

# Honors Transition Committee Report

University of Kentucky

December 9, 2016

Kristin Ashford (Nursing)  
John Balk (Engineering)  
Margaret Bausch (Education)  
Lisa Blue (Arts & Sciences)  
Becky Dutch (Medicine)  
Jonathan Glixon (Fine Arts)  
Phil Harling (Honors), Chair  
Jeff Huber (Communication & Information)  
Vanessa Jackson (Agriculture, Food, and Environment)  
Nancy Jones (Fine Arts)  
Scott Kelley (Business & Economics)  
Hannah Latta (Honors Student Representative)  
Meg Marquis (Honors)  
Claire Renzetti (Arts & Sciences)  
Leon Sachs (Arts & Sciences)  
Bruce Webb (Agriculture, Food, and Environment)  
Lisa Wilson (Provost Office)

## **Charge to the Committee**

On April 4, 2016, Prof. Ernest Bailey, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure (SAOSC), wrote to Prof. Andrew Hippisley, then Chair of the University Senate Council, to recommend the establishment of an Honors Transition Committee to design a structure for the new Lewis Honors College. The Honors Transition Committee has closely followed Prof. Bailey's suggested nine-point charge, merely adding the first point in the following list:

1. Consider what an Honors College ought to *mean* – i.e. its proper ethos, essence, and culture – both in its own right and in the contexts particular to UK
2. Consider an appropriate curriculum for the Honors College, and how best to expand from a 21- to a 30-hour curriculum
3. Consider the appropriate staffing for the Honors College, and develop an appropriate staffing structure
4. Determine the overall composition of the faculty for the Honors College and a regulatory structure to govern faculty eligibility and involvement
5. Determine the criteria for participating in faculty governance in the Honors College
6. Recommend an Honors Faculty of Record for the Honors College and develop a governance structure for membership terms and renewals
7. Determine how to ensure diversity of both faculty and students in the Honors College as well as access for students of diverse economic and social backgrounds
8. Recommend how to ensure effective consultation of the Honors College dean and faculty with the deans of other colleges, faculty participating in the program, and the External Advisory Board

9. Identify how the proposal will ensure success for other colleges as well as provide unique educational opportunities for students
10. Assess the plans for economic sustainability of the Honors College

Let us address these charge points in order.

***1. Consider what an Honors College ought to mean – i.e. its proper ethos, essence, and culture – both in its own right and in the contexts particular to UK.***

The Transition Committee feels that the Lewis Honors College should be more deliberate in addressing what it *means* to be an Honors student. We agree that Honors students ought to be intellectually curious, and they ought to be encouraged to think and talk about how they can make an impact beyond the curriculum – not only professionally, but in their communities and in their inquisitive and adventurous approach to the world around them. Imparting such an ethos to students takes time. The distinctive ethos that marks a number of liberal-arts colleges, for instance, has often been the work of a century or more. But there are ways of catalyzing a sense of ethos, and the Lewis Honors College should be invested in doing so.

We should predicate the Honors curriculum upon a more specific sense of what and whom we would like Honors students to *be* and to *become*.

- We want them to be intellectually curious beyond their major field of study.
- We want science and social-science and humanities students to obtain a better appreciation of ways of seeing that are different from those that prevail within their majors
- We want to help ensure that Honors students achieve significant depth within their major area of study.
- We want Honors students to play a meaningful ambassadorial role to their fellow students and to the broader university.

These goals suggest a broader vision for what we would like to see the Lewis Honors College look like in 5 or 10 years:

- A College in which faculty members across UK's broad campus want to participate, and where UK's best teachers routinely find themselves in front of UK's best students
- A College that serves as an incubator for good teaching ideas that instructors will carry back to their home departments
- A College that offers students a richer variety of Honors seminars, and of dedicated Honors sections of established departmental course offerings, than it does at present
- A College where service learning is better integrated into the student experience than it is at present
- A College that better coordinates its mission and goals with those of the Office of Undergraduate Research and the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards
- A College in which dedicated career counselors (there will be 4 of them, according to the terms of the Lewis endowment agreement) work closely with the Stuckert Career Center and the career-services professionals in the Colleges of Engineering, Business & Economics, Agriculture, etc. to facilitate student planning and preparation (e.g. through targeted summer research and internship opportunities)

Right now Honors students tend to think of Honors chiefly as a credential. We want to encourage them to see it as their avenue to become more interesting and cultivated people who possess moral imagination and are committed to life-long learning. We also want them to see the Honors program as a path to achieving deeper research proficiency and fluency within their major courses of study.

**2. Consider an appropriate curriculum for the Honors College, and how best to expand from a 21- to a 30-hour curriculum.**

While the current flexibility of the Honors curriculum is in some ways desirable, it lacks intentionality and is too much of a grab bag; it does not inculcate in students a common sense of what and whom we wish them to become. There is strong support for building out the Honors curriculum from the current 21 to the proposed 30 credits in ways that promote the qualities we enumerate in point #1 above. Our specific proposals are as follows:

<b>Current Curriculum</b>			<b>Proposed Curriculum</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Credit Hrs</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>When</b>	<b>Credit Hrs</b>
WRD/CIS 112 (Suggested Only)	1st Yr	0	<b>WRD/CIS 112 (Required)</b>	<b>1st yr</b>	<b>3</b>
Lower-level Honors courses (151, 152, 251, 252, or Dept Honors section)	1st Yr	6	Lower-level Honors courses (HON 151, 152, 251, 252, or Dept Honors section)	1st yr	6
		0	<b>Foundational Honors Seminar</b>	<b>within first 2 yrs</b>	<b>3</b>
Upper-level Honors courses (HON 301, Dept Honors sections, course conversions, G-level courses)	2nd-4th Yr	6	Upper-level Honors courses (HON 301, Dept Honors sections, course conversions, G-level courses)	2nd-4th Yr	6
Honors Experiences (Edu Abroad, UG Research, Experiential Edu)	2nd-4th Yr	6	Honors Experiences (Edu Abroad, UG Research, Experiential Edu)	2nd-4th Yr	6
		0	<b>Directed Elective (HON 301 or Dept Honors course outside student's major)</b>	<b>2nd-4th yr</b>	<b>3</b>
Honors Capstone (typically in major)	4th Yr	3	Honors Capstone (typically in major)	4th Yr	3
	<b>TOTAL CREDIT HOURS</b>	<b>21</b>			<b>30</b>

There was some concern expressed that this more credit-intensive Honors curriculum could in the abstract cause difficulties for students in more prescribed courses of study, such as Biology or Engineering. But this year's Honors freshmen entered UK with an average of 29 AP credits, which means the addition of a few more requirements should not pose much of an obstacle to participation in Honors. It will nevertheless

remain important for many Honors requirements to continue to satisfy UK Core requirements, in order to preserve the modicum of flexibility needed for top students in credit-intensive majors to continue to participate in the Honors program.

Let us now walk through the steps we propose in moving from a 21- to a 30-credit hour Honors curriculum.

**Current: 21 credits**

**Plus 3 (to 24 credits): Make WRD 112/CIS 112 compulsory for all Honors students.** WRD 112 and CIS 112 (Accelerated Composition and Communication) are accelerated versions of UK's standard 2-semester composition and communication sequence. They focus on integrated oral, written, and visual communication skill development and emphasize critical inquiry and research. (CIS 112 differs from WRD 112 in including a community-service obligation). Virtually all current Honors students already take one or the other of these accelerated courses. All current students can be accommodated at current instructional staffing levels.

**Plus 3 (to 27 credits): Add a foundational seminar to be taken by all Honors students by the end of their 2<sup>nd</sup> year.**

The purpose of this course is to build a sense of intellectual community among students in the Lewis Honors College by engaging them in a shared academic experience. A 3-credit, 1-semester course taken in the freshman or sophomore year, it will emphasize the development of analytical reading and writing skills. The course will be writing intensive, requiring students to produce a minimum of 20 pages over the course of the semester and to complete at least one assignment that includes a formal revision process. The overarching theme of the course addresses the relationship of the individual to society, and students will explore how the three main branches of academic inquiry—humanities, natural sciences, social sciences—address this topic. The course theme is intentionally broad, inviting periodic revision by the course instructors. It is nevertheless desirable that there be a substantial (approximately 75%) degree of standardization in texts and assignments each semester, and through successive iterations of the course, for the sake of establishing an Honors College tradition and building community across grade levels. Course instructors will participate in an annual, late spring retreat during which they will collectively decide on the course's anchor texts and assignments. The course will be composed of seminars capped at 20 students. Each of the three major units will be introduced by an evening lecture (recorded for those students unable to attend) by a prominent UK faculty member who will be asked to present a broad historical context and/or epistemological framework for subsequent student discussion within the relevant unit. These lectures will have either the natural sciences, social sciences, or humanities as their broad focus, and speakers will be encouraged to incorporate the broad course theme into their talks. Such events will afford students a more robust understanding of the specific texts associated with the subsequent course unit. Class meetings will integrate the lecture material, key texts, and other primary-source materials to promote discussion within small groups, the larger class cohort, and among students across the various course sections.

**Plus 3 (to 30 Credits): Require 3 credits of directed elective (to count only as Honors credit – i.e. cannot count toward UK Core credit)**

A Lewis Honors College student should not only be developing depth in her or his field of study but also breadth of Honors-level course experience.

Honors students must choose at least three credit hours in HON 301 or departmental Honors sections outside their general discipline<sup>1</sup> of study, including declared majors or minors, at the time of course enrollment. Students must consult with their Honors advisor to secure permission for their intended directed elective prior to enrollment; advisors will guide students to consider courses significantly outside their field

---

<sup>1</sup> Broadly classified as life sciences, physical sciences and engineering, fine arts, humanities, and social science and business.

of study or in truly elective potential areas of academic growth. The use of course conversions for this requirement is discouraged, and will only be allowed when no appropriate Honors sections are available, and only with permission of the Director of Student Services or the Lewis Honors College Dean.

Colleges and departments should see this new requirement as an opportunity to develop Honors sections, especially for blended enrollments of high-performing non-Honors majors and Honors students pursuing this directed elective. Additionally, departments should consider developing new HON 301 courses to pilot new courses that may eventually be brought back to the home department of the offering faculty member.

### **Presentation of independent work**

The purpose of this proposed curricular element is to define and formalize the already established Honors requirement to promote and ensure high-quality Honors independent work and/or capstone experiences, and to consciously assimilate the role and importance of curricular and extra-curricular experiential education as a core element of the Lewis Honors College. To meet this requirement, students will be expected to develop a formal proposal and presentation and disseminate their independent work at an interdisciplinary venue. First and second year students will be meaningfully exposed to, and involved in the Honors independent and/or capstone projects as part of a required Honors course. The intent of this recommendation is to recognize the importance of the experiential and capstone elements of the Honors curriculum and to broadly highlight these activities among the Honors student body. Exposing first- and second-year Honors students early to the best independent work of their more experienced peers will raise the expectations bar for students in the early stages of the program while giving exemplary student research the audience it deserves.

To ensure high-quality independent work and capstone experiential education within the framework of existing Honors classes, and to provide opportunities for dissemination of scholarly work, we propose:

1. A requirement for 1<sup>st</sup>- and 2<sup>nd</sup>-year Honors students to attend presentations of independent work by their more experienced Honors peers. This requirement can be embedded within the proposed foundational seminar.
2. Add some structure and requirements to the required Honors independent and/or capstone courses that would: a) have students develop and present a proposal for their independent and/or capstone honors course(s); and b) have students formally present their Honors experiential work and/or capstone in an interdisciplinary venue, either an established venue or one developed for this purpose (e.g. Showcase of Undergraduate Research, Global Health Conference, Center for Clinical and Translational Science Conference).
3. This initiative will benefit from the appointment of a coordinator who will be responsible for approval, viewing and critiquing Honors independent and/or capstone proposals in a group setting with other students (upper class and freshman), and evaluating presentations of the work when it is complete.
4. A select cohort of presentations would be chosen by Honors College faculty for highlighting in a year-end Honors showcase.

***3. Consider the appropriate staffing for the Honors College, and develop an appropriate staffing structure.***

***4. Determine the overall composition of the faculty for the Honors College and a regulatory structure to govern faculty eligibility and involvement***

***5. Determine the criteria for participating in faculty governance in the Honors College***

## ***6. Recommend an Honors Faculty of Record for the Honors College and develop a governance structure for membership terms and renewals***

As charge points 3 through 6 are closely related to each other, we will address them in one section.

*Our regular faculty must play the lead instructional role.* Our fond hope is that faculty involvement in the Lewis Honors College will broaden and deepen as we move forward. The lion's share of this richer Honors curriculum should and will be the preserve of the established UK faculty. Recruiting faculty to participate in Honors instruction has been a challenge in recent years. For its first 40-odd years the UK Honors Program was comparatively very small, and a relatively small handful of faculty members taught in it. Thus when the Program expanded aggressively in recent years there was no tradition of widespread faculty involvement from which it could benefit. At the moment, most of the larger undergraduate colleges are under-represented among Honors instructors. Compared to honors colleges in similar universities, there is also a considerable dearth of departmental Honors sections at UK. We would like to see many more dedicated Honors sections of 100- and 200-level courses, with those sections taught by regular faculty members. There is also considerable room to expand Honors seminar offerings. We would like to see greater diversity and variety among Honors seminars, with a significantly greater volume of UK faculty rotating in and out of them. The obvious goal should be to put more of UK's best teachers in front of UK's best undergraduates. We believe that a very good first step toward this goal would be the establishment of a Faculty Fellows program within the Lewis Honors College along the following lines:

### **Lewis Honors College Faculty Fellows Proposal**

**Goal:** To recruit outstanding faculty from across the University of Kentucky to teach and lead in the Lewis Honors College

**Background:** The staffing of the Lewis Honors College is a critical part of the success of this unit. The Transition Committee believes that recruiting some of the university's most outstanding faculty from a variety of disciplines to teach in Honors and have a presence in the college is absolutely crucial. It will provide Honors students with top-notch teaching from renowned experts in their fields, allow for increased interaction of Honors students with these faculty at Lewis Honors College events, and provide leadership from throughout UK for the College.

- **Description of the position:** Lewis Honors College Faculty Fellows will serve a one- to three-year term in which they will be 50% in the Lewis Honors College. During their tenure as Lewis Fellows, they will teach one Honors course (either an Honors seminar, or a newly created Honors section of a regular departmental course) each semester. In addition, Faculty Fellows will provide service to the Honors College through participation on the admission committee, attendance at three student-led Honors events a semester, and developing and offering at least one co-curricular enrichment event for Honors students in each academic year of their appointment. Finally, Lewis Fellows will serve as *ex officio* members on the Honors College Faculty of Record, so that their expertise can inform key decisions.
- **Selection process:** A yearly competition for the Lewis Fellows program will be conducted. Applicants should generally be tenured faculty members with a history of excellence in undergraduate teaching and a national reputation for scholarship, though outstanding Senior Lecturers could be considered. Applicants will be asked to submit a letter of nomination from their chair which includes verification of the release for the requested one- to three-year term if selected, documents demonstrating excellence in teaching and scholarship, along with a statement on proposed courses they envision teaching and other ways they would contribute to the College. A selection committee composed of the Dean of the Honors College, four members of the Honors Faculty of Record, and four additional members appointed by the Provost will review the applications. Fellows completing an initial term would be eligible to compete for a one-term reappointment.
- **Number of scholars:** At least three scholars will be chosen each year, giving a total of nine Lewis Fellows in the College at any one time. The fellows are anticipated to represent a diverse range of academic areas.

- **Financial Arrangements:** As 50% of the effort for a Lewis Fellow will transfer to the Lewis Honors College during their three-year term, funds equivalent to 50% of the faculty member's nine-month salary and benefits will be transferred directly to the faculty member's home department to cover necessary instructional expenses during his/her absence.

The Faculty Fellows program would of course be allied to ongoing efforts to recruit faculty members from the full breadth of our campus to offer Honors seminars and Honors sections of multi-section departmental courses. These initiatives will help to foster a cultural shift in which occasional but meaningful participation in Honors instruction becomes a matter of routine for a significantly higher proportion of UK faculty members than it is at present.

*There is a need for incentive funding.* There remains a widespread perception that participation in Honors is a zero-sum game – that “lending” UK’s best teachers to Honors brings nothing in return to the unit doing the lending. Incentive funds will be needed to help alter this perception and ensure broader faculty participation in Honors over time. There are modest ways to incentivize Honors participation that seem quite feasible. One obvious way is the establishment of an instructional-development fund that would enable prospective instructors to think expansively about possible Honors courses, chiefly with a view to how their Honors “experiments” might be brought back to their home departments as regular course offerings. In this way Honors participation might be perceived as a tool for renovating departmental curricula. The Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) has already expressed interest in assisting in such an endeavor. Funds might also be used to provide PTI support to department chairs who are reluctant to cooperate simply because they have quite legitimate concerns about the temporary instructional loss when one of their prized instructors is temporarily “on loan” to Honors (and we recognize that PTI support alone will in some cases not prove sufficient in and of itself). Funds might also be used to make overloads feasible for faculty members who want to teach in Honors, but who for compelling reasons cannot obtain release from their regular departmental teaching duties. Thus we recommend that the central administration establish a sizable recurring incentive fund from which the Dean of the Honors College can draw in her or his personnel negotiations with other academic units. Anecdotal evidence suggests that such incentive funding is standard among the well-established honors colleges; UK is an outlier in not having any. A set amount should be given to all participating units, but the “lending” unit should be afforded some flexibility in how it spends the incentive money, as one size will not properly fit all participating units.

*Lecturers will likely need to teach most sections of the new required foundational Honors seminar.* We believe that the best way of ensuring adequate instructional support for the proposed foundational seminar is to hire a modest cohort of Lecturers whose instructional time will mostly be allocated to this course. Of course it is desirable for tenure-eligible faculty to be involved in the teaching of this seminar. However, given the historic difficulty in recruiting a critical mass of tenure-eligible faculty to teach Honors seminars and Honors sections of large 100- and 200-level courses, it is not realistic to think that many such faculty members would be able and willing to teach the foundational seminar on a predictable basis. Thus we anticipate the need to hire a small group of Lecturers to do most of the foundational seminar teaching.

Lecturers should be compensated at a competitive level. They should be given some measure of instructional guidance and support. Three-year renewable terms would suggest a modicum of stability, and provide Lecturers with a reasonably stable career path. We should hire the best people we can, which means there will be some measure of turnover. Lecturers should be expected to teach one course per year in their core discipline, and their DOE would need to reflect this. Their instructional service within their core disciplines can serve to broaden the participation of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty members in Honors – core disciplines can “lend” to Honors the instructional time of one of their faculty members just as Honors is “lending” the Lecturer’s instructional time to her/his core discipline. Since we envision an umbilical connection between Lecturers housed in the Lewis Honors College and the core disciplines in which they hold their Ph.D.s, it is vitally important that the relevant core disciplines fully participate on Lecturer search committees. Once a Lecturer is hired, s/he should be assigned a faculty mentor within the core discipline, as a means of ensuring an ongoing connection with the relevant department. Since some proportion of Lecturers’ instructional time will regularly be assigned to their core discipline, there will be a mechanism

to ensure that the relevant department will meaningfully participate in the merit evaluation and promotion review of Lecturers.

With these safeguards built into their DOEs, we deem it important that Lecturers be granted primary appointments within the Lewis Honors College, where over 85 percent of their DOE will typically reside. We realize that UK's Governing Regulations will need to be amended to make it possible for Lecturers' primary appointments to reside in the Honors College. We understand that it would be conceivable for their primary appointments to reside in their core-discipline college while the large majority of their DOE was assigned to Honors. But over time we fear that such an arrangement would pose a real disadvantage to Honors. Possession tends to be nine-tenths of the law. Over time there would be strong centrifugal pressure for more of the Lecturers' DOEs to shift to their core disciplines, thus eroding the instructional capacity for the Honors foundational seminar in the long run. Since the very point of hiring Lecturers is to guarantee this capacity, we believe it is important that their primary appointments reside within Honors.

*Faculty governance within the Honors College should rest with a Faculty of Record whose primary appointments reside in UK's other colleges.* The Lewis Honors College is unusual in having no faculty members with primary appointments housed within the College. Indeed, UK's Governing Regulations explicitly state that "regular members of the Honors Faculty are tenured or tenure-eligible faculty members with primary appointment in another college who have a recurring, dedicated assignment in the Honors College, reflected in their Distribution of Effort" ([GR, Part VII.E.2.a-c](#)). Fortunately, for several years now the Honors Program/College has enjoyed the services of a Faculty of Record (FoR) comprised of 11 faculty members who are appointed through the University Senate. Moreover, we suggest that the 9 Faculty Fellows described above serve as *ex-officio* members of the FoR during their terms of service. Taken together, regular and *ex-officio* members of the FoR should amount to some twenty faculty members – thus providing a substantial cohort that will function as the faculty of the Lewis Honors College and its faculty council. This sizable FoR will be big enough to command the majority of votes on specific curricular or other matters, even on occasions when they agree to assign voting rights to Lecturers. Thus far the FoR has chiefly assisted in the vetting of Honors course proposals. We propose a significant expansion of their role, so that in governance matters they behave like the tenured faculty within a department. Most importantly, they will serve as a body that can safeguard the Lecturers appointed to Honors chiefly to teach the foundational seminar from the untrammelled will of the Honors Dean. In addition to vetting course proposals and advising the Dean on budgetary matters, the FoR will advise the Dean on annual merit review of Lecturers, and on the question of promotion from the rank of Lecturer to that of Senior Lecturer. Thus the FoR will provide Lecturers with the sort of protection from the Dean that Lecturers enjoy in other UK colleges, while providing the Dean with the regular faculty counsel that deans enjoy in other colleges. Each member of the FoR would need to have some reasonable percentage of their DOE (perhaps 5 percent) assigned to Honors. Members should also be placed on staggered fixed terms (perhaps of 3 or 4 years). There would need to be a sizable bucket of money allocated to buy out the relevant DOE time of said faculty. Rules of the College would need to be written up to formalize the role of the FoR, similar to departmental rules. There are good examples of such rules at UK from which to draw.

### ***7. Determine how to ensure diversity of both faculty and students in the Honors College as well as access for students of diverse economic and social backgrounds***

The Honors College should take a leadership role in addressing diversity and inclusion within UK. To that end, it should strive to enhance the diversity and inclusivity of our Honors community by recruiting, promoting and retaining an increasingly diverse population of faculty, staff and students. We suggest that it do so as follows:

1. The Honors College will foster a diverse community of engaged students

- By using the Holistic Review admissions process newly implemented by UK medical school as a model for Honors College admissions.
- By making full use of recruitment strategies for diverse populations – for instance, via existing programs sponsored by UK such as Ignite Night, Come See Blue For Yourself, and Preview Nights.
- By enhancing efforts toward the recruitment of international students.
- By training application reviewers in holistic review methods that are likely to enhance diversity and inclusion.

2. In order to better align with the University’s mission to enhance diversity and inclusion in a meaningful and deliberate way, the Honors College will:

- Solicit faculty of color for course development
  - In coordination with the Associate Deans, identify and recruit faculty of color and diverse identities to teach in Honors.
  - Provide incentives for teaching participation in Honors through the proposed Faculty Fellows program outlined above, or alternative mechanisms that allow faculty to teach in Honors as part of their teaching load.
- Use best practices for recruitment of diverse faculty and staff
  - Work closely with UK Human Resources to recruit and hire from a broadly-represented applicant pool for newly created/open staff positions.
  - Create a review process for instructional selection that includes a diverse selection committee.
  - Collaborate with the African American Faculty Advisory Committee and the Faculty Council on Diversity and Inclusion to devise new ways to recruit faculty and staff.

3. The Honors College will promote campus awareness of diversity by:

- Fostering a culture of inclusion and engagement.
- Developing curricular elements that address multiple, intersecting identities, especially within the proposed mandatory foundational seminar for Honors students.
- Identifying a diversity and inclusion officer, with that role clearly articulated within the employee’s JAQ<sup>2</sup>
- Facilitating unconscious bias training for faculty, staff, and students.
- Within the greater University, Lexington, and Kentucky communities, promote programs (speaker series, workshops, training opportunities) that foster diversity and inclusion.

**Finally, efforts to cultivate diversity and inclusion in the Lewis Honors College must be measurable and (re)evaluated on an ongoing basis.** To that end, these efforts will be built into the College’s annual assessment plan, and will include but not be limited to measurable goals such as:

- Matching the Honors College’s undergraduate enrollment of under-represented minorities to UK’s overall population of under-represented minorities by 2020.
- Establishing specific target goals and deadlines for increasing the number of African American and Hispanic/Latino faculty and administrators from 2016 baselines.
- Maintaining gender parity among Honors instructors.

---

<sup>2</sup> Currently, Interim Dean Dr. Phil Harling is serving as the Diversity and Inclusion Officer, with Director of Student Affairs Meg Marquis as the alternate.

***8. Recommend how to ensure effective consultation of the Honors College dean and faculty with the deans of other colleges, faculty participating in the program, and the External Advisory Board***

It will be essential for the Dean of the Honors College to be a skilled and tactful diplomat. Since s/he will have modest recurring instructional resources from which to draw, s/he must cultivate cooperative relationships with other deans and with department chairs. As we noted above, it will be imperative for the central administration to provide the Honors dean with an incentive fund from which s/he can draw to encourage deeper and broader faculty participation in a richer Honors curriculum. Most Honors instructors are currently eligible for a \$1,000 stipend. But this is not a sufficient sum to encourage broad faculty participation, and if more robust incentive funding is made available it needs to flow to colleges and/or departments rather than to individual faculty members. We are keenly aware, moreover, of the power inequities between the Honors dean and the deans of the other colleges. Since there will be no tenurable faculty in Honors, s/he will be a general without any soldiers. This is another argument in favor of the beefed-up Faculty of Record described above; this group will be able to provide needed advice and assistance to the Dean.

We anticipate that faculty members participating in Honors instruction who are not members of the Honors Faculty of Record will function very much as they do at present. The Dean will continue to meet with them several times each semester, and not only keep them abreast of developments but seek their informal counsel on curricular and other matters. The focus in these regular faculty meetings will be on the Honors classroom and on students' broader Honors experience. What should a well-informed Honors pedagogy look like? What ideas do Honors instructors have for enhancing Honors students' co- and extra-curricular activities, and how can we best get Honors instructors involved in those activities? These are the sorts of quality-control issues that ought to preponderate in the ongoing informal discussions between the Honors Dean and staff and the instructors who teach Honors students from one semester to the next.

The role of the Honors External Advisory Board is described in UK's Governing Regulation VII, F.2.b (<http://www.uky.edu/regis/files/gr/gr7.pdf> - p. 9). It is a strictly consultative Board that "shall offer advice and recommendations on matters brought forward by the Dean and leadership of the university, reserving matters of educational policy, personnel, and internal operations to the Honors Faculty and administrative leadership." The Advisory Board was established in the 2015-16 academic year. Since then it has been meeting at approximately six-month intervals. Per the terms of the Lewis endowment agreement, its members include the current or former deans of honors colleges at (currently three) other universities, several UK faculty members, a representative from UK's Office of Philanthropy, UK's Provost and the Dean of the Lewis Honors College, and Mr. Tom Lewis. At its most recent meeting the Board had a broad-ranging discussion with several members of this Transition Committee. The Advisory Board in its strictly consultative role has been bringing the valuable experience of other honors colleges to bear on the evolution of the Lewis Honors College. It provides a valuable channel of communication between the Dean of Honors and her/his experienced counterparts at well-established honors colleges.

***9. Identify how the proposal will ensure success for other colleges as well as provide unique educational opportunities for students***

We believe that the most salutary instructional goal is to ensure that UK's best teachers should have ample opportunity to teach UK's most academically-qualified undergraduates. Currently, this does not happen as often as it should. At present, there is not a unanimous idea on campus that participation in Honors is a shared responsibility. Some units welcome the participation of their faculty, while others tend to resist it as an additional burden that they feel they cannot afford. This unevenness of opinion about the intrinsic value of Honors as a collective responsibility may well stem from past history. For several decades the UK Honors

program was relatively quite small. Only recently has there even been a widely perceived need for broader participation across UK's colleges. On other campuses, shared responsibility for Honors has evolved over a longer span of time. Given this historical context, we believe it is important for the Lewis Honors College to forge closer ties with the other colleges and with academic departments –closer ties than the UK Honors program had in the past. Notably, there should be a stronger balance of departmental Honors sections. The benchmark honors colleges we have examined offer a significantly larger ratio of Honors sections to Honors seminars than UK Honors currently does. A cardinal virtue of developing more Honors sections is that it will broaden participation of regular faculty members within the Honors curriculum. Let us stress once again that fiscal incentives will be necessary to ensure the enhanced flow of tenured and tenure-track faculty into Honors seminars and sections. A good place to start would be to redirect the \$1,000 stipend currently being paid directly to Honors instructors into the coffers of their home departments or colleges. But a bigger investment will be necessary, at least up to the relevant PTI rate and ideally well beyond it. Incentive funding will be particularly important to ensure the continued Honors participation of faculty members from relatively small departments that are hard-pressed to meet their instructional commitments, as well as the participation of faculty members from departments that generate a disproportionately large share of undergraduate student credit hours.

### ***10. Assess the plans for economic sustainability of the Honors College***

Lisa Wilson, Associate Provost for Finance and Administration, has conducted a thorough review of all revenue sources to ensure the Honors College's financial sustainability after the operating gift from Mr. and Mrs. Tom Lewis expires in the 2025 fiscal year. According to her analysis and projections, the Honors College will achieve sustainability by the end of its tenth year. (See spreadsheet at the end of this report).

#### ***Revenues***

Lisa Wilson confirmed the various Lewis Gift payment schedules with the Office of Philanthropy to ensure that available funds were appropriated to the correct fiscal years. These funds are reflected in the spreadsheet at the end of this report.

In addition to the Lewis gifts, an important source of recurring revenue for the Honors College will be a student fee. Some half of comparable honors colleges assess student fees, and these range fairly widely in scope. UK's agreement with Mr. Lewis stipulates a fee of \$500 a year (\$250 per semester). We wish to be fair to current Honors students in the implementation of this fee. Current students will stand to benefit from the additional advising positions and the 4 new career counselor positions provided in the Lewis gift, but as they will be grandfathered under the 21-credit curriculum they will not enjoy the full benefits of the proposed curricular expansion. After discussing a range of options, we recommend that current students (as of Fall 2016) will pay a graduated fee of \$75 beginning FY18, \$150 in FY19, and \$300 in FY20. Students entering the Honors College from August 2017 forward will be assessed a \$500 annual fee (\$250 per semester).

In addition to these endowment and fee revenues, the Honors College will continue to receive its current state/tuition allocation of ~\$835,000 per year. UK will allocate an additional \$135,000 per year to ensure that the Honors budget begins at \$1,000,000 per year, as stipulated in the Lewis endowment agreement; other UK units will *not* be required to provide funds from their budgets to meet this figure.

It is important to stress that revenue projections include operating gifts of \$250,000 each year until FY26, at which point projections include operating gifts of \$500,000 each year. A specific requirement of the agreement with Mr. Lewis was that significant annual revenues would stem from broader philanthropic effort. We note with some concern that this development goal is ambitious for a unit with a modest history

of fundraising to date. While dedicated support from the Office of Philanthropy will be necessary to meet this goal, we have been assured that this is a high institutional priority.

### ***Expenses***

Anticipated expenses reflect the scaling-up of the Honors curriculum that we discussed earlier in this report. It also reflects stipulations in the Lewis endowment agreement for an academic dean, enhanced instructional support, 5 dedicated Honors advisors, 4 dedicated Honors career counselors, and 8 full-time Honors support staff. These numbers include current Honors staff in addition to those who will be hired over the next year or so. A budget of \$500,000 has been built into FY19 forward to support the Faculty Fellows program discussed above. The projected budget allocates an additional ~\$175,000 per year for incentive funding. In order to provide fee relief in cases of demonstrated need (in concert with the University's new UKLEADS initiative), a scholarship fund equivalent to 10 percent of the incoming class is included in the expense projections. Fund balances generated by the Honors College will be carried over to support College operations.

Provost Tracy and Associate Provost Wilson have provided us with their assurances that the University is fully committed to the success of the Lewis Honors College. If and as necessary, additional funds of up to \$200,000 per year will be allocated from state-tuition resources to ensure the financial health and wellbeing of the College.

HONORS COLLEGE PRELIMINARY BUSINESS PLAN										
	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FY26	FY27
<b>Revenues</b>										
State/Tuition Allocation	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,017,390.05	\$1,034,806.29	\$1,052,570.85	\$1,070,690.71	\$1,089,172.96	\$1,108,024.86	\$1,127,253.80	\$1,146,867.32	\$1,166,873.10
Additional State/Tuition Investment, if necessary										
Expected Fee Revenue	\$338,364.75	\$445,626.88	\$647,127.43	\$983,214.10	\$1,016,569.33	\$1,051,040.97	\$1,084,068.93	\$1,117,608.34	\$1,151,655.23	\$1,186,204.89
Lewis Operating Gift	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$750,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other Operating Gifts	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$500,000.00
Endowment Distributions*	\$320,000.00	\$388,960.64	\$249,989.89	\$275,189.89	\$290,389.89	\$305,589.89	\$320,789.89	\$335,989.89	\$215,989.89	\$215,989.89
Total Expected Revenue	\$2,408,364.75	\$2,601,977.56	\$2,681,923.60	\$3,060,974.85	\$3,377,649.92	\$3,445,803.82	\$3,512,883.68	\$3,580,852.03	\$3,014,512.44	\$3,269,067.88
<b>Estimated Fund Balance</b>		<b>\$481,854.38</b>	<b>\$111,991.37</b>			<b>\$153,906.21</b>	<b>\$321,337.45</b>	<b>\$500,071.47</b>	<b>\$689,823.94</b>	<b>\$255,088.91</b>
<b>Expenses</b>										
Dean	\$240,500	\$245,310	\$250,216	\$255,221	\$260,325	\$265,531	\$270,842	\$276,259	\$281,784	\$287,420
Faculty Support (Includes Fellows Program)	\$300,000	\$1,295,600	\$1,311,512	\$1,327,742	\$1,344,297	\$1,361,183	\$1,378,407	\$1,395,975	\$1,413,894	\$1,432,172
Incentive Fund	\$174,717	\$178,211	\$181,776	\$185,411	\$189,119	\$192,902	\$196,760	\$200,695	\$204,709	\$208,803
Operating Expenses	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Scholarships	\$55,000	\$75,000	\$125,000	\$180,000	\$185,400	\$190,962	\$196,691	\$202,592	\$208,669	\$214,929
Speaker Fee	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Staff	\$1,071,293	\$1,092,719	\$1,114,574	\$1,136,865	\$1,159,602	\$1,182,794	\$1,206,450	\$1,230,579	\$1,255,191	\$1,280,295
<b>Total Expenses</b>	\$1,926,510	\$2,971,841	\$3,068,077	\$3,170,239	\$3,223,744	\$3,278,373	\$3,334,150	\$3,391,100	\$3,449,247	\$3,508,619
<b>Estimated Balance</b>	<b>\$481,854</b>	<b>\$111,991</b>	<b>(\$274,162)</b>	<b>(\$109,264)</b>	<b>\$153,906</b>	<b>\$321,337</b>	<b>\$500,071</b>	<b>\$689,824</b>	<b>\$255,089</b>	<b>\$15,538</b>
*Includes drawdowns per agreements										
Deficits in FY20 and FY21 could be offset by changes in staff hires, faculty hires, or revenues from students fees										

