

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ernie Yanarella
Chair, Senate Council

FROM: Kathi Kern
Chair, Honors Program Steering Committee

SUBJECT: Structure for Proposed Expansion of the Honors Program

DATE: February 1, 2005

A faculty committee, selected in part from a list of names provided by the Senate Council, was given a three-fold charge: (1) develop and issue a university-wide Call for Honors Proposals, (2) evaluate these proposals, and (3) recommend strategies for implementing those proposals deemed worthy of inclusion in a reformed Honors Program. In the accompanying documents the Honors Program Steering Committee presents its findings and recommendations. The Steering Committee gratefully acknowledges the efforts of Assistant Dean Kirsten Turner (Arts and Sciences), whose benchmarking study in its thorough and thoughtful analysis set a high water mark for my committee's work. We also acknowledge and extend our thanks to Dean Steven Hoch for his willingness to assign this task to one of his staff for the benefit of the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee seeks approval of its proposal to expand the curricular structure of the Honors Program. The expanded program builds upon the strength of the existing structure, notably in its emphasis on the intellectual coherence of the core colloquia. Indeed, the Steering Committee has labored to ensure its proposal would augment and not replace the current Honors sequence of course work, a course of study that has proven itself a model most worthy of emulation. We ask the Senate Council to endorse the Committee's recommendation of an alternate framework for a course of study in the Honors Program, the successful completion of which would also confer at graduation the Honors Program citation. The constituent courses of the expanded program will be offered, beginning in the Fall 2005 term, as pilot courses under the Honors course rubric (HON 101, HON 102, etc.) with sub-titles. The Steering Committee recommends that the courses be formally vetted with the Undergraduate Council, University Studies Committee and the Senate Council no later than the fall of 2006.

The Committee began its work by analyzing programs at our benchmark institutions and consulting with various faculty deliberative groups on campus, including the Undergraduate Council, the University Studies Committee, the Writing Program and the Honors Program faculty. We also relied heavily on the last two program reviews of the Honors Program, both of which recommended a two-fold expansion of the existing program: (1) An expansion of the scope of the course work to encompass a breadth of study across all the four years of the undergraduate experience but within the 15 credit

hour structure of the current Honors Program; and, (2) An expansion of the disciplinary foci of the course work to embrace the full range of intellectual discourse within the liberal arts – the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences, the latter two areas of liberal inquiry having been absent heretofore within the Honors Programs. Copies of the most recent program review will be made available to the Senate Council members at the February 7 meeting.

The rationale for the Committee's recommendations and the context in which I ask you and your colleagues to evaluate our work have been fully articulated in the various memoranda issued by Provost Nietzel and the Steering Committee, copies of which are found in this packet of materials.

The documents we present for the Senate Council's consideration are organized as follows:

- (1) *Proposed Expansion of the Honors Program.*
- (2) *Appendices*
 - a. *Provost memo dated July 20, 2004*
 - b. *Provost memo dated September 14, 2004*
 - c. *Steering Committee memo dated October 13, 2004*
 - d. *Executive Summary - Honors Benchmarking*
 - e. *Comparison of Benchmark Programs - Honors Benchmarking*

Finally, a word about the timing of these deliberations. The University hosts its advising conferences for merit students over the weekends of March 11 and 17. Many of the students recruited into the Honors Program attend these merit weekend conferences. We hope, therefore, to have Senate Council approval of the expanded structure in time to speak with confidence to these prospective students about the future of the Honors Program.

I look forward to the conversation on February 7 with the Senate Council membership.

Proposed Expansion of the Honors Program

The Recommendations of the Honors Program Steering Committee (February 2005)

Honors Program: Proposed Structure

Basic Structure: The Honors Program Steering Committee recommends a two-tiered structure for the University Honors Program. The first two years would be dedicated to traditional coursework in which Honors students complete a series of inter-related, cross-disciplinary seminars. A “Foundations” course introduces students to the broad issues in the field. Thematic seminars follow the Foundations course. The junior and senior years would provide students opportunities to do advanced work in their chosen field. To graduate with the Honors Program citation, a student would complete one of the following:

Plan A

- 1) three courses from a topical area (9 credit hours of course work)
- 2) a 3 credit junior experience
- 3) a 3 credit senior project.

Total course work = 15 credit hours

Plan B

- 1) four courses from a topical area (12 credit hours of course work)
- 2) a 3 credit independent project or Honors Proseminar

Total course work = 15 hours

Topical Areas: The first part of University Honors Program consists of a sequence of courses in one of several Topical Areas, e.g., Western Cultural Heritage; Science and Society; Self and Society. Topical Areas provide a broad rubric under which thematic clusters of courses are offered. These broad areas arise from the kinds of courses the faculty participating in the Program teach. The Honors curriculum, therefore, is designed to flow directly from faculty expertise and interest, assuring committed and enthusiastic teaching. As the courses within the first part of the Program change over time, the Topical Areas (and the sequences they contain) also change and regroup, reflecting the current state of intellectual inquiry and scholarship, and the broader concerns of the society the university serves.

Junior Experience/Senior Project: A research university can offer students unique opportunities to learn outside of the traditional classroom. The Honors Steering Committee would like to see the Honors Program expand into the junior year by taking

full advantage of the rich experiences already offered on our campus. Our expectation with this requirement is that students will seek out an opportunity related to their developing area of academic interest. In other words, this advanced work will not be tied to a particular course sequence completed in the first two years. To fulfill the junior and senior requirements, an Honors student might choose from the following: a departmental or college honors track, Gaines program, Undergraduate Research Program, independent research project or independent study, journey project, medical science research track, study abroad, and internships through the Experiential Education program.

Sequences approved for Fall 2005 by the Honors Program Steering Committee

The Social Sciences (Jonathan Golding, et al.)

Space, Place and Culture (Jeff Peters, et al.)

World Food Issues (Larry Grabau, et al.)

Technological, Cultural, and Social Implications of Nanotechnology (Ingrid St. Omer, et al.)

Topical Area: Western Cultural Heritage

Recommendation: 1) Honors 101 serves as the foundations course. 2) Students would take remaining three colloquia. 3) Students complete an independent project or the Honors Proseminar.

Topical Area: Science and Society

Recommendation: Two proposed sequences fit under this rubric.

1) World Food Issues: an interdisciplinary proposal from the colleges of Agriculture and Arts and Sciences that examines the both the historic and contemporary relationship between world population and food resources.

2) Technological, Cultural, and Social Implications of Nanotechnology: led by faculty from Engineering (but with input and contributions across colleges), this sequence will introduce students to the emerging field of Nanotechnology. Nanotechnology is a highly interdisciplinary field involving scientists from physics, chemistry, biology, engineering, information technology, metrology, and other fields. Revolutionary discoveries are expected to impact every aspect of modern life. In addition to the scientific aspects, students will investigate a wide range of cultural, social, legal, ethical, and environmental concerns that accompany the development of technology.

3) Other possible sequences for future development: molecular biology, stem cell research.

Topical Area: Self and Society

Recommendation: Two proposals fit under this rubric.

1) The Social Sciences

This sequence is an interdisciplinary cluster that covers themes such as “the self and others,” “the social construction of human identity,” and “interdisciplinary perspectives on violence.” Led by Jonathan Golding, eighteen faculty members from across the university are listed as willing participants.

2) Space, Place and Culture

This interdisciplinary theme unites inquiry in the humanities and social sciences to analyze cultural representations of place and the self. We currently have one proposal led by Jeff Peters in French. Scholars working on other areas (Asia and Russia) are potentially interested in participating in the future. It is also possible to imagine thematic clusters might be developed in Latin American Studies, Appalachia, etc.

Honors Program PROPOSED EXPANSION

PROGRAM SEQUENCES

LEVEL	CURRENT SEQUENCE	PROPOSED SEQUENCE
CORE	HON 101 – 3 credits	HON 101 – 3 credits
	HON 102 – 3 credits	HON 102 – 3 credits
	HON 201 – 3 credits	HON 201 – 3 credits
	HON 202 – 3 credits	
ADVANCED	HON 301 - 3 credits	HON 301 – 3 credits
		HON 495 – 3 credits
TOTAL CREDITS	15 credits	15 credits

NOTES

- (1) To graduate with the Honors Program citation, students must complete the CORE and ADVANCED course work in either the current or expanded sequences.
- (2) All students who complete three colloquia in either core sequence satisfy the USP Writing requirement and the Graduation Writing requirement.

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans and Associate Provosts

From: Michael T. Nietzel
Provost

Subject: Proposed Action Plan for Attaining Goal II in the University's Strategic Plan - Attract and Graduate Outstanding Students.

Date: July 20, 2004

One of the six major goals in The Dream and the Challenge, the University of Kentucky's 2003-2006 Strategic Plan, is to Attract and Graduate Outstanding Students. This goal embraces all students at the University, including undergraduate, graduate and first professional. Based on the historic nature of land-grant Universities, the specific role of and expectations for UK in the Commonwealth, and the important goals of Higher Education reform in Kentucky as embodied in House Bill 1, it is crucial that the University develop strong undergraduate programs that will enable it to attract and enroll high caliber students and then provide these students a rigorous education that will prepare them well for life and work.

In order to achieve or even exceed several of the Key Indicators associated with this goal (improving the middle 50% ACT scores for incoming students to 23-28; increasing retention rates to 83% for returning first-year students and six-year graduation rates to 60%; and exceeding predicted scores on the quality of undergraduate education as measured by the NSSE), the University needs to design and implement a number of initiatives that will boost the ambitions and overall quality of its undergraduate education. My ideas about three of these initiatives are described below, along with the necessary, preliminary action steps to bring them forward during the next academic year.

I. Commonwealth Center for Undergraduate Excellence.

I propose the development of this Center to organize several of the University's premier programs under one banner that will serve as a focal point both for innovation in undergraduate education and for dissemination of those innovations that hold the greatest promise for a wider student audience. It would facilitate marketing of the University as an institution dedicated to the best in undergraduate education and it would serve our recruitment efforts well, especially for those students who desire a very challenging

undergraduate experience. The Center could be directed by a senior faculty member with a well-deserved reputation for high-quality undergraduate education. Each year it could support local and visiting faculty as Senior Fellows who would work on teaching or research projects intended to enrich undergraduate education. It would be a campus-wide structure that would symbolize the entire university's investment in undergraduate education. I believe the following programs should be administered under its auspices:

- * Honors Program (which should be expanded to include options outside the Humanities that would make Honors available to more students than the number now served; see below)
- * Gaines Center for the Humanities
- * Discovery Seminar Program
- * Office of Undergraduate Research
- * Office of External Fellowships
- * Student Resources Center (Writing Center and Academic Enhancement Programs)

The administrative structure of the Center is intended to stimulate and coordinate activities and initiatives between and across programs. Individual units would continue to maintain their distinct identities and program autonomy under the direction of their unit-level leadership.

II. Reorganization of the Office of Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education.

As part of the move to a Provost Model, several academic support units were restructured into an enrollment management group under the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. Significant progress has resulted in the coordination of these units, but it is now time to take the next step and move from coordination to integration. Implementing an integrated structure for the Offices of Admissions, Registrar, Student Billings, Academic Scholarships and Financial Aid will achieve a seamless approach to these services, benefiting students, the colleges, and the University.

Upon the recommendation of Phil Kraemer, I propose to convert the title of Registrar and Director of Admissions to the position of Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management. This type of position exists and has proven successful at many other universities. I am pleased that we have someone with the outstanding capabilities and proven track record of Don Witt to take on these duties, under the general oversight of Phil Kraemer.

The Assistant Provost for Enrollment Management will administer all enrollment management units and do so in a manner that should preserve their operational identities while more effectively coordinating their functions into an effective enterprise. Specifically, integrated enrollment management should:

1. Improve the University's ability to recruit, retain, and graduate excellent students.
2. Reduce redundancies and costs associated with enrollment management services. For example, an integrated approach to publications across these units will enrich the quality of the communications and reduce their costs.
3. Enhance connections between enrollment management units and the academic colleges, the Graduate School, Student Affairs, and other academic support units.
4. Integrate University Extension operations into the enrollment management stream, also improving efficiency and reducing costs.
5. Work closely with the Senate and Senate Council in calibrating enrollment goals and targets with pedagogical and learning objectives and class size limits.

III. Curricular Reform.

A collateral benefit of the delegation of the above responsibilities to the Assistant Provost is that it will allow Phil Kraemer to devote more attention to several important issues that will advance the University's educational mission and improve teaching and learning across all undergraduate programs. Among this list of priorities are the following four items that I want to concentrate on during 04-05:

1. Review and revise the University Studies Program. For several reasons, it is necessary to conduct a serious review of USP. It is questionable whether the current program represents a coherent general education core suitable for the 21st century. SACS principles will require in the future that institutions identify "college-level competencies within the general education core and provide evidence that graduates have attained those competencies." Revision of USP should be a deliberate and thoughtful exercise, fully engaged by the faculty, rather than one in which resource and enrollment parameters become too influential. Rigorous assessment of student learning outcomes to provide evidence of program effectiveness and the basis for quality enhancement should be a critical component in the revision. Director of Assessment, Deb Moore, stands ready to support the faculty in this effort and will be developing an Assessment Center designed for this type of activity. USP is preparing a self study in preparation for its periodic review. These results will provide a valuable source of information and documentation for possible changes. In addition, I am pleased that Senate Council Chair Ernie Yanarella has indicated his intention to have this topic be a Senate priority for 04-05.

2. Reconceptualize and expand the Honors Program. UK's Honors Program is one of its fine academic traditions. Over many years, the Program has offered exceptional educational opportunities to some of the University's most talented

undergraduates. Despite this excellent legacy, we have reached a point where we need to pursue some changes in the Program. Several factors bring us to this point, including: a) an attempt to expand the number of students who can benefit from an Honors experience, b) a commensurate need to decrease the over-reliance on part-time instructors who teach in the Program, c) the desirability of including other fields and intellectual traditions in an Honors curriculum, in addition to its current focus on a humanities-based Western civilization curriculum, and d) the advantage of involving faculty in the social sciences, physical sciences and engineering, and life sciences in the development and delivery of Honors education at UK. I am interested in soliciting and evaluating proposals from across the University for establishing several alternative curricular paths that would constitute an expanded Honors Program. These proposals will need to address how a given curriculum will satisfy general education requirements and how it will be enriched by living learning and service learning dimensions. Having discussed this goal with Ernie Yanarella, he and I have agreed to appoint a joint Senate Council/Provost Steering Committee that will work to define the dimensions for an expanded Honors Program, issue a call for proposals that would address the needs cited above, and then work with the necessary University governance structures to bring the most promising proposals to a stage where they could be introduced and evaluated as pilot programs as early as Fall, 2005.

3. Create the Commonwealth Center for Undergraduate Excellence and begin an aggressive campaign to raise private funding for the Center.

4. Improve teaching and learning excellence through the continued development of the Teaching and Academic Support Center.

Please share this memo broadly within your units. I am interested in stimulating wide-based discussion of these matters and would welcome feedback from you or directly from your faculty over the course of the next academic year. I would be happy to meet with your colleges to discuss these projects and their ideas about them. I know that Phil would welcome a chance to be part of such discussions as well.

kh

cc: Lee T. Todd, Jr.
Ernie Yanarella

September 14, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Faculty

FROM: Mike Nietzel
Provost

SUBJECT: Honors Program – Reform and Expansion
Call for Proposals

The Honors Program represents one of UK's finest academic traditions. Over the course of many years, the Program has offered an exceptional educational opportunity for some of the University's most talented and motivated undergraduates. Despite this fine legacy, however, we have reached the point where I am calling the University community to develop proposals that will allow this institution to pursue positive, constructive reform of the Program, reform that addresses the needs, challenges, and opportunities we face at this time as a university. There are several factors that bring us to this point.

First, as undergraduate enrollment has increased, the University has attempted to expand the size of the Honors Program commensurately. Over the past several years, however, enrollment increases have been dramatic. The academic profile of our student body has improved and there are now more potential honors students attending UK than ever before. Unfortunately, over this same period the University has sustained consistent reductions in state appropriations; the cumulative impact of these reductions for the last four years exceeds \$70 million. Consequently, it has been impossible to expand the existing staffing model for Honors, which has relied on a combination of joint faculty appointments (split effort between Honors and a home department) and part-time instructors. Second, without the opportunity to expand the number of faculty appointments, there has been increased reliance on part-time instructors. Nearly half of the sections of Honors seminars offered this semester are staffed by part-time instructors, which is not a desirable feature of a revered educational program. Third, the current humanities-based, Western Civilization curriculum excludes other important intellectual perspectives, modes of inquiry, and knowledge domains. Periodic reviews of the Honors Program have consistently recommended that the curriculum be expanded to embrace the broader intellectual scope and scholarly strengths of the modern research university. For example, the last Periodic Review explicitly recommended that learning experiences in the social sciences, life sciences, or natural sciences be included in the Program. Finally, an honors program provides a special opportunity not only for students but for faculty as well. The existing Honors curriculum, while laudable, requires scholarly expertise that precludes greater faculty involvement from across the University.

In order to address these concerns, we must consider progressive changes that can be made to the Honors Program. Our goal should be to maintain educational quality, curricular coherence, and a sense of program identity while adding new elements. The one guiding principle is that we avoid defining the Honors Program in terms of any one particular curriculum or educational experience. Although it may be possible to limit an Honors Program to a single curricular experience, and there has been success with that model at UK, it is also true that such a model is not the only viable possibility; given the limitations and problems noted above, that model is no longer feasible or desirable.

As a framework within which to contemplate progressive reform, I offer the following recommendations:

- 1.) Maintain the current humanities, Western Civilization curriculum as one of several curricular alternatives.
- 2.) Invite faculty from across the University to develop additional coherent curricula (i.e., sets of integrated courses) representative of the range of scholarly traditions practiced at the University. We should envision Honors curricula that are broadly interdisciplinary, that build on the research expertise of our faculty, and that stimulate intellectual currents on campus. Faculty from several disciplines may, for example, propose a series of courses that are unified by topic but approached through competing methodologies. Curricula in social sciences, life sciences, natural sciences, as well as applied fields would be especially welcome. Alternative humanities curricula are also encouraged.
- 3.) Consider the possible inclusion within the Program of other kinds of educational experiences (e.g., single independent courses similar to Discovery Seminars, research experiences, experiential education, and community service). Make these experiences available to students either as extensions to the curricula or as independent ways to participate in the Honors program.
- 4.) Establish a staffing alternative to the joint appointment model, which has been eliminated, and create an incentive mechanism that stimulates faculty participation over multiple years in order to maintain program coherence. Any successful staffing model will need to be reasonably flexible; e.g., faculty should be allowed to teach one, two, or more courses depending on their interests and department obligations. A commitment to a three-year assignment seems reasonable.

An expanded Honors Program would consist of several alternative curricular paths, with some possible overlap, and several additional educational options. As has been the practice, admission criteria and selection processes will be administered at the program-level. Students admitted to the Program would be permitted to participate in curricular options of their choosing, notwithstanding enrollment limitations based on the size of the faculty cohort in the Honors Program. This flexible approach to a course of study within an expanded program will require new ways to establish and maintain

overall program identity among and between faculty and students. A robust living-learning community might serve that purpose well.

Accordingly, I invite faculty, in collaboration with colleagues, from all departments and colleges to submit proposals for expanding the curriculum of the Honors Program.

Each proposal must include the following:

- 1.) A detailed description of student learning objectives, curricular plans, course content, pedagogy, and other program attributes. Preference will be given to proposals that offer a series of two or three interrelated courses that involve faculty from multiple departments or colleges.
- 2.) Currently, students participating in the Honors Program fulfill a portion of their University Studies Program (USP) requirements. This is a feature we wish to retain in the reconstituted program. Therefore, please indicate the specific USP requirements to be satisfied by each proposed course. It is important that proposals reflect an appreciation for the student learning outcomes associated with each USP requirement. These learning outcomes are described in the University Bulletin. <http://www.uky.edu/Registrar/bulletinCurrent/front/bullusp.html>
- 3.) The faculty expertise required to teach proposed courses.
- 4.) The number of qualified and willing faculty interested in participating in the proposed program.

A faculty steering committee will evaluate proposals and consider ways to implement those proposals deemed worthy of inclusion in a reconstituted Honors Program. The Committee will also work with faculty, department chairs, college deans, and other administrators to develop courses and curricula and to prepare proposals for review by appropriate governance committees (e.g., USP Committee, Undergraduate Council) and approval by the University Senate. The ambitious goal is to implement several pilot programs as early as fall 2005.

Proposals should be submitted no later than December 1 to:

Honors Program Steering Committee
c/o Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost
3 Gillis Building
0033

The members of the Honors Program Steering Committee are:

Kathi Kern (History), Chair
James Francis (Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures & Cultures)

Richard Greissman (Provost's Office, ex officio)
Gail Hoyt (Economics)
Michael Mullen (Agriculture)
Jane Peters (Art)
Robert Rabel (Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures & Cultures)
Peter Sawaya (Nephrology)
Ingrid St. Omer (Electrical Engineering)

MEMORANDUM

To: University Faculty

From: Honors Program Steering Committee

Subject: Follow-up to the Call for Proposals

Date: October 13, 2004

The faculty committee charged with expanding and revising the Honors Program would like to offer guidance to faculty on developing proposals. The [Provost's call for proposals](#) framed the larger issues motivating this curricular reform. In this message, we hope to provide additional detail and anticipate the faculty's questions.

Program Structure

The Provost's memo calls for an expanded Honors Program consisting of multiple curricular paths from which students will choose. Each of these paths should be broadly interdisciplinary and should provide students with an academically rigorous introduction to undergraduate education. We particularly seek proposals for sequences of courses at the lower division that will fulfill the University Studies Program requirements, including the writing requirement.

We thought it might be useful to put forth a sample structure for faculty to consider in shaping their proposals.

Sample Structure for Honors Program Sequence (three courses)

- 1) Foundation Course: A first semester course required of all students in a curricular sequence. Ideally, this course would be conceptualized collectively by the faculty and would provide a broad foundation for the Honors Program sequence. The Foundation Course might fulfill the first-year writing requirement; the whole writing requirement might be distributed, as it is currently, over a sequence of linked courses. Professor Janet Eldred (Director of the Writing Center) has offered to help faculty incorporate the writing requirement into their courses. Contact Professor Eldred at: eldred@uky.edu
- 2) Thematic Clusters: Two additional, thematically linked courses. These courses might retain the broad interdisciplinary approach of the Foundations Course, or

each may offer a disciplinary approach to the common theme of the sequence. We are looking for courses that are open to all students, not courses targeted to a particular college or major.

Faculty/College Compensation

In our current budgetary crisis, we are challenged to create an academically exciting program in a climate of declining resources. At the same time, we recognize that a vital Honors Program requires additional commitment of faculty time and effort beyond the classroom. The following plan assumes a three year commitment from faculty with the understanding that people can renew after the initial term. In consultation with their departments and colleges, faculty can choose in-load or overload teaching or a combination of the two.

In-load Compensation

\$1,500 tax-sheltered research fund or direct payment as summer salary to faculty the first time a new course is offered (reflects \$500 for planning and development).

\$1,000 tax-sheltered research fund or direct payment as summer salary to faculty each successive time the course is offered.

\$3,000 to Dean/Chair for course buy-out for each semester a course is taught in the Honors Program.

Overload Compensation

\$4,500 tax-sheltered research fund or overload salary payment to faculty the first time a new course is offered (reflects \$500 for planning and development).

\$4,000 tax sheltered research fund or overload salary payment to faculty each successive time the course is offered.

Proposal Format

The committee is sensitive to the compressed schedule of this endeavor. Yet we are committed to meeting the Provost's goal of piloting several new sequences for the Fall of 2005. We ask that faculty present a general overview of their proposed Honors Program sequence and put particular energy into the description of the Foundations Course that would be offered in the Fall. Here are the specific proposal guidelines:

- 1) Description of the Proposed Sequence
 - a) A one page description of the intellectual merits of the theme of the proposed sequence.
 - b) A draft syllabus of the Foundations Course that includes student learning objectives, a tentative reading list, possible assignments, pedagogical approaches, and other program activities.
 - c) A brief description of each of the thematic cluster courses in the sequence.
- 2) USP Requirements: Indicate the specific USP requirements to be satisfied by each course. Specifically, address how the writing requirement will be satisfied by this sequence. The USP requirements are explained at:
<http://www.uky.edu/Registrar/bulletinCurrent/front/bullusp.html>

In addition, Phil Kraemer, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, will advise faculty on designing courses that meet the USP requirements. Contact Professor Kraemer at: pjkrae00@email.uky.edu

- 3) The faculty expertise required to teach the proposed courses. Ideally, we seek sequences of courses that are built around broad themes rather than around the specific research focus of any individual faculty.
- 4) The faculty qualified and willing to commit to this sequence.

Deadlines

By November 1: An email notice of your intention to propose an Honors Program sequence. In this message, please include a brief description of the theme of your proposal and the names of the faculty who have agreed to teach in it. Please send your email to Richard Greissman at rgreiss@email.uky.edu.

By December 1: the proposal following the format above to Honors Program Steering Committee, c/o Richard Greissman, Assistant Provost, 301 Main Building, CAMPUS 0032.

Finally, the members of the Honors Program Steering Committee are:

Kathi Kern (History), Chair
James Francis (Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures & Cultures)
Gail Hoyt (Economics)
Michael Mullen (Agriculture)
Jane Peters (Art)
Robert Rabel (Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures & Cultures)
Peter Sawaya (Nephrology)
Ingrid St. Omer (Electrical Engineering)
Richard Greissman (Provost's Office, ex officio)

Undergraduate Honors Programs: Benchmark Analysis

Executive Summary
November 2004

The following executive summary presents a benchmark analysis performed on nineteen undergraduate honors programs. Each of the nineteen programs selected is located in one of the University of Kentucky's benchmark institutions. Information is gathered through three primary methods: (1) a review of all nineteen honors programs' websites; (2) a survey instrument emailed to the directors of all nineteen honors programs; and (3) phone interviews with the directors of twelve of the nineteen honors programs. The University of Kentucky's honors program serves as the primary unit of comparison.

All of the benchmark institutions have honors programs. And although no two programs are alike, there are several common components of programs. Most programs tend to have an elective curriculum with a large array of course offerings; committed honors faculty who are housed in their academic departments; robust and innovative co-curricular involvement; and some combination of faculty, staff, graduate student, and/or upper-class mentors. However, there are also common trends as to what is lacking in most of the honors programs. For example, most programs do not have a well developed recruitment and retention program (particularly for students of color) and/or formal assessment procedures. Given the program audit UK honors is currently undertaking, UK has a distinct opportunity to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these honors programs and appropriately poise itself to move to the forefront of honors programs among its benchmark institutions.

The following report details the benchmark analysis findings. Eight subheadings help to organize the information: (1) Recruitment and Admissions; (2) Students; (3) Faculty; (4) Curriculum; (5) Mentoring/ Advising; (6) Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities; (7) Benefits; and (8) Program Infrastructure. The report concludes with summary remarks and an appendix. Appendix I is a benchmark chart that details specific units of comparison.

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Recruitment. Most of the institutions have informal, rather than formal pre-admission recruitment programs. A handful of institutions personally call (either the director or associate director of honors) academically strong students and invite these students to apply to the program and/or encourage them to visit the campus. A few institutions will invite prospective honors students to annual honors receptions so that these prospective students are able to meet other prospective students, current honors students, honors faculty, and honors staff. The most common informal pre-admission recruitment procedure is to offer an information session during an admission's fair. For example, at Purdue University (Purdue) honors staff hold an information session during the institution's "Day on Campus." ("Day on Campus" is a series of summer orientation days for incoming students).

Exceptions to this rule include the University of California – Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of Michigan (Michigan), the University of Florida (Florida), and to a lesser extent Ohio State University (Ohio State). UCLA and Michigan's recruitment programs include recruitment literature, which is targeted to high achieving high school students, and annual recruitment visits to targeted high schools. In both cases, there is a concerted effort to target high schools that

traditionally serve under-represented populations in an attempt to attract more students of color to their respective honors program.

Florida's formal recruitment program solely targets National Merit Finalists. Florida's honors program works closely with a designated "talent" admission officer to prospect National Merit Finalists. In addition, any National Merit Finalist visiting campus will be paired with a current National Merit Finalist honor student for a campus tour, class visit, and overnight stay (preferably in the honors residence hall). The honors program's cadre of approximately fifty student Honors Ambassadors are responsible for planning and executing an Honors Visitation Day every January, which is specifically targeted to National Merit Finalists. The Honors Ambassadors also host weekly presentations (Fridays at 12:45 PM) on the honors program for any visiting high school students and their parents. Finally, the director of Florida's program cites a well designed and informative honors website as a major medium used to attract students. In terms of National Merit Finalists, Florida's recruitment program has worked as Florida ranks fourth nationally and second among public institutions for the most National Merit Finalists in attendance.

At Ohio State, the director makes the traditional personal phone calls to high ability high school students, and the honors program also piggybacks on the institution's major recruiting day by hosting an honors overnight. Similarly Ohio State holds an honors reception for prospective high school students in targeted communities. The most interesting feature of Ohio State's recruitment program is its partnership with the Columbus Public School System. Ohio State honors works with high achieving students, third through twelfth grades.

Finally, a note from the literature suggests that institutions committed to increasing the number of African-American and Hispanic-American/Latino(a) students should also consider visiting historically Black/Hispanic churches in addition to high schools that traditionally serve these populations.

Most institutions cite shrinking budgets as a reason for not having formal recruitment efforts in place. A handful of institutions instead focus on retention efforts, and hope for a spillover effect in recruitment. For example, the University of Maryland (Maryland) has invested in the retention of students of color by training student advisors of color, creating a Black Honors Caucus, a Hispanic Honors Caucus, and an Asian-American Honors Caucus, and formally surveying the satisfaction of students of color with the program. The director of Maryland's program states that Maryland's specific intention is for honors students to return to their home communities and encourage friends and younger siblings to enroll in Maryland's honors program. Similarly, UCLA hires graduate students of color to be mentors to undergraduate honors students of color. UCLA also has a formal advising program that targets retention efforts. Honors students who perform below required academic standards are required to meet with an academic advisor a set number of times per week until their grades improve. Outside of these notable yet singular efforts, the majority of institutions did not have a well developed nor formal retention program.

Admission. Admission requirements are relatively consistent throughout all nineteen benchmarks. Most institutions require students to be formally admitted to the institution first, and then complete an additional application for admission to the honors program. Traditionally, the honors program applications require high standardized test scores, strong high school grade point averages, high class ranks, and an exemplary essay or set of essays. Yet, most institutions allow students who do not meet the minimum requirements to apply. In these instances applicants are asked to supplement their applications with letters of reference and additional essays. When variations exist between programs, it is primarily regulated to minimum scores on standardized tests, high school grade point averages, and class rank, and not on the type of criteria used in admission decisions.

Of notable difference is the University of Michigan's (Michigan) honors admission policy. As an outgrowth of the affirmative action decision (*Grutter v. Bollinger*) Michigan no longer uses test scores, grade point averages, and class rank as a factor in honors admission decisions. They have a separate application process wherein students are required to submit a series of essays, letters of reference, and an optional interview. Although the director notes that this process is more time consuming, he also notes that Michigan has been able to increase the number of students of color in the program. They also have been able to construct a cohort of students who are intrinsically motivated to be in the honors program. Michigan is not interested in admitting students who are only pursuing the honors curriculum as a means to a credential (e.g. honors designation on their diploma or transcripts). The new admission procedure allows Michigan to deny admission to students seeking the honors program for extrinsic rather than intrinsic rewards. The director believes that such a policy results in a better and more engaged honors student body. It also expands the applicant pool and allows the institution to admit students who do not perform well on standardized tests and/or have had different and often difficult life circumstances.

Purdue University (Purdue) also offers a different type of program. Purdue does not have any admission requirements. Any student may enroll in an honors course, and if the student receives a B or better, then successful completion of an honors course is noted on his/her transcript. If the student goes on to successfully complete the entire honors curriculum, then his/her transcript is noted appropriately. The program is designed to match the public mission of the institution, open honors to all students, and encourage academic excellence throughout the student body. It is important to note, however, that Purdue is currently under-going a similar program audit and has made plans to implement a university honors program, which will be more in tune with the other honors programs being reviewed in this benchmark analysis.

2. Students

None of the honors programs report proportionality among the demographic distribution of students. In respect to students of color, Asian-American students are the largest cohort, often approximately 20% of the honors student population. Typically this figure is well above the proportional representation of Asian-American students at the institution. At select institutions, Hispanic Americans make up approximately 10% of the honors program, but at most institutions Hispanic Americans are less than 5% of the honors' student population. For African Americans, the majority of the institutions are well below 5% of the honors' student population. In terms of gender, most institutions mimic the national Research I trend and report more women enrolled in honors programs than men, although only slightly more.

The distribution of class rank depends upon the type of program institutions offer. Florida, Michigan, North Carolina State University (NC State), Ohio State, and the University of Washington (Washington) have bifurcated programs. Entering students start out in the university/college honors program and by their junior year they move to a departmental honors program. At about half of these institutions the honors staff coordinates both the university/college honors program and the departmental honors programs. For the remaining institutions, honors staffs only coordinate the university/college honors program. At these institutions students are not required to be enrolled in both the university/college and the departmental honors programs – essentially the two programs are mutually exclusive.

The rest of the institutions offer programs that span all four undergraduate years, and many offer compatible honors programs (e.g. departmental honors) for upper-level honors distinction.

3. Faculty

Of the nineteen institutions that are examined, the majority of honors faculty have a primary appointment in an academic department. At a few institutions the honors program occasionally hires adjunct faculty to teach a specific course. In most cases, the hiring of an adjunct is a result of a national or international scholar or professional who is visiting or living in the community and has agreed to teach a course in the honors program. When this happens the adjunct faculty member's compensation comes from the honors program's budget. Maryland pays adjunct hires a flat rate of \$3500 per course; UCLA's rate is variable depending on the subject matter, and Washington will pay as much as \$7000 per course.

In regards to faculty rank, as a whole there is no discerning trend among the benchmark institutions other than placing a priority on selecting faculty who are tenured or tenure eligible. In most programs, faculty from all academic ranks teach honors courses. Two exceptions to this rule are UCLA, who only encourages tenured faculty to teach honors, and Florida, who specifically encourages assistant professors to teach as a way to ease them into academia (e.g. smaller classes with advanced students). However, both of these institutions stress excellence in teaching over faculty rank when selecting honors faculty.

To choose honors faculty, most programs employ a combination of three methods; (1) they solicit recommendations from students and department chairs; (2) they encourage self-nominations through a formal course proposal process; and/or (3) the director of honors handpicks faculty. A few institutions have instigated a formal committee that consists of honors faculty and staff to review and approve course proposals submitted by faculty.

At many institutions academic departments are paid by the honors program for course release time. At a few institutions teaching in the honors program is considered part of the regular teaching load and no compensation is given to the departments. Some honors programs compensate individual faculty regardless if the department receives instruction replacement costs. For example, NC State pays each faculty member who is teaching a course for the first time \$1,000 for course start up costs. UCLA gives each honor's faculty a teaching assistant and \$500 to be used for course materials. At Michigan a handful of faculty receive a small stipend for teaching in the honors program.

Two programs (Florida and the University of Minnesota) are attempting to build an honors-only faculty, in which faculty members will be primarily honors teaching faculty with affiliated appointments in academic departments, similar to the traditional UK arrangement. Both directors remark that their programs are in the exploratory stage of such an arrangement, but are hopeful.

Finally, a handful of institutions have created a special type of honors faculty that are primarily responsible for participating in honors related extra-curricular and co-curricular activities (Michigan, Minnesota, Penn State, Virginia, and Washington). These faculty members do not necessarily teach in the honors program, but fulfill a mentoring or advising role in the program. For example, Washington's program is called the Faculty Mentor Program and gives faculty members an additional stipend (approximately \$1,000 per year) to come to honors events, deliver brown bag lectures and dinner presentations, and hold honors-only office hours.

4. Curriculum

Most of the benchmark institutions have a set number of required credit hours that students need to complete, but students are given great latitude in determining how to fulfill the required credit hours. For the most part institutions offer more than 70+ different honors courses per semester. However, there is great variance in the number of required credit hours. One institution does not require any credit hours (Virginia), whereas other institutions require as many as 24 credit hours (Arizona and Wisconsin). Almost all of the four-year honor programs (as opposed to those programs that focus on the first two years) require a capstone course. The most common required capstone course is a senior thesis. A few programs require a course or a course-sequence in the first year. Cited required courses include “Freshman English Composition,” “Discovery and the Arts,” “What Does It Mean to be an Educated Person?,” “Peer Advising,” and “Great Books and Western Civilization.”

The curricular offerings are an equal mixture of inter-disciplinary, multi-cultural three credit hour courses and honor versions of traditional discipline-based coursework. Many programs offer “honor options” courses in which honors students enroll in a regular course and then negotiate with the faculty member to enhance the course for the student’s honors edification. It is also common for institutions to offer honors versions of independent studies, study abroad programs, and cooperative education.

At Virginia honor students are able to complete both a bachelor degree and a master degree during their undergraduate years. However, the director of the program indicates that it is uncommon for students to actually take advantage of this opportunity.

Most programs have a cumulative grade point average, which must be maintained in order to remain in good standing with the honors program. The required average varies between 3.0 to 3.5. Most programs also require students to file an academic plan of study.

Almost all the honors programs cap enrollment in honors-only courses between 15-25 students. A handful of institutions open the honors courses to non-honors students if there are seats available.

5. Mentoring/Advising

Many programs have academic advisors/counselors as paid staff, who are housed in the honors program and serve only honors students. Two institutions have formal advising programs with alumni and/or upper-class students (UCLA and University of Illinois). For the majority of institutions faculty do not have any formal mentor/advisement roles other than the general role they fulfill as students’ professors, but as previously mentioned there are five institutions that have created faculty mentorship/advising roles. Of particular note are the two programs at Michigan and Virginia. In Michigan’s Faculty Fellows program approximately ten faculty members serve as faculty mentors to honors students. For their time each faculty member is compensated \$1,000, and they are also given an additional \$500 to be spent on student activities and incidentals.

Virginia structures its entire honors program around faculty mentorship. Virginia does not have an honors curriculum or honors classes. Honors students are free of all general degree requirements and major requirements. They create their own major based on their interests and with the help of their faculty mentor. Each honor student is assigned a faculty mentor, who is handpicked for the student by the director. The director assigns students to a faculty mentor based on the student’s academic interest and personality. It is hoped that this faculty mentor will steward the honor

student throughout his or her four years, and will be particularly knowledgeable of the student's field of interest.

6. Co-Curricular and Extra-Curricular Activities

All nineteen honors programs have strong co-curricular and extra-curricular components. All the respondents indicate that they offer an honors housing option, where students are encouraged but not required to live (and where a majority of the first-year honors students do live). Honors program offices and meeting spaces are also commonly housed in these residential complexes.

Organized trips to cultural events and restaurants combined with faculty dinner nights are commonplace, as are brown bag lunches with campus speakers or visiting lecturers, honor student governing boards, honors publications, and student programming boards. Two of the more interesting co-curricular offerings are at Purdue and Maryland. Purdue sets aside a week annually to showcase honor students' work. Maryland offers seminars wherein junior and senior honor students present their research to freshman and sophomore honor students.

As evidenced, the major difference between institutions is not regarding whether they offer co-curricular or extra-curricular activities, but rather the amount they program. For example, NC State has developed a separate program dubbed University Scholars Program (USP) (versus the University Honors Program (UHP)). USP students spend 75% of their program time on enrichment and extra-curricular activities and 25% of their time on formal academic curricular initiatives, whereas as UHP students spend 75% of their program time on formal academic curricular initiatives and 25% of their time on extra-curricular honor-related activities. The two programs are mutually exclusive, and students are not allowed to be enrolled in both.

7. Benefits

Institutions list a litany of common benefits, including enhanced borrowing privileges from the institution's library (this usually translates to having graduate students' borrowing privileges); priority registration; the ability to take upper level and graduate courses; summer and travel grant opportunities; the ability to work with faculty on faculty research projects; and transcript notation and/or citation of honors completion. Penn State has a separate honors graduation ceremony, in addition to the university ceremonies, and presents an "honors medal" to each honors student upon graduation. Another common honors benefit is the special and intense preparation available to honors students for successful competition in national scholarship programs (e.g. Marshall, Rhodes, Truman, etc.).

Finally, two institutions give honors students particular leadership training opportunities. Penn State offers an honors-only course titled "Leadership Forum" wherein honors students learn leadership skills from highly regarded civic, business, and political leaders. Florida is currently implementing a similar leadership course, which will only be offered to National Merit Finalists who are also honors students.

8. Program Infrastructure

All the honors programs employ a director of honors. At some institutions the director holds multiple appointments. For example, at Florida, the director is the director of honors, the assistant

provost for undergraduate education, and a professor in an academic department. At all the institutions the director of honors retains a joint appointment in an academic department, traditionally on quarter-time or half-time.

In addition to the director, most honors programs also employ paid staff: the range runs between 2 to 4 professional staff, 1.25 to 10 support staff members, and if applicable 2 to 5 academic advisors. The professional staff usually includes an associate and/or assistant directors. These positions traditionally do not have joint academic appointments, but at almost all the institutions these positions are filled by individuals who possess a Ph.D. Most of the advising positions are half-time positions that are split with other offices (usually the institution's advising office).

Budgets are typically over \$100,000, but most budgets are labor laden, earmarked primarily for staff and to some extent faculty salaries. Only a handful of institutions have line budgets for programming costs. In almost all the cases programming budgets are comprised of private funds and not public. Of those who are able to report out, the range for programming costs span from \$5,000 to \$50,000.

All of the programs have an eventual reporting line to the institution's provost. Two institutions have stand alone honors colleges. The deans of these two colleges report directly to the provost. Nine institutions have university-wide honors programs, wherein the director of honors reports directly to either the provost or the associate provost for undergraduate education. Eight institutions have honors programs that are housed in a college of arts and sciences/liberal arts. At these institutions honors directors report the dean of the college, who in turn reports to the provost.

Only one program has a formal assessment program beyond normal teaching/course evaluations. Minnesota has an internal assessment program, and is currently undergoing its first external assessment review. Minnesota's internal assessment includes student satisfaction surveys, program evaluation, co-curricular and extra-curricular evaluation, retention, course and faculty evaluation, and budget review. Five programs indicate that they are in the process of developing assessment procedures. For example, Florida recently created an external advisory board, made up of honors alumni. The purpose of the board is to offer advice, guide assessment, and help raise development funds. A handful of institutions conduct either formal or informal student exit interviews.

Summary Remarks

The results of this study suggest that the University of Kentucky's honors program is not out of line with many of its benchmark's honors programs. UK's honors mirrors other institutions in terms of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities and benefits that are offered to honors students. Differences are seen in faculty arrangements and curriculum structure. At only two institutions are faculty aligned with the honors program specifically, and at both of these institutions this is a new arrangement. Given that UK has already realigned its faculty with academic departments it is now in concert with most of its benchmark institutions. The other major area of difference is in the curriculum. Very few institutions have a prescribed curriculum, and most institutions do not have a curriculum grounded in western civilization.

Beyond these general comparisons, there are a few specific findings that merit further consideration. Four are highlighted below:

- As experienced by Florida, a targeted marketing plan for a specific cohort of honors students may be easily implemented and easily built upon. By targeting a subset of honors

students and developing a strong marketing effort towards this group UK might be able to enhance its honors student population, and build a successful blueprint for eventual expansion to other subsets of the honors population.

- UCLA and Michigan's manner of recruiting students of color may also be useful. They have different approaches from the other institutions, and have devoted more resources to the issue. Michigan's new approach to admitting students is worth a serious consideration, given its success. UCLA's system of targeting high schools and employing graduate students of color as mentors may also prove effective for UK.
- Given that UK's core curriculum is rooted in the western civilization tradition, it is worthwhile to note the multi-cultural breadth of the benchmark institutions' honors curriculum. The only exception to this is Michigan, whose only required course is rooted in western civilization.

In addition, UK's honors curriculum is more prescribed than most of its benchmarks. Most of the honors programs under-review are quite elective in nature. Students are free to construct a program based on interest. Honors courses at these institutions appear to be stand alone, and are frequently team taught, interdisciplinary, and focus solely on a specific noteworthy and current social problem (e.g. Washington's course on stem cell research). These courses are often taught by faculty who traditionally do not teach undergraduate students such as professors of law, medicine, and business, and traditionally revolve around the faculty member's research.

- A fourth important finding is that almost none of the institutions have formal assessment procedures. As a result, UK is in a strong position to lead other institutions in the development and implementation of formal assessment procedures.

Many of the benchmark institutions appear to lack substantive programs in recruitment (particularly for students of color), retention, and assessment. In contrast, most programs offer a wide array of courses, often multi-disciplinary in nature, and give honors students great freedom in constructing a worthwhile honors experience. However, at some institutions this freedom is often not coupled with appropriate levels of advising. Faculty course instruction appears to be strong, but co-curricular and extra-curricular faculty participation is not universal. As a result there are real opportunities for UK to make great strides in developing a first-rate honors program. UK may want to consider implementing recruitment, retention, and assessment programs, strengthening faculty engagement, and offering a more elective curriculum, to build a superior honors experience.

Kirsten Turner
Assistant Dean for Academic Planning and Analysis
College of Arts and Sciences
(859) 257-5647
jkturn1@email.uky.edu

Appendix I.

Institution	Program Location	U or A&S	Honors Faculty	Faculty Stipend	Enrollment	Capstone	Required	GDR's
NC State	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Students	U	Department Take who they can get	\$1000 first time they teach*	440	I.S. (6 hours)	Discovery & the Arts + 3	Yes
OSU	Assistant Provost for Honors and Scholars	U	Department No adjunct	No	1200	Common/ Thesis	N/A	N/A
Penn State	Dean of the Honors College	Honors College	Department	No	925	Thesis	Eng Comp	Yes
Purdue	Dean for the College of Arts and Sciences	A&S	Department Teaching Acad Members	Yes, if overload	800 take courses < 200 graduate	No	12 hours	Yes
Texas A&M	Dean of Undergraduate Programs	U	Department		2500	No	36 hours fairly prescribed	Yes
U of Arizona	Dean of Honors	U	Department		4138	6 hrs Thesis	15 hrs 1st level plus 9 hrs	Yes
UCLA	Vice Provost in College of Liberal Studies	A&S	Some lecturers are hired by honors	No, but pay for TA's and materials	4100	Thesis	No	Yes
U of Florida	Assistant Provost and Director of Honors	U	Departments Handful adjuncts	None	1900	No	4 courses	Yes
U of Georgia	Assistant Provost for Honors	U			2500		Peer advising	Yes
U of Illinois	Provost	U	Department		500		# of courses plus others	Yes
U of Iowa	Provost	U	Department	\$5000 for new course prep, Yes	4000-6800	No	No	Yes
U of Maryland	Provost Office of Undergraduate Studies	U	Department Chairs nominate	\$3500 for adjunct faculty	2000	No	4 courses "Edu Person?"	Yes
U of Michigan	Dean College of Arts and Sciences	A&S	Department	A few receive a small stipend	1800	Thesis	West Civ	Yes
U of Minnesota	Dean College of Arts and Sciences	A&S	Departments mostly 5-6 honors faculty	Honors part of faculty load	1700	No	No	Yes
UNC	Associate Dean for Honors	U			800			
U of Texas	College of Liberal Arts	A&S	Department		600	Thesis	9 elective courses	Yes
UVA	Dean College of Arts and Sciences	A&S	Program is all mentorship	N/A	832	N/A	N/A	N/A
U of Washington	Dean and Vice Provost Undergraduate Education	U	Department	No, select few \$500-\$7000	1125	N/A	Core-intern'l & interdiscipl	Yes
U of Wisconsin	Dean of Liberal Arts	A&S	Department		1300	No	Yes 24 credit hours	Yes

* They do pay the departments \$6000 to enable the dept to hire replacement faculty.

Appendix I.

Professional Staff	Support Staff	Admissions	Budget	Comments	Institution
3 (Director, Assoc Dir, Assistant Director)	4	Regular admission Asked to apply	\$700K/Including salaries		NCState
2.5 (Director, etc) 6 Proqram coordinators	4	Reviewed/invited from U app	\$1.6 million \$100K seed money for course dev	Each rec. scholarship (\$600 to full) Centralizing unit - role changing	OSU
2 Professional Staff 2 Academic (Dean)	6	Test scores, Essay, References	\$2.4 million/includes program salaries	All honors students receive a \$2500 scholarship	Penn State
.5 Director 2 Professional Staff	1	Regular admission	\$2 million/includes salaries and scholar \$15K for programming	Changing to University wide with a more prescribed curriculum	Purdue
1 Director 2 Professional Staff	4	Regular admission 1250 SAT/upper 10%		Different types, based on Uni. Honors	Texas A&M
5 Professional Staff 3 Advising/prog dev	4	GPA/test scores Regular admission		No separate application	U of Arizona
1 (Asst VP for Honors) 1 (Dir. of Counseling)	4 counselors 4 Admin		\$464K/8.5 faculty salaries \$570K/Salaries and basic support		UCLA
.5 Director 4 Professional Staff	2	1380 SAT/32 ACT	\$200K for OPS \$50K for programming	Created an external advisory board University Scholars Program differen	U of Florida
5 Professional Staff 4 Dev/Advisor	6	Selective admissions			U of Georgia
4 Professional Staff	2	Invited to apply SAT/GPA/Essay			U of Illinois
.5 Director 2.75 Professional Staff	1	B+ or 3.33	\$280K All programming comes from private fund		U of Iowa
5 (Director, Assoc Dir, and 3 Assist Dir.)	1 Adm Asst 1 Acd Adv	Certain GPA, Rank, & Test Scores	\$64K/Does not include salaries		U of Maryland
2 Senior Staff 0.5 Faculty Director	2 Records 2 Staff	Essay	\$1 Million/includes salaries		U of Michigan
.5 Director 4.5 Advisors	2	3.5 GPA/10% HS/ 28 ACT/1260 SAT	\$400K		U of Minnesota
2 Professional Staff	2				UNC
1 Direcot 3 Professional Staff	3	5% HS/SAT 1400 GPA Test scores	\$120K/Salaries and basic support \$150K/Scholarships -- \$5K/Programming		U of Texas
1 Director (reduced load)	1/4 Admin Assist			Their own major	UVA
3 Professional Staff 2 Advisors	5	Essay	\$500K		U of Washington
7		ACT 30/SAT 1340 3.9 GPA			U of Wisconsin