

1. What did you find most beneficial about the First Year Seminar?

1. I like the interdisciplinary approach. It allowed free reign in taking advantage of all the outside lectures offered. The lectures themselves are beneficial. It is impressive that JCU can offer the range and number of lectures that we do, and that the various programs can combine to support them.

2. The extracurricular activities are most beneficial.

3. The chance to interact with First Year students in a less formal setting. The interdisciplinary nature of the course.

4. Getting to know a cross section of JCU freshmen. Getting to read, discuss, and think about stuff I normally don't get a chance to in my professional life.

5. Interesting subject matters--fun to teach.

6. Interesting readings, interesting questions.

More relaxed format

Chance to interact with colleagues

Outside speakers and events

7. I'd like to mention two things, since it's hard to say which is more beneficial. First, I enjoyed working with first-semester first-year students. I liked their rawness and their freshness--the unformed but direct, sometimes spirited manner of their thinking and feeling. Second, I valued talking with and learning from faculty from different disciplines. The course was as interdisciplinary for me as it was for the students.

8. Dealing with new JCU students

9. The only aspect of FYS that was beneficial to me was the opportunity to find out what some of our incoming students are like in classes outside of my discipline.

10. For myself: the seminar was an enormous challenge. Prior to this, my teaching had been confined to areas that are highly content-driven, and this was my first experience teaching a course in which the content was less well defined. I also learned just how bad many of our students are at writing!

For the students: many of the students in my section got to know each other through in-class discussions and out-of class projects and field trips.

11. Getting to know students more individually than in most classes. Experimenting with pedagogy.

12. I enjoyed the opportunity to interact with students and utilize a discussion format. The workshops were very helpful but a bit overwhelming, too--perhaps pairing a new person with an experienced one if the new person doesn't have a relationship with someone in their own department who has experience.

13. Those who teach FYS have the opportunity to know incoming freshman in a very different way than faculty who aren't teaching (If the anecdotal student reports accurately reflects first year experiences). FYS students, in my section, often said that they spoke more in their FYS class than other classes. They are often intimidated by the experience of being in a new environment. One student called me over the course of the semester to thank me for making her speak in class. She said that she probably wouldn't have said anything, otherwise.

It's also difficult to know where students end up at the end of four years, without really knowing where they've been. FYS faculty are afforded the opportunity to learn more about the incoming class of students than the data presented at the first faculty forum each year. The full faculty knows how students perform, on average, on standardized tests and how well they've performed in their schools of origin, but we know little beyond that. Given the outstanding academic backgrounds of the students admitted to JCU, I'm often surprised by how little they know about history (theirs, ours, others) and other cultural influences. I'm surprised at the number of stereotypes they have about 'others' (not just minority 'others'). I'm surprised by their initial lack of curiosity, and the timidity that seems to extend beyond their developmental stages. Very few are comfortable being able to 'disagree' with others. I think one of the biggest benefits of FYS is that we stress the fact that intellectual curiosity is a BENEFIT to, and not a hindrance of, their future goals. Many students seem to come to the university experience with the idea that higher education is a sophisticated form of vocational training. They want to learn only what they need to know to find a 'good job'. I think that FYS, especially via Nussbaum's book, communicates the importance of intellectual curiosity. I'd like to think that we are helping students consider themselves outside of the boxes they've painted themselves into before their university careers begin.

I appreciated the format of the speaker's series. The format of the series lent itself well to the idea that faculty should have the right to design the course.

14. Shared learning environment

Multiple opportunities to weave the classroom in with speakers, field trips, service.

Being with freshmen.

15. Learning new stuff; discussing it with other faculty.

16. The discussion format gave me the opportunity to interact with students in a manner that I am not accustomed to using. I was able to get to know students in a manner that is usually not afforded [in my discipline] because I, at least, do not solicit information regarding student's opinions on topics outside [my discipline].

17. The opportunity to teach freshmen and discover what they are like when they first enter JCU.

18. My students and I *learned a lot* this semester.

19. Variety of readings; unique learning style.

20. I greatly appreciated the ability to grow by learning outside my discipline and from faculty in other departments. I love the interdisciplinary nature of the total of the texts. I benefited from the outside lectures, as most of the speakers were excellent.

21. Students challenging own beliefs. Growth in awareness of whole world and limits of our own world.

22. I thought that the theme for the course was current and useful, not too narrow and not too broad. The flow of the course was very good--readings and topics led to each other very easily--and the speakers did too, to an amazing degree.

I felt that the most successful speaker/student interactions occurred in the Jardine room--with the exception of Peter Singer, who held the students' interest quite well. Focusing on bringing in only the authors is too limiting, plus you run the risk of having a boring speaker. The speakers this fall were for the most part very good stylistically, and I felt effectively held the students' interest. The students who were compelled to goof off had to do it more subtly--they didn't feel as invisible in the Jardine room. By having the series of speakers in the Jardine room that not all the students could attend, commonality and variety were balanced nicely. Do the same sort of speaker series next year please! It also helped FYS reach out into the campus and UH communities as well.

23. Despite what I see as a deeply flawed model, I think you did a great job of getting a set of readings that held together pretty well. Assuming that I do it again next year, I would not change any of the readings (although I have lots of ideas about how I could do a better job with them).

2. What did you find least beneficial about the Seminar?

1.

2. All the faculty hand-holding in workshops, et al.

3. There were so many writing assignments that I probably did not do as complete a job of editing as I had originally expected.

4.

5. The Nussbaum text was, in my opinion, not really appropriate for the freshmen.

Also, I found myself teaching *opinion rather than fact* since I am not an expert in the fields of study.

6. Too much material/too much many readings

Not enough time to prepare for the class

Some of the material not appropriate for freshmen.

7. The least beneficial aspect of the course, for me and the students, was the student-led discussions. Perhaps I heeded to set these discussions up more carefully; however, I found these sessions, slow, desultory, and unproductive. The students don't have the training to run discussion fruitfully (see more under #6)

8. Eurocentrism, in spite of mea culpas

9. See #5

10. Many students seemed to develop negative attitudes about the course, and this showed on my course evaluations. Although most students seemed to like me as a teacher, they resented having to take the course. They did not like the speakers. (And frankly, I can't blame them; most of the lectures that my class went to as a class were far from interesting.) They did not like the readings (with the exception of GAP, which most students liked). The students' perception was that there was a wide gap in the level of expectation and the amount of work required in various sections, and that their grades would be lower because of my high expectations.

11. Lack of academic motivation/curiosity from students.

12. Nothing really.

13. I have no complaints about the course, itself. I think the seminar was extremely well planned and executed.

While the core document provides for flexibility in pedagogy, teaching the course can be made a more difficult task when 'flexibility' is interpreted as "break" and not "bend" the criteria by other faculty teaching the course. 'When faculty make the readings 'optional', I think it does a disservice to those of us who have put a lot of time and effort into our courses. I also think it's unfair to refer to the writers/writings as 'ignorant', or 'stupid' (again, if anecdotal evidence is to be believed).

Students discuss the format of their course compared with other courses. They talk to one another about the workload. If you have students in the course who are scholars and truly enjoy reading new texts and being introduced to new ideas, news that students in another section aren't required to read because the instructor doesn't think the author knows what he/she is talking about isn't an issue. I was fortunate enough to have enough scholarly students in class that our workload wasn't an issue.

If you have students in the course who are still phobic, being away from home or who are having difficulty adjusting to the intensity of the university environment, that news could become a serious issue. It doesn't just make the course more difficult for faculty, but it contributes to the idea the students' perception that the FYS is a 'joke' of a class and a waste of time. If, in part, the goal of FYS is to help students acclimate to university level work and to build a sense of community, then the lax treatment of FYS robs students of that opportunity.

I think that one of the disadvantages to FYS is that we haven't done more to determine how the goals of FYS are being met in other classes. I don't think we know enough, from senior faculty, about the changes that have occurred in the student body from their experiences with students prior to FYS and current experiences.

I think it's important to know, from students, as they exit the university, if they feel that they are encouraged to exercise their point of view, in other classes, even if it means they disagree with the professor. We should find out if they are more often required to listen and take notes or if they are encouraged to engage in conversation.

I don't know if it's fair to tell students that the skills they learn in FYS will help to make them successful in other classes, if they

aren't encouraged to use those skills in other classes. We do want students to be good writers and critical thinkers, but if they aren't encouraged to be independent thinkers, are we actually helping them in FYS?

14. Continuous comparisons they make of different sections!

15. The time commitment at expense of research, time teaching in my own area (which is quite interdisciplinary), the general indifference most feel toward student response to this failed course.

16. Some of the speakers were not beneficial. Either their lecture did not generate discussion that was of a positive nature or they were boring in their presentation style.

17. We spent too much time before it started discussing how to teach it. I feel we just need to get in the class and do what we are capable of doing.

18. Endless *general discussion* about how to teach it (think faculty from different disciplines are going to teach it differently, so there is not much point to such general discussions).

19. Not enough time to discuss the Great Ape Project.

20. *Time*--the amount needed for prep.

21.

22. This is an important course for this university, which is rife with disciplinary sniping and grousing. THE WORLD IS NOT GOING TO END IF THE STUDENTS AND FACULTY BREAK AWAY FOR A SEMESTER FROM DISCIPLINARY DETAIL!!!! You can still be rigorous about student work and not know every answer that arises!

I find this course to be an exciting way to raise questions and begin examining the relationships between the world and the university. Some faculty seem inordinately concerned about any course that isn't heavily steeped in the detail of their discipline, with the professor, godlike, as the font of all correct knowledge. These same professors often have nothing but contempt for any discipline but his or her own. This is the ONLY course at JCU where faculty come together and speak to each other in a mostly respectful way about what they do and why they do it. As such, FYS is vital to this university, even when there are disagreements about texts or dislike of a speaker or a theme.

23.

3. To what extent did the First Year Seminar attain its goals? (Fostering critical reading, writing, listening, spoken and active discussion; making connections between academic disciplines; augmenting the intellectual life of the campus; *et al.*)

1. I think the structure of the seminar offers the opportunity for all of these things. The extent to which they are realized depends on the individual instructor and on the individual student. I don't think I accomplished any of these uniformly across the board.

2. I think this course, better than most others, offers the chance to get students involved in ancillary activities.

3. Critical reading: Initially this was very good, but later, especially with GAP, I saw a decline in this area

Writing: Those who wrote well at the beginning of the class continued to excel, those who wrote poorly never really improved. In fact the one who wrote the worst in the class refused to recognize a problem because he was receiving As and Bs in EN 111.

Discussion: Much of the class participated on a regular basis.

Making connections: I think that in each of the sections of the class, students became aware of the potential contribution of many different disciplines.

4. FYS attains its goals, by and large (but see #6)

5. Critical reading--slight; writing--OK; discussion--clearly met this goal; connections--OK. I *do not* believe that it augmented the intellectual life of the campus. The amount of faculty and student time involved in the course did not result in any tangible benefits that I could see.

6. I would rate it a success in *all* of these areas. Based on personal experience and from what I have heard, year 5 was by far the best of the FYSem editions.

7. My FYS class didn't attain all of these goals. It attained some goals more than others. However, it attained all of these goals to a degree. Because there are so many goals to strive for, it seems inevitable that a class can do only partial justice to the full range of objectives. The last goal mentioned above (augmenting campus intellectual life) was hardest to measure. It happened most at the lectures. Outside of those events, it was difficult, given the disparateness of sections and of individual student experiences, to know how successful the FYS as a whole was at meeting that goal.

8. Successful given student misunderstanding of the worth and usefulness of the seminar

9. I think my section was moderately successful in "fostering critical reading, writing, listening, spoken and active discussion." I gave quizzes on the readings; many of my students indicated that they would have read far less had there not been quizzes. As it was some students only skimmed the readings.

10. Fostering critical reading writing, listening and discussion are lofty goals for any course. In spite of the fact that essentially all of my classes involved at least one of these skills, I was not able to detect an increase in my students' levels of those skills during the semester. But this is just one of many courses, and the cumulative effect of all of the students' courses, could, I would think, be expected to make a difference. It is not at all clear to me that other courses (e.g., English, math, etc.) Could not do just as good a job of developing academic skills.

As far as making connections between academic disciplines--this is where I had the most difficulty. It was difficult to do more than lip service to the connections between the course topics.

Regarding the intellectual life of the campus--since my students disliked the lectures so much, most of them will probably never think of going to another one if they don't have to!

11. I'd like to think we've made a dent, but I'm not sure.
12. I think it helped students quite a bit--they had an opportunity for all these activities.
13. When the course is taught, as conceived, I think the goals of FYS are met.
14. I am pleasantly surprised to say my section made significant progress!
15. At what cost? Many of these things happened, but this only tends to point to how these things are generally lacking in so many other courses.
16. I believe we succeeded on all counts mentioned.
17. Rather well, especially the *Great Ape Project*. Singer's visit was a great day for this campus.
18. I think my section attained these goals remarkably well. I cannot speak for other sections.
19. Very much so for 95% of the students and the instructor.
20. I think the FYS attained all of the above goals to some extent.
21. Goals were achieved.
- 22.
23. I think my section managed to meet the goals of FYS fairly well, but I wonder if that is in part because I feel quite at home with [some of the readings].

4. Did you encounter any difficulties in teaching the FYS?

1. Nothing insurmountable.
2. I always struggle with trying to evaluate the student mastery of content.
3. Attempting to organize a field trip was very difficult.
4. Only the fact that I had a back-to-back class in a different building.
5. My main concern is the overall lack of rigor--especially among the various sections. The course is not consistent among the sections. I know that several instructors rarely met with the students and had no examinations and only minor writing assignments. Those of us that did (meet religiously and had tests and writing assignments) were viewed somewhat negatively by the students.
6. Lack of expertise, or at least sufficient knowledge, of the topics discussed. I don't necessarily buy into or agree with the FYS motto of "shared learning." That is *not* what a university should be.
7. I can think of two. First, I found it very hard to get the quieter students (perhaps one-fourth of the class) to talk in discussion without calling on them. Even though I instituted a class participation policy that required each student to measure his or her participation after every class, I couldn't get these students to open their mouths. Second, I was upset with some FYS faculty who seemed to be simply grouching about the course. I can understand disliking certain aspects of the course and wanting to change them. But the vague, persistent carping for carping's sake was singularly unproductive. If you're going to teach this course, you can't expect that every aspect of this course is going to suit you. If you're offended that you have to surrender some of your autonomy and bend some of your preferences to make this common experience go, perhaps you shouldn't teach it.
8. Bad student attitudes.
9. I had a hard time grading the writing. Several students complained that they got higher grades on their papers for English than for FYS. I also had a hard time evaluating students' participation. According to student evaluations, my students would have preferred that I have some expert knowledge of the material in the course. It was difficult for me to gauge whether a discussion question was going to actually elicit discussion.
10. I came away from the workshops very confused, as many of the presenters had discussed how they planned to draw on their own expertise to enlarge various components of the course. I, on the other hand, [felt] I could do little beyond trying to create an environment in which the readings could be discussed. I also felt inadequate about establishing connections among the various readings, so the whole course felt rather incoherent to me. Also I'd like to have some material on "the other side" of the Great Ape project, that the students could read for balance.
11. Hard to achieve balance between creating a place where students feel comfortable to talk about issues on one hand, and maintaining discipline (academic) on the other.
12. Not really. I had a lot of support from people in my department.
13. No.
14. No.
15. Student apathy and/or outright disgust for the FYS.
16. None that I did not anticipate. Rather than call them "difficulties," I call them "things that I won't do in that way next time."
17. Nothing out of the ordinary--just the typical problems associated with teaching material for the first time.
18. Nothing especially difficult. There were challenges, but they were manageable.
19. 8 A.M. Class is *not* conducive to FYS.
20. I had a class with a few students who complained and had bad attitudes about the speakers and my assignments. But many (most) of the students were fine with these FYS requirements. My students became so comfortable with one another that it was sometimes difficult to quiet them down (so much conversation).
21. Great Ape Project was challenging to my beliefs. The book was repetitive.

22. I enjoyed teaching Nussbaum the most, but my students complained about her the most. I plan to restructure my course next semester and scatter chapters of Nussbaum throughout, instead of reading all of her at the beginning. One of my colleagues spoke of doing this this semester in the August workshop small groups. The FYS website was an exceptionally helpful source--saved loads of times Xeroxing. I also really enjoyed teaching Singer (this is the one that my quiet class really got excited about) and Achebe. The ones I felt least comfortable teaching were Turner and Huntington, particularly Turner, but I don't necessarily think they should be taken out--I simply must rethink what I do with them. I think Turner was actually the reading that the students had the hardest time with, despite their irritation with Nussbaum.

23. The students really didn't like the 8am time. For the most part, they were really good about attending, but I think that a later time slot would have helped participation.

5. Did FYS affect your teaching in other courses and in general?

1. Yes, because I tried a variety of assignments.
2. Not really.
3. It prompted me to begin using Blackboard.
4. Yes. My teaching in my disciplines is now more student-centered, and I'm less afraid to try new styles of teaching in the classroom.
5. No, although I had less time to devote to my other classes.
6. I found the readings interesting and they may have an influence on me.
7. It affected it in two ways. First, FYS is often about the teacher's not having the last word. I learned how to be comfortable leaving a variety of views on the table without tidying them up. I sometimes let my students in other courses have the last word. FYS made me feel easier about the merits of this pedagogy. Second, I had the students do group projects in my section. I'm considering using these projects in other classes.
8. Gave me exposure to a cross-section of freshmen.
9. I would have to say that teaching in the FYS had an adverse effect on my other courses. Fortunately, I had taught those courses before and was able to teach them in "autopilot" mode. However, these students did not get the attention from me that I felt they deserved. FYS took an extraordinary amount of time--just doing the reading for class took me twice as long as preparing for a typical class. In addition, I spent a lot of time trying to find supplementary material, writing discussion questions, and grading formal and informal writing. I also offered several field trips, which required a lot of weekend time.
10. Definitely! The effect on my other courses was that I basically had no time for them! If they had not been courses that could go on "auto-pilot," the semester would have been a disaster. (Hmmm... This might be why Nussbaum kept warning her readers that they should not be teaching far from their expertise!)
11. To some extent, though I encourage discussion, group work, writing, etc. Already.
12. Somewhat, but really no more than any other freshman course I teach.
13. Yes, I incorporated some of the FYS information into other courses. For example, while teaching a methods course in my discipline, I included some of the work of Nussbaum and the critical points she makes, especially about academic freedom, in other courses.
14. No.
15. It took lots of time and energy from other things.
16. No.
17. No. If anything it was the other way around.
18. I think it *invigorated* my teaching in other courses to some extent.
19. Yes, using student centered learning as a classroom model.
20. I think it will in the future. FYS was by far a course where participation dominated whereas in most of mine lecturing dominates. The course gave me new ideas for approaching teaching in my own discipline.
- 21.
- 22.
- 23.

6. Suggestions for improving the FYS.

- 1.
2. Allow the faculty a personal choice for one of the required books.
3. Have fewer readings to allow more flexibility in the individual sections.
4. I feel FYS is redundant in some ways. These students are taking, or will soon take, EN 111/103/114, CO 100, and PL 101 (et al.), which foster critical reading and writing and thinking. Where FYS is unique is the discussion-based format of a frosh course, the attempt at approaching problems/topics in an interdisciplinary way, and giving students the ethos of "the academic life" (or trying to do so). So, I feel we should focus on what FYS uniquely does (although we shouldn't ignore reading and writing) *and* add a good dose of student life/advising issues. The students don't seem to be getting enough of the latter.
5. Eliminate the course altogether. The course is costly to administer, being taught by instructors completely outside these instructors' areas of discipline, and keeps the instructors from doing what they should be doing--improving courses within their disciplines and conducting research that leads to a national reputation for the university.

6. a) Adopt a “question” rather than a “theme” as FYS “topic”--the Great Ape Project came closest to that ideal
- b) Cut back on reading volume
- c) Give individual instructors more leeway.

One or two common texts only.

7. This was the first time I taught FYS. I came into the experience encouraged not to be “the sage on the stage” and to let the students assume responsibility for making the course go. I interpreted these recommendations to mean that the instructor should refrain from intervening in class discussion as much as possible. I also interpreted them to mean that students ought to lead at least some of the discussions. About two-thirds the way through the course, I began to have reservations about these methods. Students flounder without some direction from the instructor. Discussion degenerated into “bull-shit” sessions. I found myself moving toward a stance in the classroom much closer to that I see in my major course, most of which are discussion classes. In other words, I guided the discussion without dominating it. The chief difference between my demeanor in the FYS class and that in my major classes was that in the former, much more than in the latter, I let the students have the last word. My suggestion, then, is that instructors be told that ceding control of the discussion doesn’t necessarily mean giving it up entirely. There’s plenty of room for faculty intervention.

8. Let me think this over

9. Give people some kind of load reduction the first time they teach it with a new topic.... I couldn’t even attempt to do any research last semester....

Another option would be to relax the stated goals and reduce the amount of common reading and “required” writing for the course. I tend to take the view that if I’m supposed to do something in a course, I try to do it. It’s very frustrating to hear from my students (and worse to hear from my colleagues) that other sections are omitting one of the readings, or doing less than 12 pages of formal writing, or simply watching a movie during the final exam period, etc. One of my students wrote on his/her course evaluation that “This class should be taught by a professor who realizes it is a joke.” After the amount of time and energy I expended to make this a good, academic class, it was disheartening to receive that comment. Such an attitude does not come from a vacuum. This student must know other students, whether from the 2000 incoming class, or from prior classes, who felt that the class was an easy three credits with no academic content.

10. A) Something has to be done to assure a little uniformity in terms of expectation and requirements. Students have reported that other sections didn’t even have to read the books, while my section had a quiz almost every day. They resented that, and that resentment does not lead to an atmosphere conducive to learning.

B) We need more material that can be used with Turner, and we need some reading on “the other side” of *The Great Ape Project*, to provide balance.

C) We should consider moving away from the idea of a common theme, and possibly offer a seminar in which students study topics more closely aligned with their academic interest. Since the students don’t seem to be discussing the course topics outside of class, and since they hated the speakers, I don’t see much rationale for clinging to the idea of a common theme.

D) If possible, “test-drive” the speakers before getting them to come here. Some of them were truly not worth hearing.

11. Jardine Room speakers with fewer Kulas one seems to have worked well.

Change Nussbaum text. Same ideas can be approached with other readings.

Drop either Turner or Huntington--too much.

12. None offhand. I found it to be an important course. There is a perception among students that this should be an easy A--perhaps finding a way to discuss it in orientation--it may be faculty spreading this inadvertently by a number of students said “they were told at orientation”--one said the faculty advisor said it during scheduling--it may not be but that was the perception the student took away from the session.

13. None regarding the course. I would suggest that chairs not be permitted to force faculty to teach the course. Some ‘involuntary’ volunteers fully embrace the idea while others do not.

14. Need to continue to improve accessibility of texts.

15. Create more uniformity in the sections.

Listen to what Nussbaum says about what makes such courses fail or succeed: more pay, more release time, travel to Africa, in-depth training. Teach with one’s discipline or closer to it (avoid the dilettantish approach we currently take).

Make this a senior year seminar.

16. More input from the sciences is needed in selecting the science focus of the major theme. The Great Ape Project is extremely biased. Freshmen are extremely impressionable. I don’t feel comfortable with the indoctrination-type nature of that book.

17. I would change the model. Rather than a theme, I would have an FYS where there is a set of books (both classics and contemporary), and we critically examine each book. The books would come from a variety of disciplines.

18. As mentioned on the reverse side, I think you should minimize general discussion of how to teach FYS. This is pointless and causes unnecessary anxiety. So, there is no need to a week-long workshop.

19. More optional activities listed before the syllabi are made.

20. I think that requiring more conformity of requirements across sections would help students' perception of the course as a common experience, or would at least dispel the aggravation many feel if their friends are required to do a lot less.

21.

22.

23.

7. Would you willing to teach in the FYS again?

1. Yes

2. Yes

3. Maybe. Obviously I will next fall, but beyond that I am not certain.

4. Yes

5. One more year only.

6. Yes, but not too soon.

7. Sure, I'd be happy to. I liked the experience and, though it was a lot of work (a lot of moving parts to keep track of and a lot of grading), I'd gladly do it again.

8. Yes

9. I think this course has a lot of potential, and I am willing to take my turn teaching it. I will definitely teach it next fall, but I won't be volunteering to teach it again any time soon after that.

10. I will teach it again next year, in order to fulfill my 2-year commitment. After that, I have no interest in teaching it again.

11. Yes

12. Yes

13. Yes

14. Yes

15. I hope not--unless there is significant change.

16. Yes

17. Yes. I will teach it again next fall.

18. Yes.

19. Yes.

20. Yes, but not right away.

21. Yes.

22. Yes

23. Yes

8. Preference:

Common meeting time:	
Yes	111111111111
No	1
Indifferent	11111111
Three 50 minute periods:	
Yes	11111111
No	1
Indifferent	1111111
Two 75 minute periods:	
Yes	11111
No	1111
Indifferent	1111111

9. Other comments:

1. The common meeting time allowed for the instructor to choose which lectures to require. There was no time during the week days when all my students could get together other than class time. I think it is extremely valuable to have the afternoon and evening offerings in addition.
- 2.
- 3.
4. Thanks for all your hard work, Bob and Bob!
5. You--Bob Kolesar (history)--did and *excellent* job preparing the course materials and organizing training for the instructors. Clearly, however much fun it is to teach, the course does not benefit the university. My own research productivity suffered from the extensive time required to prep for a course completely outside my area of expertise. What is the point of being a university professor anyway?
6. The remuneration is insufficient. Normal compensation for developing a course is \$3,500 or even more. Without compensation I cannot be expected to spend much time preparing for the course, which would really be necessary.
7. I liked the theme of frontiers and borders. I felt that my students and I were able to conceptualize this theme in rich and often concrete ways throughout the readings. Though many of students disliked Nussbaum, her idea of the "world citizen" seized their imaginations. I had the feeling (probably encouraged by some who simply wanted to be "nice" and go along) that a significant number of students were more open at the end of the course than at the beginning to exploring cultural and intellectual opportunities beyond their normal domain of experience. Whether they will act on this openness in the future remains to be seen.
8. Congratulations to the FYS organizers, esp. Bob Kolesar, History.
9. It would be helpful if we could get an idea ahead of time of what the noon speakers will be discussing. On more than one occasion I seriously misjudged whether I should have taken my class to a particular lecture
- 10.
- 11.
12. I think 75 minutes would be more appropriate for what we do in FYS--I often ran out of time during really engaging discussions--we frequently wished we had more time.
- 13.
14. While this course is not perfect, it does much good for the students and the campus environment.
15. p. 75 Nussbaum: "Faculty should not be asked to teach material that lies to some extent outside...."
"First-rate faculty will not choose to get involved in such new courses unless they are compensated for the sacrifices." cf: summer salary pay
16. I actually enjoyed teaching this more than I thought I would. I really enjoyed participating.
17. Kudos to history Bob Kolesar for his efforts in producing a successful FYS!!!
18. *Many thanks* to the FYS subcommittee for a very positive experience.
- 19.
20. Two 75 minute classes would be beneficial when outside speakers come. Students could ask more questions, or a least thing wouldn't feel rushed and speakers would be less likely to be walked out on.
- 21.
- 22.
23. I highly recommend drawing one's first year advisees from one's FYS section... I actually felt, once I got to know the students, that I had advise to give.