" self-perceived enhancement in their interpersonal skills, self-understanding, social self-confidence, and community-building skills.

Seminar Ratings
Tables 4 and 5 display results from two questions included on the spring 2006 enrolled student survey that asked students to rate aspects of their USIE seminar experience.

13

Table 4. Enrolled Students' Ratings of Selected Aspects of Their USIE Seminar

	Frequencies (%)* (N=151)				
	Agree Strongly	*Agree Somewhat*	*Neutral*	*Disagree Somewhat*	*Disagree Strongly*
Course Organization					
The major themes that underlie this seminar are clear to me.	73	20	5	3	0
Intellectual Engagement					
The class discussions are thought provoking.	60	31	8	1	1
I have been challenged to think critically.	54	33	11	1	2
Real Life Relevance/Applicability					
The coursework is relevant to my everyday life.	36	35	23	5	2
The coursework is relevant to my future career plans.	31	25	28	9	9
Community					
My contributions are valued by the seminar facilitator.	75	20	4	0	1
There is respect for diverse perspectives/beliefs.	72	19	7	1	1
I feel comfortable voicing my ideas/perspectives within this seminar.	65	25	7	2	1
My contributions are valued by other students in the seminar.	51	33	13	2	1
There is a strong sense of community among seminar participants.	39	33	19	5	3
Overall Seminar Perception					
If I had it to do over again, I would enroll in this seminar.	73	19	5	2	1

*Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

On the whole, enrolled students evaluated their USIE seminars very positively. The overwhelming majority agreed that the major themes underlying the course they took were clear. There was also widespread agreement that they had been challenged to think critically; fully three-quarters rated as "excellent" or "very good" both the level of intellectual stimulation and the amount of learning that took place.

Enrolled students were most consistently complimentary, however, when asked whether their contributions were valued by the seminar facilitator; whether discussions were characterized by respect for diverse perspectives and beliefs; whether they personally felt comfortable voicing their ideas and perspectives; and whether class discussions were thought provoking. In total, more than nine in ten students "agreed" that each of these conditions was met satisfactorily, while at least six in ten "agreed strongly" that they were. As exemplified by the following comments, the USIE seminars provided many students with a "unique" and highly valued opportunity to engage in "focused dialogue" with their peers about issues and topics of great personal interest and importance:

> *"I really liked the course. You are with people who want to learn and are interested in the same topics. [Relative to my other courses], there is much more class discussion and more intriguing questions and ideas are brought up. I like having people my age discussing relevant topics."*

> *"The student-led element made me feel like we were all learning and not just being taught."*

14

"Discuss[ing] intellectually stimulating issues in a stress-free and fun environment was very enjoyable."

"The subject was really interesting. I felt comfortable speaking up in class and interacting, unlike in my lectures."

Table 5. Enrolled Students' Ratings of Selected Aspects of Their Seminar Experience

	Frequencies (%)* (N=151)				
	Excellent	*Very Good*	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
Intellectual Rigor					
Amount of learning	42	33	19	5	1
Intellectual stimulation	39	40	17	3	1
Personal Involvement					
Your level of enthusiasm about the course	54	29	14	3	1
Your level of involvement/engagement with the course	45	29	19	6	1
Interpersonal Interactions					
Quality of your interactions with the facilitator	53	30	12	3	1
Quality of your interactions with peers	40	31	22	6	1
Overall Seminar Perceptions					
Overall satisfaction	60	30	6	3	1
Overall value of the course	56	32	10	1	1
Overall quality of your learning experience	51	37	11	1	1

*Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

The majority of students also felt that their contributions were valued by other students in the seminar. In addition, nearly three-fourths agreed that a strong sense of community had developed among seminar participants. On the whole, they expressed positive sentiments regarding their interactions with both the student facilitator and other students who were enrolled in the class. Generally speaking, however, students were more likely to report that they experienced positive relations with the student facilitator than with other peer participants.

Not surprisingly given the topical nature of some of the seminars and the broad mix of students who were attracted to enroll, students did not universally agree that their USIE coursework was "relevant" to their everyday life or future career plans. Nonetheless, their personal enthusiasm and engagement levels were generally very high. For example, more than eight in ten students rated their level of enthusiasm for the course as "excellent" or "very good" while roughly three-fourths assigned similar ratings to their level of course involvement/engagement.

Overall, nine in ten students rated their overall satisfaction level with the seminar as "excellent" or "very good." Similar proportions assigned the same ratings to the overall value of the course and the overall quality of the learning experience. The vast majority also agreed that if they had it to do over, they would enroll again in the seminar they took; of these, nearly three-fourths "agreed strongly" that they would make the same decision. Students' responses to the open-ended survey questions underscored these overwhelmingly favorable ratings:

15

"I enjoyed the casual yet stimulating atmosphere. Also, [the program] allowed for a topic that is often ignored by academia. This is a great way to address subjects that exist on the outskirts of the academic world."

"This class is unlike any other in [this] department. I really appreciated that, and I loved interacting with an undergrad."

"[This was] an open and available teaching environment where all are responsible for teaching/ learning; a course independent of grade worries shifts focus to personal development...how school should be."

The most pervasive complaint from enrolled students about their USIE seminar was that the hour-long weekly meetings did not afford enough time for discussion.

Student Facilitator Ratings
Enrolled students nearly unanimously rated the overall quality of their USIE instruction as "excellent" or "very good," with more than two-thirds indicating "excellent" (Table 6). Yet, whereas students very often assigned "excellent" ratings to their facilitator's fairness, personal involvement, enthusiasm, and responsiveness, they were generally less likely to similarly rate various aspects of their facilitator's pedagogical skills and content knowledge. For example, just six in ten students described as "excellent" their facilitator's ease in initiating and facilitating discussion and their preparedness for class . Roughly half gave top ratings to their facilitator's subject matter expertise, clarity of seminar purposes and goals, and logical organization of class material. Not surprisingly given that for many facilitators this was their first time teaching, just under half of the enrolled students rated as "excellent" their facilitator's clarity and skill of presentation. Importantly, however, very few enrolled students rated their facilitator's performance in any particular area as "fair," and even fewer gave "poor" evaluations.

All in all, students' assessments of their seminar facilitators were overwhelmingly positive:

"The facilitator was extremely prepared, enthusiastic, and clear. She was easily approachable and stimulated discussions in and out [of] class."

"I loved the subject and the fact that it was taught so well and informally. It was really wonderful to have an extra class [on this topic] in which I learned really valuable and interesting new things."

"[The student facilitator] was the best part of the course. He was honestly really involved and enthusiastic about the material, and I could get a feel for that myself. He made me want to do the assignments and come to class. He made it interesting."

"The student facilitator is an absolutely amazing teacher. She is supremely knowledgeable and kind and she treated everyone with respect."

"This was one of the best classes I have taken. The structure and the environment made it amazing. I would take this class or one like it every quarter. [The facilitator] made the class!"

16

Table 6. Enrolled Students' Ratings of Their Seminar Facilitator

	Frequencies (%)* (N=151)				
	Excellent	*Very Good*	*Good*	*Fair*	*Poor*
Knowledge					
Expertise in subject	57	35	6	2	0
Pedagogy					
Pace appropriate to student ability	69	23	7	1	0
Ease in initiating and facilitating discussion	62	24	11	3	0
Preparedness for class	61	26	11	1	1
Clarity of seminar purposes/goals	56	29	12	2	1
Logical organization of course material	51	28	17	3	1
Clarity and skill of presentation	46	37	11	5	0
Personal Engagement					
Overall level of involvement/engagement with course	83	13	3	1	0
Enthusiasm	81	15	3	1	0
Other					
Fairness	85	13	1	1	1
Responsiveness to student input and needs	75	21	3	1	1
Overall quality of instruction	69	25	5	1	0

*Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Personal Aspirations

For some, participating in the USIE seminars was best characterized as "empowering." These students often underscored their "intrinsic" interest in the subject matter and praised the program's capacity for "allowing for creativity" and "encouraging students to take charge of their learning." Overall, just under two-thirds of the enrolled students reported that they would personally be interested in applying to teach a USIE seminar. Their desire to serve as future facilitators was based primarily on their positive seminar experience; their expectation that the responsibility would be both "fun" and "challenging"; and the fact that they would "love" to teach about a subject for which they feel great "passion." Several students noted that they had enrolled in a USIE seminar specifically because they were potentially interested in teaching one themselves and wanted to get a sense of what that experience might be like.

A few students (approximately 10%) expressed mixed feelings about personally serving as a USIE seminar facilitator. Although they were "intrigued" by the possibility, they were unsure what they would teach, concerned that they might not have enough knowledge and experience to teach effectively, or worried about how they would be able to manage the required time commitment given their other responsibilities. The remainder (roughly 30%) expressed resolute non-interest, either for similar reasons or simply because teaching "just isn't my thing."

4. Perceived Value of the USIE Program to UCLA

As noted at the outset of this report, a central interest in conducting the inaugural year assessment of the USIE program was to evaluate the program's value to undergraduate education at UCLA. In listening to the sentiments expressed by participating students and faculty alike, it is readily apparent that USIE offers undergraduates a potentially transformative educational experience.

For example, apart from shifts in their own perceptions about the teaching-learning process and their associated responsibilities therein, the inaugural year facilitators spoke, often at length, about USIE's value. Described as "the most effective and important program that I've been a part of for a long time at UCLA" and

17

"one of the most memorable experiences of my undergraduate career," the program provided those who were involved as student facilitators important perspective and offered them unique opportunities.

Many facilitators highlighted the non-traditional classroom dynamic that undergraduate peer teaching provides and talked passionately about the "special opportunities' such an environment creates for facilitators and enrolled students alike to "think outside the box." Quite a few underscored the fact that student-led seminars create "a whole different environment" for teaching and learning that they felt was readily embraced and genuinely respected by most of the students who enrolled in their classes. One facilitator elaborated on why he feels this type of learning experience is especially important for UCLA undergraduates:

> *"A program like this provides kind of an outlet where it's not academically competitive like it is in a lot of different classes. It teaches kids to value other undergraduates. I've seen a lot of people feel that they don't have anything to learn from their friends or from their peers as undergraduates. They want to learn from professors and T.A.s and whatnot, but they don't want to learn from their next door neighbor in the dorms. The USIE program highlights the fact that we're here as much for each other as anything else and that we have different interests...we come from different walks of life...and we can teach people about that..[and] all sorts of things that [they] otherwise wouldn't learn. The USIE program kind of opened that up to a much higher extent than anytime before, and that's really important."*

Student facilitators also identified multiple personal and professional development benefits associated with their participation in the program, including enhanced knowledge of their subject matter and greater confidence in their teaching, administrative, and general leadership abilities. The comments of two facilitators illustrate well the powerful impact that participating in the USIE program had on many of these students:

> *"I really believe that the strengths I gained from this program will help me for whatever it is I want to do... [or] just thinking effectively. I learned more than I could possibly learn from just reading a book or taking a class and I was told by a lot of the students [who took my class] that not only did they have a great time, they actually learned something!"*

> *"The past twenty-something weeks have been, by far, the most challenging, exasperating, rewarding, and beautiful adventure I have attempted. Proper understanding and articulate description will probably only come with time. I never had any intention of teaching. I applied for this on a whim—sort of hoping I wouldn't get picked. I suppose I saw myself spending the rest of my life working a 'job-job,' perhaps continuing onto grad school, though most likely not. Now though, I realize learning something means nothing unless you get to see this knowledge passed on to someone else [and] watch their eyes light up with understanding. I don't think I ever learned as much until I tried to find a way to explain it to someone else. I don't think I ever would have considered [education as a career] without having had this USIE opportunity."*

Students who enrolled in USIE seminars also offered their perspectives on the program's contributions to undergraduate education at UCLA. As reflected by the following remarks, many highly value this "different," "innovative," and "interactive" program:

> *"[USIE] highlights and emphasizes an important facet of university life: Students have as much to learn from each other as they do from professors, and in non-traditional subjects."*

> *"It is a perfect manifestation of the teaching-learning function in which teachers teach and learners learn but learners also teach and teachers also learn. I absolutely believe that classes like this are imperative to a well-rounded undergraduate education."*

18

"[This program] allows students to pursue their interests in a low-stress environment, eliminating competition between students for grades and allowing us to really just focus on the topic."

'There is so much more to be learned from our peers that professors can't always articulate (let alone find the time or desire to). Small seminars like this are less frightening too. I learned so MUCH from the other students in this class!'"

"It makes the UCLA experience more enjoyable. In this class, we learn to learn, not to get a grade."

"[It's] a different dynamic in education—student facilitators [are] easier to relate to—interesting people who teach for merely their own love of the topic—not for prestige or money."

Some enrolled students also specifically highlighted the potential personal and career development benefits of peer-based approaches to teaching and learning that are exemplified by the USIE program:

"Peer instruction is an integral part of the academic journey and enriches the scholarly experience of not only the facilitators, but participants as well."

"Because UCLA is so big, it is difficult to get students together to talk about intellectual issues that matter to them. Student-to-student dialogue and learning is invaluable to the undergrad experience."

"[The USIE program] is very important because it provides an outlet that is fun but also educational. It also gives students who are very passionate about a subject the chance to share their knowledge and [the] students [who take these courses] the opportunity to learn something different. It's also a great way to segue into a teaching career and it's also a great way to meet people who are interested in similar things. I really like it!"

"UCLA is providing an opportunity for students to share their knowledge and get experience for teaching, graduate school, or work. Facilitators gain skills in presenting and organizing a class Students don't feel so intimidated (as opposed to large lectures from Ph.D. professors)."

Like the undergraduate students who participated, those who served as faculty mentors shared very positive impressions of the USIE program's value to UCLA. Most frequently, they highlighted the "exciting possibilities" and tremendous opportunities for "creativity" that can be inspired by the USIE

program, underscoring especially the personal and professional development opportunities that such a "bold" program and "wonderful experiment" specifically offers for students. As one faculty mentor shared:

"I really like the idea of empowering students based upon the proposition that this kind of pure learning can be the best kind of learning that takes place. I've always told my graduate students that you'll learn the most from your fellow graduate students. I really felt that it came off. And I saw students totally engaged when I went to sit in on class…having done the assignments… having thought the issues through…and being super motivated. So I like the idea."

Focusing specifically on the program's benefits for student facilitators, another faculty mentor commented:

"I think [this program is] very, very important. It's important for the student because they begin to understand what it is that they get in the university context and the kind of seriousness with which courses are constructed. This is a very, very good learning experience for a student. It provides

19

them experience and knowledge that can be applied in other realms [and] it provides them an opportunity to construct something with a little bit of rigor and depth."

Among the elements that faculty spoke most positively about with respect to the USIE seminars themselves is that they are "very defined," "special interest" topics that faculty "haven't been working on or aren't working on, or may approach in an entirely different kind of way." As such, these course offerings were viewed by faculty as valuable to the extent that they "add to" the existing curriculum by focusing on "interdisciplinary subjects" that people are concerned about in a "topical, punctual way" and that "might not otherwise be taught."

Importantly, as facilitators and enrolled students also highlighted, faculty frequently pointed out that these seminars are also "not high pressure." Consequently, they applauded the fact that taking a USIE seminar enables students to step back from the daily stresses of academic life at UCLA and enjoy learning purely for the sake of personal interest and enrichment. In keeping with this inherent characteristic of the program, a few faculty also encouraged promoting freshman enrollment in these seminars not only to provide them with opportunities to gain confidence in expressing themselves, but also to expose them early on in their undergraduate careers to the "power" of peer teaching and learning. Also very important from the vantage of point of some faculty is the community-building potential that a program like USIE offers. As one faculty mentor explained:

> *"One [value of the USIE program] is that it helps to create community among students on a campus where community is almost institutionally impossible. [A] second [value] is that it helps to create an intellectual community. One of my concerns...or even gripes...about UCLA is that, especially at the undergraduate level, there's not an intellectual community, which is to say that there is not generally a community of students who are lovers of learning...who make the extra effort to learn beyond taking a class and getting a grade and achieving whatever vocational benefit one can get. Education here is very much instrumental. This has a little bit more of the feeling of learning for its own sake. And I love that. I think we should do whatever we can to cultivate that kind of intellectual passion."*

5. Thoughts About USIE Program Evolution

When asked how they would like to see USIE evolve in year two of the pilot program and beyond, students and faculty alike enthusiastically endorsed its continuation essentially "as is." Nonetheless, they highlighted a few key considerations and "cautions." Primary among them were issues of "quality control," especially with respect to limiting the program's overall size and maintaining a "very careful screening process" for selecting student facilitators. The overwhelming majority also concurred that individual seminars should remain "relatively small" and agreed that, while the program might reasonably be able to expand a bit beyond the 15 seminars that were offered in spring 2006, large-scale growth is not advisable. As one faculty member elaborated:

> *"In my opinion this program should be kept small because it involves significant administrative overhead and there's a lot of faculty time and resources and a lot of administrative time and resources that goes into creating this...much more than if a faculty member were teaching a course. I wouldn't want to see this grow to, say, 90 courses. It's appropriate to keep it small.   I think it's a great program...it's great for the students...it's great for the student leader...the faculty seem to be willing to offer their time on a pro bono basis for this...but I really do think it should be small. I wouldn't want to see the program think that it was going to improve by expanding. Keep it small. Maintain high quality."*

Based on their experiences during the program's inaugural year, faculty also concurred that, to work most effectively, the USIE program requires the continued participation of "outstanding" undergraduates in the student facilitator role. Specifically, they should be "self starters," have an "interest in pedagogy," and

20

identify a topic about which they are both "passionate" and have "expertise" and that is not the primary focus of any existing faculty-taught course. To succeed as USIE facilitators, faculty also agreed that students must also be able to exercise effective peer leadership. One mentor shared his perspective:

> *"When I went and sat in on class...yes, [the student facilitator] was an undergraduate just like the other students, but they basically treated her like a professor and I think that's because she is a step ahead of most undergraduate students and they appreciate that. I think there are a handful of undergraduate students here [who] are so extraordinary that that can be said. And I think for those sorts of people, this program is appropriate. For students who are—and would be seen to be—peers of the students in the class, I think it's not appropriate."*

Student facilitators and faculty mentors also underscored the importance of future facilitators recognizing and appreciating the significant time commitment that is required to prepare and teach a course well and emphasized the fact that those who hope to serve as facilitators "start early" and "plan accordingly." One faculty mentor elaborated:

> *"The student might be thinking of it in terms of a one- or two-unit course and think, 'Well, that's not that much work. But, of course, it's much, much more work from the teacher's viewpoint than it is from the student's viewpoint. The students in this group didn't seem to underestimate it...but I think that's a potential problem and [prospective facilitators] need to be made aware that this is quite a commitment and it's really going to be a serious time commitment."*

Especially critical in the eyes of the 2005-06 faculty mentors is the degree of "openness" the student facilitator has to seeking faculty input and the willingness of faculty mentors to be available to discuss ideas and offer support to their mentees through the inevitable ups and downs of teaching a course. When these conditions are collectively met, the faculty who were interviewed believed that undergraduate participation—either as a facilitator or an enrolled student—in the USIE program can be a "richly rewarding" experience. Reflecting on the type of student who is "best" suited to serve as a USIE facilitator, one faculty mentor remarked:

> *"We have a good number of students here who will want do this simply because it will look good on their resume. That's not a kind of student you want. You will have students who will want to do this because they think it's an easy credit to pick up. That's not a student you want. And then I think there are students who are deeply interested in teaching and helping and doing things of this sort. Their record will tell you...their activities...their engagements with other students...all of that will tell you who is good and who is not."*

Another shared similar convictions:

> *"I probably wouldn't do this with most students. [It's something I would weigh on a case-by-case basis] both because of the burden it would put on me as the supervisor and also because of the fairness to the students who are taking the class."*

While faculty generally underscored that it is "really important" to "keep the burden [for faculty mentors] low," they also shared ideas for how to perhaps more effectively engage other faculty. As exemplified by the following comments, one idea is to create opportunities for USIE faculty mentors to converse with each other about the program and their respective experiences:

> *"I think it might be interesting to bring faculty together who are working on these kinds of classes to share their experiences. I know people are busy, but I still think that it would be a nice thing to do for the faculty members and also might raise some interesting experiences that would be*

21

> *valuable [for administrators]. Are there maybe some things that faculty members could learn from one another about the experience? It would be valuable to have a chance to talk together."*

> *"Gather together all of the students who are doing this and perhaps invite the faculty sponsors for a get together so that people can exchange ideas about how to make this work even better."*

Another idea that was offered by faculty mentors is to provide more information to faculty at large about the program and its overarching purposes and goals. Several faculty also endorsed prioritizing the creation of a "community of undergraduate teachers working in tandem" where student facilitators would engage not only with their own faculty mentor but also with faculty who are mentoring other student facilitators. Such interaction—designed to stimulate cross-generational dialogue about teaching and learning and to simultaneously support student and faculty development—could potentially occur either as part of the pedagogy seminar or via some other programmatic mechanism.

Student facilitators also endorsed these recommendations. While they welcomed the opportunity to take the lead in designing and teaching their seminars and embraced a "supporting" as opposed to "directive" role from their faculty mentors, many also expressed a desire for more communication with faculty. As one facilitator suggested:

> *"I would like to see more interaction between the faculty and the student facilitators. If that would be possible, it would be great...maybe once or twice a month have get togethers where the facilitators and faculty can meet all together...not just one-on-one...have a faculty-mentor night or something where you get to meet."*

Many facilitators also supported the idea of engaging faculty in pedagogy seminar discussions. Especially attractive was the possibility of inviting those who are serving as mentors—or who are members of the UCLA faculty at large—to attend pedagogy seminar meetings and share with facilitators their philosophies of teaching, their own good (and bad) classroom experiences, and their insights on how best to engage students in class discussions and activities. Appreciating that it may not always be feasible given scheduling conflicts and their mentor's overall workload, several facilitators also suggested that it would be helpful for faculty mentors to make at least two visits (i.e., one at the beginning of the quarter and one near the end) both to offer content-related insights and to provide pedagogical feedback.

Overall, faculty mentors praised the efforts of the students, faculty, and administrators who were involved in establishing the USIE program. They encouraged its continuation and advocated ensuring that there is adequate support in place—ranging from the availability of helpful mentoring to better information technology infrastructure—so that future cohorts of undergraduates who teach and enroll in these seminars can benefit optimally from the myriad educational opportunities that USIE can potentially provide. In summing up her impressions of the program, one faculty mentor concluded:

> *"I personally think that there's a return on the part of the student body to wanting to understand how the world works and that the university is in a time lag and it's actually becoming less responsive to these kinds of questions and far more technocratic. Unfortunately, academic learning has become increasingly abstract and self referential. I don't know how you bridge that, actually, and I think it's a really big, big challenge. Fortunately, there's this outlet but it's only as good as the faculty mentor [that students] find to help them do it. It's really important for faculty to be there and involved."*

Like many of their peers who enrolled in USIE seminars, the undergraduates who facilitated these innovative courses frequently expressed a strong sense of ownership and pride in having been part of this experimental program. Many spoke particularly passionately about their hopes for the program, its future participants, and its place within UCLA. The remarks of one facilitator capture especially well the sentiments of many of her peers:

22

"I'd like to see the program evolve so that it's something as fresh in people's minds as the Rose Bowl and the Alumni Association. When we say, 'The USIE program...,' I want it to be something that people know about. I want it to be one of those things at UCLA that people will remember. It would be great if this became a tradition."

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The undergraduates who served as inaugural year USIE seminar facilitators viewed their responsibilities in association with that role as an honor. On the whole, they reported overwhelmingly positive sentiments about the program and its potential to enhance undergraduate education at UCLA. For many, teaching was more challenging than they originally presumed it would be. However, for the vast majority, it was a rewarding experience that was enhanced immeasurably by their participation in the winter quarter pedagogy seminar and their interactions with faculty mentors. Serving as a seminar facilitator also tended to provide powerful insights about the respective roles and responsibilities of faculty and students, and led to an enhanced respect for teaching as a profession. Participating in the USIE program also helped to refine some facilitators' career aspirations. Overall, they conveyed tremendous ownership not only of their individual seminars but also of the USIE program as a whole. Beyond expressing a desire to see the program continue and mature, many indicated a willingness to share their experiences and insights with future facilitator cohorts and to serve as general resources and representatives as the program evolves.

Having experienced the myriad responsibilities, rewards, and challenges of leading a seminar, facilitators offered several recommendations for the future. First, they supported making minor refinements in the program's administrative structure and creating enhanced communication networks to relay key procedures and timelines. Second, facilitators encouraged adjustments in the pedagogy seminar curriculum such that more time can be devoted to exchanging ideas about teaching and learning, inviting guest speakers, and engaging in practice teaching. Third, they expressed a need to clarify, and perhaps revise, the role of faculty mentors within the USIE program and endorsed efforts to help the UCLA faculty as a whole understand the program's fundamental purposes and goals. Finally, facilitators advocated maintaining a very careful vetting process for selecting future facilitators in order to uphold the core educational values upon which the program was founded.

Faculty mentors also shared generally positive perceptions of their USIE experiences and expressed strong support for the program's continuation. Although they were forthcoming in expressing their early reservations about the program's viability given its innovative focus on undergraduates teaching other undergraduates, those who served as mentors ultimately expressed high regard for the facilitators they sponsored and for the program's contributions to undergraduate education at UCLA. Like facilitators, they supported maintaining very high standards for selecting future facilitator cohorts both in order to ensure educational quality and promote positive experiences for all involved. While they recognized that there are potentially many students at UCLA in any given year who would do an excellent job leading USIE seminars, faculty advocated keeping the program small; perhaps enlarging it somewhat, but not tremendously so. Finally, paralleling the sentiments expressed by student facilitators, faculty welcomed having more information available to them about the USIE program and specifically encouraged more clearly stated expectations for the faculty mentor role. Emphasizing the program's potential community-building capacity, some faculty also supported having more structured opportunities for student and faculty participants to connect with each other and share insights and experiences.

Like the faculty mentors and the facilitators, students who enrolled in the USIE seminars also lauded the program. They expressed great enthusiasm and tremendous gratitude for having had an opportunity to engage in focused dialogue with their peers about topics and issues that have considerable personal and societal value. Many also reported gains in both their intellectual and personal development as a result of their seminar involvement. Students conveyed their appreciation for being able to learn in a low stress

23

academic environment where they could rediscover the joy of learning purely for the sake of learning and gain sometimes newfound respect for the perspectives, talents, and contributions of their peers. They also expressed respect for their peer facilitators based not only on the courage they demonstrated in accepting responsibility for teaching a course, but also for their capacity to effectively engage their peers intellectually and to promote teamwork, mutual respect, and feelings of community within their courses. All in all, they strongly endorsed the program's continuation. Many also expressed interest in teaching a USIE seminar themselves. Enrolled students' most frequent criticism of their USIE seminars was that the hour-long, once per week structure did not allow as much time for discussion as they would have liked.

In summary, the USIE program provides unique and valuable opportunities for students, faculty, and administrators to interact with each other in non-traditional ways. As such, it has the potential to promote new connections and facilitate enhanced awareness and understanding for all involved. Perhaps most importantly, the program provides a curricular mechanism for promoting engaged learning and community building. As evidenced throughout this report, students and faculty alike embraced the program's possibilities and welcomed its incorporation as a regular part of undergraduate education at UCLA. Students' enthusiastic endorsement of USIE and the resoundingly positive personal, academic, and professional outcomes they associate with their participation in the program provide further evidence that, with appropriate guidance and support, undergraduates can not only "handle" peer teaching and learning environments, but thrive within them.

24

APPENDIX A

USIE SEMINARS
SPRING 2006

Student Facilitator	Faculty Mentor	Course Title	Department
Whitney Mercer	Steven Nelson	*Outsider Art*	Art History
Aaron Fai	Stephen Dickey	*American Short Story Today*	English
Holly Schwarz	Katherine Hayles	*Comic Books as Literature*	English
Cindy Tran	Mark McGurl	*Resurrecting Philosophers and Victorians from the Dead with "The Matrix"*	English
Christopher Crump	Stephanie Pincetl	*Peak Oil: Understanding the Problems, Creating Solutions*	Institute of the Environment
Henry Lin	Wayne Grody	*Genomic Medicine: Current Progress and Future Implications*	Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Max Spielberg	David Myers	*Jewish Mysticism and Kabbalah: From Moses De Leon to Madonna*	History
Combiz Abdolrahimi	Michael Morony	*US-Iran Relations: The Politics, Rhetoric, and History of the Conflict*	History
Melvin Jiminez	Teofilo Ruiz	*1980's Pop Culture*	History
Jeffrey David	Damon Woods	*History of Science Fiction*	History
Manal Quota	Edmond Keller	*Internal Conflicts in Developing States: A Closer Look at the Rwandan Genocide*	Political Science
Patrick Lam	Ronald Rogowski	*Globalization and Inequality: Why Are Some Countries Poorer Than Others?*	Political Science
Lindsey Hilde	Michael Chwe	*U.S. Education Policy: From the Capital to the Classroom*	Political Science
Faith Christiansen/ Alex Gruenberg	Timothy Groseclose	*Conservative Political Movements Among Youth in the United States*	Political Science
Camilla Liou	Daniel Posner	*Explaining Ethnic Violence*	Political Science

25

APPENDIX B

USIE SURVEYS AND INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Undergraduate Student Initiated Experience (USIE) - Student Facilitator Survey
Winter 2006

Name: _____

Student ID: _____

Please take the time to give us your honest and detailed feedback about your USIE experience. Your comments and suggestions will greatly assist us in providing the best program possible.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and will have no impact on your standing in the program. You may choose not to fill out the questionnaire, and this again will have no bearing on your standing in the program. The mentors and instructors will never see or have access to your individual responses to the questionnaire, and your name will not be associated with your responses. Only aggregate responses to the questionnaires will be used in this assessment. Thus, your responses to each questionnaire will remain confidential.

You are being asked to provide your name and student ID number on the questionnaire so that your responses can be tracked over the course of your participation in the program. You can also choose to fill out the questionnaire anonymously.

If you have any questions or concerns about this assessment project, please feel free to contact Marc Levis-Fitzgerald. His email address is mlevis@college.ucla.edu and his phone number is 310-206-5409. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you can contact the Office of Protection of Research Subjects at 310-794-9565.

Instructions to students: Circle one answer for each question on each scale: NA = Not Applicable; 1 = lowest rating to 5 = highest rating.

MOTIVATION FOR PARTICPATION IN USIE

1. **Why did you decide to participate in USIE?**

	NA	Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	A lot	A great deal
Develop teaching skills	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Learn more about the subject matter of my seminar	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Share my knowledge of a particular subject	NA	1	2	3	4	5

26

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT PREPARATION and GAINS

2. **How much did each of the following aspects of the USIE experience help you develop your seminar syllabus?**

	NA	Was of no help	Helped a little	Helped	Helped a good deal	Helped a great deal
Faculty mentor	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Pedagogy seminar	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Feedback from USIE students in pedagogy seminar (HC 101E)	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Feedback from USIE students outside pedagogy seminar (HC 101E)	NA	1	2	3	4	5

3. **How much has the USIE pedagogy seminar (HC 101E) ADDED TO YOUR SKILLS in each of the following?**

	NA	Nothing	Just a little	Somewhat	A lot	A great deal
Developing seminar course goals and objectives	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Developing seminar assignments	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitating seminar discussion	NA	1	2	3	4	5

4. **To what extent did you MAKE GAINS in any of the following as a result of your participation in USIE ?**

	NA	Not at all	Just a little	Somewhat	A lot	A great deal
Knowledge and understanding of my seminar topic	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Confidence in my ability to lead a seminar	NA	1	2	3	4	5
Skill in facilitating discussion	NA	1	2	3	4	5

27

GENERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

5. What challenges did you face during the application process and how might it be improved?

6. What challenges did you face when developing your seminar?

7. Describe interacting with your faculty mentor.

8. Do you have any suggestions on how the pedagogy seminar (HC 101E) might be improved?

28

<div align="center">

Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE)
Student Facilitator Focus Group Protocol
Winter 2006

</div>

Introduction (5 minutes)

    A.   *Introduce yourself*
Hello! My name is Marc Levis-Fitzgerald and I direct the Office of Undergraduate Evaluation and Research. We are conducting an ongoing assessment of USIE and the experiences of students who participate in USIE.

    B.   *Student rights*
Please take the time to give us your honest and detailed feedback about your USIE experience. Your comments and suggestions will greatly assist us in providing the best program possible.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and will have no impact on your standing in the program. You may choose to not participate in the assessment. Your name will not be associated with your responses. Only aggregate responses to the questionnaires will be used in this assessment. Thus, your responses will remain confidential.

    C.   *Preface discussion*
We hope to have an open discussion based on your opinions, comments and experiences regardless of whether they are good, bad or neutral. All your thoughts are very important to us because there are no right or wrong answers here and we want to hear everything you have to say. Your comments will be used to help guide the development of the program.

Our discussion should last about 45 minutes.

    D.   *Set ground rules*
Before we begin, let's set out some ground rules:
        We will never identify you directly, however, your comments may be used in our write-up as we discuss the opinions regarding this course.
        Again, there are no right or wrong answers. There may be differences in opinions, and in fact, we're hoping there will be. Please share any comments with us and don't worry if they're not what your neighbor is saying. Conversely, if you agree with your neighbor, we want to know that too. Speak up clearly and talk one at a time. We're recording this session because we don't want to miss any of your comments, but the recording has a tendency to get garbled if more than one person speaks at once or if you speak too quietly.

    E.   *Questions? If not, let's get started.*

Motivation and Goals (10 minutes)
    1.   Let's start by going around the group so that each of you can tell us why you chose to participate in USIE.
    2.   When you began the experience, what did you hope to get out of it?
        a.   How did the experience meet or not meet these goals?
        b.   What helped to facilitate or prevent accomplishing them?

Interaction (10 minutes)
    1.   What challenges did you face during the application process and how might it be improved?
    2.   Describe interacting with your faculty mentor.
    3.   How did you find the faculty mentorship experience? What were the associated challenges?
    4.   Comment on the pedagogy seminar (HC 101E). What were the strengths of the seminar? How could the seminar be improved?

<div align="center">29</div>

5.   Describe your interaction with the seminar pedagogy (HC 101E) instructor?
6.   Has it been valuable for you to be class with other student facilitators?

Course Development (10 minutes)

1.   What has been your experience with seminar approval procedures at UCLA and other procedural requirements?

2.   Have you learned anything about the ethical obligations of teaching a seminar at a university?

Closing (10 Minutes)

A.   Have you ever taken a 1 unit seminar before?

B.   Why do you think students would be interested in taking a student led seminar?

C.   Do you think students will be attracted to your seminar?

D.   Is there anything else we haven't already talked about that you feel you have gained from this experience?

E.   Thank you for your time and your thoughts. Your comments will be helpful to future program development.

30

USIE Course Evaluation Form
Spring 2006

The Office for Undergraduate Evaluation and Research (OUER) at UCLA is currently in the process of conducting a programmatic assessment of the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE) Program. As a student who is enrolled this quarter in one of the USIE seminars, your perspectives on the program and your involvement with it are a centrally important part of this research. In lieu of a regular course evaluation, we are asking that you fill out this survey which asks you to reflect on your USIE seminar experience. On average, it should take approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire.

Your answers to this survey are confidential. You are being asked to provide your student ID number on the questionnaire so that your responses can be merged with key demographic data (i.e., gender, race, major(s)/minor(s), year in school) from the Registrar's office. You can also choose to fill out the questionnaire anonymously. The information you provide will be combined with responses from other participants and reported in the form of summary statistics and group totals. Your name, student ID, and any identifying attributes will NOT be connected to your responses in any reports or publications. Although we hope you complete the survey, your participation is voluntary and you may skip any questions you would prefer not to answer. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no bearing on your participation in the course or your academic standing at UCLA. Your completion and return of the survey questionnaire indicates your consent to participate in this study. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Dr. Jennifer Lindholm at (310)206-6661 or via email: jlindholm@college.ucla.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Research Subjects, 1401 Ueberroth Building, UCLA, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694, (310) 825-8714. Thank you very much for your participation in this important survey.

Student ID:_____

1. **How did you hear about this Undergraduate Student Initiated (USIE) seminar?**
   (Mark all that apply.)

   ____Through other students
   ____Through a faculty member
   ____Through my involvement in USAC
   ____I happened to come across it when registering for my other classes.
   ____I had a friend who was facilitating a seminar.
   ____Flyer/other advertisement
   ____Other (specify) _____

2. **Why did you originally enroll in this USIE seminar?**
   (Circle one for each item.)

	Not Applicable	*Not Important*	*Somewhat Important*	*Very Important*
I thought the topic would be interesting.	0	1	2	3
I thought it would enrich my education.	0	1	2	3
It fit well with my schedule.	0	1	2	3
I needed an extra unit.	0	1	2	3
I was intrigued by the idea that it was student initiated and taught.	0	1	2	3
My friend was facilitating this seminar.	0	1	2	3
Other friend(s) encouraged me to enroll.	0	1	2	3
A faculty member encouraged me to enroll.	0	1	2	3
Other (specify) _____	0	1	2	3

31

3. As part of this USIE course, how often did you engage in the following activities?
(Circle one for each item.)

	Not at All	*Occasionally*	*Frequently*
Participate in class discussions	1	2	3
Make class presentations	1	2	3
Participate in group projects	1	2	3
Offer input/feedback on the design of seminar content/activities	1	2	3
Participate in intellectually stimulating activities	1	2	3
Talk with students outside of class about the seminar	1	2	3
Talk with the facilitator outside of class about the seminar	1	2	3
Study with other students enrolled in the same seminar	1	2	3
Carry out seminar assignments in small groups or teams	1	2	3
Go to the library to find materials related to the course (*not* reserve reading)	1	2	3
Exchange e-mail with the facilitator	1	2	3
Exchange e-mail with other students in the seminar	1	2	3
Use the World Wide Web or Internet as part of a course assignment	1	2	3
Apply classroom learning to real-life situations	1	2	3
Feel bored in seminar meetings	1	2	3
Skip seminar meetings	1	2	3

4. How many hours per week, outside of regularly scheduled meetings, did you typically spend on this seminar?
(Mark one.)

____Less than one hour
____1-2 hours
____2-4 hours
____4-6 hours
____6-8 hours
____More than eight hours

5. Please rate the following components of this USIE seminar.
(Circle one for each item.)

	Disagree Strongly	*Disagree Somewhat*	*Neutral*	*Agree Somewhat*	*Agree Strongly*
The major themes that underlie this seminar are clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5
The coursework is relevant to my everyday life.	1	2	3	4	5
The coursework is relevant to my future career plans.	1	2	3	4	5
The class discussions are thought provoking.	1	2	3	4	5
I have been challenged to think critically.	1	2	3	4	5
There is a strong sense of community among seminar participants.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel comfortable voicing my ideas and perspectives within this seminar.	1	2	3	4	5
There is respect for the expression of diverse perspectives/beliefs.	1	2	3	4	5
My contributions are valued by other students in the seminar.	1	2	3	4	5
My contributions are valued by the seminar facilitator.	1	2	3	4	5
If I had it to do over again, I would enroll in this seminar.	1	2	3	4	5

6. To what extent do you feel that your skills/abilities in each of the following areas were improved as a result of taking this USIE seminar?
(Circle one for each item.)

	Not at All	*To Some Extent*	*To a Great Extent*
Content-related knowledge	1	2	3
Writing skills	1	2	3
Analytic/problem solving skills	1	2	3

32

	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Great Extent
Critical thinking skills	1	2	3
Library research skills	1	2	3
Public speaking skills	1	2	3
Interpersonal skills	1	2	3
Intellectual self-confidence	1	2	3
Social self-confidence	1	2	3
Community-building skills	1	2	3
Understanding of the topic	1	2	3
Self-understanding	1	2	3
Understanding of others	1	2	3
Respect for viewpoints that differ from my own	1	2	3

7. **Please rate the following aspects of your seminar experience:**
   (Circle one for each item.)

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Intellectual stimulation	1	2	3	4	5
Your level of enthusiasm about the course	1	2	3	4	5
Your level of involvement/engagement with the course	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of your interactions with the facilitator	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of your interactions with peers	1	2	3	4	5
Amount of learning	1	2	3	4	5
Overall value of the course	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of your learning experience	1	2	3	4	5
Overall satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5

8. **Please rate your seminar facilitator on each of the following:**
   (Circle one for each item.)

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Expertise in subject	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity of seminar purposes/goals	1	2	3	4	5
Logical organization of course material	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity and skill of presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Preparedness for class	1	2	3	4	5
Ease in initiating and facilitating discussion	1	2	3	4	5
Enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5
Pace appropriate to student ability	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to student input and needs	1	2	3	4	5
Fairness	1	2	3	4	5
Overall level of involvement/engagement with the course	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of instruction	1	2	3	4	5

9. **Looking back, what aspect(s) of this USIE seminar did you like best?**

10. **Looking back, what aspect(s) of this USIE seminar could have been improved?**

33

11. **Do you feel that the time and effort you put into the seminar is well reflected in the number of units you are receiving? If not, please explain.**

12. **Why is the USIE Program important to undergraduate education at UCLA?**

13. **Would you personally be interested in applying to teach a USIE seminar? Why or why not?**

14. **Please offer any additional feedback in the space below.**

Thank You!

34

Protocol for Interviewing Student Facilitators of USIE Seminars
Spring-Fall 2006

[Begin by providing an overview of USIE Program assessment plan and goals and summarizing information contained in consent form]

1. Background
--Year in School
--Major
--Graduate School/Career Plans
--Prior Teaching Experience
--How did you hear about the USIE Program?

2. Motivations/Personal Expectations
--Why did you decide to apply?
  --Did you receive encouragement from others to apply (e.g., faculty, peers, family)? Discouragement?
  --Were the application materials and related expectations clear? (Describe)
  --How did you view this experience as potentially serving your educational/professional goals?
--How did you feel when you heard that your proposed seminar was accepted?

3. Experiences with the USIE Program
--How did you go about designing your seminar course?
  --When did you begin conceptualizing your seminar?
  --Why that particular seminar?
  --What resources did you draw on to make decisions about your seminar?
  --Do you feel that you had sufficient preparation and support in order to design your seminar? (Describe)
  --Are there other types of support that you think would have been useful? (Describe)
  --What were your primary goals in association with the seminar? (Address personal and professional
       as well as student impact)
--Do you feel you had sufficient preparation and support in order to teach your seminar? (Describe)
  --Address experiences with (a) 197SA (b) HC101E and (c) 197SB
     --Focus on intellectual engagement & development and community building aspects; also, check whether there
      are directly perceived links between seminar facilitators' engagement with (a)-(c) above and one's performance/
      comfort level as a facilitator? (emphasize course development, topical knowledge and pedagogical approach/style.
      If there are directly perceived links, how/why? If not, how/why?
  --Are there other types of support/resources that you think would have been useful? (Describe)
  --Do you feel that your workload in association with USIE responsibilities was appropriate given
       the associated program credit(s)? (Explain)
--How well do you think your seminar worked for your students? How can you tell?
--To what extent do you feel that you achieved your course goals? (Describe)
--Did you learn anything about yourself through teaching this seminar course? (Describe)
--(If have prior teaching experience) Was this teaching experience different from others you've had? Why/How?
--How would you characterize your relationship with your faculty mentor?
  --Frequency of interaction?
  --Perceptions of availability and support? (Describe)
  --Influence of interactions on educational/professional development? (Describe)
--Has teaching this course affected how you view:
  --Your role as a student?
  --Your relationships with faculty?
  --Your relationships with your peers?
--Has this teaching experience had any influence on your future plans? (Address personal and professional)
--Overall, was teaching a USIE seminar a positive experience? Why or why not?
  --What, if anything, was particularly good about it?
  --What, if anything, was particularly bad about it?

35

tem 4.3

4. USIE Program Perspectives and Recommendations

    --How do you view the importance of the USIE Program:

        --to UCLA?

        --to you as an individual?

        --to your peers?

        --to USAC (student government)?

    --How would you like to see the USIE Program evolve in future years?

    --Do you have any advice for those involved next year as:

        --Seminar facilitators?

        --Faculty mentors?

        --Undergraduates who are considering taking a USIE seminar?

        --HC101E instructors?

        --USIE administrators

        --Others involved with USIE program?

5. Are there any issues related to the USIE Program—good or bad—that we haven't covered yet but that you would like to discuss?

36

Protocol for Interviewing Faculty Sponsors of USIE Seminars
Spring-Fall 2006

[Begin by providing an overview of USIE Program assessment plan and goals and summarizing information contained in consent form]

1. **Background**
     --Academic Discipline/Department
     --Time at UCLA
     --Appointment Type/Rank
     --Years of experience working with undergraduate students
     --How did you hear about the USIE Program?
     --Any prior involvement (as student/faculty/administrator) with similar programs at other campuses?

2. **Motivations/Personal Expectations**
     --What thoughts did you have upon first learning about the USIE Program? (address expectations,
        preconceptions, congruence between program goals and personal goals/values related to
        undergraduate education, thoughts about students' potential reactions to peer facilitators)
     --Why did you decide to serve as a faculty sponsor?
        --How well did you know the student you agreed to mentor?
        --What expectations did you have (for self and student)?

3. **Experiences as a Faculty Mentor**
     --General mentoring dynamics and related effects (including intellectual engagement, intellectual
        development, and sense of community)
        --Observations regarding student's growth/development (personal and professional)
             --Perspectives on course design process
             --Impressions of the seminar meeting you attended? (content/organization/student
                engagement, etc.)
     --Impact on one's own personal/professional perspectives and practice
             --Intellectual engagement/development?
             --Perspectives on undergraduate education?
     --Impact on time/other work responsibilities (HPW and related implications)
             --How much time did you spend in actual contact with the student?
             --Were there other ways you provided mentorship/support?
     --What did you learn through this experience (about self, student, other things, as applicable)
             --Anything you would do differently if you had it to do over?
     --Were the expectations of you as a mentor clear? If not, what could have helped you?
     --Would you be inclined to serve again as a faculty sponsor for a USIE seminar? (Why?/Why Not?)
             --Ideas for how best to engage other faculty?

4. **USIE Program Perspectives and Recommendations**
     --To what extent do you feel the USIE program is important to UCLA and its goals for undergraduate
        education? (Explain)
     --Do you have any advice for those involved next year as:
        --Seminar facilitators?
        --Faculty mentors?
        --Undergraduates who are considering taking a USIE seminar?
        --HC101E instructors?
        --USIE administrators?
        --Others involved with USIE program?

5. **Are there any issues related to the USIE Program—good or bad—that we haven't covered yet**
     but that you would like to discuss?

37

APPENDIX C

PEDAGOGY SEMINAR SYLLABUS
WINTER 2006

University of California, Los Angeles   **Winter 2006**

Undergraduate Student Initiated Education
HC 101E - *Facilitating Dialogue.*

2 units, P/NP   Kumiko Haas
Location: TBA   Office of Instructional Development
Meeting Times: TBA (One 2 hour seminar each week)   70 Powell Library Building
                                                              (310) 206-1440
                                                         khaas@oid.ucla.edu

    This seminar is designed for you to learn and explore issues that are integral in developing your own course and enable you to develop skills to become effective facilitators. We will be covering practical teaching strategies and techniques as well as pedagogical, organizational and technological issues confronted by new instructors. At each meeting, the first hour will be spent discussing key topics. During the second hour of each meeting we discuss the syllabi you have developed for your course and conduct micro-teaching presentations. I will invite guest speakers to expand on topics which will arise from our discussions.

Requirements and some clarifications about the seminar:
Grading
    The seminar will be graded on a Pass/Not Pass basis. Your grade will be based on attendance, participation and completion of the assignments (non-graded). Attendance at all class session, participation in the micro-teaching and feedback, and the completion of all assignments will earn a passing grade.

Attendance
    The seminar will be exploring topics as a group. As such, attendance and participation by everyone is crucial. Missing more than one class will result in a Not Pass. If you cannot make it to class, email me in advance.

Participation
    A seminar is a unique learning environment defined largely by the active participation of its members. The level of your engagement, the quality of your questions, and the amount of your enthusiasm will all have a direct impact on how much you will learn from and enjoy this course. Furthermore, in a seminar, you are not only responsible for your own education, but also for the education of your classmates. I will do my part to create an environment in which you can freely share your thoughts, questions and ideas. You must do yours by attending all class sessions and by arriving on time with the required reading thoughtfully and thoroughly completed.

38

Discussion

In an academic environment, differences of opinion are not only common, but desirable.

- Don't be afraid to speak your mind, but also do not try to keep others from doing so.
- Understand that we all come from different backgrounds and have different perspectives and that, in general, there is an element of truth in almost everyone's point of view. Keep an open mind, allow your assumptions to be challenged, and learn from one another.
- Treat others opinions and comments with courtesy, even if they are dramatically different from your own.
- Although I would like to see you draw upon your own personal experience to place a concept into context or use them as illustrative examples, be careful not to argue a point by referring to single case incidents.

MicroTeaching and Feedback

We will use the second half of each weeks' class time to provide individualized feedback on syllabi and teaching. In order to accomplish this, during the quarter you will do one or more 5 minute micro-teaching presentations. On the week prior to your individualized feedback session, you will post online your syllabus for review. Following the 5 minute micro-teaching presentation, your classmates will provide feedback on both your syllabus and micro-teaching.

Assignments

Readings: Each week, you will be expected to complete the assigned readings. The readings will allow you to contribute to the class discussion, and ultimately help you refine your syllabus and prepare you to teach your class in the spring quarter.

Final assignment: Your final assignment is your final syllabus that you will be using in your class in the spring quarter, due on the last day of class.

Course Topics:

Meeting 1   Introduction - Developing & organizing a course
Syllabus design
Setting the goals for the class
Addressing some common fears about teaching

Meeting 2   Making assignments meaningful
Information literacy - what is it and why is it important?

Meeting 3   Preparing for class
What to do!? - Preparing for the first day of class
What is a lesson plan and why would I need one?

Meeting 4   What is a facilitator*?*
Will I have authority when I need it?
Administrative issues
Ethics

Meeting 5   What does it mean to facilitate dialogue?
Leading discussion
How to improve classroom interaction.
The case for Active Learning

39

Meeting 6   Evaluating your students and yourself
                 Evaluating your students: why talk about evaluation in a P/NP course?
                 Evaluating yourself: what can I gain from student evaluations?

Meeting 7   Resources available to you
                 Teaching resources
                 Mini grants
                 What do I do if there is trouble?

Meeting 8   Using technology in teaching
                 Teaching resources
                 Mini grants

Meeting 9   Guest Speaker (Topic TBA)

Meeting 10   Guest Speaker (Topic TBA)
                 Orientation to administrative issues

Required reading

Course reader (will include: selected chapters from McKeachie (2006) and Davis (1993); checklists, lists of resources, and sample syllabi.)

McKeachie, Wilbert. J. et al. (2002). *McKeachie's Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers (11th edition).* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Davis, Barbara Gross (1993). *Tools for Teaching.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

40