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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

From the end of World War Two until the late 1960's American higher education enjoyed an era of confident expansion, stimulated by the eagerness with which returning war veterans pursued their delayed or interrupted educations, the subsequent baby boom, a prospering economy, and the widespread conviction that more education for more people was the solution to social problems as well as the path to individual upward social mobility. However, the relative unanimity, public confidence, and growth higher education experienced was disrupted by the social and political turmoil of the late 1960's and early 1970's. Perhaps the most dramatic indications of dissatisfaction with traditional institutions and authority were the radical student revolts, themselves a confluent expression of three broader American social movements -- the Black liberation movement, the Vietnam peace movement, and the youth cultural liberation movement. While the university itself was not usually the primary source of student disaffection, it was a convenient target for the broader attack on traditional culture. Of course, this brief scenario is simplistic. The prosperous postwar period has also been described as one of student apathy and conformity, and of rigid, tunnel-visioned bureaucratization. Correspondingly, the disruptive, disorganized late 1960's have also been viewed as a time of essential, healthy self-examination and reform.
Higher education survived this period of confrontation, though not without much self-analysis. In the last ten years educators have churned out volumes of literature examining the condition and speculating about the future of higher education. Recent issues of *Daedalus* (Fall, 1974 and Winter, 1975), for example, were devoted to 81 essays on "American Higher Education: Toward An Uncertain Future." This and other writing about the problems and prospects of higher education has revealed a significant lack of consensus among academics about the responsibilities, purposes, and goals of their profession. Many colleges and universities have suffered a loss of self-confidence, confusion of purpose, and uncertain sense of direction. Public confidence in and support for higher education has also diminished. Demographic, cultural, and socioeconomic changes have demanded institutional responses that are creative and innovative, yet are also sensitive to the traditional values that have helped to define a university.

Certainly the problems facing higher education today stem from broader social issues and problems. The demographic certainty that in 20 years there will be nearly 25% fewer 18-21 year-olds means that colleges must attract older, nontraditional students or risk declining enrollments. Smaller institutional budgets have made "creative management of decline" an essential administrative skill. With budget cuts have come public demands for efficiency and accountability. Higher education is expected to respond to our egalitarian society's demand for greater accessibility to its services, while at the same time maintain high standards and quality control. As college has become the right of nearly all, rather than the
privilige of a few, high school graduates, serious questions have arisen regarding the university's capacity to function in this new role. Howard Bowen (1977) summarizes the challenge to higher education, as an increasingly heterogeneous student clientele brings diverse interests, abilities, and goals to campus:

This does not mean that every single institution should shift gears, though many should. It means rather that the system as a whole should adjust to the needs of students of many backgrounds, interests, and ages. New kinds of institutions, new modes of delivering educational services independent of colleges and universities as we know them, new methods of instruction, and new subjects of study will be needed in this transition. (p. 459)

Institutions must recognize their moral and pedagogical responsibility to teach all the students they admit, regardless of the commitment to basic skills remediation this position may entail.

Changing internal circumstances also pose serious problems for leaders in higher education. Leadership in large, complex, increasingly fragmented institutions is made difficult by the time and energy spent brokering competing interests. The political model of university governance developed by Victor Baldridge (1971) more aptly describes the administration of large university systems than either the collegial model, emphasizing decision-making based on informal, cooperative, interpersonal influence, or the bureaucratic model, featuring decision-making based on rigid role expectations and formal, positional authority. Richman and Farmer (1974) describe the political governance model:

The political model takes conflict as a natural phenomenon and focuses on problems involving goal setting and values rather than on problems maximizing efficiency in carrying out goals. It takes into account the role of interest groups and power blocs... small groups of political elites tend to dominate major decisions... formal authority is often severely limited by the political pressure and bargaining that groups can engage in. (p. 30)
University administrators who have become accustomed to the more traditional collegial or bureaucratic models may have difficulty in providing effective leadership in this more "open systems," political governance system.

Colleges and universities, then, are being pressured by both internal and external forces to do more and better and different ... with less. Institutional leaders, one of whose tasks has always been to stimulate and guide the improvement and reform of higher education, must more consciously assume the role of change agents, balancing a commitment to innovation with a dedication to those aspects of university life and learning that are essential to the viability of higher education.

Honors programs, which are organized arrangements to provide bright, motivated students with challenging learning opportunities, are one segment of higher education which must respond to the call for such leadership. They were established predominantly during the prosperous post-World War II era, but must now re-examine their purposes and methods, and must justify their existence to an increasingly accountability-minded administration and public. The central purpose of this study is to examine the honors movement in higher education and to make some modest suggestions about their future. This researcher believes that a necessary element of this future should be a serious commitment to curricular and instructional innovation.

**Statement of the Problem**

The central problem this study considers is the following: What has been, currently is, and should be the curricular and instructional
innovation used by honors programs in American higher education to meet their primary goal of providing challenging educational opportunities for academically superior undergraduate students? This question divides into three related parts, the first of which involves an examination of the history and development of honors programs. Particular consideration is given to the extent to which the honors movement developed as an innovative response to changing social and political issues.

The second part of the study involves an analysis of the current character of honors programs, including their major programmatic features: enrollment, governance, budget, curriculum, recruitment and selection processes, orientation, counseling and advising, communications, extracurricular activities, evaluation, and self-reported strengths and weaknesses. Emphasis is placed on the extent to which honors programs have either initiated or are using various curricular and instructional innovations designed to improve undergraduate education. This section also considers current honors directors' attitudes toward specified innovations as being appropriate or desirable honors programming.

The third part of the study is the researcher's suggestions, based on a consideration of what has been and what currently is the nature of honors education, about areas of programmatic, curricular, and instructional innovations in which honors programs might become more involved.

**Definition of Terms**

**Honors Programs**

Honors programs are planned, organized sets of arrangements designed to meet the particular interests, needs, goals, and abilities of academically
talented students. Joseph Cohen (1966), generally regarded as the founding father of modern honors programs, defined them as "organized attempts to provide all superior students with a special and different learning experience" (p. 1).

Honors programs should be differentiated from the generic meaning of "honors" in university education, which refers to all special treatment or acknowledgment of the superior student, including honors-in-course designations (cum laude, magna cum laude, summa cum laude) and honors societies (Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Pi, Mortar Board) which recognize and certify a student for high academic achievement. Honors programs, on the other hand, are less concerned to recognize academic achievement than they are to promote and generate it through curricular and extracurricular programming.

While the primary purpose of honors programs is to challenge good students to realize their academic potential, there is much diversity among these programs with regard to size, curriculum, institutional support base, and educational philosophy. This study defines honors programs operationally as those which are institutional members of the National Collegiate Honors Council, the national professional association of honors programs.

**Academically Superior Undergraduate Students**

These students are defined in their relationship to honors programs as those whose demonstrated academic ability and motivation are sufficiently high that their academic needs would not be adequately met by existing programs. Depending on the admission criteria of individual honors programs, these students have shown evidence of their academic ability...
in high school by graduating in the top ten percent of their class, having a 3.5 grade point average, or scoring at the 90th percentile on the Scholastic Aptitude Test or American College Test; or in college by having at least a B average and faculty recommendations that attest to ability and potential to do significantly above average academic work. Additional criteria frequently used include written statements, personal interviews, and extracurricular involvements that suggest the potential for high undergraduate academic achievement.

Of course, not all academically superior students enroll in honors programs, nor are all honors students academically talented, motivated, or intellectually inclined. They are very rarely geniuses and are not necessarily superior to nonhonors students in their morality or personal qualities. A recent, unpublished comparative study of the backgrounds, characteristics, and attitudes of honors and nonhonors entering freshmen by this researcher indicated that while honors students were more academically successful and prepared for college than nonhonors students, their values, goals, and social attitudes were not significantly different. Most honors educators are inclined to agree with John Portz (1977), who is "obliged to conclude that there are only differences in degree, not in kind, between the two groups" (p. 6).

Challenging Educational Opportunities

While there is no common set of honors program services to students, the following four areas delineate the offerings of most programs: (1) courses, seminars, and colloquia, which usually have small enrollments, employ discussion rather than lecture and note-taking instructional methods, and explore subject matter in depth; (2) independent study and research,
commonly directed by a faculty advisor and culminating in a senior year thesis; (3) advising and counseling, including guidance in the selection of courses, faculty, and programs of study and information about financial aids, foreign study, graduate study, and other student concerns; (4) extracurricular cultural and social programming, including sponsorship of lectures and film series, poetry readings, workshops, field trips, outdoor activities, and other activities for students, faculty, and staff.

Curricular and Instructional Innovation

For the purposes of this study curricular and instructional innovation is defined as planned, intentional change in what is taught and learned in honors programs, and in the methods by which the learning takes place.

Innovation is most clearly understood by following Leon Botstein's (1972) definition of it as "a novel reordering of resources within a coherent process which leads to an identifiably different result" (p. 14). In this study innovation implies an attempt to improve upon the traditional; thus, innovative and nontraditional are terms used synonymously. An assumption is made that the motivation for innovation is the perception of a need for an alteration in an existing condition. This intentional change need not oppose or replace the status quo, but must intend at least to add to or improve it. This researcher assigns little validity to the phrases "innovation for its own sake" or "change for the sake of change," which impugn the intent of, rather than evaluate the need for or success of, innovation.

Arriving at a completely satisfying, commonly accepted definition of innovation is difficult, for there is no general understanding of what
is traditional or what is nontraditional in higher education. What is considered new in one program may be well-established in another program. As defined in this study innovation need not be original, creative, or the product of a unique experimental method. Intentional change intended to improve honors education in a given program is considered innovation, even though such innovation may be in use, or even have been tried and discarded by another program.

Curricular innovation is change which responds to the question, "What knowledge is worth knowing, and how shall it be organized for instruction?" Curricular change refers to the introduction of new subject matter or to new approaches to traditional subject areas. Such innovation may be implemented at an individual course level, for example a course offering in an unusual topic. It may be implemented as an interdisciplinary course, in which the perspectives of two or more disciplines are combined. For example, a seminar might be offered on the energy crisis using subject matter from several sciences. Curricular innovation may also be implemented at a program level, in which a series of related, perhaps sequential, courses constitute a general education program, or in which students design their own, faculty-advised majors and curricula.

Instructional innovation is change which responds to the question, "How is the knowledge worth knowing best taught and learned?" It refers to how rather than what a student learns, to the various new procedures for the presentation and acquisition of knowledge. Positing traditional college instruction as classroom teaching involving lecture, limited discussion, note-taking, and testing, this study delineates instructional innovation as that including interdisciplinary colloquia,
independent study arrangements, community internships, self-paced instruction, and media- and computer-assisted instruction. It also includes instruction using interpersonal process techniques such as simulation and gaming, team teaching, instruction by nontraditional teachers, and learning that is evaluated by a competency-based system.

American Higher Education

In this study the term "higher education" is limited to degree-granting, four-year colleges and universities in the United States which have established honors programs. Many institutions are thereby excluded, including all junior and community colleges, government and business training centers, trade schools, and other proprietary institutions offering postsecondary education. Few of these institutions have honors programs. Nearly all of the fully developed honors programs are members of the National Collegiate Honors Council, which was the characteristic used to define operationally honors programs.

Significance of the Study

The need for this study arises from a realization shared by most educators that innovation and adaptation to changing internal and external conditions are essential to the well-being of organizations. Colleges and universities, confronted by retrenchment and other challenges outlined earlier in this paper, must be particularly receptive to new ideas and reordering resources toward improved teaching and learning. This study has significance because higher education has not, in fact, been adequately receptive to experimentation and change.

Universities have been typed as conservative, tradition-bound
institutions that frequently resist needed change. Jean Hills (1968) has characterized these institutions as

those intent on pattern maintenance, which means that they are marked by stability and resistance to change, intent on maximizing pattern consistency and keeping the integrity of their own value system at the expense of adaption, goal attainment, and integration. (p. 108)

Samuel Gould (1970) agrees with this perception of the university:

Here we are at the source of weakness in the academic condition. The University has failed ... to recognize and reflect the innovative and experimental character of American society (p. 30) .... one is struck by the dreariness and pedantry which pervade all too many courses of study, as well as by the tenacity with which perpetuation is protected (p. 38) .... an institution must constantly examine itself and must change toward what each examination reveals and anticipates. Universities are in deep trouble partly because they do not do this. (pp. 64-65)

Ladd (1970) examined the dynamics of change in 11 colleges and universities, concluding that "except when faced with severe pressure or the threat of it, the ability of our institutions of higher education to respond to change is frightenly limited" (p. 9).

Universities have begun to experiment more with new curricular and instructional ideas, particularly since the student disturbances a decade ago startled the establishment into an awareness that reform was necessary. Howard Bowen (1975) is optimistic: "Even though genuine and serious innovation is still not the norm at the present time, it appears that it is catching on and might be the source of profound changes in the next quarter century" (p. 155). Algo Henderson adds that "almost any discussion of what is currently happening in higher education seems to hinge upon the concept of innovation" (p. 3). Indeed, in the last ten years a wealth of literature, organizations, conferences, and committees on innovation have
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surfaced. At least two journals have taken root, Change Magazine and Alternative Higher Education: The Journal of Nontraditional Studies. Dozens of books have addressed the issue, and one publishing company, Jossey-Bass, has specialized in books about nontraditional higher education. Without forgetting that in the essentially conservative environment of higher education there is generally more discussion than action, it seems that an increasing number of educators agree with Henderson's exhortation: "The solutions to problems must be found in action, even if it involves departures from tradition. The situation calls for an innovative spirit" (p. 301).

While honors programs are particularly logical and appropriate loci for innovation in higher education, they are also somewhat precarious settings for experimentation. Their vulnerability derives from several circumstances. Many are only recently established, having been founded in the last 20 years. They serve a small, academically superior minority of students and are often perceived as elitist. Their pedagogical origins and traditions are in the classical liberal arts and sciences, which are being threatened at many institutions by student interest in more vocational and career-oriented programs of study. Their clientele is primarily the traditional, 18-21 year-old student, of whom there will be nearly 25% fewer in about 20 years.

Despite these factors, however, and in some cases because of them, honors programs are proper settings for innovation. Since many of them do not have long traditions, large budgets, or highly formalized programs, they have less to lose, and thus should be more open to experimentation and change. The honors student has learned to excel in and meet
many of the challenges of the traditional classroom. Certainly honors education should provide rich classroom challenges, yet it should also present bright students with other challenges that complement classroom learning and prepare students for the many postgraduate situations they will encounter outside the context of formal schooling.

Organization of the Study

Each of the three parts of the research question is considered in a separate chapter. The history and development of the honors program movement in American higher education is the focus of the review of literature in Chapter Two. This review not only traces the chronological development, but also the significant and recurring themes in the honors movement. The current nature of honors programs is analyzed in the presentation of data gathered from a questionnaire sent to honors directors and is considered in Chapter Four. Finally, some proposals for the future of honors programs is the concern of Chapter Five. In each of these sections particular consideration is given to the role which educational experimentation and innovation have played or should play. The design and methodology of the study is described in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: A HISTORY OF HONORS PROGRAMS

Development of Honors Programs

The honors movement in American higher education has had two "found­ing fathers," both of whom have written the only books on honors programs to date. Frank Aydelotte, former President of Swarthmore College, wrote a pioneering report in 1925, "Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities," based on an extensive catalog study of honors education at that time. He also wrote the first book about honors programs in 1944, Breaking the Academic Lockstep.

The modern father of honors programs was Joseph Cohen, "who had been developing an honors program at the University of Colorado since 1928 ... and became as he said, a modern Johnny Appleseed sowing interest in honors across the nation" (Austin, 1975, p. 161). Cohen wrote The Superior Student in American Higher Education in 1966. This book, Aydelotte's earlier book, and the honors program professional journal, The Superior Student (1958-1965), which became Forum for Honors (1970-present), contain much of the literature about the development of and recurrent themes in the honors movement.

The concept of special educational experiences for the academically talented student, which is the essence of the honors concept, derived largely from the tutorial system at Oxford and Cambridge Universities, which in 1830 began to differentiate between pass and honors degrees, requiring more and higher quality work for the latter degree. Aydelotte
suggests that the Rhodes Scholarships, established in 1904, were a catalyst for the honors movement in America, as many returning Rhodes Scholars became college teachers and administrators and implemented the Oxford pass-honors system in their own institutions. Aydelotte was an active promoter of the innovative pass-honors approach and set up an honors program at Swarthmore in 1922, based on a slight modification of this Oxford tutorial model. He wrote,

The method of doing it seems clear; to separate those students who are really interested in the intellectual life from those who are not ... with these more brilliant students it would be possible to do things which we dare not attempt with the average .... for the honors students the course and hour system should be abolished, attendance at lectures and classes should be entirely voluntary, and the honors degree should depend upon the student's success in a series of examinations, written and oral, conducted by external examiners. (1944, pp. 31-2)

Aydelotte's honors approach, emphasizing student flexibility and freedom, was radically innovative in American institutions. However, while it was widely proclaimed, it did not spread much to other institutions because of "the inescapably elitist nature of the British model, the restriction to the upper division, and the atypicality of Swarthmore itself" (Cohen, 1966, p. 10).

While the Swarthmore honors program was the most publicized, it was not the only early root of modern honors education. Honors recognition at graduation, based on a thesis, an approved arrangement of courses, and a more flexible, individualized academic program, began at Wesleyan College in 1873 and at the University of Michigan in 1883. In the early 1900's several other schools took the first steps toward establishing honors programs, and in 1925 the first national conference on honors education was held at the University of Iowa (Aydelotte, 1944, pp. 47-48).
That same year Aydelotte published a small pamphlet on honors education in which he stated, "A large number of colleges and universities have honors systems under consideration at the present time. The actual achievement here recorded is less important than the promise implied in the widespread interest in the subject" (1925, p. 6).

Aydelotte reported that by 1944, 130 colleges and universities had established some form of honors education, falling into one of three types: honors work as an extra requirement; honors work as a replacement for one or more regular courses; honors work for the entire academic program. His description of early honors programs does not mean that fully developed programs were firmly established by the 1940's. Most of the programs Aydelotte described offered honors only as an extra option or as a substitute for a few courses at the upper-level, departmental stage of a student's program. Also, most of these early programs enrolled only a few students.

In 1927 W.S. Learned observed that "of the 93 honors programs surveyed by Aydelotte in 1925 only those at Swarthmore, Harvard, and the University of Toronto involved enough students to be worthy of mention" (cited in Cohen, 1966, p. 11).

Early honors programs were also limited geographically and by institutional type. Most early programs were in small, private East Coast colleges: Smith, Colgate, Goucher, Brown, Dickinson, Middlebury, Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Williams, Amherst, Lehigh. Aydelotte noted this fact and devoted a chapter of his book to reasons why no more than a few programs were being established in large, public universities around the country. While acknowledging a few exemplary honors programs at the University of
Virginia, The Ohio State University, and the University of Colorado, he concluded that it was
difficult for large institutions to experiment . . . and particularly
difficult to persuade state legislatures to appropriate funds for a
program of this type, limited to a few, when they find it hard enough
to supply the needs of the many. (1944, p. 91)

Ironically, then, pioneering efforts in honors education came from the
most selective liberal arts colleges, whose homogeneous student body made
the need for special programs to identify and provide good students with
enriching educational experiences less compelling than at the public insti-
tutions serving a diverse, less privileged clientele.

Thus, honors began in the early 1900's as luxuries for the few
schools which could afford them. Yet, the honors movement did not grow
much through the mid-1900's, as Walter Weir (1962) notes: "After the
founding fathers had met for the last time and the initial enthusiasm
for a new program had faded, most of these programs quietly slipped into
the neat obscurity of catalogue prose" (p. 1).

One honors program which did not fade into obscurity, however, was
developed at the University of Colorado by Joseph Cohen. Established in
1928, the Honors Council introduced several key features to education
in the large, public university. The concept of general, lower-division
freshmen and sophomore honors was devised by Cohen and his colleagues in
1930. Budgetary provisions were made for an honors library and newsletter.
In 1940 the Honors Council received its first permanent (though halftime)
director, E.F. D'Arms, who was succeeded three years later by Cohen.

Significantly, Cohen's Honors Council managed to remain viable even
during World War II, which was a major factor in the demise of many other
honors programs. Timely adaptation, flexibility, and the willingness to innovate were keys to the survival of the Colorado Honors Council. It offered, for example, new courses related to the war years, such as a series of "World Crisis Courses," and introduced popular, nongraded, senior honors colloquia. Abandoning the absolute requirement that a student must take general as well as departmental honors, Cohen remarked, "Compromises like this kept the honors idea alive" (1966, p. 22). One is impressed with the Honors Council's openness to change when challenged by serious threats. Cohen admits, "Few of our ideas were brand new; cues were taken from every source" (1966, p. 23). His innovations were not always original, but they were sufficient to keep the program going through crises.

Cohen not only kept his own program alive, but he emerged as the postwar catalyst for the development of an organized, nationwide honors program movement. In 1957 he and others founded the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student (ICSS), a central agency "which was to operate independently and act as a clearinghouse for information on honors activities across the nation" (Cohen, 1966, p. 27). The ICSS was the product of a 1957 national conference on honors at the University of Colorado, attended by faculty and administrative representatives from 27 institutions. A conference steering committee met again four months later and formally established the ICSS in October, 1957.

Shortly after its formation the ICSS received a $125,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to be used for developmental purposes over a 2 1/2 year period. The grant was renewed in 1960 with an additional $140,000,
supporting the ICSS for two more years. The Carnegie Corporation also funded another separate honors group in 1960, the College Committee on Outstanding Students, which was formed to collect and distribute information and raise questions about the way that colleges, particularly many small private colleges not a part of the ICSS, were providing special educational services for the superior student. The CCOS conducted a national meeting in 1961, held some additional regional meetings, and produced a few reports and articles. However, it did not emerge as a continuing expression of the honors movement, as did the ICSS.

From 1962 until 1965 the ICSS also received funding from other sources, including the National Science Foundation, the United States Office of Education, the U.S. Steel Foundation, the Ford Foundation Fund for the Advancement of Education, and 338 individual institutions that paid membership dues to the organization.

Individual colleges and universities were also awarded grants to establish honors programs. For example, in 1958 the Carnegie Corporation gave $54,000 to the University of Michigan and $84,700 to Boston College for "the launching, development, and enhancement of honors programs" (The Superior Student, 1 [4], p. 10). In 1960 the Ford Foundation granted Brooklyn College $120,000 to plan and operate a special academic program for the carefully selected gifted student . . . the top two or three percent of the freshman class will be freed from all formal course requirements to pursue a program of studies tailored to their individual needs. (The Superior Student, 3 [2], p. 28)

The generous funding which the ICSS and individual programs received during the honors boom period from 1955 to 1965 was instrumental in establishing honors programs in American higher education.
In the summer of 1965 the ICSS disbanded: "It was felt that by this time the honors movement had reached the point where the colleges and universities could themselves carry forward its development" (Cohen, 1966, p. 28). However, the consensus of honors directors was that a national organization was still needed, and a new organization was established.

The ICSS had promoted the cause of honors in two principal ways. One was the extensive travel schedule of Cohen, who in his five years as Director of the ICSS spread the honors word by participating in more than 100 conferences and visiting more than 300 colleges. In addition, most other ICSS executive committee members also regularly visited college campuses to stir up interest in honors programs and to gather information on programs already in progress . . . . Through the visits the ICSS tried to interest everyone it could reach in honors . . . and learn everything that could be learned about existing programs. (Cohen, 1966, p. 31)

The second way that the ICSS promoted honors education was by publishing an honors newsletter, The Superior Student, whose 48 issues between 1958 and 1964 had a peak circulation of 12,000. The journal contained practical information about dozens of honors programs around the country. It also provided analysis and interpretation of theoretical issues, such as women in honors, honors and democracy, honors and the minority student, honors in the professions, and honors research and evaluation. The journal published articles by Margaret Mead, "Gender in the Honors Program," who was a member of the ICSS executive committee for four years, and by Marshall McLuhan, "A Fresh Perspective on Dialogue." Other articles were contributed by leading academicians connected either directly or indirectly
with the honors movement.

One of the clearest expressions of the ICSS conception of what an honors education should necessarily involve was a statement of specific honors objectives, "The Sixteen Major Features of a Full Honors Program." These guidelines were a definite departure from the conception of honors prevalent in the early 1900's, in which honors was synonymous with the training of future scholars, rigid admissions criteria, acceleration on an individual, upper-level, departmental basis, and a preoccupation with "the student's intellective, analytical, critical, and research prowess, not on his creative, intuitive or symbolic powers" (Cohen, 1966, p. 29). The ICSS statement, on the other hand, urged that programs admit students by other criteria than GPA, admit lower-level and entering freshmen students, develop general honors programs, appreciate the personal and social, as well as cognitive, needs and interests of students, and encourage honors learning as a group-based, as well as a solitary research, experience.

Authors of the "Sixteen Major Features" statement left no doubt that the honors movement was to be an exciting, innovative venture. Cohen realized that honors was not a completely new phenomenon, that the debt to the past included lessons from Plato's Dialogues, the Oxford Tutorials, and Dewey's emphasis on the importance of experimental and experiential education. These honors educators believed that a dynamic honors movement was, however, dependent on curricular and instructional innovation, as well as the best of tradition:

The Sixteen Major Features . . . called for some important innovations . . . . increasing the work load is not enough to qualify as real honors; talented students, the ICSS insisted, require a different curriculum and different teaching methods and materials. (Cohen, 1966, p. 30)
One illustration may be representative of the differences between Cohen's approach to honors and that of Aydelotte 20 years earlier. Discussing the Socratic teaching method in honors seminars, Aydelotte writes,

> It demands all the humanity and imagination and intellectual curiosity and ripeness of scholarship which the professor has at his command. It is preferably not a job for young instructors, but rather for the oldest and strongest members of the department. Young men of ability will learn to do it effectively if they are modest and alert. (1944, p. 111)

Of honors teaching and teachers Cohen, on the other hand, writes,

> the younger and midrank faculty members are likely to be the source of the best honors teaching . . . . the younger good faculty member is closer to the students . . . . teachers trained in more formal ways can suffer from timidity with newer methods that involve greater freedom on the part of both teacher and student. (1966, p. 37)

Clearly, the modern honors movement led by Cohen was an attempt to complement the best of tradition with promising new learning methodologies.

While the ICSS was a catalyst for the growth of honors education, two historical factors made the emergence of honors programs most propitious. The Soviet Union's success with Sputnik awakened America's Cold War-conscious public to the need for more rigorous standards and higher performance levels in all areas of education. C. Grey Austin (1975) acknowledged the significance of Sputnik to the honors movement: "Then in 1957 the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, which called attention to the need to foster talent, making that year pivotal for the development of honors programs" (p. 161). Indeed, the honors movement was influenced by this event: a 1959 honors journal article was entitled, "Finding and Launching the Superior Student."

The ICSS reflected America's particular concern with improving science education. In 1962 the National Science Foundation awarded the ICSS $89,100
for an extended study of the impact of honors programs on the improvement of teaching and research in the sciences (The Superior Student, 4 [9], pp. 1-2). For several years the ICSS executive board hired an Associate Director of Science to coordinate science-related programs and issues in honors.

The rise of college honors programs was one response to the call for excellence in American education following World War II. The President's Science Advisory Committee issued a report which was excerpted in The Superior Student as part of a general mandate for honors:

The committee accepts as a national goal the lifting of student performance to higher levels of excellence by greater motivation and by the provision of rewards for intellectual achievement and more adequate and extensive opportunities and challenges to the highly gifted student . . . . We are specifically concerned about providing adequate educational programs for those with talent for and interest in achieving professional careers in science, engineering, and technology. (2 [7], p. 8)

In an influential book published in 1960, The Process of Education, Jerome Bruner also asserted the need for excellence and honors: "It is clear that there is in American higher education today a new emphasis on the pursuit of excellence . . . . The quest is to devise materials that will challenge the superior student" (p. 70). Honors programs were at least suggested as one means to encouraging excellence in Nevit Sanford's (1962), The American College:

We lay our bets on efforts to create or encourage groups of special quality within the bosom of the conglomerate institutions . . . . a good beginning is made if by way of organizational experimentation we can learn how to create small groups within the college in which a vigorous exchange of intellectual stimuli is pursued. (p. 519)

Perhaps the leading spokesman at this time for a renewed commitment to educational excellence was John Gardner, author of Excellence: Can We
Be Equal and Excellent Too? He clarified the difficulty a democracy has in pursuing excellence by comparing three competing principles in our society -- hereditary privilege, equalitarianism, and competitive meritocracy -- and the resultant line of tension and ambivalence between the emphasis on and the restraint of individual performance. Gardner suggested that we resolve this tension in ways that allow us to "seek excellence in a context of concern for all" (1960, p. 77). He, too, recognized the new demand for talent:

The fact is that we are witnessing a revolution in society's attitude toward men and women of high ability and advanced training. For the first time in history such men and women are very much in demand on a very wide scale. (p. 33).

He argued that higher education should recognize the increasing diversity of its clientele by cultivating much greater diversity within the system, including special programs for the academically advanced students.

The development of honors programs were one immediate response to this call for diversity and excellence in American higher education. Table 2.1 indicates the increase in honors programs, particularly between 1957 and 1960.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Number of Honors Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1945</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1954</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**total = 174**

**Note.** From The Superior Student, 3 (9), p. 40.

Yet while the Cold War and Sputnik stimulated an increased concern for educational excellence, there were also warnings about a too-narrowly defined conception of excellence. Jerome Bruner (1960) cautioned that "The danger signs of meritocracy and a new form of competitiveness are already in evidence" (p. 7). David McClelland (1971) urged educators to consider other criteria for excellence than those measured by academic GPA and standardized tests:

Our national problem is that we have tended to focus increasingly on encouraging one type of excellence, and a practical, measurable action-oriented type at that. Other types of human excellence exist, particularly those involving character and the inner life, and the world of imagination and human sensitivity . . . . They can be measured, if necessary, to combat the stress on academic performance. They, too, need encouragement, and they can be encouraged by less stress on the purely academic side of life. (p. 723)
The noted social and educational critic and visionary, Paul Goodman, decried the bureaucratization and institutionalization of the modern university, in which students compete in "the stifling atmosphere of the race for position, which the college itself generates by anachronistic grading methods" (1962, p. 64). He also perceived the emerging honors program movement as having little lasting impact:

Another attempt to escape the impersonal mass has been the creation of Honors Programs in which small groups of teachers and students dispense with credits and grading, meet fairly informally, and sometimes manage to cut through departmental barriers. But aside from the fact that such reforms are not a major tendency, I am not convinced that merely administrative arrangements, like small colleges or honors, can profoundly change the spirit of the community of scholars. In a big state university I have seen Honors students form a pathetic and tiny college of incestuous intellectuals in a busy crowd of engineers, aggies, and practical nurses. (p. 67)

Notwithstanding the cautionary, skeptical voices of Goodman and others, the ICSS-led honors movement grew; the number of honors programs more than trebled between 1957 and 1965. A 1965 ICSS survey revealed that honors programs, in one form or another, "existed in 423 or 58% of the 732 responding four year colleges and universities" (Phillips, 1967, p. 13). That this survey identified 423 honors programs is misleading, however, since perhaps only half of these programs appear to have met the criteria of a comprehensive honors program earlier established by the ICSS executive committee. Nonetheless, the data indicates that honors programs were much in evidence by the early 1960's.

When the ICSS disbanded in 1965 a number of honors educators felt that another professional honors association was needed. In April, 1966 12 honors faculty and administrators, mostly honors directors at large Western and Midwestern universities, met for two days at the University
of Colorado "to debate the purpose, feasibility and nature of such a national organization . . . deciding very early in its deliberations that a national organization was needed" (Bhatia, 1975, p. 41). The name of the organization, the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC), was suggested by James Robertson of the University of Michigan, who became its first President. Colorado's Walter Weir, who had been a mainstay with the ICSS from the beginning, held the important leadership position of executive secretary-treasurer for the first five years.

Response to the NCHC was immediate: one year after being established it listed 194 institutional and 303 individual members. The purpose of the NCHC was and has been to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas about honors programs. It offers opportunities for honors directors, faculty, and students to discuss honors-related issues and ideas, with the goal of promoting and improving honors education. The NCHC provides five basic services directed toward this goal, which are discussed below.

Annual national conferences, held each Autumn, are professional association meetings, hosted by a particular institution or group of institutions. They give members the chance to communicate about subjects ranging from "nuts and bolts" issues, such as starting, financing, and maintaining a program, to philosophical concerns, such as the relevance of honors education in egalitarian times. In 1971 the meetings began using a workshop format, one of many contributions made by John Portz, former Director of Honors at the University of Maryland, former NCHC President, and a guiding light in honors until his recent retirement. Each year the conferences have a major theme, reflecting a timely issue: 1968, The Relevance of Higher Education; 1969, Honors Programs and the Student Revolt;

Forum for Honors, the honors newsletter, is published five times a year. It provides descriptions of individual honors courses and programs, analyses of promising learning methods, reports by regional associations, and articles and editorials about honors-related issues.

Regional associations, affiliated with the NCHC, coordinate and promote honors activities and information within given geographical areas of the country. They are active in the Northeast, South, Ohio area, Midwest, Great Plains, and Northwest. These groups generally meet twice each year, once at the national meeting and once at annual, individually arranged conferences.

Special Projects, which the NCHC develops as a service to its membership, have included consultant services by honors directors, an annual honors program budget survey, and a series of interinstitutional, interdisciplinary honors semesters that emphasize experiential learning. The first one took place in 1976 in Washington D.C. to coincide with the nation's bicentennial celebration. Sixty students from 40 institutions in 32 states earned one semester of credit by taking seminar classes and participating in internships. The second NCHC semester is the Grand Canyon Semester, based at Northern Arizona University and involving a series of courses and outdoor experiences about the geology, ecology, and culture of the American Southwest. A third semester is being planned, a United Nations
Semester in New York City. These programs have caught the interest of honors students; twice as many applied for the United Nations Semester as could be accepted.

An information clearinghouse is maintained by the NCHC, located presently at The Ohio State University, the home school of the NCHC executive secretary-treasurer. From this base the association coordinates "experts" to advice on new honors programs and evaluate existing ones, responds to inquiries about honors, and generally represents and promotes honors education.

It is somewhat difficult to assess the current status and vitality of the honors movement, although it does not seem to be matching the sheer activity and high profile of honors in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Perhaps this is so because the program is not being funded as generously as it was during that era. One indication that honors is not as "hot" an item in higher education as it once was is the fact that a recent NCHC request for funding to help defray costs for the United Nations Semester was turned down by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Yet while honors programs have not become a national force in higher education, many programs continue to serve thousands of able, motivated students. John Portz recently predicted, "For the very bright students I think honors programs are the wave of the future" (1977, p. 1).

**Significant Issues in Honors**

This researcher has identified five issues which have been important, recurrent areas of consideration in the honors movement. The first is the rationale for honors programs, which questions whether they are elitist
and undemocratic. A second area is curriculum, which asks what is to be taught in honors programs. A third area is instruction, which considers what are appropriate teaching and learning methods in honors education. A fourth area is evaluation, which concerns how the effectiveness of honors courses, faculty, and programs can be measured. A fifth area is experimentation and innovation in honors, particularly the attitudes of honors educators toward experimentation and change. A review of the significant honors literature which has addressed each of these areas follows.

Rationale for Honors

A clear rationale for honors programs is stated by C. Grey Austin, current NCHC executive secretary-treasurer:

In any institution in which the student body is intellectually heterogeneous, two groups of students are disadvantaged by the regular offerings . . . . those whose ability or preparation render them incapable of meeting the challenge of the full program, and at the other extreme are those of such ability and previous achievement that the regular program provides insufficient challenge. The premise governing programs for the disadvantaged is that all students should be encouraged and enabled to realize their talents. The same premise furnishes the rationale for honors education. (1975, p. 161)

The question of whether honors programs are elitist in a pejorative sense has been with the movement since the beginning. In a 1976 Forum for Honors article Reed Straus attempted to compare from an educational perspective the relative advantages of meritocracy and egalitarianism in honors education. He concluded that "this painful question cannot be easily settled . . . proffered rational solutions or answers must be inadequate from a purely educational perspective, especially those which come down clearly on one side of the issue or the other" (p. 36). Straus suggested that when
considering the critical factors influencing the balance between support for more egalitarian or meritocratic higher education, objective pedagogical variables will be less important than factors such as shifting social values, public pressure, and the job market.

One might, indeed, conclude that the origins of honors education were elitist, but that just as higher education has been increasingly democratized, so have honors programs. They began with the brightest students in the most prestigious institutions of an already selective system. Honors in the early 1900's was an instance of the rich getting richer. Aydelotte wrote, "It is good that weaker students should be helped to make the most of themselves, but what happens to the best makes much more difference to the welfare of the society than what happens to the poorest" (1944, p. 130). Understandably, educators have questioned the purposes of honors programs. David Hawkins (1959), then chairman of the Philosophy Department at the University of Colorado, asked,

Is the spreading honors system mainly a maneuver, a strategic part of a larger program to raise the general level of American education? Or is it a surrender of concern for the general level, a retreat to some system of high selectivity, in which the excellence of a few is thought to compensate for the doltishness of many? (p. 11)

Responses to these allegations of elitism were made forcefully by honors leaders who pointed out that true democracy was not identity of opportunity, but equality of opportunity. They agreed with Gardner (1960), who stated that

The traditional democratic invitation to each individual to achieve the best that is in him requires that we provide each person with the particular kind of education which will benefit him. That is the only sense in which equality of opportunity can mean anything. The good society is not one which ignores individual differences, but one that deals with them wisely and humanely. (p. 75)
Weir made a similar point in a paper presented at the 1974 conference of the American Association for Higher Education entitled "A Democratic Rationale for Honors Education":

What is required in a democracy is not equal treatment in any absolute sense, but the opportunity for every man to realize the promise in him. In the field of education this will mean the opportunity to participate in different programs designed to serve the interests, the talents, the preparations, the motivations for a vast variety of students. (from Austin, 1975, p. 161)

Yet, while the idea of honors is not necessarily elitist and undemocratic, individual programs can be so when they confine their objectives to providing special privileges to a few students who have been identified using too-limited criteria. Weir (1976) warns:

When honors programs are too narrow in their conceptions of the talented, or place too much stock in test scores or even grades, or fail to take into account motivation, or fail to provide opportunities to take honors work at different times and thus fail to recognize the phenomenon of "late blossoming," . . . or promote the view that intellectual achievement alone establishes human worth, then and only then are honors programs undemocratic. (p. 16)

Honors programs are not elitist when they perceive of their role in a broad social context, when they help their institutions to attract a diversity of excellent students and faculty, and when they are able to move some of the best features of honors education into a wider institutional context.

Honors Curriculum

The honors movement has been more an effort to provide good students with alternative or special learning methods than course content. Nonetheless, the subject matter of honors education has been an issue, particularly since honors has moved from being solely an upper-level, departmentally-based alternative to being a general education alternative as well.
Several curricular trends have been apparent. Honors programs generally have been strongest in the arts and sciences, particularly in the humanities. Cohen, himself a Philosophy professor, regarded the humanities-oriented general education at Columbia University as a model for the honors seminar. He writes, "The first specifically 'general honors' experiment, later called the Colloquium on Important Books, began in 1919 at Columbia" (1966, p. 17). Many honors directors were and still are humanities professors, and many programs emphasize early and modern Western civilization studies, often from an interdisciplinary humanities perspective. Cherry (1976) argued for the continuance of the humanities as a foundation for an honors education:

Such study programs, I believe, do not represent a superficial hodgepodge, but rather a basic commitment to the humanities . . . . These students are not blind to postgraduate realities, but neither have they opted for the tunnel vision of the restricted major . . . they provide models of a sensible, truly well rounded education, one in which the humanities are not ignored but are supported and reinforced. (p. 18)

Early honors journal articles and conference workshop titles suggest that honors educators have championed the humanities even before increasing vocationalism began to erode their popularity in higher education.

The national post-World War II push for improvement in science education was reflected in the curricula of honors programs too. The National Science Foundation awarded the ICSS a large grant to encourage and develop honors science courses. The Superior Student published numerous articles about honors science courses and programs: "A New Honors Approach in Science"; "A Program for Superior Students in Chemistry"; "Mathematics for the Gifted." One issue of the journal was devoted entirely to promising honors courses in the sciences.
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Honors also began to emphasize the need for courses not only in the arts and sciences, but in professional preparation areas as well, particularly engineering and medicine. In 1966 Dudly Wynn had lamented:

What single feature of their programs had honors directors found least successful? The most frequent reply was failure of professional colleges to develop programs . . . . This general lag in the development of honors work for professional college students is, with its implications, the most unpalatable aspect of the whole honors picture. (p. 118).

In an earlier honors journal article Harrington (1959) had said much the same thing: "Honors programs are least often found where they are most needed -- in the professional schools that train young people for specialized careers in such fields as Engineering, Business Administration, Education, Law and Medicine" (p. 1). The lack of honors programs in these areas has largely persisted, and was one of the concerns discussed at the most recent national NCHC conference.

On the other hand, in response to vocationalism in higher education, honors programs have also been among those forces reaffirming the value of liberal education in college. The 1974 and 1976 national conferences dealt squarely with the issue, as the 1976 program notes indicate: "We face a new emphasis on career-oriented education . . . which has altered our constituency and some think seriously threatened the liberal arts. We face, indeed, new challenges and new responsibilities" (1976 NCHC conference program notes, p. 1). Rosemary Park (1975) even suggested that "only in honors will one find true liberal education today, for only there does serious and committed learning lead to the full recognition of the ethical dimension of learning" (p. 6).

A trend in honors curriculum that coincided with a general trend in
the late 1960's and early 1970's was experimentation with nontraditional subject matter. Many conference workshops during this era explored non-traditional curricular matters, among them the following: New Directions in Honors Humanities Courses; Structuring Honors Courses in Problem Areas -- Drugs, Labor Relations, Population Crisis, Race Relations, Youth Alienation, and Poverty; New Courses on the Ecological Problem; Unusual Courses in the Social Sciences. Consideration is given to current honors involvement in innovative, nontraditional curricula later in this study.

Honors Instruction

The "honors method" of instruction has consisted primarily of independent study and discussion-oriented seminars. Honors in higher education began, for the most part, as individual, departmental honors arrangements in which independent study and research was the major feature. Honors independent study has permitted students some freedom from regular course or degree requirements, but has expected that it have a strength and coherence equal to or beyond traditional course work. Independent study has allowed students to study with greater intensity and depth than they might otherwise be able to do, and has let them work more closely with faculty.

While independent study is central to honors education, honors directors have cautioned about its possible abuse. Cohen (1960) refuted the idea that honors education was little more than independent study:

An undergraduate program of independent study is not an honors program. It is a single device. In itself, without the power of a continuous and varied honors program, it cannot provide the needed climate for motivation, the required range and flexibility . . . . it simply has not proved satisfactory or effective as the sole reliance in meeting the requirements of superior undergraduates . . . . good students will engage in it when they recognize its contribution to the larger honors objectives. (pp. 1-2)
Perhaps the chief limitation of independent study, as well as its main advantage, is that it is usually a private transaction between student and teacher, involving little dialogue with others. Occasionally a student's independent study has little faculty guidance, and is little more than a mechanical device for awarding credit for self-study. Cohen notes its limitations:

Being a solitary approach to the abler student, it denies the communal aspects of learning, teaching and scholarship. The students do not learn from each other, as they do in the mutuality and cooperation, the sustained challenge and stimulation of a joint group venture. (1960, p. 1)

Honors educators have increasingly perceived the seminar to be the mainstay of the honors method. Cohen believed that "the use of the colloquium -- or the seminar, theme group, conference, or symposium, as it is variously called -- is at the heart of the honors method" (1966, p. 40). Writing years earlier in a 1961 issue of The Superior Student devoted entirely to honors colloquia, he loftily appraises the colloquium:

For freshmen it is a training ground in the Honors outlook; for seniors it is often that outlook's full embodiment and realization -- a focus of the infighting and rapport of young minds in quest . . . . What is at the heart of the colloquium? The answer must be the generation of living dialogue, the confrontation of ideas and values with all the vigor, sincerity and aplomb of which superior students are, or can become, capable . . . . It is the good undergraduate's finest adventure of ideas, the professor's most stirring challenge. (pp. 1-2)

Not surprisingly, the colloquium method of instruction has not been easily or fully realized by many honors programs. Cohen noted that "no single feature of an honors program has elicited more demands from us for its clarification" (1960, p. 1). Weir admitted that "the difficulties in conducting a successful colloquium are notorious" (1966, p. 81), and
warns about highly verbal students who might antagonize one another, shy students who might be left out or intimidated, and faculty who might either dominate or provide insufficient leadership and control. Yet, Weir also appreciated the potential of the colloquium: "But at its best the colloquium approach to learning stimulates students to read critically, to appreciate the joy of intelligent conversation, and to develop disciplined habits of expression" (1966, p. 82).

Honors instruction includes other methods than independent study and the colloquium. Honors sections of regular, departmental courses are increasingly popular, primarily because they are more easily staffed and financed than seminars deriving entirely from an honors program. Some educators, however, have argued that such honors groupings rob other sections of classes of the best students, making teaching less interesting and learning less likely in those nonhonors sections. Honors programs also provide some nontraditional instructional methods, which are considered later in this study.

Honors Evaluation

Systematic evaluation of honors programs received very little attention until Cohen and the ICSS emphasized its importance. A chapter of Cohen's book, "Evaluating Honors Programs: History, Problems, and Prospects," written by Heist and Langland, chronicled some of the early efforts to assess the effectiveness of honors education at Swarthmore College and the Universities of Wisconsin and Colorado. Evaluation was the subject of the tenth point of the ICSS "Sixteen Major Features of a Full Honors Program": "Build in devices of evaluation to test both the means used and the ends sought by an honors program" (The Superior Student, 4[1], pp. 23-4).
The ICSS encouraged honors evaluation in several ways. They sought and received research and evaluation assistance from recognized authorities and national agencies, such as the National Merit Scholarship Corporation and The Center for the Study of Higher Education. They discussed evaluation procedures in national conference workshops and in honors journal articles. A 13-article issue of The Superior Student was devoted to evaluation in and of honors programs (6 [2]). Cohen stated a clear rationale for evaluation in honors:

> We believe that if honors programs are to achieve the objectives for which they are designed, and play their proper role in the development of higher education, honors faculties should avail themselves of the best social science research and use this research to develop suitable procedures for evaluation of their own programs. (1960, p. 2)

Cuzzort (1965) surveyed evaluation efforts by honors programs, finding that "less than half had conducted or even begun any evaluations that would result in a written report. Only 1/5 had written reports which were available" (p. 3). Studying the manner as well as the extent of honors evaluation, he found that most honors programs relied on subjective opinions of key persons for feedback, rather than the more methodologically sound instrumental approach to evaluation. Cuzzort urged more formal, objective evaluation methods.

Heist and Langland (1966) described comprehensive program evaluations at the Universities of Michigan, Oregon, and Illinois, in which evaluators were trying to answer the deceptively complex questions of whether and to what extent honors programs made a difference in student's careers. They state, "The key concern is whether the effects of the honors experiences are equivalent to or greater than what the accomplishments of regular course work would have been" (p. 227). They discuss two basic approaches
to honors evaluation: postexperience assessment, the most common method of evaluation; pre- and postexperience assessment, the more difficult method of evaluating students before and after their honors experience. They remark that "any evaluation program attempting to assess the effectiveness of honors experiences for particular students must, we feel, include the rudiments of the design shown in Figure 1" (p. 280). Figure 1 is shown below.

**Figure 1. Diagrammatic Presentation of the Elements of a Research Design for Longitudinal Evaluation of the Student's in Honors Programs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment and Selection</th>
<th>Pre-experience Testing</th>
<th>Postexperience Testing</th>
<th>Follow-up Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measures of aptitude, achievement, motivation, aspiration</td>
<td>background information, aptitude, present knowledge, motivation, attitudes</td>
<td>achievement, attitudes, ways of thinking, reactions to courses, etc.</td>
<td>thinking and behavior as future student, adult, citizen; achievement, attitudes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Heist and Langland conclude that the measurement of long-range performance is the only true way to evaluate the success of honors programs:

The best testimony for the real success -- or failure -- of any honors experience would undoubtedly be found in the thinking and behavior of the adult citizen. If it cannot be shown that education in general, or honors work, leads to more constructive, productive, or meaningful lives, then the systems and the programs need re-examination. (p. 281)

Despite the obvious need for formal honors evaluation and research, little has been reported in the literature. Portz recently concluded, "I have been struck by how little the honors movement has depended on basic statistical, psychological and generally scientific research in order to justify and validate its existence" (1977, p. 3). One of the few studies reported was completed by Jean Phillips in 1965, who conducted a survey assessing the nature and extent of honors programs. In the roughly 25% of all colleges and universities that had at least minimal honors arrangements, the following curricular practices were most prevalent (rank-ordered by frequency): independent study, advanced placement of entering freshmen, honors courses, honors upper-level seminars, honors lower-level seminars, honors sections of departmental general education courses, interdisciplinary colloquia (1973, pp. 13-14). However, perhaps as interesting as the findings is the fact that the survey was published in a 1973 edition of the Forum for Honors, suggesting the paucity of honors research conducted in the eight year interim. Of course, undoubtedly many individual programs conducted studies of their own operations which were not published on a wider scale.

Beginning in 1971-72 and continuing since then, the NCHC has sponsored an annual Honors Program Budget Survey, conducted by William Mech,
Honors Director at Boise State University. Mech's survey reports include data on honors budgets, director's salaries, staff salaries, and other budgetary information. Institutions are divided into five enrollment categories, with ranges, averages, and median figures reported by category for each of the data areas. For example, in 1976-77 the average gross honors budget for programs in large institutions was $57,690, with a range of from $300 to $160,000 (1976, pp. 28-31).

In 1977 Carol Jadhenke conducted a comparative survey of honors and nonhonors graduates at Iowa State University, using as variables advanced study, career achievements, and attitudes toward life. She concluded that "few statistical differences were found between the two groups" (pp. 28-9). An unpublished comparative study was conducted by this researcher in 1977. Based on questionnaire results from 132 honors and 93 randomly selected nonhonors freshmen at Western Michigan University, he compared possible differences in six areas: academic preparation for college, reasons for selecting WMU, probable field of study and career, ability to finance college, attitude toward significant social issues, and personal values and goals. He found that "Entering honors and nonhonors freshmen differed in degree of academic preparedness and past scholastic success, but not in kind of values, goals, personal characteristics, or social attitudes" (Rinehart, 1977, p. 12). The researcher plans to send the same sample of students another questionnaire in their senior year to evaluate the effectiveness of honors education in a pre-experience - postexperience evaluation.

Other research studies of honors programs are underway. John Portz, former NCHC President, spent much of the summer of 1977 traveling around...
the country, visiting honors directors, and collecting a wealth of information from them. The honors community anticipates his report.

Innovation in Honors Programs

Reviewing the honors history, one might conclude that the movement has been characterized by educational innovation from the beginning. Aydelotte urged honors educators to "break the academic lockstep" by allowing the brightest students the freedom to work out individual academic programs in which "the course and the credit system should cease to exist" (1944, p. 74). Cohen also considered honors to be essentially innovative:

The traditional specialties, the traditional approaches to knowledge and education cannot alone give adequate answers . . . honors programs as they are predominantly conceived in this book fall into the category of forces that make for change in an institution. (1966, p. 1X)

The Superior Student contained numerous articles describing innovative courses that were being tried out -- for example, "An Interdisciplinary Course in Science for Gifted Nonscience Students," which discussed a new team-taught course at the University of Michigan (Howard, 1960, pp. 3-8). The journal also included an article about plans for a radically innovative college in Amherst, Massachusetts, which later became Hampshire College, one of the most successful nontraditional colleges now operating.

When Philip Mitterling succeeded Cohen as ICSS Director he left little doubt that he, too, saw honors as a force for innovative reform:

The most important effect of the honors movement in past decades has been experimentation, and from this, innovation in undergraduate education (p. 2) . . . . We are not suggesting that validated honors methods and approaches be experimented away. Constructive changes in
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educational processes come only too slowly and too agonizingly. We are proposing that new departures to meet effectively the intellectual needs of a changing and growing body of students be tested through experimentation with the talented . . . . honors programs should be the experimental arm of the college. (1964, p. 4)

As the ICSS gave way to the NCHC Mitterling expressed the hope that what was to follow would be an association of persons "interested in educational experimentation and programs for the talented [and a] . . . . quarterly journal on educational experimentation and innovation" (1965, pp. 1-2). Dudly Wynn, an honors educator and leader from the inception of the ICSS through its transition to the NCHC reinforced this position:

An honors program should be carried on, if possible, in an aura of experimentation and excitement and new expectations . . . . A good honors program seeks to deprogrammize the student's education and to resist constantly its own tendency to formalize and blandly institutionalize itself. (1966, p. 97)

Honors educators have continued to urge experimentation in honors. Searching for new honors dimensions based on the premise that "excellence in the sense of doing more intensively and more competitively what had always been heretofore done was simply no longer a suitable aim," Wynn suggested honors experimentation with student-initiated courses, work-study, peer teaching, and interdisciplinary social problems and issues (1971, pp. 1-2). Samuel Clark, Director of The Honors College at Western Michigan University for 15 years, has conducted conference workshops on innovation and alternatives in honors and has initiated a variety of innovative ventures in his own program. In a 1971 Forum for Honors article urging independent, interinstitutional, and foreign study, Clark remarked that honors programs should be innovative because they can provide an opportunity for experimentation when injury to students is least likely and support from faculty is most likely . . . .
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no one should argue the classroom and traditional course ought to be displaced, but they can be supplemented and diminished as the total occasions for education. (p. 8)

Virgil Peterson, Director of Honors at West Virginia University, described his reformulated honors program as one with a unique emphasis on experiential learning, particularly service-oriented community internships, and on learning in the affective as well as cognitive domain (1973, pp. 21-22). Warner Chapman, Honors Director at Indiana University, believes that his and other honors programs have been "catalytic agents for academic innovation," in which an array of academic innovations pioneered by honors programs have been extended to the general undergraduate body (1977, p. 14).

A frequent rationale for honors innovation is that honors programs can and should serve as "advance scouts," experimenting with programs and ideas in the university. Weir hoped that they could "serve as testing grounds for new ideas and techniques and provide models for what might be done on a larger scale" (1966, p. 76). Portz concurs:

The future of honors I judge to be in the direction of experimentalism, though not in the sense of that experimental institution which has a way of becoming more elitist and snobbish . . . . they must serve as models of what is to come on their campuses. (1972, p. 6)

Conducting a survey on significant facets of the contemporary honors scene, Tom Maher (1973) found that almost every respondent agreed with the following statement: "The honors program ought to encourage experimentation which seeks to extend the honors idea to any and every group of students" (p. 28).

Some honors educators, however, have issued warnings about the honors tendency to serve as "stalking horses for general curricular change," using
honors students as "guinea pigs" (Hinkle, 1975, p. 26). Hinkle, who has learned that the transition from honors to entire student body of a promising innovation frequently involves problems, has listed safeguards which he believes programs should take to protect students from the risks of experimentation. These include providing clear, objective information to students beforehand, "transferring the burden and responsibility for model-induced failures from them to the model itself ... anticipating as many likely obstacles to sustained and satisfying high-level intellectual performances inherent in the experimental design as possible" (pp. 28-29). Otto Graf, long-time Director of Honors at the University of Michigan, has also expressed concern that honors program spin-offs into the general student body have not retained the vigor, supervision, and academic integrity of the original program: "I fear that many of the good things we have engendered for the select few have been substantially diluted and degraded in accommodating the average or even below average student" (1977, p. 22).

One way of minimizing the risk inherent in educational experimentation is through careful evaluation. Formal evaluation of nontraditional programs is too frequently neglected. Wright (1972) addressed this problem by describing what evaluation does, why it should be an integral part of honors programming, and what variables and criteria might be most appropriate for such evaluation (pp. 17-22).

While many honors educators have pointed out the appropriateness of innovation in honors, others have admitted that honors programs have not fulfilled their promise in this area. Robert Clark (1976) admits
our failure, save in isolated instances, to experiment with radical departures from traditional methods of instruction. The very flourishing presence of honors in public higher education . . . is a radical innovation, much to be praised. But it does not represent a new approach to instruction so much as a conservative retreat to the traditional ideas, means, and values made possible because budgets are proportionately larger and students brighter than the average. (pp. 8-9)

Myron Lunine (1974) expressed the fear that honors programs were getting trapped in the false dichotomies of stabilization versus innovation, legitimacy versus faddishness, and excellence versus relevance. He asserted that innovation was, in fact, an essential part of excellence:

We should be the mentality and instrumentality for viable excellence within our own institutions. By viable excellence I mean innovation -- of roles, relationships, and responsibilities -- and experimentation -- with new subjects, with new configurations of subjects, with new approaches and techniques, with new structures and processes. But innovation and experimentation not as fads, not as sops, not as public relations, but for the sake of individual and institutional excellence. (pp. 12-13)

Lunine suggested that honors programs set the direction and pace for three redefinitions -- of learning, of campus and of responsibility.

John Portz has recently written that the publication of Cohen's book in 1966 "marked the end of the period of experimentation as far as honors programs were concerned; from that point on, everybody knew what elements needed to be assembled and how those elements might very well proceed" (1977, p. 7). He added that honors programs are now viewed as inherently conservative, a characterization which, if accurate, would have infuriated Cohen.

Indeed, the honors movement has been characterized by ambivalence regarding experimentation and innovation. Aydelotte cautioned, "The first rule of educational wisdom in inaugurating a new plan of study is to begin slowly. The introduction of any new educational device on too large a
scale is a precarious enterprise" (1944, p. 125). Cohen, too, qualifies
his endorsement of innovation in honors:

In its experimentalism the ICSS conception of honors programs is
as pilot projects calculated to have their ultimate impact in each
college and university . . . . but the ICSS conception is primarily
one of an experiment within, not apart from, established curricula.
(1966, p. 20)

This more traditional approach to honors curriculum is summarized by an
honors committee writing in an early issue of The Superior Student. They
conclude that the honors liberal education ideal

... can be achieved only by a return to those essential values of the
old classical idea of a liberal curriculum, by a revival of what
may be called the Greek aim. We must bring to bear upon student's
minds the tempering effects of discipline and selection; we must
restore order and rigorousness. (1 [2], p. 7)

A few honors educators have even viewed educational innovation as
being mostly anti-intellectual, permissive, and erosive of academic
quality and standards. James VanPatten has written that one of the undesir­
able pressures being exerted upon honors programs is "the cult of value
clarification [which] stresses individualization of instruction based
on catering to student desires and wishes rather than the cognitive con­
cerns of education" (1975, p. 1). Carlyle Beyer (1972) has questioned
whether honors students are the appropriate ones to model educational
innovations and, if so, whether they then still deserve honors recogni­
tion: "Honors for him is therefore not really 'earned' in the experimen­
tal course itself according to the traditional connotation of the word
honors" (pp. 2-3). Otto Graf minces few words in his preference for tra­
ditional rather than innovative honors education:

... It is the consensus here that the strength of the Honors Program
lies in its structure, its rigor, its integrity, and its refusal
Honors housing has given rise to a variety of living and learning facilities, with radical innovations in curricula, degree requirements, and methods of evaluating student performance. They impress me as play schools and not as sound academic educational ventures. (1977, p. 22)

Most honors educators are not as opposed to educational innovation as Graf. They tend to agree with Austin, who believes that while innovation in honors is not essential, it may be helpful. Remarking that "change is not always progress," and that "innovation is always situational," he writes:

Innovation is instrumental rather than essential in the honors context. I hold it essential that the most capable students be presented with a high degree of intellectual challenge and that the learning experience be vital for both students and faculty. When innovation makes its contribution to these ends, and only then, it belongs in honors programs. (1974, p. 1)

Austin, who understandably favors innovation when it "works," may not fully appreciate that innovation necessitates experimentation, which always involves some risk of failure. Also, some innovation attempts not only to improve existing honors education, but also endeavors to introduce new or additional conceptions of what is excellent and challenging.

One may conclude from the literature on the history and development of honors programs that they have been both innovative and conservative forces. They have pioneered independent study and interdisciplinary seminars on many campuses, yet they have also tended to resist serious experimentation with many of the more recent curricular and instructional innovations. They have wrestled with the dilemma that confronts all institutions, that of adapting to changing circumstances while also preserving what is essential and of most value to their central purposes.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Introduction

There are two methodological parts to this study. The first is a systematic review of the literature on honors programs, with particular emphasis on the role of innovation in their development. The researcher has considered much of the published literature on honors programs and has attempted to construct a meaningful exposition which responds to the first research question, "What has been the history and development of the honors movement in American higher education?"

The second source of the research study is based on a questionnaire sent to honors directors around the country. Analysis of the data derived from the returned questionnaires, plus brochures, papers, and reports returned with the questionnaires, is the method used to respond to the second research question, "What is the current character of honors programs, particularly with regard to their involvement with curricular and instructional innovation?"

The literature review and data analysis are instrumental in responding to the third question, "What are some areas of programmatic, curricular and instructional innovation in which honors programs might become more involved in order to better serve their students?" These suggestions will be offered in the final chapter, along with suggestions for further research.

What follows in this chapter is a discussion of the research procedures
of the study, which involves the selection of a sample, the construction of the research instrument, and the collection and analysis of the data.

Population and Sample

Determining the population of honors programs is difficult, for there is no commonly agreed upon minimal definition of an honors program. One cannot identify with complete accuracy all honors programs currently operating. Nonetheless, nearly all established, functioning programs in higher education are members of the National Collegiate Honors Council, the national professional association of honors programs. Although not all NCHC members are, in fact, currently active with full-service programs, the NCHC membership list is the most accurate indicator of the population of honors programs.

The current NCHC mailing list was obtained from the NCHC executive secretary-treasurer, and an attempt was made to identify from that list of several hundred individual and institutional members all of the honors programs in four-year colleges and universities. While there were probably honors programs omitted from the sample (either because they were not current, dues-paying NCHC members or because the researcher overlooked their names on the mailing list), as many as possible active honors programs were identified. While the sample does not equal the population, it is representative regarding the basic characteristics of the programs and the institutions which house them.
Instrumentation

The questionnaire sent to honors program directors asked for much statistical and descriptive information about their programs. They were asked to respond about the following aspects of their programs: year founded, enrollment, general education and departmental programming, graduation requirements, director's academic background and honors position, governance, budget, orientation, counseling and advising, recruitment, evaluation, communications, honors housing, honors graduates, perception of program on campus, extracurricular programming, course methodology, and self-reported strengths and weaknesses of the program. This part of the questionnaire elicited information which would provide an understanding of the programs' structure, operations, and support services.

The second part of the questionnaire asked directors to provide information about and attitudes toward the relationship between their honors programs and innovative, nontraditional education. The instrument identified ten areas of curricular and instructional innovation and asked directors to report what experience, if any, their programs had had or were having in each of these areas, and to what extent each of these areas of innovation might facilitate reaching their program goals. These ten areas are the following:

1. Interdisciplinary and integrated courses
2. Independent and student-designed study
3. Vocational and career-oriented courses
4. Affective and personal growth-oriented courses
5. Off-campus study in the community
6. Foreign study  
7. Team-taught courses  
8. Courses taught by nontraditional instructors  
9. Media- and computer-assisted courses  
10. Courses in which nontraditional calendar or time boundaries are used

Directors were also asked to rank-order six resistance-to-change factors which inhibited their efforts and capacity to effect needed change in their programs. These factors are the following:

1. Inadequate honors budget  
2. Lack of faculty interest or participation  
3. Inadequate honors staffing  
4. Lack of student interest or participation  
5. Lack of top-level administrative support  
6. Conservative tradition in higher education

The ten-page questionnaire was constructed with guidance from previous honors questionnaires. Particularly helpful was an extensive questionnaire designed by John Portz. A first draft of the questionnaire was sent to six honors directors who are long-time honors educators and leaders; their critique of the instrument was very helpful, and a final version of the questionnaire reflected their considerable input.

Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaire, an explanatory letter, and a stamped return envelope were sent to the directors of the 140 identified honors programs in September, 1977. In October the researcher attended the national NCHC
conference, which afforded him an opportunity to urge honors directors he met to return the questionnaires. In November the questionnaire and a second cover letter were sent to nonrespondents. Completed questionnaires continued to come in until the end of the year.

Because the questionnaire was long, requested statistical information that necessitated digging into files and records, and included several open-ended questions not quickly or easily answered, the researcher did not anticipate a high response rate. Yet, the researcher believed that to shorten the instrument by asking for less data or fewer open-ended questions would compromise the study's main objective of understanding honors programs' structure and operations and their actual and desired relationship to curricular and instructional innovation. The researcher decided to trade less information about more programs for more information and understanding of a smaller, but representative, number of programs.

Of the 140 questionnaires sent to honors directors, 72 (51%) were returned. Of these 72 returns, 61 questionnaires were usable. Of the 11 not usable, two were returned after the data analysis was completed, three were insufficiently answered, and the remaining six were returned but not completed because these programs were either currently inactive or (in one case) "undergoing a period of serious reassessment." Probably several more of the questionnaires were not returned because the programs were relatively inactive. The returned questionnaires provided more than 600 pages of information from a representative sample of honors programs around the country.
The 61 usable questionnaires were geographically representative, as they included thirty states: seven Eastern, seven Southern, nine Midwestern, and seven Western states. The sample was also representative of institutional size, as Table 3.1 indicates.

Table 3.1
Number of Honors Programs in Study by Institutional Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-5000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10,000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total = 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixteen private and 45 public institutions were represented in the study. Of the 16 private schools, eight are affiliated with the Roman Catholic church, three with the Presbyterian church, and three have no denominational affiliation. Since the private schools also tended to be the small-enrollment schools, the sample include small, private as well as large, public, institutions.

Barron's Profile of American Colleges, Tenth Edition (1976), groups all colleges and universities into one of six "selectivity levels," according to their degree of admissions competitiveness. Criteria used include
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median high school GPA, ACT or SAT scores, and the percentage of accepted
students to those applying.

Table 3.2
Number of Honors Programs in Study by Institutional Selectivity Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity Level</th>
<th>Median ACT Score</th>
<th>Number of Programs in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Competitive</td>
<td>28+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Competitive</td>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Competitive</td>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Competitive</td>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompetitive</td>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**total = 61**

Table 3.2 indicates that honors programs are rarely found in the
most selective institutional groupings. Schools in these categories tend
to consider their entire undergraduate program as being an honors arrange­
ment. This data confirms the notion that whereas honors programs had their
origins in the exclusive Eastern private schools, they now function pre­dominantly in institutions with academically diverse student populations.
Perhaps this diversity more fully justifies meritocratic groupings to
assist the brightest, most motivated students to fully realize their aca­demic potential.

Information from the questionnaires was analyzed, using program
brochures and papers for additional information and clarification. Analysis of the data provided from the closed-response questions made much use of descriptive statistics, particularly percentages, frequency distributions, and measures of central tendency and dispersion. Analysis of the open-ended questions involved a thorough content analysis.
CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS: HONORS IN 1978

Introduction

The presentation of data gathered from the questionnaire is divided into three areas. First, the data that describes the general organization, the structural characteristics, of honors programs is presented. Second, the data which indicates what experience honors directors and their programs have had with selected curricular and instructional innovations is presented. Third, data is presented that indicates directors' attitudes toward the appropriateness and desirability of these selected areas of innovation and of experimentation and innovation in general.

Organizational Characteristics of Honors Programs

Year Founded

As the literature review indicated, most honors programs were established in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Table 4.1 shows that 44 of 61 (72%) programs were "launched" during the 15 year period from 1956 to 1970.
Table 4.1
Year Honors Programs Established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1950</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 1955</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 - 1960</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 - 1965</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966 - 1970</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 - 1977</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total = 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment

Honors program enrollments vary greatly from program to program, with a range in this sample of from 4 to more than 2500 students. The size of a program relates to the nature of its programming and its likely strengths and weaknesses. Honors conferences occasionally run workshops that are divided by program size, so that educators from small and large programs may discuss concerns more closely related to the prospects and problems associated with their program size. For example, directors of large programs may discuss ways to facilitate community among honors students, perhaps not a significant concern for small-program directors.

Arbitrarily considering programs of less than 100 students to be small, and those of more than 500 students to be large, Table 4.2 indicates that roughly 25% of the programs are small, about the same percentage are...
large, and half of them are in a middle enrollment range.

Table 4.2
Honors Program Undergraduate Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honors Program Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 199</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 299</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 - 499</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honors program enrollment also can be characterized by the percentages of male and female students. Honors programs tend to have a slightly higher percentage of female than male students. According to Table 4.3, 26 programs have fewer male than female students, while 15 programs have fewer female than male students. For the 51 programs reporting data, the mean percentage of male members is 46.7%, the mean percentage of female members is 53.3%. Some programs reported that they experienced more difficulty in recruiting male students, particularly at the entering freshman level.
Table 4.3
Percentage of Males Enrolled in Honors Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Male Students</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response (includes non-co-ed schools)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{total} = 61 \]

The percentage of minority students enrolled in most honors programs is low. The mean percentage for 43 programs reporting data is only 3.2%. As Table 4.4 indicates, 19 of 43 (44%) programs enroll no more than 1% minority students. It is not apparent from the data or information volunteered from directors whether honors programs are "bright and white" because few minority students are eligible and interested or because programs are making insufficient efforts to attract qualified minority students.
Table 4.4
Percentage of Minority Students in Honors Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Minority Students</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another characteristic of honors enrollments is that they derive largely from arts and sciences departments. The average percentage of students in some area of the arts and sciences is 63%. Table 4.5 indicates that nearly a third (20 of 61) of the programs reported that 80% or more of their students were majoring in the arts and sciences, although the data may actually overestimate the actual number of honors arts and sciences students. First, a number of the smaller colleges in the sample are predominantly or entirely liberal arts colleges; they may have a high percentage but a small actual number of students enrolled in the arts and sciences. Second, many programs have a high percentage of freshmen and sophomores, who may initially be enrolled in an arts and sciences curriculum, but who may subsequently move into an applied sciences, business, or other more vocationally-oriented curriculum.
Table 4.5
Percentage of Honors Students in Arts and Science Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 79</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total = 61</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honors directors were asked whether they perceived that their students "are increasingly oriented toward vocational and career-oriented education at the expense of general and liberal education." Table 4.6 reports their responses.

Table 4.6
Directors' Opinion of Students' Increasing Vocationalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much/Not at all</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total = 61</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While more than a third of the directors (37%) perceived this trend toward increasing vocationalism in their students to be significant, only about 10% do not express much concern about it.

Leadership and Governance

In this sample the administrative heads of honors programs are faculty members holding faculty status in a department as well as an honors administrative position. Of the 61 directors reporting, 49 (80%) have continuing honors positions, while 12 (20%) hold regularly rotating positions. More than half of them have held their positions for four years or less, as Table 4.7 shows. The mean period of service for current directors is 5.6 years.

Table 4.7
Honors Directors' Years in Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Position</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps one reason for the fairly frequent turnover of honors directors is that they usually hold other teaching and administrative duties. Table 4.8 indicates that only 9 of 61 directors hold full-time honors appointments; they most frequently hold half-time positions. As one might
expect, the frequency of full-time directors is greater in the larger institutions. In smaller programs the director often assumes program responsibilities as a part-time duty or even as an overload.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Appointment</th>
<th>Number of Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All (Full-time)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Overload)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**total = 61**

The most frequent nonhonors responsibility of directors is teaching. Of the 45 teaching directors, eight teach full loads, nine teach 3/4 or 2/3 loads, 18 teach half loads, and 10 teach 1/3 or 1/4 loads. In addition at least 25% of the directors have other nonhonors administrative duties in areas such as orientation, academic advising, special programs, general education, international study programs, and financial aids.

All of the directors represented in this study hold the Ph.D., usually in the humanities. In fact, 40 of 59 reporting directors have humanities
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related doctorates, with 16 English/Literature and 12 History doctorates comprising most of them. Ten directors have a doctorate in one of the social sciences and nine have one in the physical sciences. Early leaders of the honors movement were predominantly humanists, and it is interesting to note that they still are the principal source of honors directors.

The honors director usually reports to either the Academic Vice-President or the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the former usually in the larger, public universities, the latter in smaller, private colleges. Thirty-three of 61 (54%) directors reported to the Academic Vice-President, while 25 of 61 (41%) reported to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Nearly all of the programs (95%) have advisory committees comprised of faculty or faculty and students. These bodies assist the honors administrative staff in an evaluative or "watchdog" capacity, and also advise the staff in areas of program policy and procedure. Students sit on these bodies in more than half of the reported cases. All-student committees are also a feature of 22 of 61 (36%) honors programs. These committees perform a variety of functions related to the organization of extracurricular activities, recruitment and selection of students, course and instructor evaluations, and other areas. One of the most successful programs in generating student involvement is the University of Maryland's program. Former Director, John Portz, revealed that one of the reasons for their relative success was their program's insistence on such involvement from its inception. The University of Arizona has tried to promote student input by offering a course, "Student Planning Board," to students interested in honors program organization and administration.
Budget

Honors budgets vary greatly. While the annual budget of honors programs in this study is $48,284, the range extends from a low of $300 for a program of 48 students and no paid staff to a high of more than $300,000 for one of the largest programs. The former budget includes no funding for a director or faculty, which is typical of many programs. The latter budget includes the salaries of 13 full-time equated faculty members, including two who serve as administrators for the program. Of course, the size of program budget relates to enrollment and structure of the program.

Table 4.9
Honors Program Operating Budgets (1976-77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Operating Budget</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1000 - $9999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No separate budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

total = 61
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The tremendous range in budgets suggests not only that programs vary greatly in size, but also that institutions have different methods of funding them, both by direct allocation of resources and by indirect means not separately budgeted to the programs. William Mech, who annually conducts an honors program budget survey, has noted that programs' budgets, including directors' salaries, directors' released time for honors administration, and incidence of full-time honors administrative appointments have increased steadily, if modestly, in the last five years (1976, p. 29).

The main resource of honors programs is teaching faculty. Most programs beg or borrow, rather than buy or have budgeted to them, teaching faculty.

Table 4.10
Source of Honors Programs' Teaching Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Source of Honors Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donated from, compensated by department</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased from departments by program</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty volunteer to teach overload</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salaries budgeted to program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10 indicates that most programs depend on the generosity of individual departments for their teaching faculty. Of course, the interests of honors programs and departments may combine. Some faculty may find that teaching honors students is satisfying and challenging. Also, departments may realize that some of these bright students may decide to take further course work or even major in that department, based on an interest stimulated in an introductory honors course. From a more self-serving perspective, as departments, particularly those in the arts and sciences, become increasingly concerned to maintain satisfactory course enrollments, they may welcome honors sections which attract additional student credit hours.

Few honors programs apply for funding from foundations or other sources outside the university. Seven of the 61 programs did report receiving some outside money, though most of these grants were either from private, unsolicited sources or were received to start new programs. Three programs have received private, family grants for discretionary use. Western Michigan University's Honors College has won grants for foreign study seminars and for educational innovation, the latter a modest Danforth Foundation grant. Members of the NCHC executive committee are currently exploring possibilities for securing foundation grants and for encouraging individual honors programs to make applications.

Not unlike other educators and administrators in higher education, honors directors perceive inadequate budgeting to be one of their primary problems. They identified inadequate budget as their most pressing problem, ranking it as most problematic with twice the frequency with which they identified four other problem areas (see Table 4.18).
Curriculum

Nearly all honors programs have the twin objectives of assisting students to achieve both breadth and depth in their studies. To facilitate a breadth of knowledge most programs offer a lower-level general education component. To achieve depth and intensity of study programs commonly include an upper-class, individualized study and research component. Some programs combine these two objectives into one continuous program, while others separate the two complementary aims or provide one or the other. Some honors programs provide only the former, but rely on individual departments to offer in-depth, upper-level honors study.

Breadth of Study: General Education Honors Programming. In response to the question, "Do you have a general education honors program?", 50 of the 61 (82%) programs answered affirmatively. While the mean number of students enrolled in these programs was 289, the range was from 23 to 1228 students. It is difficult to generalize about honors general education programs, because there is such diversity in program sizes and characteristics. As Table 4.11 indicates, nearly a third of the programs enroll no more than 100 students, while 16% (8 of 50) enroll more than 500 students.
Table 4.11
Enrollment in Honors General Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 300</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total = 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on responses from 31 of the 50 directors whose programs include a general education component and who provided information about their attrition rates, the mean percentage of students completing program requirements was 47%. The range of from 6% to 95% again suggests the diversity of program methods and objectives.

Despite considerable program diversity it is possible to describe the major features of most general honors programs, based on information provided by the directors. General honors programs are almost always modifications of the university's regular general education or distribution requirements. General honors programs usually provide more rigor and challenge than the regular requirements, though if an honors program is much more demanding than the regular curriculum it may have difficulty...
enrolling or retaining students. All of the programs require completion of a certain number of honors courses or credits, ranging from as few as two courses to as many as 42 credit hours. Honors students must complete an average of six to eight courses (20 to 30 credit hours) and maintain a minimum grade point average, usually a B or higher. While a few programs offer separate courses for each class level, others differentiate only between lower- and upper-level classes. Frequently programs offer a beginning honors colloquium or seminar for entering freshmen.

In addition to a minimum number of credits, there is typically a distribution requirement, often following the traditional tripartite division of knowledge into humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. One program requires 42 credit hours in seven areas: philosophy, theology, the arts, literature, history, social science, and natural science. This program typifies many honors programs by emphasizing the humanities. A few programs offer most of their courses in the humanities, leaving honors study in the social and physical sciences to individual departments. Few programs require courses in the languages, mathematics, or writing, though most encourage them.

Honors seminars and colloquia are at the core of these programs. These seminars are usually small (10-20 students), discussion-oriented, and led by a faculty member adept at encouraging student participation. Table 4.12 indicates how frequently honors courses make use of discussion courses. Less than 10% of the honors courses are primarily lecture courses.
Table 4.12
Percentage of Honors Courses By Instructional Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Instruction</th>
<th>Percentage of Courses Using It</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture - Discussion</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total = 100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honors general education courses are sometimes interdisciplinary in course content, and are occasionally team-taught by faculty from different disciplines. The most common interdisciplinary courses are those which examine early and modern Western civilization. Examples reported by directors include: "Modern Man: The Cultural Tradition"; "Ideas and Modern Man"; "The Ascent of Western Man"; "The History of Western Ideas"; "Civilization of the West." Another common subject area might best be described as "Ways of Knowing," which attempt to help students "learn how to learn." Reported courses in this area include "Unity and Diversity of Knowledge," "Conceptual Development and Analysis," "Methods of Inquiry," and "Symbols and Structures." A third common emphasis in these interdisciplinary courses is in contemporary social issues, including courses such as "Issues in Social Biology," "Equality and Its Dilemmas," and "Africa and the Modern World."

Honors courses are either designed and administered entirely within the program or they are offered as honors sections of departmental courses.
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Honors directors reported the source of their honors classes. An average of 54% of the honors courses derive from their own administration, while the remaining 46% are honors sections of regular departmental courses. Table 4.13 further clarifies the administrative source of honors courses.

**Table 4.13**

Percentage of Honors Courses Administered Within the Honors Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Courses</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (all departmental)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (all honors program)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total = 61</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another source of honors courses used by a few programs is the "honors expanded" course arrangement, in which one or several students enroll in a nonhonors class and contract with the faculty member to do more and presumably better course work than the other students are required to do. This extra component is often a term paper or book reports. While the "honors expanded" course has administrative advantages, it may not be as academically enriching or challenging as honors study which concentrates groups of able, motivated students in small discussion classes.
Depth of Study: Upper-level Individualized Programs. Nearly 75% of the reporting programs assist honors students to pursue in-depth study in their major academic interest area. In most of the programs a student can follow a continuous path through general honors into upper-level honors, culminating in a senior honors project required for honors graduation. The senior year honors study is often done in close conjunction with departmental faculty in the student's major. An individualized senior honors project is generally considered to be the student's most ambitious and fully-realized academic work. The topic for this senior project usually relates to the student's particular interest within his major field and may derive from several sources: a research problem in the field, perhaps suggested by an interested faculty member; a topic raised in a class on which the student wants to do further research; a clinical or field experience in which a student is able to relate classroom concepts to actual experience; an offshoot of research that a faculty member is working on and in which a student becomes interested and assists with.

In some programs the senior project is followed by an oral examination by faculty and honors staff, the purpose of which is to evaluate the student's ability to explain and discuss the work, and to provide the student with the experience of relating collegially with faculty. Most honors directors believe that students who have had the experience of individualized, faculty-advised research and writing, culminating in a major paper or project that is critiqued by knowledgeable faculty and defended orally, have prepared themselves well for the subsequent challenges of graduate or professional study.
Student Recruitment and Selection

Most honors programs recruit and select for admission both entering freshmen and on-campus students. Only one program indicated that it used an open enrollment policy, with no required minimum grade point average. Table 4.14 indicates that most honors programs rely primarily on high school grades and American College Test or Scholastic Aptitude Test scores to select entering freshmen.

Table 4.14
Criteria Used to Admit Entering Honors Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Percentage of Programs Using It</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school GPA</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT or SAT scores</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written application</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rank</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations from high school</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean minimum high school GPA considered was 3.33, with a range of from 2.75 to 3.75. The modal GPA used was 3.50. Most programs reported that they had flexible, rather than rigid, GPA standards that would allow them to consider and weigh other factors when special cases seemed to warrant such consideration. They almost always use GPA in conjunction with other criteria, usually standardized test scores.
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Of the 16 directors who specified a minimum test score required for admission, the mean minimum ACT score used was 26.7, with a range of from 24 to 30. The mean minimum SAT score used was 1156, with a range of from 1050 to 1300. Three programs reported using a formula to identify honors students from high school, using test scores, GPA, and class rank. Of course, the standards that an honors program requires depends on the standards of their institution; programs in more selective institutions may employ higher standards than those in less selective schools.

About half of the programs in this study require entering freshmen to complete a written application, often with a statement of goals and personal background. One program asks for a 30 minute extemporaneous essay at an initial information meeting. Nearly a third of the programs conduct personal interviews with prospective freshmen honors students. About the same number say that they consider class rank, with the usual cut-off point being the upper 10%.

The criteria used depends in part on the size of the program. Most large programs, which may contact and recruit hundreds of high school students each year, are not able to use the more personal recruitment and admissions criteria employed by smaller programs. Larger programs tend to rely more on quantitative data and mass mailings, while smaller programs take more advantage of personal interviews, written statements, and recommendations from high school teachers and counselors.

Recruiting and admitting students who have already had at least one year of college requires honors programs to use other criteria and methods. Table 4.15 indicates the percentages of programs using the four main selection criteria for on-campus college students.
Table 4.15
Admissions Criteria for On-campus Honors Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Percentage of Programs Using Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College GPA</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recommendations</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written application</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly all of the directors reported that they considered college GPA, although several said that their GPA standards were flexible, particularly when students showed motivation for honors work by making self-initiated inquiries about the program. The mean minimum GPA standard is 3.22, with a range of from 2.0 to 3.75.

Table 4.16
Minimum GPA Considered for Admission to Honors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Percentage of Programs Using GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 3.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 - 3.25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.26 - 3.49</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

total = 100%
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Table 4.16 shows that roughly two-thirds of the programs set their minimum GPA levels at either 3.00 or 3.50. Several directors indicated that they had recently raised their grade point level expectations to correspond with the trend toward grade inflation which much of higher education has experienced in recent years.

**Student Orientation and Advising**

Nearly half (27 of 57) of the directors responding to questions in this area indicated that their programs conducted an orientation for beginning honors students. Some programs have orientations for entering on-campus students, though most frequently the orientation periods are directed toward entering honors freshmen. These sessions range from one or two hour meetings to two or three-day gatherings. An academic purpose of these orientations is to acquaint students with the academic requirements, expectations, and opportunities of the honors program and the university, to assist them in registering for their first semester classes, and to provide general academic advising. Another purpose for the sessions, according to some directors, is to provide an occasion for students, faculty, and staff to become acquainted personally and socially.

Most honors programs, particularly the larger ones, provide advising services for students in addition to the counseling and advising honors students get from regular college and departmental advisors. Sixty-three percent (36 of 57) of the directors reported that they and their staff regularly advised honors students. Their assessment of their advising ranged from "Advising is our biggest and best service," to "It is the
disaster area at our university and we need to do more to address it."
In most programs advising is done by the director and his staff assistants, although a few directors reported that advising was also done by graduate student assistants, administrative secretaries, and undergraduate students.

Most honors advising is done with lower-level students, since upper-classmen decide on majors and curricula and receive much of their counseling from specific departments. In fact, nine of the directors reported that even their freshmen counseling is mostly departmentally based. Four directors reported that a major feature of their program was the establishment of regular faculty honors advisors in most departments, so that honors students are able to identify exactly whom they can get advice from in any particular department.

Most honors directors reported that their advising dealt more with academic than personal concerns. Honors programs frequently serve as a convenient and relatively nonbureaucratic office where students can come for advice and assistance. Many programs also serve as an unofficial referral service for students whose questions are best answered by other agencies of the university. One valuable role that honors programs apparently can and do play, particularly on large, impersonal campuses, is that of informal information center for honors students.

Communications in Honors Programs

Honors programs communicate internally with honors students and faculty and externally with the rest of the university and with high school students and their parents, honors alumni, other honors programs,
and the local community. Nearly all programs use brochures as recruitment tools, to publicize their programs, and to exchange information with other honors programs.

Fifty-nine of the 61 programs reported that they regularly publish an honors newsletter or bulletin, sent to program students and faculty, and often to administrators, department heads, the entire faculty, and honors alumni. Some programs also send their newsletters to other honors programs and local high schools. About half of the programs rely on students to write the newsletters. They are commonly sent monthly, but may be written as often as twice a month or as seldom as once each semester. The newsletters generally provide information about honors and campus-wide curricular and extracurricular activities, financial aid, foreign study, graduate school examinations, fellowships, and programs, and personal notes about honors students’ achievements and plans.

Five programs publish journals of honors student writing each year. Three programs publish an Alumni Newsletter every year or so. Most programs also communicate through articles in the campus and local newspapers, announcements on the local radio stations, fliers posted around campus, and class announcements. The honors program at one institution, a perennial national football power, publicizes itself in the football programs, a strategy promising a wide and enthusiastic, if not particularly scholarly, audience.

In addition to formal communication methods most honors programs also have informal channels of communication and interaction between students and faculty. They often have an honors center where students
can gather informally to talk, study, or just "hang out." The extent to which honors programs are able to establish such a center depends, in part, on whether they can generate a sense of identity and community among honors students. Some programs are relatively successful in this regard, while other programs have had a long history of frustration in trying to generate student camaraderie and involvement based on honors membership.

Special housing arrangements for honors students is one way by which this sense of identity and informal interaction is encouraged. Only 20% of the directors in this study reported that their programs include an honors housing option. In only two of these programs are more than 25% of the honors students living in the special housing. It seems that honors students, and some honors faculty and staff, are wary of the honors housing concept, perhaps because they suspect it may encourage an unhealthy cloistering of honors students.

**Extracurricular Programming**

The extent of honors extracurricular activities varies widely from program to program. While some programs organize extensive extras to complement curricular offerings, others perceive their purpose to be solely academic, and try to serve as an alternative to the social and other non-academic forces at the university. Table 4.17 indicates the level of extracurricular involvement in which directors report their programs are engaged. Three areas are specified: academic lectures, discussions, readings, workshops, conferences; outdoor activities such as camping, hiking, skiing, canoeing, bicycling, and other sports; social gatherings such as parties, picnics, dinners, and field trips. Of course, the three
areas are not mutually exclusive. An extracurricular event may have an academic focus, take place in a natural setting, and also have social objectives.

Table 4.17
Honors Programs' Involvement in Extracurricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Activity</th>
<th>Level of Honors Program Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 suggests that based on the responses from the 58 directors who answered this question, honors programs frequently engage in academically related extras, rarely organize and conduct outdoor ventures, and sponsor a moderate number of social events.

Nearly 80% (46 of 58) of the directors reported that their programs offered at least some academically related extracurricular activities. Nearly a quarter of these programs sponsored lectures, often by visiting academicians and open to the entire campus. Ten programs sponsored faculty- and/or student-led discussions or symposia as either regular, on-going series (Friday Afternoon Discussion Series, Wit and Wisdom Fireside Chats, Sunday Evening Potluck Discussions) or events scheduled periodically during the school year. Five programs have conducted semester-long, noncredit...
seminars related to a particular theme, such as "Varieties of Religious Expression" or "The Challenges of Marxism." Six programs have sponsored a film series, one bringing the 13-show, American Film Theatre series to campus. Other programs sponsor poetry readings and even modest theatre and dance productions. One program has conducted a Renaissance Festival, which for at least one year attracted several thousand people. Honors programs occasionally co-sponsor programs with academic departments. A few programs have conducted day-long and weekend workshops for honors students which focus on a central theme and may employ affective as well as cognitive learning methods and goals. Several programs run field trips to major urban centers, often attending cultural events not available around their campuses.

Honors programs also sponsor activities that have a more obviously social purpose, although as Table 4.17 clarifies, nearly half of them (25 of 58) do little or no programming in this area. Indeed, one director responded, "Ours is an academic program!". Nevertheless, 57% of the directors (33 of 58) reported that social activities were at least some part of their programming. Honors programs have parties, picnics, dinners, teas, and other social events to celebrate back-to-school, end-of-school, seasons, graduations, and for no other reason than to have a good time and encourage informal community and interaction among students and faculty. In about half of the programs these activities appear to be organized by honors students, while in the other programs honors staff do most of the organizational work.

Only a few programs (13 of 58) report that they organize at least
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some outdoor, nature-oriented activities. One program conducts an annual week of backpacking in the Smokey Mountains, while other programs plan shorter hiking and canoeing ventures. Outdoor activities are sometimes combined with academic programs, such as "Plato in the Wilderness" and "Getting in Touch with Nature," courses offered by two programs. In general, however, honors programs have not much "returned to nature"; no programs report doing "much" in this area, while 64% of the programs report that they have offered no outdoor activities.

Evaluation of Honors Programs, Courses, and Faculty

More than 25% of the programs reported that they have no formal evaluation procedure for judging the effectiveness of their instructors, courses, or overall programs. Most, however, do get informal feedback from students and faculty, often in regularly scheduled meetings and conferences. Forty percent of the programs (23 of 58) conduct formal, written course and instructor evaluations, which are usually read by the honors staff and are often used as a criterion for making decisions about which courses to offer again and which faculty to teach them. In six honors programs the faculty evaluate in writing each of the honors courses they teach.

Monitoring and reviewing the honors program is frequently the responsibility of an honors committee or council, usually comprised of faculty and students. Only about 20% of the programs, however, indicate that they undergo a formal evaluation as often as every two to five years, in which outside evaluators assess the programs and make recommendations. Occasionally programs ask an honors director to observe, evaluate, and suggest improvements,
although this is also an infrequent practice. The NCHC encourages such evaluation by making available lists of qualified, willing honors directors.

Certainly one means of evaluating the effectiveness of honors programs is to follow the postgraduate careers of honors graduates. Nearly half of the reporting programs (26 of 56), however, indicated that they had no regular communication with their alumni. Seven of the programs regularly send graduates an alumni questionnaire, asking them to evaluate their honors program education. Twenty-five percent of the programs (14 of 56) send honors newsletters to their alumni, and about the same percentage report that they keep in touch with many of their graduates informally through personal correspondence and return visits. A few programs invite local graduates to honors functions and attempt to keep them actively involved in honors operations.

Another possible indication of honors program effectiveness is the percentage of honors graduates who continue their schooling with graduate and professional study. While only 15 directors provided information in this area, the data is interesting nonetheless. The mean percentage of honors graduates who attend graduate or professional school is 69%. Twelve of the 15 directors wrote that at least 50% of their graduates continue their schooling. Not surprisingly, several directors noted that more of their graduates were applying to professional schools, primarily law and medical schools, than were applying to graduate schools in academic disciplines.
Directors' Perceptions of Honors Program Strengths

Directors were asked what they considered the most successful aspects of their programs, a question which honors educators sometimes answer by discussing theoretically the strength and value of an honors education. In this instance the responses generally were directed to the real benefits and advantages of particular honors programs.

Directors most frequently cited the honors class, particularly the interdisciplinary seminar, as the most successful part of their programs. Almost 50% of the directors (27 of 56) so identified superior honors courses. Among their responses were the following:

- classes in which good students and good faculty interrelate to gain a sense of discipline and accomplishment
- the interdisciplinary colloquia that discuss important questions of and with a breadth that does not sacrifice depth

Other directors specified their Junior-Senior colloquia, honors sections of regular courses, and other course arrangements that exposed good students to challenging material.

The strength of honors programs mentioned next most frequently (by 15 of 56 directors) was independent study and the honors thesis. Representative comments included the following:

- excellent honors theses, as the result of close and continuing faculty-student tutorials
- the self-designed undergraduate degree plan and attendant project
- the independent research project with a faculty mentor . . . requiring the self-motivation necessary to realize a successful academic project

More than 20% of the directors (12 of 56) referred to the interpersonal interaction between students and faculty and a sense of community among
students as the most successful aspect of their programs. Two directors singled out their programs' ability to involve students in program planning and administration and the attendant commitment of students to these programs.

Personalized counseling and advising, in which "students don't get lost in the mill," was mentioned by several directors as being the most successful part of their programs. One director described his "Academic Progress Plan," wherein each student yearly submits a plan of academic progress and honors involvement to the honors staff, who then appraise and confirm it or suggest changes. One director praised his honors faculty, writing, "The strength of our program lies in the dedication of the faculty to our goals and ideals." Three directors characterized their programs' strength as the ability to foster in able though not brilliant or intellectual students the interest, enthusiasm, and capacity for becoming lifelong learners, whose educations are increasingly marked by self-direction and self-motivation.

Directors' Perceptions of Honors Program Problems and Weaknesses

Honors directors were asked to rank order five problem areas according to which posed the most difficulty for them in maintaining their programs. Of the 19 directors who did not rank order the problems, eight indicated that they had no problems of that magnitude; two saw the problems as inextricably interrelated; three indicated that their only real problem was adequate student interest; three added inadequate budget to inadequate student interest as their only problems; two identified only
inadequate staffing and budget as their problems; one director made no response. Data from the 42 directors who did rank order the problem areas is presented in Table 4.18.

Table 4.18
Directors' Rank Orderings of Five Problem Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>( \bar{X} ) Rank Order</th>
<th>Frequency Ranked First</th>
<th>Frequency Ranked Last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate budget</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate faculty interest/support</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate staffing</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate student interest/support</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate administrative support</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{X} = 3.0 \quad \text{total} = 42 \quad \text{total} = 42 \]

More than a third of the directors ranked inadequate budget as their major problem. More than a third also ranked inadequate student or faculty support as their primary problem. On the other hand, 14 directors ranked inadequate student interest as their least troublesome area. It is clear that major problems are often program specific; what troubles one director may be of least concern to another director. It appears that only inadequate budget is a generally perceived problem for honors directors.

Because one problem that most educational leaders have is overcoming resistance to the implementation of new ideas, honors directors were asked
to rank order six resistance-to-change factors according to the extent that they impeded change in their programs. Table 4.19 indicates that the 46 responding directors did not perceive one factor as being much more inhibitive to desired change than the other factors, except that inadequate budget was again seen as the most troublesome factor and lack of administrative support was seen as least problematic. Interestingly, lack of faculty interest was seen as a somewhat greater problem than lack of student interest.

Table 4.19

Directors' Rank Ordering of Resistance-to-Change Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance-to-change factors</th>
<th>X Rank Order</th>
<th>Frequency Ranked First or Second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate honors budget</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty interest/participation</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate honors staffing</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative tradition in higher education</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of student interest/participation</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A content analysis of the open-ended question asking directors to reveal what they considered to be the least successful aspect of their honors programs may more accurately reflect their real concerns. The
most frequently identified factor was the low level of student involvement in and commitment to honors programs. Twenty-three of the 52 responding directors (44%) identified this problem. They wrote that they were experiencing difficulty in recruiting sufficient numbers of students excited about undertaking challenging academic work. One director admitted that many of his students were in honors mainly because it enhanced their chances for financial aid. Other directors reported that their students seemed to be taking the path of least resistance academically, that they were unwilling to enroll in non-major, upper-division honors seminars, for instance. Others said that their students were dropping out of honors not because they could not do the work, but because they chose not to be challenged. Other directors complained that their students were not inclined to participate in extracurricular activities or assume a leadership role in program organization. While not all directors are dissatisfied with the commitment of their students to program goals, some obviously are.

The "least successful" area mentioned next most frequently involved the number or quality of courses that their programs offered. Sixteen of the 52 directors (31%) noted weaknesses with their course offerings. They pointed to a lack of coordination with individual departments and the resultant paucity of departmental honors programs and courses, particularly in non-arts and sciences areas. Other directors noted budget cuts and their inability to compensate teaching faculty as reasons for insufficient courses. One pointed to the rigorous, inflexible requirements of professional programs, in which increasing numbers of honors students are enrolled, as the main reason for declining enrollments in honors courses.
Three directors stated that a major weakness for their programs was the lack of control they had over teaching and course quality. One director admitted, "The least successful aspect of this program is that an unfortunately high percentage of our honors courses are not that much different from regular courses."

Most of the remaining directors singled out a variety of administrative problems. Three indicated that their programs were ineffective in promoting their services on campus. However, data from a question asking directors to assess the image of their program on campus suggests that most honors programs are well thought of, at least from the directors' perspective.

Table 4.20

Directors' Perception of Honors Program Image on Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Perceiving Honors Program</th>
<th>Perception of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 shows that directors perceive their programs to be well thought of by most of the administrators on campus, although they believe that nearly half of the students and more than a third of the faculty view them no better than indifferently.
Inadequate counseling and advising is a weakness that three directors indicated. They remarked the inadequacy of their attention to graduating seniors needing assistance in preparing for national fellowships and graduate schools. The least successful aspect of two directors' programs was testing and evaluation of honors students, particularly because the quality of senior papers varied so greatly among departments. Finally, one fortunate director wrote,

We are hard pressed to answer this question because in general we have been successful. I suppose the things that have been less successful result from the fact that while we meet our objectives, we would like to meet them better, but cannot do so because four years is simply not enough to produce a broadly educated person.

Interestingly, this director's program budget is the largest in the sample.

Curricular and Instructional Innovation in Honors

Introduction

Realizing that there is no commonly shared understanding of what is innovative or nontraditional, this researcher nonetheless identified several areas of nontraditional education. Directors were asked to describe curriculum and instructional methods which their programs have offered in each of these areas. A content analysis of their responses was made and the results are reported.

The directors were also asked to evaluate the extent to which each of these areas of innovation might help their programs to provide students with excellent, challenging educational opportunities. Their responses are summarized in Table 4.21 and further analysis of the data follows.
A final, open-ended question asked directors the extent to which they believe that one of the goals of their program is to assume a leadership role on campus in effecting curricular and instructional innovation. They were also encouraged to share any other observations they had on the relationship between honors programs and innovative, nontraditional higher education. A content analysis of their responses is presented in the last section of this chapter.
Table 4.21

Directors' Perception of Innovation as Valuable to Their Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Innovation</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$ score</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary courses</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study/ student-designed courses</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign study</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught by nontraditional faculty</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus study/ internships</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interinstitutional study</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal process techniques</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational, career-oriented courses</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media- or computer-assisted instruction</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $\bar{X}$ score was derived by assigning the following scores: very much = 3; somewhat = 2; little = 1; none = 0.
Interdisciplinary Courses

Courses which integrate the subject matter and perspectives from two or more disciplines are a feature of 39 of 59 (66%) honors programs represented in this study. They are sometimes taught by one faculty member presenting material from more than one discipline, but are ideally team-taught by faculty from two or more departments. Interdisciplinary courses, as the literature review indicated, have been and still are the heart of many honors programs, which are in some cases the only agencies on campus that offer the arrangement.

About half of the programs in this study require interdisciplinary courses, while nearly all of the rest offer them as electives. Few programs offer interdisciplinary majors, though, since most programs have no authority to establish honors-coordinated majors and minors. Interdisciplinary study is not an innovation in most programs, although some are experimenting with variations of it. As Table 4.21 indicates, honors directors believe that interdisciplinary study is a vital part of an honors education. Only 2 of 53 directors feel it has little or no role in their programs.

Independent Study and Student-designed Courses

As the literature review and the data make clear, independent study is also perceived to be a vital part of honors education. Forty-five of 59 programs (76%) offer some form of independent study, directed reading, individual research, or faculty-student tutorials. In 29 of the reporting programs independent study is required for graduation, as part of the
senior project. It is usually regarded as an upper-level option and is discouraged in the freshman and sophomore years. Although nearly all of the programs insist that independent study be taken under faculty guidance, several programs reported difficulty in maintaining high academic standards for it.

Like interdisciplinary study, independent study is not considered an innovation any more by most programs. Table 4.21 reveals that it is highly regarded by most directors. Only 4 of 53 directors see it as having little or no value in their programs. Although it is not seen as being nontraditional education any longer, two directors reported innovative variations of independent study. The "contract independent study," wherein students sign independent study contracts with faculty that specify the nature and extent of work to be done, is one method employed to assure that high standards of quality are maintained. Another innovative variation is the Summer Independent Reading Program that enables students to earn credit for independent study while away from school in the summer. Honors faculty set up, or students arrange with faculty members, a list of reading and writing assignments centered around a basic theme or topic area. Students read, write, follow study guides designed by faculty, and in some cases regularly correspond with the faculty member. Students submit final papers and take examinations when returning to campus in the fall.

While independent study is one type of student-designed course, it generally involves only the student and a faculty member, who may, in fact, have been the principal organizer of the course. Students occasionally
help to initiate and design courses for others as well as themselves, although only nine of 59 directors reported any experience with such courses. One director wrote that an honors student interested in humanistic psychology (in a school whose Psychology Department is dominated by behaviorists) planned and coordinated a successful honors humanistic psychology course for 20 students. The student relied largely on guest authorities from the campus and community. A biology student from the same program organized a disease seminar series taught by authorities from a local pharmaceutical company. For the most part, however, student-designed courses are not prevalent in honors education.

**Foreign Study**

Foreign study is often encouraged and sometimes facilitated by honors programs, but they rarely plan and conduct overseas programs. Only four directors reported that their programs had sponsored foreign study ventures. One program offers honors courses at their university's Rome campus; another ran an honors foreign travel seminar to Germany in 1974; a third conducted a Junior Year at Oxford program for a small number of students several years ago.

Only one director reported that his program conducted much foreign study. The Honors College at Western Michigan University has organized two Asian Humanities Seminars, the last one in 1967, a 4 1/2 month study trip to Japan and India for 25 honors students and five faculty. In the past five years the director and his staff have also organized and conducted a six-week trip to the People's Republic of China, two trips to Mexico and two study trips to Guatemala.
That few honors programs have organized and conducted foreign study ventures is not because honors directors do not believe that it is of value and appropriate in an honors education. Table 4.21 shows that slightly more than one third of the directors judge it to be of very much value and another third believe it has at least some value in an honors program.

**Courses Team-taught or Taught by Nontraditional Faculty**

More than half of the programs have used team teaching, usually in conjunction with their interdisciplinary seminars. Several directors remarked that they saw team teaching decreasing as departments become increasingly concerned to generate student credit hours and maintain an appropriate student-faculty ratio. Team teaching is perceived by some to be a luxury that will be less affordable in the future.

Honors programs in this study have made little use of nontraditional instructors, such as off-campus authorities and professionals, graduate students, and especially able undergraduates. Five directors reported that they have offered classes in which undergraduates were teachers or co-teachers. Graduate students have taught courses in four of the reporting programs, and as one director explained, "not as an innovative move, but as a financial necessity." One program located near Washington D.C. has made considerable use of professionals, particularly those in government, to teach and assist teaching honors classes. Another program has called occasionally on community artists and scientists to teach special seminars. Nontraditional instruction, however, does not
appear to be used much by most honors programs. This is partly because programs cannot fund nontraditional instructors, but also because some directors appear to agree with the director who wrote,

Here is another one of those late 1960's innovations. We don't include them in our program and I doubt that we would. We are interested in engaging our students in serious scholarship and view traditional academic credentials as central.

Off-campus Study and Internships

Honors study off campus, such as community-based internships, is found in about 25% (15 of 59) of the reporting honors programs. Internships afford students semester- or year-long experiences with community professionals, such as doctors, businessmen, teachers, lawyers, judges, newspapermen, public administrators, social workers, laboratory scientists, and others. Internships help students to preview possible career areas and settings. They may also be part of senior honors projects. Several directors said that they encouraged but did not offer internships, because they were offered elsewhere at their university. One director reported that his program had tried internships but had discontinued them because students were unwilling to sustain their initial enthusiasm for the internship for its full length.

While only 25% of the programs have thus far engaged in off-campus study arrangements, nearly 2/3 of the directors reported that they see them as at least somewhat valuable to their programs' goals. A few of the directors with experience in offering internships reported that their students are enthusiastic about them.
Interinstitutional Study

Study at other schools for a period of time or for a particular class is coordinated both on an individual program level and by the NCHC, which has published a handbook with pertinent information for and about the more than 50 honors programs which are willing and able to participate in interinstitutional exchanges of honors students. In the NCHC program students can spend a semester or full school year at another honors program institution, affiliated with the host honors program.

Table 4.21 indicates that directors are about evenly divided regarding the value of this idea, although nearly a quarter of them (12 of 53) strongly endorse it. It is somewhat surprising, however, that 42% of the directors believe that it has little or no value in an honors education. One director reported that his honors students have taken advantage of the opportunity to study and take courses at an excellent neighboring institution, primarily courses that they would not have been able to take at their own school.

Courses Using Interpersonal Process Techniques

Courses using interpersonal process techniques for instruction and to address affectively oriented subject matter have increasingly become a part of college curricula. Many educators have concluded that the capacity to feel and express emotions both on an intrapersonal and interpersonal level is important and complementary to a curriculum that emphasizes cognitive development. Honors directors, however, have not much embraced the idea of affective education as belonging in their programs. Of course, they are not
all as adament as the director who referred to affective education as "gobbledygook, the lack of academic content, rigor, and competence."

Only five programs reported course work in this area. Two programs offered 1-2 credit hour seminars, such as "Education for Human Liberation" and "Ways of Seeing." One program regularly offers honors sections of an Interpersonal Communications class and occasional seminars such as "Humanistic Education for Lifelong Learners," and "Eurythmy." Several directors indicated that although they did not offer specific classes in this area, the growth and development of the "whole person" was a hidden agenda in many of their small seminars. Others noted that developing affective sensitivities was a goal of their extracurricular activities, but was not a part of their curriculum.

Honors directors, in fact, do not seem to think that affective education has much place or value in their programs, at least as a part of their regular curricular offerings. Nearly 60% of the directors (31 of 53) wrote that this area of innovation would be of little or no value to their programs. One responded, "Sorry, we don't even know what these terms mean." Others appeared to agree with the director who wrote, "We don't have them and are not at all likely to. I question whether they are a necessary part of an honors program. Our program is aimed at intellectual, not emotional or psychological development."

Vocational and Career-oriented Courses

Curriculum in this area is becoming increasingly popular on college campuses, but is seen by most honors directors as tangential or even
antithetical to honors education. Seventy percent of them perceive that
courses in this area have little or no place in their programs. Only two
of 53 directors believed that career-oriented courses had very much
value as a part of their program offerings. This data is not surprising
when one considers that the honors movement grew out of and has a strong
tradition of defending and encouraging liberal education.

A few honors programs have offered courses in this area, such as
"Vocations and Employment," "Women's Work," "Career Options," and
"Seminar for Law Students." A particularly innovative course organized
by one program is "Introduction to the Professions," a series of courses
focusing on professional and career areas such as law, medicine, and pub­
lic administration. The courses are taught by representatives of the
professional schools, with community professionals participating as
guest lecturers and discussants. Some honors programs also have honors
sections of regular departmental courses that relate to specific pro­
fessions. Other programs coordinate internships which also address the
strong interests students have in previewing their vocational possibili­
ties as undergraduates. In general, however, honors programs have had and
continue to offer liberal rather than vocational curricula.

Media- and Computer-Assisted Instruction

Courses which employ new instructional technologies are becoming
increasingly popular in higher education, but are an insignificant part
of honors programming. Honors programs have traditionally stressed the
value of the exchange of ideas between teacher and students in small
class situations using good books as the primary reference point for instruction and discussion. Only slight use appears to have been made of films, videotape, television, and computers. A few programs offer a course or two that use films extensively, and one program offers courses through the college's media learning center. Two programs occasionally offer film interpretation courses and another runs a course which relies on critically-acclaimed films. However, Table 4.21 indicates that directors see little value in new instructional technologies for honors education. Seventy-eight percent of them believe that they have little or no value in their programs.

Other Curricular and Instructional Innovation

Directors did not report many other innovations which did not fall into one of the above categories. Two innovative courses are worth noting, however. One program has offered a course called "Natural History Awareness," a Winter natural awareness/explorations experience which cuts across semesters, beginning in early November and ending in early Spring. Another innovative course is a group independent study, in which ten students were advised by four faculty in an examination of "Death, Dying, and Resurrection." The students studied individually, but also joined for group discussions and to produce a four-part, multi-media presentation on the topic.

One of the most radical honors experiments reported was the "Ten-Twenty Program," which gave ten freshmen and twenty sophomores freedom from all graduation requirements except the university's total credit hour requirement. They had only to maintain a "B" average, submit papers
each year involving one of their studies, pass an oral examination in
their senior year, and accumulate sufficient credits to graduate. Inter­
estingly, all but two students followed rather conventional paths to
their degrees, earning conventional catalog majors and minors rather than
devising individualized curricula. The students indicated that they ap­
preciated the expression of confidence in their judgment and enjoyed the
feeling of few requirements, but they ended up satisfying most of them
anyway. The results of this experiment reflect what seems generally
true of honors students, that they are unwilling to depart much from
the conventional routes to degrees even when given the freedom to do so.
It appears that most honors students are satisfied with the conventional
offerings and do not feel much oppressed by traditional requirements,
particularly when they are able to have honors sections of some of their
classes and independent study in their later undergraduate years.

Honors Directors' Attitudes Toward Innovation in Honors

Honors directors were asked, "To what extent do you believe that
one of your goals in the honors program is to assume a leadership role
on your campus in effecting curricular and instructional experimentation?"
They were also asked for other concluding observations about innovation
in honors programs.

A content analysis of the responses from 44 directors indicated that
13 of the 44 (29%) believe that their programs should definitely be a
leader in fostering innovative reform on campus. Seventeen of 44 directors
(39%) feel that honors programs are appropriate loci for innovation, but
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with qualifying reservations and under certain circumstances and conditions. The remaining 14 directors (32%) do not appear to perceive that innovation is one of their objectives. Several of these directors also noted that they do not believe that much of the innovation referred to in this study would improve the teaching and learning in their programs.

The following responses from five pro-innovation honors directors were representative of those who believe that honors programs should experiment with promising curricular and instructional ideas.

We have always been the experimental wing of the college. Much of what we have done has been adopted by the college in general. As long as we maintain clear quality we face no difficulties in the experimental aspects.

Without doubt on this campus the multiple honors programs have served as significant examples of innovative coursework. Major honors ideas have been expanded to the whole student body in a large number of areas. The honors division has taken an aggressive lead in upgrading the quality of undergraduate education and in giving renewed emphasis to the concepts of a liberal education.

Many courses in the common curriculum grew out of experiments at the Honors Center. The faculty looks to the Center as a place and as a group of people where and who welcome thoughtful and original experimentation. Every university ought to have a place where good things can be tried with a minimum of red tape and financial risk.

We must play a leadership role to a very great extent. If educationally innovative ideas are conceived of and followed by honors-level students, the depth and quality of these courses is bound to be attractive to students, faculty, and administrators.

Honors programs provide a safe and relatively respectable haven in which to experiment (provided that some discretion is exercised). The students involved have the ability, energy and enthusiasm to make new things happen or find out when they don't. It is vital that honors programs do not revert to their old roles of rewarding conventionally high performance students.

The sixteen directors who qualified their positions that experimentation and innovation should play a significant role in honors programming
generally see these functions as instrumental, but by no means essential, aspects of honors education. One director saw an innovative leadership role as valid "only to the extent that such leadership is required if we are to succeed in meeting the need of the superior student." Another made a similar point:

At times the honors college concern for quality education leads to innovation and experimentation, but we do not necessarily equate quality education, our primary goal, with innovative, experimental education.

Other directors also perceive innovation to be useful not "for its own sake," but as the by-product of other goals.

There is a temptation to innovate just to "stay ahead," and I see that as dangerous to us in two ways; a) anything too different may scare off too many brightish but vocationally minded students; b) our primary need is to raise the quality of honors work, mostly by freeing faculty time for closer contact with students.

Educational experimentation is a legitimate by-product of a good honors program . . . however we have never set out to achieve this goal by design. It is something that happens with any successful program. Honors programs are by their very nature innovative and involved in educational experimentation. However, it is a mistake to think that they have to be nontraditional.

Of course, even those directors who favor educational reform question what needs reforming and what direction the reform should take. A few directors indicated that what they thought was innovative in their programs, or at least what differentiated them from the regular curriculum, was a return to more rigorous, traditional education. One wrote,

Our honors program has always been a place for experimentation in courses. Faculty could try out a new experimental course before offering it to the general student body. During the 60's every department became chock-full of experimental courses. So, the recent innovation of our honors program has been to go back, as much as our students will allow, to traditional education and required courses. The rest of the College of Arts and Sciences is following suit.
Another director also suggested that innovative honors leadership might involve a back-to-basics approach:

Honors faculty should assume the role of innovators, and in our era that may constitute a rather strong assertion that basic skills such as writing and verbal communication should be developed. At the present time I'm not really sure how to even define "nontraditional."

What is innovative and nontraditional is, indeed, difficult to define. Some directors do not, in fact, define their leadership role in curricular and instructional reform as being innovative:

During the riotous years we seemed much more innovative than we do now. We consciously try to put on courses that are not offered elsewhere on campus. We've pushed experiential learning recently . . . all as a means of stirring up our students and providing them with at least the semblance of an unorthodox education. But in a real sense, I don't regard these things as innovative. They have been kicking around for a long time now. We simply did what has to be done and what any good, active program would do for its students.

While some directors reported that they wish their programs were more innovative, they gave some reasons why such innovation is difficult to achieve. One said, "This should be a goal of the Honors Program, but given limitations on the director's time and resources and given a certain amount of student apathy, it is difficult to do so." Another director wrote,

We saw ourselves as curricular and institutional leaders in innovative ways. We were not supported by our academic senate, departmental chairmen, or even by our honors students. We no longer see ourselves as such innovative leaders. We are not, however, the keepers of the status quo. While keeping the cloak of traditional respectability, we really do bootleg innovation within our classes.

Remarks of two directors seem to summarize the thinking of many of the directors in this study, which is that honors programs should be a part of, but not necessarily on the cutting edge of, experimentation in the university:
My campus has been deeply involved in experimental, innovational, nontraditional education for a decade. In fact, these activities are by now traditional, almost institutionalized. The Honors Program as such has been beneficiary and participant in this activity, but has not needed to be in a leading or forcing role.

Honors programs should attempt to lead in this area, but should also be part of the mainstream. Their approach in leadership for change should be evolutionary. A revolutionary program might find itself abolished for lack of broad-based support.

While most directors at least somewhat affirm the role of experimentation and innovation in honors programs, nearly a third of the directors (14 of 44) responded to the questionnaire in a way that suggested that they did not believe that it was the business of their programs to be much involved with innovation. Some wrote that other agencies on campus were and should continue to be the primary forces for innovation.

We have not concentrated effort on innovation, although in recent years we have begun to explore a wider variety of course options. Most of the curricular categories discussed in #23 and #24 above have been explored on this campus outside of honors, largely because the Office of Undergraduate Studies exists to do precisely that. As a result honors has not been the primary venue for change here.

This is not a goal of our program. Any development along these lines must come from academic departments.

We have a division of the university that specifically works on this mission . . . the honors program is not the center of instructional innovation except that classes are small with emphasis on seminars and independent study.

Other directors appear to associate the innovations specified in the questionnaire as that which honors education should not be. Their assumption seems to be that the traditional is working well enough, and that even if it is not, much nontraditional education is simply capricious change and of little real value to promoting excellent, challenging undergraduate education. One director remarked, "What is so
terrific about being different, for God's sake? Innovation for innovation's sake is educationalese garbage. When there is a reason to change, change. Why should honors espouse change just for the hell of it?" Another director felt that his goal of encouraging excellence was difficult enough to fulfill without also trying to be the vanguard of change in the university:

I do not view as one of our major goals that of effecting curricular and instructional experimentation. One of our major concerns is to provide the kind of classroom atmosphere and to create among honors students the kind of spirit which will encourage them to continue their interest in high academic achievement. In a large state-supported university where there is emphasis on athletics, fraternities and the like, and where large numbers of students are not especially academically talented, even trying to achieve the above goal is no mean task.

In summary, a few honors directors enthusiastically endorse a leadership role in experimental education for their programs. A few, on the other hand, believe that their programs cannot or should not play such a role. Most directors appear to favor honors experimentation and innovation when it seems likely to enhance their primary honors function of providing challenging learning opportunities for bright, motivated students.
RATIONAL AND SUGGESTIONS FOR INNOVATION IN HONORS

Rationale for Experimentation and Innovation in Honors Programs

The well-being of societies, of organizations, and of individuals depends, in part, on the ability to adapt to changing circumstances. Santayana writes beautifully about the inevitability of change: "No specific hope about distant issues is ever likely to be realized. The ground shifts, the will of mankind deviates, and what the father dreamt of the children neither fulfil nor desire" (cited in Bennis, 1966, p. 27). The constant, rapid pace of social change characteristic of contemporary life necessitates flexibility and innovation. Gardner states,

The solutions of today will be out of date tomorrow. The system that is in equilibrium today will be thrown off balance tomorrow. Innovation is continuously needed to cope with such altered circumstances. (1964, p. 28)

Yet, despite recognizing the need to anticipate and respond to changing conditions, individuals and organizations have difficulty in initiating or accepting change:

Change is the natural state of all living things. Yet, while this may be universally acknowledged, it is evident that the process is seldom welcomed. Even universities, institutions dedicated to initiating and nurturing the new, tend to resist when it is they who must change. (Denenfeld, 1971, p. 1)

Universities, in particular, have been characterized as conservative, change-resistant institutions. Gardner has noted that

Much innovation goes on at any first-rate university -- but it is almost never conscious innovation in the structure or practices of the university itself. University people love to innovate away from home. (1964, p. 76)
Authorities on organizational change have noted that particularly as organizations become well-established and "successful," they become less able and willing to change. Gardner remarks that

When organizations and societies are young, they are flexible, fluid, not yet paralyzed by rigid specialization and willing to try anything once. As the organization or society ages, vitality diminishes, flexibility gives way to rigidity, creativity fades and there is a loss of capacity to meet challenges from unexpected directions. (1964, p. 3)

Bennis makes much the same point:

The old, the learned, the powerful, the wealthy, those in authority -- these are the ones who are committed. They have learned a pattern and have succeeded in it. But when change comes, it is often the uncommitted who can best realize it, take advantage of it. (1966, p. 27)

Universities, like other organizations, must constantly guard against the tendency to formalize and maintain their operations at the expense of creative adaptation and innovation. Paul Goodman, Ivan Illich, and other social critics have pointed out the dangers of an overly institutionalized society, in which the established social institutions, including schools, are less able to serve their clientele as they become increasingly concerned to maintain their own well-being. Bennis anticipates the end of bureaucracy and a new organizational structure for the future:

bureaucracy seems most likely to founder on its inability to adapt to rapid change in the environment (p. 9) . . . . organizations of the future . . . . will be adaptive, rapidly changing temporary systems . . . . conducted on organic rather than mechanical models. They will respond to the problem rather than programmed role expectations. (1966, p. 12)

A consideration of the history and current nature of honors programs in American higher education has indicated that while they began as innovative forces in their universities, many programs have increasingly tended to formalize their operations into a relatively risk-free pattern of services
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in which they confer certification of honors on conventionally bright students in tried and tested ways. Honors education emerged in the late 1950's and early 1960's as an alternative to the status quo in higher education. Though not revolutionary in purpose or means, it meant to promote meritocracy, excellence, and challenge as an alternative to egalitarianism, mediocrity, and permissiveness. One is particularly impressed with the widespread energy and enthusiasm for experimentation and innovation in the Cohen-led ICSS era of honors, when a fervor for creative education combined with an insistence on quality (and generous funding!) to produce courses and instruction determined to be different and better. (pages 18-22 and 42-43 describe innovative honors efforts during this period).

While the founding and early development of many honors programs was accompanied by innovative reform efforts, particularly as they pioneered interdisciplinary seminars and independent study on many of their campuses, most programs have become increasingly less experimental and innovative. John Portz has admitted that the publication of Cohen's book in 1966 marked the end of experimentation as far as honors programs were concerned. The data presented in Chapter Four seems to confirm this notion. While programs continue to offer interdisciplinary seminars and independent study, they are little inclined to experiment with other curricular and instructional innovations. Few programs offer foreign study, off-campus internships, courses taught by nontraditional instructors, media-assisted courses, interinstitutional study, interpersonal process content or instruction courses, or other innovations which some
educators are discovering are promising reforms in teaching and learning (pages 97-104 further discuss the lack of honors innovation in these areas). Furthermore, many honors directors are not particularly anxious to incorporate or even try much innovation in these areas, as Table 4.21 on page 94 indicates. A content analysis of directors' responses to questions about the relationship between honors education and experimental, nontraditional education indicated that only about a third of the directors believed that their programs should take a leadership role in effecting curricular and instructional innovation at their universities, despite the risks such a position necessarily entails (pages 104-109 support this conclusion).

A willingness and capacity to experiment with new learning strategies is dependent on some dissatisfaction with what is and on a striving for something better, characteristics of any dynamic, creative program. Experimental honors programs affirm that even an honors education, though perhaps already superior to a nonhonors education, can always be improved. Honors programs are necessarily innovative, particularly in response to constant, rapid changes in higher education and the society (see pages 2-4 for a further discussion of the internal and external changes confronting higher education today), or they fail to realize their full potential for leadership in the university. The problems and weaknesses in their programs that honors directors identified in questionnaire responses -- recruiting adequate numbers of good students to accept academic challenges, maintaining student interest in liberal education, assisting students to assume greater responsibility for their own educations, generating lively interaction...
among students and faculty — call for curricular and instructional innovation.

Honors programs must innovate not only to improve what they are already doing, but to discover new sources and methods of excellent, challenging learning. One goal of honors innovation can be to help honors programs and their universities break from three constraining features of higher education: it is too frequently space-bound, time-bound, and custom-bound.

Space-bound education relies too extensively on classrooms and the campus and too little on other, broader settings, as Newmann and Oliver suggest:

After one wrenches oneself loose from the paralyzingly constricted posture that all true education must be programmed, planned, and happen in schools, one's imagination trips over a host of exciting places for youth and adults to learn, by themselves and in association with one another. (1967, p. 103)

As honors programs increasingly promote internships, field studies, and foreign study, for example, they will permit good students to take advantage of the diverse and rich learning opportunities off campus.

Time-bound education limits learning for credit to semesters, class periods, examination periods, and assignment dates. Too much learning is compartmentalized into convenient, rigid time units, often at the expense of spontaneous or opportunistic study. "Time spent," as the inviolable standard in acquiring an undergraduate degree forces students into an academic lockstep in which Milton (1972) and others have noted that creative students have particular difficulty:

Data from three highly regarded schools indicated that students who approach academic matters in ways characteristic of creative people are less likely to graduate than are other students . . . perhaps a
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reduction in the time spent and a loosening of the lock-step are alternatives toward improved learning which can be implemented relatively painlessly. (pp. 32-33)

There is little empirical evidence to support the contention that most learning is a function of time spent in classrooms. Milton remarks that "Spending a specific amount of time in the classroom is an educational practice perpetuated despite lack of evidence that it is sound" (1972, p. 13). In a study at the University of Colorado (Gruber and Weitman, 1962) time in class was reduced from three times per week to once per week in twelve different and varied courses. The authors reported that generally content understanding, as measured in several ways, was not adversely affected. Honors programs have freed students from time restraints by offering independent study, but there are other innovations which may also do this; some of them will be considered later in this chapter.

Custom-bound education is exemplified by the "tyranny of the catalog," in which curriculum is uniformly defined in terms of specific courses and credits, and is dutifully followed by students who may not understand its logic, direction, or purpose. Custom-bound education is often perpetuated by confusing the verbs "to teach" and "to learn." Not all that is learned must be taught, as Kestin (1963) among others has pointed out:

When we think about the problems of higher education we are too often carried away by the frequent use of the active verb, "to teach." With very few exceptions, students are not taught by their professors in any direct sense. Teaching is not the transfer of knowledge or understanding from the brain of the instructor to a number of brains which belong to the students. A higher education must be acquired by learning. Achievement in learning is the result of an intensive solitary struggle of each individual with himself. (p. 437)
Custom-bound education is also generated by the tendency to treat students as though they were alike or to categorize them prematurely or for efficiency. Even honors students, who share more in common with one another than other students in terms of academic preparation for college, differ from one another with regard to their rate of learning, life situation and circumstance, learning style, and learning goals. Such diversity, which authorities in higher education note has been increasing in recent years, calls for a diversity of learning styles and strategies.

Honors students differ in rate of learning. While a few of them are ready for accelerated and advance course work as freshmen, others may even need remedial basic skills development in some areas. It is a mistake to assume that honors students are uniformly bright and motivated. Areas of innovation which respond to differences in learning rates include self-paced instruction and competency-based evaluation models; both are discussed later in this chapter.

While honors students are primarily "bright, white, and 18," (see Table 4.4, page 61) honors programs will increasingly need to attract and respond to the needs of students with diverse life situations, as higher education generally is having to do. They may need to offer more night courses, weekend courses, and off-campus courses for nontraditional students who live off campus and work part or full time.

Honors students also differ from one another in learning style, although most have apparently excelled in the traditional lecture-testing classroom methods. Considering the different cognitive styles that students may have, Witkin and Cox (1975) have advanced the idea
that students may process information in one of two basic ways, which they characterize as either "field dependent" or "field independent" styles. They write, "Field dependence persons are particularly attuned to available social frames of reference . . . they are better at learning and remembering social material" (p. 1). Of field independence persons they remark, "They are less sensitive to social cues, and less sensitive to people . . . Their interests are likely to be in the theoretical and the abstract" (p. 2). Their distinction is not necessarily the most valid or useful one that might be made in this regard, but it does suggest that educators are making distinctions between students' learning styles, which honors and other educators might respond to through diverse learning methods.

Honors students differ from one another according to their learning goals. Not all honors students are preparing for graduate or professional schools, and not all of them will want to take advantage of honors curricula which prepare students for careers in academe. Honors directors are, in fact, concerned about the vocationalism apparent in their students' goals (see Table 4.6, page 62). Certainly honors programs should promote the value of liberal education and the "examined life"; yet they must also be aware of students other real interests and goals. They must be able to make some compromises to the ideal when the best interests of their program and, more importantly, student felt needs suggest such adaptation. Flexibility is not necessarily an indicator of permissiveness or diminution of standards.

Honors programs, then, could increasingly encourage learning that is
not space-, time-, or custom-bound and that responds to differences in students. The programmatic, curricular, and instructional innovations proposed in this chapter, while not inclusive of potential honors innovation, are meant to suggest some promising directions in which some honors programs may move. Many of these suggestions are probably most applicable to honors programs in larger universities with adequate budget, sufficient staff, and broad-based institutional support. Certainly some of the suggested innovations will not relate realistically to the circumstances of smaller or recently developed programs. There is not, in fact, any one ideal model for an honors program; the specific programmatic structure and goals of a program depend on characteristics of the institution of which the honors program is an interrelated part. Austin (1975) remarks,

There is no one model for an honors program which can be superimposed on any institution . . . . Just as there is no single model for honors curricula, neither is there a single model for placing an honors program in the organizational and budgetary structure of a college or university. (p. 166)

Diversity is desirable and necessary in honors programs as well as in all of higher education.

One must also emphasize that many of the areas of innovation suggested in this chapter have not been empirically demonstrated as superior to more traditional education, although there is a growing body of literature which reports the successful efforts of educators trying new teaching and learning methods in their classrooms and schools. Thus, one the one hand there is little research on which to base a preference for nontraditional instruction. In fact, Milton (1972)
discusses the research conclusions of several studies which argue that there is no demonstrable difference in teaching methods (pp. 19-24). One of these studies (Dubin and Taveggia, 1968) pooled data from 91 studies between 1924 and 1965 on the relationship between achievement and instructional arrangements, concluding that

These data demonstrate clearly and unequivocally that there is no measurable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations. (p. 35)

Yet, on the other hand, recent books and articles have reported the successful results and enthusiastic endorsements from many innovative teaching and learning efforts. Change Magazine, in fact, recently published a series of five reports which discuss more than 100 new and successful teaching and learning ideas being used at colleges around the country. Thus, while little formal research yet informs educators about the impact of innovative, nontraditional study on students' educations, there is much experience to take direction and inspiration from. Of course, more formal research is needed regarding the consequences of nontraditional learning.

Many of the innovations suggested here are applicable, of course, to nonhonors students as well as honors program students. An assumption is made, however, that many of these promising new ideas may necessitate, or at least benefit from, learning abilities and motivations that honors students are more likely to possess. Successful nontraditional education frequently depends on self-discipline, basic communication skills, and demonstrated capacity and motivation for learning that honors students might have acquired more than nonhonors students. Thus, while honors
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students should not be the exclusive target population for such experimentation and innovation, they would seem to be among those students best prepared to experiment with and take advantage of new learning ideas. What follows are some suggestions for innovation in the following programmatic, curricular, and instructional areas: enrollment, governance, curriculum, recruitment and selection, orientation, counseling and advising, housing, extracurricular activities, evaluation, and curricular and instructional innovation.

Programmatic, Curricular, and Instructional Suggestions for Honors Programs

Enrollment. As the review of literature indicated honors programs began as small programs, most enrolling only a few of the most promising or motivated students (see page 16). As honors programs spread into the larger state universities, larger programs developed. As Table 4.2 (page 59) indicates, 41 of the 61 reporting programs (67%) still enroll no more than 300 students. However, nine of the programs enroll from 500 to 1000 students and seven programs have more than 1000 honors students.

The question of optimal size is one that faces honors programs and other organizations as well. E. F. Schumacker is a noted proponent of the "small is beautiful" and "economies of scale" philosophies, but others also have warned of the dangers of growing too large. Gardner points out that

There is a problem in organizing for renewal that has never been adequately dealt with . . . though all experts are aware of it: how to combat the almost inevitable movement of an organization toward elaborateness, rigidity and massiveness and away from simplicity, flexibility, and manageable size. (1964, p. 80)

Paul Goodman (1962) was a critic of large organizations who proposed setting up smaller learning units within or even apart from the larger
university structures:

How is the mean size to be determined? It must be small enough for face to face relations; to insure frequent meetings of students and the collegiate teachers, and conversation and commensalism of students within the same studies; and also to recruit by acquaintance rather than by records . . . Theodore Newcomb estimates that 300 to 400 is the optimal size. It is a badge of honor if they remain small. (pp. 297-8)

Goodman, himself, proposed an unchartered college, in which no more than 10 teachers and 120 students might teach and learn together.

Honors programs might follow these examples, resisting the temptation to grow in numbers at the risk of quality of services to students. They should be personal, "as if people mattered," operations within larger institutions, in which faculty are more likely to be able to teach, counsel, write meaningful letters of recommendation, recreate with, and generally respond and relate to students in small group and personal interactions. When honors programs grow to enroll several hundred students, some decentralization by college or even department might be desirable. Of course, sheer size does not necessarily lead to bureaucratic rigidity and impersonality. Adequate staff, good internal communication, flexibility, and adaptability are organizational qualities which help prevent such outcomes.

Honors programs should be concerned not only about optimal enrollment size, but also should attempt to enroll students of diverse ages, ethnic background, and life situation. Honors programs began as rather elite programs, enrolling a homogeneous student clientele in selective Eastern schools. However, as they were increasingly established in schools enrolling a more heterogeneous student body, honors program enrollments reflected
at least to some degree the increased heterogeneity. Nonetheless, most programs still enroll few minority or nontraditional students. Table 4.4 (page 61) shows that of the 43 reporting programs, only six (15%) enroll more than 5% minority students. In fact, 19 of 43 programs (44%) enroll 1% or fewer minority students.

That most programs are lacking a diverse student population is both a problem and a challenge. The problem is that color-blind, meritocratic recruitment and admissions practices without special efforts to reach and attract minority students practically assures that programs will lack an enriching diversity of racial, ethnic, and cultural perspectives. The rationale for such diversity is that it improves honors curricular and extra-curricular programming by generating various, both competing and complementary perspectives and life experiences that may challenge and inform ethnocentric points of view. Bright minority students able to benefit from an honors education contribute not only to their own educations, but to those of their white peers. Such diversity in honors programs also contributes modestly to a more equal, just society.

The challenge for honors programs is to find special ways to attract and hold minority students, not by creating double standards, but by actively promoting the idea of honors in predominantly black high schools and in minority organizations on campus. Honors programs can coordinate their recruitment efforts with college minority student offices, and can enlist the assistance of honors minority students and faculty. Programs might also consider accepting minority students whose test scores are somewhat below regular standards, but whose grades and motivation warrant admission.
Honors programs should also make a special effort to attract the qualified nontraditional student, who has been working or raising a family before completing college. A diversity of ages and life situations is desirable, since older students may bring life experiences to bear in class discussions which younger students have not yet had, but might learn from. Donald Oliver (1974) has emphasized the importance of human diversity in social and organizational life, including as a necessary element of any communitarian reform institution (which he believes should be the model for organizations and society in general)

a broad range of human diversity along such dimensions as age, sex, temperament, and talent to allow for the natural evolution of interdependent coalitions as well as leadership. (p. 37)

Honors programs should make an effort to include students who may learn from one another's different ethnic, cultural, life stage, and experiential backgrounds and perspectives.

Governance. Honors programs should be administered whenever possible by faculty members who have full and continuing, not part-time and rotating positions, although the history of honors shows that most programs have never enjoyed the advantages of a full-time honors director. Cohen, in fact, noted with some pride that the University of Colorado appointed a continuing half-time director when it established its honors program in 1940. Currently, only nine of 61 reporting directors (15%) hold full-time appointments. Forty of the 61 directors (65%) are honors administrators on a half-time or less basis (see Table 4.8, page 64).

C. Grey Austin (1975) has listed some guidelines for honors program organization, drawn from the past 50 years of experience, which include
the following recommendation: "Provide continuity of leadership . . . .
Even with an adequate budget, much of the program's growth will depend on the cumulative work of a director" (p. 167). Indeed, many of the past and present guiding lights of the honors movement in America have been directors with long years of commitment to and experience in honors education. While the rotated position may seem to insure "new blood" in honors programs, most directors favor the permanently held position, believing that this arrangement makes for greater program effectiveness, and that possible stagnation of leadership is not solved by regular rotation of leaders, but by a sustained commitment to the honors concept.

A key feature of honors program governance is the role that students should play in some aspects of the decision-making. Historically, honors leaders have urged a role for students in honors organization. In the early 1960's the Cohen-led ICSS fashioned "The Sixteen Major Features of a Full Honors Program," which included the following points:

Establish a committee of honors students to serve as liaison with the honors committee or council. Keep them fully informed on the program and elicit their cooperation in evaluation and development . . . . Use good students wherever feasible as apprentices in teaching and as assistants . . . . Employ honors students for counseling, orientation, and other appropriate honors purposes within the general student body. (Cohen, 1966, p. 48)

More recently Austin (1975) has urged programs to "include faculty and students in the governance of the program" (p. 167).

The rationale for student input into program governance is not simply to increase program efficiency, but to enrich the personal and academic lives of students. As students become involved in honors organizations to the point that honors is not simply done to or for them, but rather
involves taking some responsibility for the nature and extent of program-
ming and practice, they may feel a sense of accomplishment, of identifi-
cation with the program, and of community with others that affords much
personal satisfaction. Gardner (1961) has said that, "To be needed is one
of the richest forms of moral and spiritual nourishment, and not to be
needed is one of the most severe forms of psychic deprivation" (p. 153).
Honors programs can provide all honors students with an opportunity to
be needed through their honors membership, in part by involving them in
program organization. Students might ideally comprise several standing
committees: recruitment, admissions, orientation, housing, publications,
social affairs, tutoring, evaluation, special projects. They can be em-
ployed by the honors office to help with clerical, even janitorial, work.

Of course, encouraging student participation in honors organization
is not an easy task. Establishing a system of student committees may
take more time and effort, at least initially, than such assistance can
benefit the program. Also, many students have no apparent desire to take
an active role in organizational matters, and such involvement should
not be required. Nonetheless, programs which are able to generate con-
siderable student participation in the administration and operations
of the program promote intellectual and personal growth in active students.

Honors programs should strive to be horizontal, decentralized deci-
sion-making structures, rather than hierarchial structures in which all
key decisions are made at the top and communicated downward. Hage and
Aiken (1970) have hypothesized that the higher the rate of centralization
and formalization in an organization, the lower the rate of program
change. They suggest that the concentration of power in the hands of a few persons in an organization "tends to lead to the preservation of the status quo because one aspect of power is the ability to veto ideas for change or otherwise block attempts to introduce change into an organization" (p. 38). Regarding excessive rules and prescribed routines and roles in an organization they remark,

Rules not only discourage new suggestions or new patterns of behavior because of the possibility of getting into trouble, but they also discourage the search for better ways of performing the same tasks . . . . Rules thus encourage conformity and discourage new ideas and suggestions. (p. 43)

Warren Bennis (1966) has also argued that "communication (and innovative ideas) are thwarted or distorted because of hierarchial divisions" (p. 6), and he has proposed ideal organizational structures as those which are adaptive, organic, flexible, and geared to solving problems by putting together appropriate temporary teams, rather than relying on positional authority and programmed role expectations. Honors programs can and should call on students, faculty, and staff in the administration of honors education. Honors program directors can serve as leaders, in part, by helping their staff, faculty, and students to relate to one another not as functionaries and positional authorities, but as persons sharing a common work, study, and social circumstance.

Curriculum. Early honors programs were limited to upper-division, departmentally-based study programs. Cohen and his colleagues at the University of Colorado devised one of the first general honors programs in the 1930's, but they did not become a common feature of most honors programs until the ICSS era of honors in the 1950's and 1960's. The ICSS "Sixteen
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Major Features of a Full Honors Program included the following recommendations:

Start programs for these students immediately upon admission to the college or university. Make such programs continuous and cumulative through all four years. Formulate such programs so that they will relate effectively both to all the college work for the degree and to the area of concentration. (Cohen, 1966, p. 46)

A full honors program, then, will be a continuous, cumulative, four-year program that begins with entering freshmen and is completed by graduating seniors, although transfer students and other undergraduates can be admitted at appropriate entry levels. It will generally consist of two related parts, a general education component and an upper-level, individualized, departmentally-based component. The former emphasizes breadth of knowledge, while the latter stresses in-depth study in a student's area of concentration.

The general honors program is based on the premise that a significant part of an excellent undergraduate education consists of an interdisciplinary introduction to three basic areas of knowledge -- humanities, social science, and physical science. Table 4.11 on page 60 indicates that 50 of 61 programs (82%) have some general honors program, while other questionnaire data revealed that nearly 75% of them have an upper-level, departmental program. General honors programs have emphasized and should continue to promote liberal education, not only as enriching general education, but as excellent vocational preparation as well. Perhaps the best preparation for doing well in a future endeavor (vocation) is doing well in one's current occupation. General honors courses which challenge students to do excellent work would seem to be the best vocational as well.
as liberal education.

A number of universities are currently reassessing their undergraduate core curriculum, with particular concern to reinforce and promote the value of liberal education. Among the curriculum reform efforts underway, the one at Harvard University has received the most publicity:

The proposal, considered one of the most important of many curriculum reform efforts at colleges and universities around the country, is likely to have a broad impact on American higher education . . . . The aim of the new curriculum, which would require a number of courses in several "core areas," is "to have students acquire basic literacy in major forms of intellectual discourse." (The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVI [2], p. 1)

The researcher's own institution, Western Michigan University, appointed a 1977-78 Liberal Education Ad-Hoc Committee to explore ways to promote the value of liberal education in an increasingly vocationally-oriented environment. The researcher was a member of this committee, which considered its first task to be one of defining the characteristics of an ideally liberally educated person. This definition is presented here as being instructive for general honors programs, which might offer curriculum designed to meet the following ideal of an educated person:

1. derives joy from learning and is open to the excitement of continuing inquiry
2. has acquired the ability to think and express thought clearly and effectively in speech and writing
3. cherishes the languages of mankind as the matrix of cultures
4. appreciates works of literary and artistic excellence and has the ability to make judgments based on aesthetic criteria
5. is knowledgeably aware of past and present views of the natural world and the mathematical and experimental methods of the sciences
6. has an informed acquaintance with the structure and workings of past and present social, political, and economic systems and the ways in which we come to know about them
7. has acquired a special competence or skill sufficient for a deep understanding of one aspect of human life either for its own sake or for a career which sustains life and serves society

8. accepts the need for timely change to continue social vitality; values the past for a heritage of insights and accomplishments that offers guidance to the present; and recognizes that a debt to generations past is best repaid by a sense of responsibility toward the future

9. has gained some insights into the major religious, philosophical, and psychological interpretations of human life

10. has an understanding of moral and ethical problems and the ability to affirm those values and manners which life in an open and multi-ethnic democratic society requires

(Liberal Education Ad-Hoc Committee Report, Western Michigan University, May, 1978, pp. 4-5).

As the history of honors indicates, honors education has been closely affiliated with liberal education from its beginnings (see pages 33-34). The current curriculum of honors programs also reflects a belief in the importance of the humanities in honors education. Not surprisingly, 40 of 59 directors responding to the questionnaire (68%) hold doctorates in some area of the humanities. As vocationalism continues to threaten the well-being of liberal education, at least in many universities, honors programs can serve the best interests of higher learning by continuing to be a force for liberal education.

The upper-level, individualized component of honors programs features in-depth study in a student's major field of interest, usually culminating in a senior year thesis or project and an oral examination. Senior projects should be closely advised by faculty in order to assure that their scope and design is appropriate to the discipline in which they are written. This project will generally involve research and analysis, something more than is generally expected from a term paper for a class, and will ideally
represent the finest scholarship of which the student is capable. A conventional research and analysis paper is not necessarily the only form the senior project might take. Students majoring in the fine arts, for example, might produce a portfolio or a performance with an accompanying shorter paper explicating their creative work.

The subsequent oral examination might bring together the student, honors director, primary faculty advisor, and other involved faculty who have read and evaluated the project. This oral exam asks students to defend, clarify, and amplify their work. Faculty ask questions initially about the specifics of the work and later about broader issues which relate to the work. While an effort should be made to retain an intellectual tension, more emphasis should be placed on generating a lively, somewhat informal discussion between colleagues and an emerging colleague, the student. Students should seldom fail the project or oral exam since they will have been alerted to shortcomings at checkpoints with the faculty advisor.

A key to successful completion of senior honors projects is a good relationship between students and their faculty advisors, often in the form of independent study. A promising innovation which tries to formalize and improve the quality of independent study is "contract learning," wherein a student develops an individual, tutorial learning arrangement with a faculty member. It differs from regular independent study in that it specifies subject areas to be covered, evaluation procedures and criteria, and time schedules. Honors programs might require that graduating honors seniors have such a contract learning experience as part of their senior project, a credit-generating experience which might strengthen the essential student-faculty relationship that is the cornerstone of upper-level honors study.
Student Recruitment and Selection. Most honors programs rely primarily on quantitative data such as GPA and ACT or SAT scores to identify and select students. Table 4.14 (page 75) shows that 93% of the programs use test scores, and 83% use high school grades to select entering freshmen. Only about half the programs require a written statement and only a third use personal interviews. Honors educators, however, have urged programs to identify students by more personal methods as well as by quantitative information. Cohen felt that honors selection should involve making full use of "predictive techniques, past records, entrance tests, and interviews, as well as of studies of aptitude, motivation, readiness, and achievement" (1966, p. 43). Austin (1975) noted that most programs rely on test scores and grades, but also warned,

But to rely on these measures alone is to miss those bright students who were underachievers in high school or who had a bad day when the test was administered. To rely on these measures alone is to overlook motivation -- a factor which may change almost overnight in adolescence. (p. 168)

A useful recruitment aid that some programs use is the ACT Student Profile Sheet, which provides such information as ACT scores, self-reported high school grades, extracurricular interests and activities in high school, interest in honors work, probable major and curriculum, and an indication of probable success in college in four subject areas. From this data programs can send letters to hundreds of potential honors freshmen inviting them to parents-students visiting sessions. Both the letters and visiting sessions can be friendly, informal, encouraging efforts, which not only are recruitment strategies for the honors program, but for the university as a whole.

Other recruitment methods are possible for students who attend high
schools proximate to the college. For example, honors staff and students who have recently graduated from area high schools may return to these high schools to encourage interest in honors by talking with National Honors Society students and others interested in honors study. Honors staff can also coordinate their efforts with high school counselors and teachers more so than most currently do. They can work, too, with regular university admissions staff, participating in regular college recruitment efforts, emphasizing honors options, distributing brochures and other written information, and responding to inquiries. These less mechanical methods of identifying potential honors students may be more effective because they are more personal.

Honors programs can recruit on-campus students by at least three methods. First, they can send letters to all students with a certain grade point average. As Table 4.16 (page 77) indicates, programs most frequently use minimum GPA standards of between 3.00 and 3.50; about a third of them require a college GPA of 3.50 or higher. Programs can also send letters each year to all university faculty, asking them to identify their outstanding students. This method may identify capable students who have not attained a high GPA. It is important that the faculty, who are closest to students, have an opportunity to identify and encourage good students into honors study. This invitation may also foster good will and faculty support for the program. Finally, honors programs might increasingly attract good students by being visible on campus, in part by sponsoring academic and cultural programs that have campus-wide appeal. A criticism frequently made of honors programs is that they do not adequately publicize their services.

Honors students can play an important role in recruiting entering students...
freshmen, because they can tell these students what the program is like from a student perspective, reassuring wary, anxious freshmen. They may be able to allay the understandable fears of many entering students that honors in college may be too difficult or take away from other interests and activities, such as music, drama, sports, or debate. A recent, unpublished study (Bianchini and Brewer, 1977) examined reasons why freshmen who were invited to join an honors program and who did attend the college chose not to enter the honors program. Of the 55 students who responded to the questionnaire, the following percentages of students listed these reasons for not joining the honors program:

- Classes too hard: 44%
- Take time away from
  - social life: 27%
  - studying: 24%
  - working: 11%
  - sports: 7%
- I'm not smart enough: 24%
- Just not interested: 22%
- Conflict with major: 20%
- Sounds too elitist: 16%

(From Bianchini and Brewer, 1977, p. 11)

Current honors students can put some of these apprehensions and misinformation to rest by talking openly and informally with potential honors students.

Honors programs are always faced with the question of how many and how diverse a group of students to admit (see pages 120-123). Some programs attract a large number of students, expecting that many will decide not to complete program requirements. Austin (1975) describes this more open enrollment approach:

In this open pattern the freshman year is seen as an introduction to honors work for a relatively large number of students, perhaps
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10-15% of the entering class, whereas at commencement it will be found that no more than 1-2% will have chosen to complete a full honors education. Between matriculation and graduation many students will have been served by honors courses and seminars, counseling, special programs, and comradeship with no stigma attached to the decision not to participate more fully. (pp. 165-6)

This approach is based on the assumption that as many students as possible should benefit from honors programming, particularly because college academic success cannot be predicted very accurately for entering freshmen.

Other programs place more confidence in their ability to select the "right"students and, thus, anticipate a smaller attrition rate. These programs may believe that dropping from an honors program can be stigmatizing and traumatic to some students who are not used to "failing." They also understand that trying to serve too many students may compromise a program's capacity to serve any students as well as they might. The quality-quantity issue is no more easily resolved in honors programs than in the rest of higher education.

Freshman Orientation. Nearly all colleges and universities have an orientation period for entering students, agreeing with the following rationale for it:

Orientation should be for most students an important step toward academic success and personal satisfaction . . . . With a strong diversified, well-planned orientation program, new students can be introduced to the physical campus, to the University's cultural and social resources, and to the breadth and variety of its academic programs. (Denenfeld, The All-University Committee on Undergraduate Education, Western Michigan University, 1971, p. 56)

Honors programs can enrich this experience for their entering freshmen by meeting with them earlier or longer than the regular period. Currently, however, only about half (27 of 57) of the programs in this study have
special orientations for their entering honors students.

The primary purpose of honors orientation in addition to the regular orientation period (certainly not to replace the regular activities) is for honors staff, faculty, and students to meet personally with entering students to advise them in choosing their first semester schedule of classes. They can talk with these students about their high school academic backgrounds, tentative academic interests, career goals, part-time work, extracurricular involvements, housing, and other factors which relate to their critical first semester of college. An informal, helpful, personal orientation atmosphere can begin to counteract the impersonal institutionalism of many large campuses.

Honors advisors should be concerned to coordinate their efforts with other university personnel to assure that students' honors involvements complement their other obligations. Increasingly honors students enter curricula in their freshman year which require courses that must be meshed with general honors programs. Honors programs must work with other colleges, even when they suspect, for instance, that students might benefit more from an initially more general, liberal program of studies.

Some honors programs might wish to include in their orientation an introduction to the community as well as the campus. For instance, one or two honors students might take a group of entering freshmen on a tour of the proximate, off-campus community, pointing out various cultural, educational, and even recreational settings, such as community libraries, theatres, nature centers, art centers, downtown areas of public institutions, banks, and other institutions which students might use while studying and living in the community.
Some programs might also find value in extending the orientation period to as long as several days. One ambitious plan might be an "Acclimatization Week," a camping outing designed to increase students' awareness of and sensitivity to their natural surroundings. More than a camping trip, this week of structured, purposeful outdoor activities would ideally enable students to more easily "get in touch with nature" and one another. Such a week together would also afford faculty and students an opportunity to explore topics and issues of mutual interest in casual group settings.

Another idea for extending freshman orientation for honors students might be called Freshman Explorations, a program which could consist of several mini-courses, each involving a faculty member, upper-level honors student, and ten freshmen. Each course might be a one-credit hour topical colloquium exploring an issue or theme of common interest to the group. The courses could revolve around shared ideas based on reading, life experience, and currently troubling or puzzling concerns. The process of learning how to learn might be emphasized rather than the acquisition of specific knowledge or skill development. The exploration groups would sometimes meet in addition to or instead of regular course meetings, in order to facilitate potluck dinners, theatre parties, field trips, and other nonclassroom activities. The overall goal of this and other programs designed to extend and enrich orientation periods is to assist students to integrate their personal, social, and academic lives as they enter their first semester of college.

Student Advising and Counseling. Advising and counseling should be differentiated. The former refers to all aspects of academic problems and progress, while the latter refers more to a professional, personal procedure directed at the solution of personal problems. Honors programs should take a
direct, active role in advising, but should serve more as a first-step, referral service for students wanting personal counseling, unless, of course, honors staff are professionally prepared to serve in such a role.

Good advising is essential to any program that emphasizes individual learning and student freedom to choose and act:

Greater student freedom, we believe, will require more, not less, academic advising. And we reject as unsound . . . that such advising, as well as the development of relevant academic programs, can rely largely on classroom or informal contacts between students and faculty. (Report of The All-University Committee on Undergraduate Education, Western Michigan University, 1971, p. 50)

Honors programs have long stressed the importance of sound academic advising. James Robertson speaks for honors educators when he notes the value of the advisor: "If the honors student is to get the attention he merits, the student - teacher relationship, as fruitful and essential as it is, must be supplemented by the availability of informed, interested faculty advisors" (1966, p. 68). He defines the honors advisor's function as being "to help each student shape an appropriate program of study and evaluate his experience critically and realistically so that he can make informed choices" (p. 70).

Most current honors programs offer advising for honors students, although the success of such service varies widely among programs. Sixty-three percent of them reported that they regularly advise honors students; most of the other programs rely on nonhonors faculty to advise honors students (see pp. 78-79 for further discussion).

The advising that programs begin with entering freshmen during orientation should continue throughout a student's career in honors. Honors advising for lower-level students will generally concern curricular choices, general program requirements, and accommodation to college life. Upper-level
students will have more use for advising related to graduate school applications, tests, and fellowships, as well as foreign study, senior honors project requirements, internships, and career plans. Some honors staff and faculty might, for instance, be able to read and critique honors seniors' fellowship and graduate school applications. Honors faculty can help the very best students become more competitive for national fellowships.

Comprehensive honors advising should be informal, accessible, and knowledgeable. During predictable peak advising periods honors staff can arrange special advising periods and convenient access to such advising. For example, honors staff might hold regularly scheduled annual meetings a few weeks after the semester begins or shortly before the next semester's registration period. They might take their offices to the students by holding advising hours in honors housing. They might schedule weekly open-door hours. Even in the very largest programs the honors director and his staff should be available to the students who have need for advising. Honors directors should find time to talk with all honors students at least twice in their careers, once upon entry, and once during the senior year to discuss the senior project and postgraduate plans. Of course, programs should also have numerous other, more informal occasions for honors faculty, staff, and students to come together.

Honors programs should consider "peer advising," which enables upper-level students to assist honors freshmen and sophomores with various concerns. Most honors freshmen indicate at least tentative curricular choices. With this information a program might connect freshmen with upper-level students who have similar curricular interests plus some experience. These
upperclass student advisors can pass along helpful, if-I-knew-then-what-I-know-now suggestions. The character of peer advising should be informal, nonprofessional discussion between students interested in similar curricula; it is meant to complement, not replace, regular honors and university advising and counseling.

Honors Housing. The provision of special housing arrangements for honors students is a relatively recent development in honors education. Honors programs began in small, selective liberal arts colleges in which all students, honors and nonhonors, were housed proximate to one another in living quarters that were conducive to study. As programs were established in the larger, less selective state institutions following World War Two, the concept of providing not only special curricular advantages, but also special housing, for honors students began to emerge.

Honors housing was an issue raised by James Robertson, former honors director at the University of Michigan:

The question of whether or not there should be special honors residential units sparks lively debate. Abler students are frequently unhappy over the nonintellectual tone of most college dormitories. On the other hand, many of them are reluctant to be set apart in special residences. Practically all vehemently oppose and requirement that they live in such an establishment. Perhaps the best resolution is to provide honors housing for those who want it, and to allow for easy transfer. (1966, p. 73)

Currently, however, only 20% of the honors programs responding to the study questionnaire offer special housing for their students (see page 81).

Honors programs in small institutions may have no real need for honors housing, since their students may live near one another already. At larger institutions, however, a concentration of honors students in one residence hall and perhaps on one or two floors, may facilitate friendships and
camaraderie among students who might otherwise not get to know one another except through occasional shared classes. As Robertson pointed out, some students are wary of honors housing, suspecting that they may be housed and isolated with dull intellectuals or social recluses. Of course, this is not the case, as honors students represent as lively and well-rounded a group of students as there is on campus. Nonetheless, to avoid more subtle distinctions or apprehensions, it may be well to mix honors and nonhonors students in honors housing, so that while honors students may live close to one another, they are not identified as a wholly separate living group. Such an arrangement would still meet the objective of providing a living atmosphere conducive to serious study and informal interaction between bright, motivated students.

Another advantage of honors housing is that it facilitates extracurricular programming. Programs may schedule activities, hold meetings, or conduct advising sessions in such housing. An honors student housing committee might coordinate activities between staff and students. It might, for example, compile an Interest Exchange Bulletin, which is a list of names and room numbers of honors students, indicating their main interests, skills, and involvements which they would like to share, teach, or learn. Such an idea might enhance the discovery among students of mutual interests, often the basis for lasting friendships. Some honors programs have discovered that students who become friends in honors housing maintain these friendships and continue living together as they move off campus into houses and apartments, sustaining community where it is most often difficult, among upper-level honors students. It seems that more than 20% of the honors programs should be working with their housing offices to offer some honors housing option for their students.
Extracurricular Activities. While certainly not subscribing to the popular cliche, "Don't let classes interfere with your education," honors educators would agree that much learning takes place outside formal classrooms, particularly in the informal association of faculty and students. Arthur Chickering (1969) brought together data from several studies in support of his conclusion that "when student-faculty interaction is frequent and friendly and when it occurs in diverse situations calling for varied roles, development of intellectual competence, sense of competence, autonomy, and purpose are fostered" (p. 153).

The literature on honors programs has given little consideration to the role that extracurricular activities should play in honors education. Most honors educators, while they may affirm the value of such activity, seem to perceive it as tangential to honors programming. Table 4.17 (p. 82) shows that while 79% of the programs sponsored some or much academically-related extracurricular activity, 57% sponsored some or much social activity, and only 22% sponsored at least some outdoor activity. One gets the impression that while honors programs began as almost completely curricular programs, they are increasingly providing some extracurriculars to supplement their primary academic objectives.

Honors programs can and should make an effort to sponsor some extracurricular activities for their students. While many honors students will rely on other sources for such activity, a percentage of them will probably be grateful for the opportunities provided to attend social and cultural events with other honors students and faculty. Programs can not only organize these events themselves, but can encourage their students to take full
advantage of the wealth of cultural and academic programs that generally abound in university communities. Many settings offer students an almost staggering array of theatre, music, art, lectures, and other events from which to choose. Honors programs can encourage student participation by advertising them, by arranging student-faculty parties to them, and by encouraging faculty to incorporate them into their classes where appropriate.

Most extracurriculars should be organized by students, often a difficult task in a society which has encouraged the passive consumption of experiences, rather than active planning of and involvement in them. Students both gain organizational experience and responsibility and are more enthusiastic about activities that derive from their own interest, initiative, and organization.

Outdoor activities would seem to be a particularly promising way for honors students and faculty to interact socially and intellectually, for they provide relatively inexpensive, quiet settings in which an increasing number of students seem to have an interest and enjoyment. With regard to these and other extracurricular activities honors programs should adopt the same goal that informs their curricular offerings -- to promote learning experiences that are excellent and challenging, and which stimulate personal and intellectual growth. These ideals can be realized by faculty-student outings to the big city or natural area in addition to classroom study.

Evaluation. Evaluation of honors programs, including courses and instruction, received very little attention until Cohen and the ICSS called attention to its importance by enlisting the aid of evaluation
and research specialists and by promoting the need for evaluation through articles in *The Superior Student* (see pp. 37-40 for further discussion of the development of evaluation in honors).

Questionnaire data indicates that honors programs still do not engage in as much systematic evaluation as they probably should. More than a quarter of the programs reported having no formal evaluation procedures for determining the effectiveness of their courses or overall programs. Only about 20% of the programs undergo formal, regular program evaluation every two to five years. Nearly half of them have had no regular communication with their graduates, a good way of judging program results (see pp. 84-85 for further discussion).

Careful, systematic evaluation of honors instruction seems critical to the success of honors programs, particularly because honors faculty usually come from different colleges and departments in the university and may not share a common understanding of the expectations, methods, and standards used in particular honors courses. It would seem that more than 40% of the reporting honors programs in this study should have formal, ongoing evaluation of their courses and faculty.

Programs might evaluate their courses in two ways. Students could complete formal course and instructor evaluations, to be used by honors staff in assessing the effectiveness of particular classes. These evaluations might do more than measure the extent to which students enjoyed the course or thought the instructor was effective. They might include an objective and open-ended evaluation of four different aspects of a learning experience. The following evaluation criteria are used by the Honors College at Western Michigan University; honors students write objective and open-ended responses
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for each of their honors courses according to the following format:

1. Instructor
   - a. understanding of subject matter
   - b. communication of enthusiasm for learning
   - c. effectiveness of relating to students
   - d. course organization
   - e. respect for others' views
   - f. met class regularly and on time

2. Course
   - a. contained meaningful content
   - b. class time interesting and stimulating
   - c. relevance of books and other teaching materials
   - d. effectiveness of tests, papers, and other assignments

3. Learning Outcomes
   - a. thinking and reasoning capabilities
   - b. speaking and verbal communication abilities
   - c. writing abilities
   - d. reading comprehension abilities
   - e. extent to which learning has enriched daily life

4. Students Own Participation in Course
   - a. class attendance
   - b. class attentiveness and participation
   - c. accomplished class assignments
   - d. related class learning to other classes and daily life

The value of this instrument is that it attempts not only to measure the course and instructor, but also the student's own involvement and what was actually learned. The emphasis shifts from "being taught" to "learning."

A second way programs can evaluate their offerings is by asking the teaching faculty to write evaluations of their experience in the honors class, discussing their estimation of what and how much the students learned, comparing the honors section to nonhonors sections of the same class, and describing any curricular or instructional innovations which they used. Honors instructors should also receive results of the student evaluations.
after the course has concluded in order to give them feedback and help them plan future honors courses.

Programs should attempt to evaluate not only their courses, but other aspects of their operations, even extracurricular programs. Students who participate in weekend workshops or field trips can evaluate these experiences and suggest improvements. Programs should also send questionnaires to their graduates to discover how these alumni perceive their honors education and what aspects of it have been most and least useful to them in subsequent study, work, and living. Programs should also invite periodic evaluation of their total programs by outside evaluators. Comprehensive, systematic evaluation is crucial to the well-being of any dynamic organization, and honors programs are certainly no exception.

Curricular Innovation. As the review of honors literature has indicated (see pp. 32-35, 42+), honors programs have been innovative forces in some areas of curriculum. They have pioneered on many campuses interdisciplinary seminars, particularly in the humanities. Yet, the analysis of data derived from the questionnaire in this study suggests that many honors programs are no longer searching for new subject matters or new approaches to traditional subject matters. While Table 4.21 (p. 94) reveals that honors programs are still much inclined toward interdisciplinary courses, it also indicates that other areas of curricular and instructional innovation are perceived less positively. Other data revealed that little honors innovation is currently underway in curricular areas (see pp. 95-104). What follows are some suggestions for curricular areas in which honors programs might offer more courses and other learning opportunities.

Honors programs should continue to offer exciting interdisciplinary
courses, in which "individuals trained in different fields of knowledge with different concepts, methods, data, and terms (are) organized into a common effort on a common problem with continuous communication among the participants" (Saeger, 1976, p. 2). Despite factors discouraging interdisciplinary courses, such as increasing departmentalism, institutional formalization (in part a by-product of faculty unionization), and the abuse the concept has taken from courses which are interdisciplinary in name only, honors programs should strive to continue promoting team-taught, multidisciplinary courses. As Dean McHenry (1977) has recently stated,

Especially in undergraduate work there is a need for a breadth of study that comes not only from a student taking courses in departments other than his own, but also from associating with faculty members and other students who read and think and talk in multidisciplinary ways . . . the major criticism is that conventional departments foster a specialization and particularism that narrows the horizons of both students and professors. (p. 132)

Many honors programs have established interdisciplinary courses in the humanities, relating to the study of Western Civilization. They need also to develop more courses in the social and natural sciences that address the critical questions of contemporary life, such as medical ethics, social biology, the energy crisis, and the personal and social consequences of rapid technological change. Programs might also encourage students to construct their own majors and minors from various departments. Honors students should be encouraged to choose courses and learning experiences from many departments and sources that can contribute to learning in the primary academic interest area. Intensive, in-depth study is no less possible in interdisciplinary curricula than in those which relate to a single academic department. Of course there is an administrative
difficulty that some programs face in structuring such interdisciplinary courses and programs when they have little control over faculty and graduation requirements. Nonetheless, honors programs can promote excellent interdisciplinary study in their institutions by encouraging and assisting faculty and students to organize interdisciplinary courses and studies.

Honors programs should offer more learning opportunities that involve affective educational outcomes. In the past the honors movement has been little concerned with the affective function of education, which has been defined by McMurrin (1967) as

pertaining to the practical life -- to the emotions, the passions, the dispositions and motives, the moral and esthetic sensibilities, the capacity for feeling, concern, attachment or detachment, sympathy, empathy, and appreciation. ("What Tasks For the Schools"? Saturday Review, p. 41)

Programs today rarely offer affectively oriented courses or programs, nor do the directors perceive this area of curriculum as particularly relevant to their program goals, as Table 4.21 shows. Fifty-nine percent of the directors feel that interpersonal process instruction has little or no value in their programs. Honors programs have always emphasized cognitional rather than affective learning.

Honors programs have not been alone in favoring cognitive over affective content. Weinstein and Fantini (1970) have noted this and argue for a more affective, humanistic curriculum:

Rarely is curriculum designed to help the student deal in personal terms with the problems of human conduct (p. 17) . . . . Our present educational system gives highest priority to cognitive content and regards other content areas merely as instruments for getting to prescribed cognitive content. The prevailing assumption is that by mastering cognitive content, the individual learns to behave appropriately as a citizen in the open society. We question the validity
of this assumption that extrinsic subject matter alone can lead to humanistic behavior ... our proposal is to reverse the direction of the prevailing cognitive emphasis. We suggest that knowledge alone does not adequately produce the behavior necessary to such a society. The chances of affecting behavior will be greater if the learner's feelings and concerns are recognized and made to direct the cognition that logically should follow and if cognition is used to help the learner cope with his concerns. (pp. 31-32)

These authors have designed a model for an affective curriculum, one that offers a structure for beginning to utilize some of the "at least 350 major approaches to dealing with psychological growth and some 3,000 affective exercises and techniques (that) have been identified" (p. 220).

Certainly there is a need to address questions of personal growth and well-being among college students. A recent documentary, "College Can Be Killing," examined the prevalence of and causes for college student suicides. The National Center for Health Statistics reports that the rate of suicide for young people between the ages of 15 and 19 has trebled since 1950, while the rate of increase for other age groups has been barely 10% (Kalamazoo Gazette, June 27, 1978, p. C-8). The same article reported that officials at the University of Wisconsin estimate that at least 200-300 students seriously attempt or threaten suicide every year at their school. Other social scientists have noted "the new anomie" of contemporary youth:

the students I saw wanted to escape their own emotions ... the essence of fragmentation -- the sense of life and relationships as a succession of experiences without meaning or purpose -- is embraced by young people as a necessity, the means of concealing their own feelings and avoiding the emotions of others. (Hendin, 1975, p. 26)

Honors programs can complement their cognitive offerings with affective courses which help students to develop self-awareness, sensitivity to others, and interpersonal communication skills. Certainly much affective
education has lacked the essential excellence and challenge of honors education at its best, as critics are keen to point out. Yet, honors programs need not be bound by mistakes or inadequacies of the past. Models, such as that designed by Weinstein and Fantini, are being tested. Change Magazine described 15 "Personal Growth" related courses and programs that have been tried and enthusiastically endorsed by colleges and universities in a recent five-report series on innovations in higher education (vol. 10, 1). Honors programs should appreciate the harmony between affective and cognitive learning and offer courses that reflect it.

Honors programs should also offer more curriculum relating to values, ethics, and moral development. Sociologists and educators have noted that as traditional institutions, such as the family, church, and local neighborhood, teach and instill values less frequently and with less authority than they once did, the obligation falls more to the schools. John Dewey (1938) presented the challenge that many others have since posed: "Hence, it is argued that growth is not enough; we must also specify the direction which growth takes place, the end toward which it tends" (p. 75).

Value-based education for moral development is often a hidden agenda rather than an overt goal of many schools and programs, for teaching values is often assumed to necessitate an entirely subjective approach, risking dogmatism and confusion over "whose values?" Yet, this need not be the case. Kohlberg (1972), for example, has developed pieces of a curriculum which facilitate students' sequential development through seven stages of logical and moral reasoning. He says,

Because there are culturally universal stages or sequences of moral development, stimulation of the child's development to the next step in a natural direction is equivalent to a long range goal of teaching
ethical principles. Because the development of these principles is natural they are not imposed on the child -- he chooses them himself. (p. 475)

Kohlberg has taught a popular freshman course at Harvard which consists of small group discussions of moral dilemmas, accompanied by lectures and reading designed to raise basic issues in moral philosophy and the psychology of personal development.

Agreeing with Kohlberg and others that moral development can and should be an aim of higher education, Derek Bok, President of Harvard, has stated that Educators have a responsibility to contribute in any way they can to the moral development of their students . . . . students in these courses will become more alert in perceiving ethical issues, more aware of the reasons underlying moral principles, and more equipped to reason carefully in applying these principles to concrete cases. (1976, p. 30)

Harvard's newly revised undergraduate core curriculum requires two courses in Social and Philosophical Analysis, "each organized around selected topics or themes chosen for their effectiveness in demonstrating how social scientists and philosophers think about social and moral issues" ("Harvard Weighs Plan to Reform Curriculum," The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVI [2], p. 15). In the same article they state their rationale for such a core requirement: "It may well be that the most significant quality in educated persons is the informed judgment which enables them to make discriminating moral choices" (p. 15).

Earl McGrath, an elder statesman and authority on higher education, recently stressed the importance of teaching values in college and remarked, "How to teach values is not to set up a three-hour course in Modern American Values . . . . The solution, I think, is to get the people who teach the
various disciplines to consider the value implications of what they are teaching" (The Chronicle of Higher Education, XVI [6], p. 4). Honors programs can promote the teaching of values in their curricula by exploring the ideas of Kohlberg and others who are designing systematic considerations of moral and ethical questions. More importantly, however, they can take McGrath's advice and select and encourage faculty who are willing and able to provide excellent learning opportunities for students in these areas.

There are other areas of curriculum in which one might argue that honors programs should offer more courses, such as writing, languages, and non-Western culture and society. Generally, honors educators should attempt to develop and offer learning opportunities as they perceive and as their students suggest that there is an interest and a need. For example, one honors program designed a course called "University Governance," responding to the need for honors and nonhonors student leaders to gain a greater understanding of the formal and informal university decision-making processes. The rationale for the course was that students who more fully understand the structure and governance of the university are better able to represent student interests and take full advantage of what the school has to offer.

In general, then, curricular innovation in honors programs might involve additional course work and other learning opportunities in the areas of interdisciplinary study, affective education, and education for moral and ethical development. As honors educators have observed, the honors movement has been more concerned to provide alternative instructional methods than course content. The following section
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offers some suggestions for instructional innovations which honors programs might consider.

Instructional Innovation. There is a wealth of exciting, promising instructional innovation on the market. Universities fund instructional development offices for the purpose of improving college teaching. An extensive literature provides much information on (and some evaluation of) new learning methods being tried at some colleges. Entire colleges, such as Hampshire College, Evergreen State College, and Metropolitan State College, build whole programs around radically new educational methodologies and philosophies. New instructional technologies and delivery systems make available an array of new learning ideas and opportunities.

Yet, there is an apparent paradox, for in most colleges, departments, and individual classrooms the traditional teaching methods (lecture - discussion - note-taking - testing) continue. Most learning continues to rely on teaching, which continues to rely on the "banking" concept of instruction, in which a teacher "deposits" information into students, drawing "interest" where possible. Instructional innovation appears to be much talked and written about and much less frequently actually tried. This seems to be true in honors programs as much as with the rest of higher education. Honors education emphasizes alternative learning methods, but such nontraditional instruction is mostly variations of the small, interdisciplinary seminar and independent study and research, which are no longer experimental or innovative on most campuses. As Table 4.21 (p. 94) and the data analysis (pp. 97-109) have indicated, little honors experimentation or innovation is apparent in many other areas of new learning methods.

Certainly it is not easy for honors programs to initiate new ideas.
One of several reasons why it is difficult to innovate in higher education is that many faculty resist trying new teaching methodologies.

Patricia Cross (1976) remarks,

It is hard to explain why college professors, who are so curious and experimental in the pursuit of improvements and better answers within their own disciplines should be so conservative in the practice of their profession. (p. 10)

Leon Mayhew (1970), another authority on American higher education, adds,

Among traditional vices faculty conservatism is the most endemic and hurtful. College professors do not like educational change and will not undertake it unless forced by an external power (for example, students), bribed by financial inducements, or persuaded by powerful leaders. The great innovations in higher education were all generated outside the faculty and imposed over faculty opposition. (p. 69)

Not all faculty, of course, resist educational change. Researchers have pointed out organizational as well as personal factors blocking educational innovation. One team of researchers concluded that there were four basic barriers to implementing instructional innovation:

1. lack of clarity about the innovation; not clear about the kinds of role performances necessary to carry out the changes

2. lack of capacity to perform the new role model; lack skills and knowledge to perform new roles, including new relationships to students

3. incompatible organizational arrangements; the necessary supportive changes in the structure and administration of the school are lacking

4. lack of motivation to implement innovation; new methodologies require time, effort, and risk, which will not be expended if administrative support is lacking or if other felt responsibilities, particularly research, are pressing (Gross, et. al., 1971, pp. 122-47)

These and other factors work against the application of new learning methods which may supplement more than replace traditional methods. The purpose of such innovation is not to discover any best way of teaching, but to apply the most effective, appropriate learning strategies to particular
situations and for individual students. That honors programs have pioneered and continued to rely primarily on seminars and independent study should not lead them to conclude that none of the instructional innovations currently being tried are appropriate to their programs.

A promising, increasingly popular alternative instructional method is personalized, self-paced, modular instruction, generally called Personalized System Instruction (PSI), a concept largely developed in the 1960's by Fred Keller, an American behavioral psychologist. There are five characteristics of PSI, separately familiar to most educators, but innovative when synthesized into a continuous process. While it seems most applicable to mathematics or science courses, its proponents claim that it is also adaptable to humanities and social science courses.

In a PSI course critical content is divided into sequential units of study, each requiring unit perfection by students. PSI recognizes that students learn at different rates and that mastery of content, not the time to do it, is important. Students work and take quizzes at their own pace, which is possible because course content and materials are available in permanent written form, rather than in situational lectures. PSI uses peer proctors, students who have previously performed well in the course, primarily to evaluate unit mastery quizzes. This proctor is not a disseminator of information, but does free the teacher from dealing with routine administrative duties in order to facilitate handling the more complex issues that the course may entail.

PSI is catching on in much of higher education. A center was established in 1973 to promote the idea through national workshops, conferences,
and publications. Enthusiastic claims are made for it:

Literally hundreds of studies in more than fifty disciplines, from poetry to nuclear engineering, from elementary grades to medical schools, have left little doubt that self-paced courses produce better academic performance, both short-term and long-term, and that they are better liked than more traditional courses. (Semb, cited in Maggarrell, 1976, p. 6)

In 1970 Temple Buell College committed half of its undergraduate courses to PSI, reporting that while freshmen have some trouble because they have not yet learned to budget their time well, the system has worked well with older students: "Not only is content learned better under these arrangements, but the intangibles -- interest, enthusiasm, and so on -- are also acquired" (Milton, 1972, p. 73).

One reason that PSI is not used more widely is that it is a difficult system to design and administer for the first time. Teachers must be able to devise study guides and revise conventional role behaviors in order to coordinate and manage a more loosely structured course. It also conflicts with the basic educational philosophy of some educators. The grade loses much of its traditional meaning in a mastery-based system in which most students can earn "A's". PSI also diminishes what many teachers believe to be an essential personal contact with students. The master-apprentice, socratic approach is not a feature of PSI, and is apparently not much missed by pro-PSI educators, including Gilbert Sherman (1976), one of its co-founders:

The belief that students should be taught by experts has been an expensive mistake. There is an uncomfortable gap between a person who knows all about something and someone who knows nothing about it. Experts tend to give more complex answers than are called for by the question asked. (1976, cited in Maggarrell, p. 6)

Of course, close faculty-student interaction, a feature of the best honors education, should not be sacrificed to PSI. Honors programs might experiment with it, however, perhaps even adapting it to emphasize and enlarge
the lecture-discussion aspect, in order to try for the best of both worlds.

A related innovation that honors programs might consider is learning based on **competency-based evaluation**, which as Burrill (1976) notes, is a new concept in higher education, being explored and tested throughout the United States. Curriculum is being recast to put forth specific goals and measurable achievements while allowing students to find their own routes by various means. These competency-based systems stress clear demonstration of ability through a variety of evaluation methods. (p. 132)

Like PSI, it helps to personalize learning and free students from structured time units. Students study material or assume tasks until they wish to demonstrate that they have mastered them, by passing written and oral exams or otherwise giving evidence of attainment. A single course, a sequence of courses, or an entire undergraduate program may use this method, although as Burrill notes, "Those who are curious about this educational approach outnumber those who have tested it or who have designed programs through which specific competencies can be identified and demonstrated by students" (p. 132).

Hampshire College conducts all its studies according to a competency-based system. Students pass through three divisions (Basic Studies, Concentration, Advance Studies) with no required courses or accumulation of credits necessary for graduation. Rather they pass examinations at each level, which are taken when students and their faculty advisors feel they are prepared. They are ungraded (pass/fail), designed by students as well as faculty, and take many forms, although all ideally measure certain, specific competencies in each division. The freedom students have from traditional requirements necessitates self-discipline and self-motivation; they commonly go through a period of "creative floundering" before more fully accepting
responsibility for their own educations. The system also requires comprehensive, labor-intensive advising and counseling services for students as they attempt to shape and sustain individualized learning programs.

Competency-based evaluation is also offered on an institution-wide scale at Alverno College, where students get no credits or grades, but must earn 40 "competency units" in eight general education and skill areas. Not surprisingly, both Hampshire and Alverno are small institutions which place a premium on faculty advising. More honors programs, which are also usually relatively small and offer good counseling for generally motivated students, might consider experimenting with courses or even programs that evaluate student learning on an individual, competency-based system.

Related to competency-based evaluation is the issue of accelerated studies based on credit by examination, a feature of some honors programs. Advanced placement enables students to move at their own pace and have educational experiences suited to their talents, particularly when it is firmly based on demonstrated attainment. Honors programs, however, must establish appropriate guidelines for its use. Entering freshmen honors students, for example, can in some colleges earn up to 30 hours of credit by passing the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) tests. When CLEP credit satisfies general education requirements, which are often most of a student's exposure to liberally educating courses in college, it may erode rather than promote excellent honors education. The value of general and liberal education is measured less by the possession of specific knowledge as demonstrated in a set of objective tests than it is by the personal, social, and intellectual process of acquiring knowledge. Honors
programs should conceive of acceleration in most cases as a vehicle for enriching, not replacing, undergraduate honors study.

New instructional technologies make use of various media resources and computers. They are commonly thought to respond mostly to the needs of non-traditional, off-campus students by creating flexible, innovative delivery systems. They are also associated with providing large numbers of students information on a one-way, impersonal but inexpensive basis. Honors programs have been little involved or interested in these developments (see Table 4.21, p. 94 and pp. 102-3), for they enroll primarily traditional, full-time students on campus and rely on small, personal classes. Nonetheless, honors programs may want to more fully and effectively use media- and computer-assisted instruction, particularly as it is able to supplement both traditional and nontraditional learning, rather than to make a budget-conscious compromise to classroom faculty-student interaction.

Instructional media such as films, slides, tapes, and sound recordings can serve as supplements to lecture and discussion modes of instruction more often and effectively than most instructors use them. In some cases instruction that uses technology can make available information that students might otherwise not have access to. Instructional media proponents claim, in fact, that the involvement of different senses in the receiving of information often leads to a more integrated understanding of a given topic. While honors programs may not offer curriculum in computer programming and usage if it is otherwise available at the college, they may offer courses considering the implication and possibilities of computers in our personal and social lives. Such study is relevant and important in our efforts to produce and manage a humane and social technology.
Implementable ideas for using instructional technology to improve undergraduate teaching are plentiful. The Change Magazine series of reports on teaching (see references) describes 25 innovative course experiences employing multi-media and 17 using computer-related procedures. Offices of Instructional Communications and Instructional Development have many more good ideas. Honors programs can get ideas from the literature and experiment with their own multi-media teaching projects; most colleges have authorities in these fields who can assist.

The potential benefit of interpersonal process techniques has already been suggested when discussing affective education. These methods are instructional procedures that establish interpersonal situations that are unusual in most academic settings, even in most small discussion classes. These methods frequently derive from a belief in the significance of sensitive, effective intrapersonal and interpersonal communication, closely associated with "the human potential" or "humanistic psychology" camps. Within these temporary, consciously interpersonal environments, faculty and students are able to play leadership, participant, or observer roles related to affective or combined affective and cognitive outcomes. These include enhanced observational skills, personal development, sensitivity to and knowledge about interpersonal and group dynamics, increased leadership and management abilities, as well as cognitive development.

A particular type of this interpersonal process method is simulation and gaming. Simulation refers to the deliberate effort to construct a model of reality, and gaming occurs when participants take on roles, play out parts, and make decisions in the context of a designed model. An advantage of these learning games is that students are able to experience actively a
model of reality which approximates real life experience at relatively little cost in time and money. Proponents of these techniques have written that

they are particularly valuable because students' decisions are, for the most part, clearly consequential and thus provide for immediate feedback while allowing for objective evaluations. By requiring students to interact cooperatively and competitively with one another, most games are thought to promote emotional growth and facilitate socialization into adult roles. ("Alternatives For Learning," Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education report, 1976, p. 3)

While honors courses and extracurricular activities include some of these interpersonal growth objectives, they differ from the more explicitly structured and closely monitored processes referred to in this area. Detractors of these learning situations argue, in fact, that the situations are too staged and contrived to reflect accurately "real life" situations. Many doubt also the ability to realize cognitional learning objectives through techniques which use, even emphasize, verbal and behavioral interaction based on emotions. Certainly honors programs should not become branch offices of the Esalen Institute. They can, however, provide more curricular and extracurricular learning opportunities based on some of these processes, calling on some of the faculty expertise and experience available on most campuses. Students have demonstrated a desire and a need for curriculum and instructional processes in these areas.

Experiential education, which is not really innovative to most programs, refers to "learning by doing." Dewey (1964) described the experiential level of learning as follows:

To "learn from experience" is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions doing becomes trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction -- discovery of the connection of things. (p. 140)
Honors programs can increasingly encourage and promote experiential learning opportunities through internships, undergraduate assistantships, and "direct encounter courses."

Programs can help students coordinate internships with community professionals, such as lawyers, doctors, businessmen, public officials, media persons, teachers, and others who work in settings and careers that afford students an opportunity to learn by performing, observing, and questioning. When internships are sustained by both parties, not an easy task, they offer the chance for students to complement classroom study with field work and to preview potential postgraduate careers by "getting a feel" for the work and the setting in which they are interested. A curricular idea related to the internship concept is an "education in community" course, which might include three related activities to assist a student in using the whole community as a learning resource. In this course students would read and discuss literature that describes how and why education should be a function of the total community, rather than the exclusive business of specialized institutions. Students would also engage in semester-long "mini-internships" in the community, perhaps related to their academic and career interests. They would share their internship experiences with classmates in weekly discussion settings, relating actual experiences to reading. They might also participate in field trips and cultural events in the community which are educationally rich, such as visits to the art center, nature center, civic theatre, local businesses, public administration offices, and other settings. Students might increasingly realize that formal schooling is only one among many settings for education, and that as they rely less on schools for their life-long
educational efforts, they will begin to take fuller advantage of the wealth of community resources facilitating such learning. Honors programs can also help their students to take advantage of the wealth of internship programs that are sponsored by other educational and governmental institutions at the local, state, and national levels.

Undergraduate assistantships are another vehicle for experiential learning. They connect students with faculty or community professionals in scholarly, experiential enterprises in which students assist faculty with their research or teaching or community professionals with their various endeavors. Modest stipends, rather than academic credit, might be awarded to students, not so much as a financial incentive or reward, but to help defray money lost when students work on assistantships rather than other part-time jobs. The idea in the assistantship relationship of student to faculty member or community professional is to encourage mutually beneficial interaction between the two; students learn by doing and their mentors or sponsors ideally benefit from the product of their labors.

A related curricular idea is to learn about something by having a "direct encounter" with it, rather than reading about or discussing others' experiences with the phenomenon. A "Direct Encounter With the Arts" course, for example, might adopt a sensory approach to the humanities. Instead of just reading about and discussing the cultural, creative world, students could have first-hand experience with it in a number of areas: cinema, photography, theatre, music, poetry, dance, and architecture. They might attend a performance, talk with artists, and write about and discuss their experiences. Students might even perform themselves, the clearest expression

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of learning by doing. While honors educators and others realize that not all experience naturally or automatically results in personal, social, or intellectual growth, they can increasingly provide structured, faculty-advised, well planned experiential learning opportunities for students.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

Research is needed on two levels-- in individual programs, carried out by honors faculty and students, and on a larger, multi-program scale by interested educational researchers. Most individual honors programs could benefit by learning more about the interests, needs, and learning goals of their students in order to more effectively serve them. With increased awareness of where students "are coming from," what they believe about their personal lives and social issues, and what their immediate and longer range goals are, honors programs can more surely fit meaningful curricula to students rather than students to curricula.

Researchers should compare honors student characteristics and attitudes to those of their nonhonors peers. Are there differences beyond academic preparation and achievement that suggest curricular or instructional innovations? Should honors students have different as well as more challenging studies? A difficult but necessary research area involves asking the question, "So what?" Do honors programs really make a measurable, discernable difference in students' educations and achievements? What is the value added of an honors education? Answering these questions requires longitudinal research which examines and compares the entry and graduation levels of honors and nonhonors students. It also necessitates comparing the postgraduate careers
of honors and nonhonors graduates. Researchers will realize, of course, that there are other factors that impinge on the variables used to compare honors and nonhonors students, some of which might limit what can be learned about the effects and consequences of honors education.

Another area for study involves learning research in honors courses. On an individual program level studies can be conducted which enable honors staff to know more about their methods of instruction, not only by formal course evaluations but by thoughtful discussion with honors faculty and students. While many honors classes are described as discussion classes, for example, how much time does the teacher actually lecture and dominate discussion compared to genuine student participation and other course input? As noted elsewhere in this paper, more evaluative research is needed of honors classes, instructors, and general programs.

Even if honors educators are aware of the content and instructional methods used in their courses, can they relate differences in curriculum and instructional arrangements to measurable performance levels? Do honors students who have had nontraditional study experience learn more or demonstrate higher academic, personal, or social achievement levels than other students? While nontraditional learning must be evaluated, in part, by testing for performance attainments on examinations, it is more importantly and appropriately tested by devising sophisticated "learning resourcefulness" instruments which attempt to ascertain enthusiasm for learning, ability to learn independently, and development of a spirit of critical inquiry. An area equally difficult to measure, but still important, is the comparative effect of traditional and nontraditional learning on students' attitudes and values.

In considering the relationship between honors education and instructional
innovation, perhaps the most needed research is that which attempts to
determine the impact of particular innovations on student achievement.
Researchers might use several instructional arrangement variables to
try to determine what aspects of the teaching and learning process are
most effective: the nature of the delivery system (lecture, reading, small
group discussion, use of technological and interpersonal processes, etc.),
amount of time spent in class, testing and evaluation methods, changing in­
structor and student roles, and use of nontraditional faculty.

Researchers might review the considerable literature which has already
begun to address these questions. At least one team of researchers, in fact,
has studied the effectiveness of different college level teaching methods
and has concluded from a review of studies in this area, "These data demon­
strate clearly and unequivocally that there is no measurable differences
among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when measured by
student performance on final examinations" (Milton, 1972, pp. 21-22).
This conclusion is a challenging one. Educational innovators and researchers
must devise instructional evaluation procedures and criteria which effectively
measure the outcomes of curricular and instructional innovation. Honors
educators should be among those interested and experimenting agents in the
university which are informed by such research and consider it when devising
their curricula.

Conclusions

The main purpose of honors programs has been and continues to be
the provision of challenging learning opportunities for bright, motivated
undergraduate students. Toward this end these programs have relied primarily
on interdisciplinary seminars and independent study. In these areas they have pioneered needed innovation and influenced higher education to the point where these methods are established in most colleges. Honors programs have not, however, been a leader in initiating or promoting promising new learning content areas and methods.

Honors programs can and should both continue to refine traditional education and also increasingly experiment with new learning ideas. They best challenge bright students by experimenting with, not dismissing as inappropriate or unhelpful, some of the curricular and instructional areas of innovation suggested in this paper. They assume a leadership role in their institutions both by promoting high academic standards and by adapting and responding to changing personal and social requirements that are not mere fads or whims, but legitimate responses to evolving social, cultural, and economic conditions. Honors programs can promote not more and better schooling, but more and better learning, encouraging students to be less, not more, dependent on schools for their educational attainments. To do this they must be continually willing, as Aydelotte put it half a century ago, to "break out of the academic lockstep."

One way to break out is to realize that honors education is constantly in need of improvement, and that there are many possible expressions of excellence, challenge, and creativity that are stimulated and nourished in ways not yet fully recognized or employed by most programs. The ideal of honors programs should be not to prepare students for the future, but to prepare the future for students. This study strives to make a modest contribution toward that immodest end.
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APPENDICES

FIRST LETTER TO HONORS DIRECTORS

SECOND LETTER TO HONORS DIRECTORS

QUESTIONNAIRE: HONORS PROGRAMS AND INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION
September 20, 1977

Dear Honors Program Director:

I am an assistant in the Honors College at Western Michigan University, and am writing my doctoral thesis on the relationship between honors programs and innovative, nontraditional higher education. The viability of honors programs in an era of increasing accountability and retrenchment is dependent, in part, on careful research and evaluation. I hope that this study will advance the cause of honors programs in higher education by providing information and some insight toward making reasoned decisions about them.

Will you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by October 20, 1977? I realize this questionnaire is not one which can be easily and quickly completed. However, I very much need your thoughtful perspective and judgment, as well as specific program information, in considering the relationship between honors and innovation.

This questionnaire is being sent to the administrative heads of all honors programs in the National Collegiate Honors Council. I hope to share some initial study results with you at the Fall NCHC meeting, and to make available a more complete report in the Spring.

Your responses will be treated confidentially; specific program data and personal opinion will not be identified by director or institution.

I realize that determining what is or is not innovative and nontraditional is problematic. I do not believe that innovation is necessarily something completely original or creative. What is new to a particular program may be considered an innovation for that program, though other programs may have created or already been using it. I am interested in discovering from you the basic features of your program. I also want to learn about the intentional changes you have been making recently and those you would like to be making in order to improve the learning in your program.

When you return this questionnaire please also send any brochures or other materials which will help me learn more about your program.

Thank you, in advance, for the time and energy necessary to complete this questionnaire. I believe that this and other research can contribute to strengthening and solidifying the place of honors programs in higher education.

Sincerely,

Timm Rinehart
Assistant, Honors College
WMU
Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001
November 7, 1977

Dear Honors Program Director:

A few weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire about the relationship between honors programs and innovative, nontraditional higher education. I asked for information about your honors program and for your observations about the extent and ways that the goals and methods of honors relates to those of innovative higher education.

As of this date I have not received your response to the questionnaire and so am sending another one to you. I realize that the questionnaire is long, means digging into your files or annual reports, and may even be in an area in which you have little interest or confidence as relating to your honors program goals.

I am convinced that looking at the ways and extent to which honors programs might become more innovative is a worthy research area. I very much need to know what your thinking is in this area. Feel free to leave some of the questions unanswered if you cannot find the appropriate data, but please do complete as much of the questionnaire as you are able to.

Please return the questionnaire no later than November 23, 1977. In the Spring I will send you some report on my research findings. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Timm Rinehart
Assistant, Honors College
WMU
Kalamazoo, Mich. 49001
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HONORS PROGRAMS AND INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION

Institution: _____________________________________________________

Title of Honors Program: ____________________________________________

Name, Title of Administrative Head: __________________________________

1. Year honors program founded: __________

2. Current total enrollment: __________
   a. percentage male: ______
   b. percentage female: ______
   c. percentage minority students: ______
   d. percentage in following curricular areas (estimate if necessary):
      Arts and Sciences: ______ Business: ______
      Applied Sciences: ______ Individualized: ______
      Fine Arts: ______ Undecided/Other: ______

3. Do you have a General Education honors program? Yes: _____ No: _____
   a. number of students currently enrolled: __________
   b. briefly list requirements for degree/citation/graduation:

   c. percentage of students beginning your general honors program who successfully
      complete it (indicate average % for last two years; estimate if necessary):

%
4. Do you have a departmental, upper-level or Senior year honors program? Yes:____ No: 
   a. number of students currently enrolled: ____________
   b. briefly list requirements for degree/citation/graduation:
   c. percentage of students beginning your upper level honors program who successfully
      complete it (indicate average % for last two years; estimate if necessary):
         __________________________ %

5. Information about administrative head of honors program:
   a. Is the position permanent or regularly rotated? __________________________
   b. How many years have you held this position? _____________
   c. What academic degrees do you have? In which disciplines?
   d. Percentage of appointment with honors program: All____; 3/4___; 1/2____; 1/4____
   e. What non-honors administrative and instructional responsibilities do you have?
   f. To whom do you report? _______________________________________________

6. Does your honors program have a faculty and/or administrative advisory committee? ___

7. Does your program have an Honors Student Committee? _____________
   a. If so, what does it do? (recruitment, extra-curricular activities, policy-making,
   b. If not, to what extent and how do honors students assist in the organization and
      implementation of honors program, policy and activities?
8. Total Budget last year (1976-7) including all operating costs and salaries: $_______
   a. If funds for securing teaching faculty are not included in the above figure, how
do you recruit and secure teaching faculty?
   b. Have you ever received grant, foundation or government funds to support special
honors projects? If so, indicate the source and purpose of your most recent grant:

9. Rank order the following items according to their being problematic for you in main-
taining your honors program:
   a. _____ inadequate student interest and involvement
   b. _____ inadequate faculty interest and support
   c. _____ inadequate budget
   d. _____ inadequate staffing of honors program
   e. _____ inadequate top-level administrative support

10. Do you have an honors housing arrangement for your students? Yes:_____ No:_____ 
   Percentage of honors students currently living in these facilities: _________ %

11. Your perception of the image of your honors program on campus in the eyes of:
   a. students: mostly positive_____; indifferent_____; mostly negative_____
   b. faculty: mostly positive_____; indifferent_____; mostly negative_____
   c. administration: mostly positive_____; indifferent_____; mostly negative_____ 

12. Your perception of whether your honors students are increasingly oriented toward
vocational and career-related education at the expense of general and liberal arts
education:
   a. _____ very much so
   b. _____ somewhat
   c. _____ not much/not at all
13. Indicate which of the following criteria and methods you use to recruit and select (a.) entering freshmen and (b.) on campus undergraduates for your program:

a. entering freshmen (please check those used)

   _____ high school GPA minimum GPA considered: ____________
   _____ ACT/SAT scores minimum test score considered: ______
   _____ personal interviews
   _____ written statements/applications
   _____ other (briefly describe):

b. on campus undergraduates (please check those used)

   _____ college GPA minimum GPA considered: ____________
   _____ faculty recommendations
   _____ written statements/applications
   _____ personal interviews
   _____ other (briefly describe):

14. Briefly describe the orientation, counseling and advising services you offer your honors students:

15. What methods, if any, do you use to evaluate your honors courses, instructors and overall program:
16. What, if any, methods do you use to communicate with your honors program graduates?

Supply any information you have about the number or percentage of your alumni presently in or graduated from law, medical or graduate schools:

17. What do you judge to be the most successful aspect of your honors program? Why?

18. What do you judge to be the least successful aspect of your honors program? Why?

19. What newsletters and other materials does your program regularly publish, and to whom are they sent?

What, if any, other ways do you have of communicating with students, faculty and the general university community?
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20. Are there other programs or offices on campus which somewhat parallel the purposes and services of your honors program? If so, who are they and what do they do?

21. For each of the areas of extra-curricular activity listed below indicate the level of involvement of your program in recent years. Give examples of recent extra-curricular activities organized or sponsored by your program.

(A= much involvement  B= some involvement  C= little involvement  D= no involvement)

____ Academic discussions, lectures, readings, workshops, conferences
   Examples:

____ Outdoor Activities (nature hikes, camping, skiing, canoeing, sports, etc.)
   Examples:

____ Parties, picnics, field trips, potlucks, other social gatherings
   Examples:

22. What percentage of the honors courses currently offered by your program are:
   a. designed and run entirely within the honors program _____%
   b. honors sections of regular departmental courses _____%
   c. elective courses for honors students _____%
   d. primarily lecture courses _____%
   e. primarily lecture-discussion courses _____%
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f. primarily discussion courses _____%  
g. independent study courses _____%  
h. credit/no credit courses _____%  
i. evaluated by competency-based criteria _____%  

23. Honors Programs and Curricular and Instructional Innovation:  

There is no commonly accepted understanding of what is innovative or non-traditional in higher education. What is new or different to one program may be old hat to another. For the purposes of this study, however, several curricular and instructional areas have been identified in which honors and other programs are working to improve teaching and learning at their institutions. For each of these areas please describe the courses and instructional methods which your program has initiated.

a. Interdisciplinary and integrated courses:

b. Independent Study and student-designed courses:
c. Vocational and career-oriented courses:

d. Affective, personal growth, interpersonal group process courses:

e. Off-campus, community-based study (internships, work-study, etc.):

f. Foreign study:
g. Team taught courses:

h. Courses taught by "non-traditional faculty" (graduate assistants, undergraduates, community resource people, etc.):

i. Courses, in which instruction relies primarily on media resources or computer:

j. Courses or programs using non-traditional calendar or time boundaries:

k. Other curricular and instructional innovations not covered by above categories:
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24. Assuming that one of your primary program goals is to provide students of high academic ability and motivation with challenging academic opportunities, to what extent do you feel that each of the following areas of innovation may help your program to better meet this goal? (A= very much • B= somewhat • C= little • D= not at all)

a. _____ interdisciplinary and integrated courses
b. _____ independent study and student designed courses
c. _____ vocational and career-oriented courses
d. _____ affective, personal growth, interpersonal communication courses
e. _____ off campus, community based internships and study
f. _____ foreign study
g. _____ interinstitutional study
h. _____ courses taught by non-traditional faculty or team-taught
i. _____ courses emphasizing media or computer instruction

25. Initiating and implementing new ideas and programs is often slowed by various sources of resistance to change. Based on your experience with your honors program, rank - order the following potential resistance-to-change factors as they have been a compromising influence on your change efforts.

a. _____ lack of student interest or demand
b. _____ lack of faculty interest or willingness to participate
c. _____ inadequate staffing of honors program
d. _____ inadequate honors program budget
e. _____ lack of top-level administrative support (based on pedagogic considerations)
f. _____ an inherent and systemic conservative tradition in higher education

26. To what extent do you believe that one of your goals in the honors program is to assume a leadership role on your campus in effecting curricular and instructional experimentation? Please state any other observations or comments you have about the relationship between honors programs and innovative, non-traditional higher education. Thank you.