TO: Honors Program Committee
Laura Putsche, Chair
William Loucks, President, HSAB
Stephan Flores, Director
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
Steve Beyerlein
Dale Graden

Jennifer Ladino
Allan Caplan
Mark Hoversten
Dev Shrestha
Robin Baker, HSAB Representative
Chris Price

RE: Minutes of meeting held Nov. 26, 2012

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Laura Putsche, with the following members present: Laura Putsche, Stephan Flores, Alton Campbell, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Allan Caplan, Robin Baker, Jennifer Ladino, Dev Shrestha, Chris Price.

AGENDA ITEMS

• A motion to approve the Nov. 12th minutes was made by Allan Caplan and seconded by Dale Graden. The motion passed unanimously.

• Elective Agreement: Stephan Flores noted that the phrase “or if the class is a faculty-directed undergraduate research course (3 credits max) was added to the revised elective agreement. Robin Baker expressed enthusiasm for the proposed changes and noted that students would appreciate having more options in earning the Core Award or Certificate. Motion to approve the revised Elective Agreement was made by Robin and seconded by Jenn Ladino. Motion passed unanimously.

• Seminar Proposals for 2013-14: Stephan Flores noted that there is a possibility that Sarah Nelson may offer a one-credit seminar on writing women's lives. Since this would be a one-credit course, the membership felt that either the proposal could be considered via email or taken up during the Spring committee meeting. Allan noted that three of the proposals (Graden, Murphy, Byers) were clear on the structure of the class, expectations and student evaluation while the Bitterwolf proposal was less structured and contained language that the instructor was to be a “ringmaster.” Stephan noted that he was familiar with both the class (the seminar has been offered previously and is popular with students) and the instructor. Stephan mentioned that in addition to prompting and facilitating students' discussion as a “ringmaster,” Dr. Bitterwolf also is ready to intervene and to offer the students guidance and expertise. The seminar asks students to research the issues and be prepared to discuss the issues presented. Flores also noted that “Doc” reaches out to the “reserved” student(s) to assist them in classroom participation/discussions as well as to outspoken students who might be constructively challenged to explain and to defend the premises of their views and research. In addressing the “how are students” evaluated issue raised by Allan, Stephan noted that in prior years, Dr. Bitterwolf has required a research paper and topic presentation. Stephan suggested that the reason the proposal was not as detailed as the rest was that the class has been taught before and this proposal was more of a letter of interest and evidence of willingness to offer the class during the next academic year.

Allan requested that Dr. Bitterwolf be asked to amend his proposal to indicate assignments and to note expected outcomes to bring the Honors Seminar Proposals into line with University requirements and expectations and to allow new committee members to become familiar with the instructor and the course. Stephan said that he will contact Dr. Bitterwolf to present the committee's concerns and ask him to outline his intended outcomes.

Steve Beyerlein suggested that the Call for Proposals may need clarification in asking for inclusion of specific outcomes. Flores cautioned that he did not want to discourage faculty participation by making the requirements for proposing a course too onerous. The intent is and was to encourage development of new classes, and for some faculty, the seminar may be a one-time offering. Jenn asked if the committee had a concept of “deliverables.” Laura said that due to representation of a variety of disciplines, it is difficult to set standards. Stephan noted that the expectations of an Honors Seminar are addressed briefly in the Call for Proposals, and that he thinks that faculty whose proposals are accepted are interested and committed to offering strong, high quality seminars. These expectations include some sort of critical thinking as evidenced in a paper or a project and classroom discussions/conversations and student presentation of topics/issues. Dale mentioned that in his classes, he places emphasis on the student demonstrating engagement with the topic/issues discussed in class. Dale puts less emphasis on extended, lengthy writing assignments (offering changes for students to rewrite papers if they want assistance with writing skills) to encourage non-majors to take the class and to offer their viewpoints.

Laura asked for a motion to approve the proposals as a package. Steve Beyerlein made the motion to approve and Dev Shrestha seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. (Dale was excused during the vote because his proposal was under consideration.)

• Future Business – Stephan recently returned from the National Collegiate Honors Council Conference. While there, he attended several sessions on curricular development, including discussion of several options/alternatives to the traditional elective agreements. He feels that in elective options/contracts there may be a way to strengthen and to provide for greater
instructor-student interaction along with interaction among honors students; with the current Honors Elective Agreement option individual honors students in a nonhonors course do not have formal, structured opportunities to meet with one another as a group, and with the instructor as an honors group, outside of the typical larger enrollment course setting. He is exploring the idea of identifying nonhonors courses/sections that honors students want and need to take, and then designating an honors section and cohort of perhaps up to 10 students within the class. With faculty agreement, these students would meet with the instructor bi-weekly during the semester outside of regular class time and be required to complete an honors level project to earn honors credit for the class. This arrangement might require a separate honors section for the course. It's uncertain whether faculty would be willing take on this additional work, with modest to no monetary benefits, though it would be a way to enable students within particular colleges and departments to complete honors projects and to enjoy some of the social and educational advantages associated with honors only courses. He asked for members to consider the idea and be prepared for possible discussion in the spring. He noted the main issues to be overcome are 1) how to reimburse/thank faculty for their participation and 2) enrollment cap limitations.

Allan asked if the committee could take up consideration of a mechanism to bring students enrolled in Directed Study classes together for discussion and presentation of their research topics. He noted that students need to learn how to present their work to other researchers and to the public. He envisions this as a way for students to develop these skills.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Next Meeting – Spring 2013
TO: Honors Program Committee
Laura Putsch, Chair
William Loucks, President, HSAB
Stephan Flores, Director
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
Steve Beyerlein
Dale Graden

RE: Minutes of meeting held Nov. 12, 2012

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Laura Putsch, with the following members present: Laura Putsch, Stephan Flores, Alton Campbell, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Allan Caplan, Chris Price

As the meeting opened, Dale Graden requested faculty remind students of the New York Times subscription benefit. Stephan Flores agreed to send a reminder to UHP students.

AGENDA ITEMS

- A motion to approve the minutes of the Oct. 22 was made by Steve Beyerlein and seconded by Dale Graden. The motion passed. It was also decided that since so many members were missing, any actions taken would be emailed to all and either call for an on-line vote or discuss the issue during the next meeting.

- Elective Agreement: Stephan Flores noted a desire to give students more options in achieving the Honors Certificate. He mentioned that in the past, there has been a desire for Honors students to be encouraged to take classes outside of their major, however with so many students in double majors; this is causing issues and a hindrance to students. He also noted that students on a study abroad or exchange program, may be allowed to count up to six credits in determining program eligibility (number of credits taken by a certain semester). The revised elective agreement would allow study abroad or exchange credits to be counted. The new/revised elective agreement will allow for the new senior experience classes proposed by the university. A new addition to the elective agreement is the opportunity for undergraduate research experience to be considered. This addition raised several issues.
  a. Will research methods courses count as undergraduate research? Stephan Flores said no, only Directed Study courses will be considered. There was discussion that they may in fact be methods courses with a substantial research component that should count.
  b. Stephan asked for alternate wording to make the intent clear. Allan Caplan suggested the phrase “individually guided research” be included. Steve Beyerlein asked if the assumption was that the student would be working on some type of research project – which would make the class be a Directed Study. Stephan Flores suggested the description should include, “Faculty directed undergraduate research.”
  c. The Elective Agreement will be reworked with the new wording and brought back to the committee.
  d. Steve Beyerlein asked if the faculty should actively promote this option to students. Stephan Flores said that caution should be used so Faculty does not feel over worked. However, if the option is appropriate, there needs to be a mechanism for it to count.

Dale Graden moved to that the Elective agreement be approved with rewording. Laura Putsch and Steve Beyerlein seconded the motion. Motion passed

- STEM Count Update: Stephan Flores went over the figures for the entering from high school first year (freshman) class;
  a. Total students entering UPH Fall 12 = 109 with 61 (different/unique) majors
  b. 82 students with STEM majors and 27 with non-stem majors

It was noted that past assumption has been that Honors student majors tend to cluster in the Liberal Art, but there appears to be a shift towards STEM related majors.

- New Business – Stephan Flores reported that Mathew Hunt, an Honors and Grouse scholar made an appointment to discuss his desire to see broader participate by the College of Business in the Honors Program. Stephan noted the need to gain great participation by all Colleges. He suggested that perhaps the committee consider allowing some Honors classes to be offered under a hybrid model. These sections would be opened to non-honors students who would have to meet program entrance requirements. The issue and problem is allocation of faculty resources. It was suggested that this idea be placed on the agenda for a future meeting.
Dear Honors Program Committee,

A quick reminder about the upcoming meeting:
9:30am-10:20am Monday Oct. 22
Honors Program Lounge, room 327 Idaho Commons

To provide an overview/profile of the University Honors Program, including enrollment figures as well as perspectives offered by students last spring, I think you may find the attached profile document useful and interesting— I prepared this a while ago in quick response to a request from Chris Murray (VP for University Advancement) in support of a fundraising/development query related to the program's students. If we have time to get to this item on the agenda, I also will propose a revision to the Honors Elective Agreement option, so that instead of this elective option being limited to one course/three credits during a student's career, up to six credits could be counted (typically two courses) toward the UHP Certificate. This opportunity to incorporate an honors project into a nonhonors course and have that count within progress towards the certificate may enable some students to complete interesting, supervised work that fulfills the spirit of the honors curriculum, in the context as well of addressing scheduling conflicts or limited honors course offerings for those who will have completed 20 or more HON-designated credits but lack the chance to complete the full 27 credits in honors courses.

I encourage you to explore the UHP website, including the following pages.

Honors course offerings: http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics
Featured Students page: http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents
HSAB page, including minutes of meetings this semester, also The Looking Glass from last spring: http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/hsab
UHP Certificate and Core Award requirements: http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics/curriculumanddistinctions
Quotes from alumni: http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/alumni
Honors Program Committee, including Call for Honors Seminar Proposals (PDF download): http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpcommittee

I look forward to seeing you this Monday, and looking ahead, I know that the committee will need to meet on Monday Nov. 26th to review and select honors seminars for next year. Please contact me or Laura with any issues, items you wish to add to our agenda for this semester and academic year.

Sincerely,

Stephan
Quick reminder of the mtg. this morning.

sf

[prior Nov. 21 email]

Dear members of the Honors Program Committee,

A reminder that we meet this next Monday Nov. 26, at 9:30am in the Honors Lounge, to discuss the attached seminar proposals. I've also attached the minutes of the last meeting, and the revised Honors Elective Agreement, approved by those present at the meeting; however, with four voting members at the meeting, we need either at least one more vote to approve the Elective Agreement, or if anyone wishes to discuss further, we can do so at a future meeting.

That is, if at least one of you votes to approve the attached elective agreement, I'll assume it has passed for approval, unless before this next meeting, someone wishes to discuss further (!). Thanks.

The seminar proposals are from Professor Tom Bitterwolf (a reprise of a popular seminar that he offers every other year, on Energy and Public Policy--as you know, he teaches honors Chem 111-112), from Professor John Byers on Writing about Nature (Dr. Byers taught an honors integrated science course on Human Nature some years ago) from Professor James Murphy (a version of a previous seminar on the history of music in film, with a focus this time on songs in film, and from Prof. Dale Graden (on the Spanish Civil War--Dr. Graden is a member of the Honors Program Committee, and has taught an honors Core Discovery course sequence "Contemporary American Experience."

Because the UHP seeks to offer at least four seminars each year, your evaluation may focus on determining whether all proposals pass muster with you for being offering next year, and to pass along any observations/advice/concerns regarding the proposed seminars.

Please review as well the Call for Honors Seminar proposals, which is available as PDF download on the HPC page:

http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpccommittee

Thank you for reviewing and discussing these proposals. You may wish to know that the Call for Proposals went out to all UI faculty, and a good, select number of faculty were contacted individually to encourage/request that they submit a proposal. Some faculty expressed interest, but for various reasons were unable to submit a proposal for this next year.

There's a possibility that an additional proposal is forthcoming, for a one credit course. If that comes in, I'll forward to you.

The Honors Student Advisory Board reviewed the proposals from Bitterwolf, Graden, and Murphy, and report that "all three look good." Dr. Byers' proposal arrived just after they met, so they have not reviewed that.

I have received approval from each department chair in support of these proposals.
TO: Honors Program Committee
Laura Putsche, Chair
William Loucks, President, HSAB
Stephan Flores, Director
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
Steve Beyerlein
Dale Graden

Jennifer Ladino
Allan Caplan
Mark Hoversten
Dev Shrestha
Robin Baker, HSAB Representative
Chris Price

RE: Minutes of meeting held October 22, 2012

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Laura Putsche, with the following members present: Laura Putsche, Stephan Flores, Alton Campbell, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Jennifer Ladino, Mark Hoversten, Dev Shrestha, Allan Caplan, Robin Baker (HSAB representative), Chris Price

AGENDA ITEMS

- Introductions of new and continuing committee members: The meeting opened with Laura asking each member to introduce themselves.

- Honors Program Overview: Prior to this meeting, Stephan Flores had encouraged committee members to explore the program website, including the following pages:

Honors course offerings: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics)
Featured Students page: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents)
HSAB page, including minutes of meetings, also The Looking Glass publication: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/hsab](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/hsab)
UHP Certificate and Core Award requirements: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics/curriculumanddistinctions](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics/curriculumanddistinctions)
Quotes from alumni: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/alumni](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/alumni)
Honors Program Committee, including Call for Honors Seminar Proposals (PDF download): [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpcommittee](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpcommittee)

Stephan also had provided a summary profile of the program (see appended file) that included enrollment statistics for entering first-year students:

Fall 2012
Total members: 393
First-year entering freshmen statistics as follows.
- Entering first-year students (‘freshmen’): 109 (increase of two from fall 2011)
- 67.9% of entering freshmen are Idaho residents
- 32.1% of entering freshmen are nonresidents
- 3.893 average, unweighted high school GPA (compared to typical 3.91 recent average)
- Average SAT combined verbal and math scores: 1283.6 (compared to recent 1290 average)
- Average ACT composite: 28.9 (same as 28-29 average of recent years)
- Average UHP index score, based on correlation between GPA and test scores: 90 (85 is minimum for applying without letters of recommendation, and 90 is typical average)
- Registered for average of 16.07 overall credits
- Registered for average of 3.933 HON credits
- 60 new freshmen have AP credits (average of 14.41 credits per student)
- 85 new freshmen have college/transfer credits (average of 14.75 credits per student)
- 44% male in freshmen class
- 56% female in freshmen class

a. Committee members were interested in having information:

   i. Number of honors students with STEM majors; Stephan replied that typically over 50% of UHP members are in the sciences and technical fields; he stated that there is not yet a breakdown for this entering class but that is forthcoming. He also mentioned that two data requests to the Registrar/Admissions to compare entering honors freshmen with entering freshmen who meet the program’s GPA and test score criteria have been denied. Because of the importance of this data, both for ongoing recruitment of these students as well as information about potential growth opportunities among respective majors/colleges, he will request a meeting to explore how the program might be permitted to receive such information on nonhonors freshmen. Stephan completed a similar analysis several years ago, and an update for comparative purposes also would be useful for recruiting and bases for development of new honors courses.
ar members of the Honors Program Committee,

ding to Chris Price's count, the UHP's 109 incoming from high school first-year students are clustered in 61
dent/unique majors; taking into account dual and multiple majors, these students have declared 156 majors; for
ample, 62 students have one declared major and 47 students have two declared majors.

students are in STEM majors;
in non-STEM majors (16 students with one non-STEM major and 11 students with two non-STEM majors).

e definitions for which majors are typically counted as STEM majors is broader than the count that I did several years ago, and
ich I mentioned in the HPC meeting. At that time, 54% of UHP students were counted in the sciences and technical fields. I

't count majors in College of Business, for example, but under broad/national STEM guidelines, you can see the range of
ors that count as STEM disciplines, as noted in the table/file below.

ie shorter columns to the right on the excel sheet pasted below are the actual incidences of a major. The longer columns more
the middle of the excel sheet is where Chris counted the students individually by their major's status (STEM/Non-STEM -
double major).

ris advises that we can basically ignore the three columns after the "Secondary Major" column. She used those just to verify
hat she had accounted for each student and their major and that her figures matched her major count (the shorter columns to
ie right)

cap: Total freshmen entering the program = 109

3 students have declared 156 majors of which 100 can be considered STEM majors

several students have more than one major, a further breakdown is necessary to understand the demographics of this group.

udents have one (total) STEM major.
.8 students have two different STEM majors.
.8 students have one STEM and one non-STEM major.
.6 have one non-STEM major
.1 have two different non-STEM majors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health and Wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Non-Sem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Student Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>One Non-Sem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Two Non-Sem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>One Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>One Stem + One non-Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Non-Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>One Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>One Stem + One non-Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Non-Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Major 1:
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Physics

Primary Major 2:
- Economics
- Computer Science
- Engineering

Secondary Major 1:
- Business Administration
- Accounting

Secondary Major 2:
- Psychology
- Social Science
- History

Minor:
- French
- Spanish
- Physical Education
- Health and Wellness

Electives:
- Business Management
- Economics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
<th>3rd Semester</th>
<th>4th Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Non-Stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Stem</td>
<td>One Non-Stem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RE: Minutes of meeting held October 22, 2012

The meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Laura Putsche, with the following members present: Laura Putsche, Stephan Flores, Alton Campbell, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Jennifer Ladino, Mark Hoversten, Dev Shrestha, Allan Caplan, Robin Baker (HSAB representative), Chris Price

AGENDA ITEMS

- **Introductions of new and continuing committee members**: The meeting opened with Laura asking each member to introduce themselves.

- **Honors Program Overview**: Prior to this meeting, Stephan Flores had encouraged committee members to explore the program website, including the following pages:

  Honors course offerings: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics)
  Featured Students page: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents)
  HSAB page, including minutes of meetings, also The Looking Glass publication: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/hsab](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/hsab)
  UHP Certificate and Core Award requirements: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics/curriculumanddistinctions](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/academics/curriculumanddistinctions)
  Quotes from alumni: [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/alumni](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/alumni)
  Honors Program Committee, including Call for Honors Seminar Proposals (PDF download): [http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpcommittee](http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/uhpcommittee)

Stephan also had provided a summary profile of the program (see appended file) that included enrollment statistics for entering first-year students:

Fall 2012
Total members: 393
First-year entering freshmen statistics as follows.
Entering first-year students (‘freshmen’): 109 (increase of two from fall 2011)
67.9% of entering freshmen are Idaho residents
32.1% of entering freshmen are nonresidents
3.893 average, unweighted high school GPA (compared to typical 3.91 recent average)
Average SAT combined verbal and math scores: 1283.6 (compared to recent 1290 average)
Average ACT composite: 28.9 (same as 28-29 average of recent years)
Average UHP index score, based on correlation between GPA and test scores: 90 (85 is minimum for applying without letters of recommendation, and 90 is typical average)
Registered for average of 16.07 overall credits
Registered for average of 5.933 HON credits
60 new freshmen have AP credits (average of 14.41 credits per student)
85 new freshmen have college/transfer credits (average of 14.75 credits per student)
44% male in freshmen class
56% female in freshmen class

a. Committee members were interested in having information:
   i. Number of honors students with STEM majors; Stephan replied that typically over 50% of UHP members are in the sciences and technical fields; he stated that there is not yet a breakdown for this entering class but that is forthcoming. He also mentioned that two data requests to the Registrar/Admissions to compare entering honors freshmen with entering freshmen who meet the program’s GPA and test score criteria have been denied. Because of the importance of this data, both for ongoing recruitment of these students as well as information about potential growth opportunities among respective majors/colleges, he will request a meeting to explore how the program might be permitted to receive such information on nonhonors freshmen. Stephan completed a similar analysis several years ago, and an update for comparative purposes also would be useful for recruiting and bases for development of new honors courses.
ii. Retention rate; Stephan replied at length to describe selective array of honors course offerings, particularly in upper-division courses, that limits some students' ability and interest to participate throughout their studies; the 3.3 minimum UI GPA and course enrollment conditions for remaining in good standing also place limits on retention; in sum, there are a range of students who graduate in good standing, who achieve the 19 credit Honors Core Award, and who achieve the 27 credit UHP Certificate. Robin Baker observed that in her own experience as well as her knowledge of some peers' course of study, it is difficult to take full advantage of honors courses beyond the largely lower-division general education sections, because of priorities for her major, and lack of courses offered as honors section in her major.

b. Mark Hoversten remarked that honors sections should be considered a part of teaching load and not as an overload. If the university is to have an honors program that can be sustained, colleges should provide at least one course and faculty member or members every year or at a minimum of every other year. He will bring up these issues during the next Provost/Dean meeting. He suggested that at stake is to ask deans/colleges to consider the cost of the Honors program to the university vs. the value received by the University from having an Honors Program. He wondered if this issue of the difficulty of departments and colleges releasing faculty to teach honors sections had been discussed at the deans' level—he did not recall such a discussion, though Stephan indicates that this has been a longstanding, expressed concern familiar to university leadership.

• Honors Program Student Activities: Alton Campbell highlighted efforts to create a sense of a social community for the honors students. He described the honors Intr 204 Quest for Survival course that enables upper class honors mentors to meet weekly with small groups of entering freshmen to explore all facets of making the transition to the university and to the UHP; Alton teaches an honors leadership course and these students have been undertaking a variety of social engagement projects on behalf of the program's students, such as a recent "Test Drive in Five" speed meeting and ice cream social, and exploration of creating an honor code for the university.

• Honors Student Advisory Board Activities: Robin Baker provided a description of activities and events HSAB has completed or is planning, including an earlier fall leadership retreat and a variety of upcoming social events.

• Future agenda items:
  a. Proposed changes to the Honors Elective Agreement (November 12?)
  b. Consideration of proposed Honors Seminars (November 26)

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.
University of Idaho: University Honors Program
Director, Dr. Stephan Flores
The Value of Honors Education, Program Strengths, UHP Development, Academic Profile of Honors Students, Students' Perspective, Achievements, Plans

The Value of Honors Program Education

As reported by Gregory Lanier (co-chair of the National Collegiate Honors Council Assessment and Evaluation Committee) in the Spring/Summer 2008 issue of the Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council, the NCHC Board of Directors proffered the following list of reasons to underscore the value of honors education:

- High-caliber students provide intellectual enrichment for the entire campus
- Retention and six-year-persistence rates are often much higher for honors students, so graduation rates are better
- The higher retention rates for honors students have a significant economic impact on the campus
- Honors students bring social enrichment to campus
- Honors students bring service enrichment to the community through service activities
- Honors students provide an active and effective alumni base
- Honors students have good personal experiences: the small college within the large university feel
- Honors students create a community of like-minded individuals
- Honors residential living enriches campus
- Honors alumni create donation/development opportunities
- Honors programs foster the exploration and development of new courses/pedagogy
- Honors programs provide faculty/student interactions/mentoring opportunities
- Honors programs contribute significantly to the institution’s undergraduate research agenda
- Honors students provide leadership & involvement on campus (NCHC 84).

The values represented in this list are to be understood in the context of honors education and in accord with the institution's university-wide learning outcomes and strategic emphases, allocations of resources, and recognized and developing strengths. Program assessment also occurs in the context of the National Collegiate Honors Council’s guidelines document, Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program (appended below).

UHP Curriculum and Extra-Curricular Opportunities and Dimensions

The University Honors Program offers the advantages of an enriched learning community and course of study for students from all colleges and majors. Through small honors core courses in general education and innovative seminars, honors faculty work to enhance each student's intellectual curiosity, knowledge, and creativity. As part of a dynamic, broad-based education, members are encouraged to participate in domestic or international exchange programs, and to take advantage of opportunities to engage in undergraduate research programs as well as internships, other forms of cooperative education, and volunteer and service-learning. The program director, associate director, and program advisor act as supplemental academic advisors to all students who qualify for honors study. Beyond the classroom, the program's extra-curricular opportunities include concerts, plays, films, lectures, and off-campus excursions that foster cultural enrichment, friendship, and learning. The great majority of the 400 students
active in the program are able to participate without adding to the total number of credits needed for graduation.

**UHP Development**

The UHP’s unique role in the university’s mission and demonstrated prominence for excellence require institutional and alumni support commensurate with its strengths and its potential. The program must continue to meet the academic needs and expectations of high achieving students. The University Honors Program and its over 400 members fulfill important university-wide interests to recruit and retain exceptional students, and contribute to the success of these talented students and to the departments and colleges in which they study.

The UHP seeks development support to expand curricular and extra-curricular programming through the Honors Program Gifts Fund and the Henberg Endowment. These gift funds are designated to support distinctive curricular and extra-curricular offerings, including enhanced resources for students’ research, academic travel, and cultural enrichment. In addition, the Honors Program Scholarship Endowment provides support that helps to offset fee costs for selected students. Potential donors may have particular interests that would dovetail with the program’s mission and values. One example: students who wish to take advantage of special internship, study, travel, and service opportunities in Washington, D.C. (and elsewhere) may decide against applying because of additional costs above usual tuition and fees. Yet it is precisely such experiences that may develop these students’ leadership, knowledge, connections, and future prospects for further study, graduate and professional school, and major scholarships. UHP scholarship support is typically directed to over 100 students representing over 150 majors across the university’s colleges and departments.

**Program Support Priorities**

Priorities to develop the University Honors Program to meet the needs of highly motivated and academically talented students are summarized as follows:

- Increase funds to provide sufficient compensation to departments for honors course offerings and to broaden the program’s extra-curricular opportunities
- Increase percentage of director’s 60% academic year appointment in Honors and associate director’s 50% position in the UHP
- Advance fundraising on the program’s behalf, including directed support and assigned consultation from the university’s Office of Development
- Enhance resources and coordination for major and national scholarships advising
- Strengthen the university’s recruitment and retention of honors students, to include development of the program’s curricular and extra-curricular profile, and scholarship benefits
- Determine means to develop co-curricular study abroad, undergraduate research, and service-learning opportunities

**Academic Profile of Honors Students**
Fall 2012
Total members: 393
Entering freshmen: 109 (increase of two from fall 2011)
67.9% of entering freshmen are Idaho residents
32.1% nonresidents
3.893 average, unweighted high school GPA (bit below typical 3.91 recent average)
Average SAT combined verbal and math scores: 1256.3 (below recent 1290 average)
Average ACT composite: 28.691 (typical 28-29 average of recent years)
Average UHP index score, based on correlation between GPA and test scores: 90 (85 is minimum for applying without letters of recommendation, and 90 is our typical average)
Registered for average of 16.07 credits
Registered for average of 5.933 HON credits
60 new freshmen have AP credits (average of 14.41 crs. per student)
85 new freshmen have college/transfer credits (average of 14.75 crs. per student)
44% male in freshmen class
56% female in freshmen class

Spring 2012:
Average UI institutional GPA of all members in good standing: 3.81

Fall 2011:
Total members: 413
Entering freshmen: 107
Average HS GPA of entering freshmen: 3.91
Average ACT composite score: 28
Average SAT: 1294 (sum of verbal and math, does not include writing portion)
68% Idaho residents
32% Nonresidents

Fall 2010:
Total members: 437
Entering freshmen: 120 (out of 1750 new freshmen at UI)

Fall 2009:
Total members: 438 members
Entering freshmen: 111
Average HS GPA of entering freshmen: 3.91
Average ACT composite: 29.1
Average SAT: 1294 (combined verbal and math scores)
Average UI institutional GPA of all members at end of semester: 3.61

Fall 2008:
483 total members
123 honors freshmen admitted out of 1709 entering freshmen (7.197% of total freshmen)
3.899 average HS GPA (comparison: 3.93 HS GPA fall 2007)
29.146 average ACT composite score (comparison: 28.45 ACT fall 2007)
1334 average SAT reading and math combined score (comparison: 1281 SAT reading & math combined score fall 2007)
71 female (57.72%)
52 male (42.27%)
71 Idaho residents (57.72%)
52 nonresidents (42.27%)
30.89% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Engineering
32.52% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences
13.82% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Science
10.56% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Business & Economics
53.65% of UHP freshmen have majors in the sciences and in engineering

Number of UHP students studying abroad or on national student exchange: 20

Since 1991- 25 Goldwater scholarships (recent: UHP member Rebecca Johnson, April 2012)
Since 1996- 14 Udall Scholars
Since 1997- at least 22 Fulbright Scholars
20 Rhodes scholars (last Rhodes in mid-80s)

Honors Students’ Achievements/Kudos: excerpts from May 2012 responses from UHP
graduating seniors and some responses from other program members. Not necessarily listed
below are the many honors students who win Alumni Association Awards for Excellence and
ASUI Student Achievement Awards in Leadership and Service, as well as a variety of other
departmental and college level awards.

See also the Featured Students page and main page slideshow, on the UHP website:
http://www.uidaho.edu/honors/people/featuredstudents

My name is Micaela Iveson, and I am a Sophomore in International Studies (4.0 GPA). Here is
an overview of what I’ve been up to this year:

This year I worked for the International Studies department researching non-governmental and
inter-governmental organizations of my choosing, and designing informative posters about them,
which are hung in our department hallway. This job also allowed me to meet with visiting
scholars and dignitaries, like those who are brought to the university for the Borah Symposium.

I am currently the Director of Scholarship for my sorority (Alpha Phi), and have also served my
chapter as the Director of Sisterhoods. Through my membership in Alpha Phi, I was selected as
the Outstanding Greek Sophomore for my community and campus involvement, as well as
academic achievement and leadership.

This February, I had the pleasure of attending Harvard Kennedy School’s Public Policy and
Leadership Conference, which was essentially a recruiting conference for Freshmen/Sophomores
in college who HKS believes to be candidates for their Masters in Public Policy program. This
conference was an all-expense paid trip to Boston, where I was able to meet with the Dean of
HKS, the Directors of Admissions, several professors, fellowship directors, current students, as
well as some of the brightest undergraduate students from around the country. It was an honor
and privilege to be counted among this group, and I believe this trip has set me on a great
trajectory for my future plans.

I was fortunate enough to participate in an Alternate Service Break this March, which sent me to
Salmon, Idaho. This trip expanded my understanding of rural poverty, and heightened my
interest in service learning work.

As part of my International Studies coursework, I attended the Model United Nations Conference
in New York City this April. This was an incredible experience, where I got to meet students
from around the world, and seriously work on policy propositions to solving the humanitarian
crisis in South Sudan.

This summer, I will be returning to my hometown of Reno, NV, where I will engage in several activities. First, I am starting an independent research project detailing the involvement of the United States in the 2011 Arab Spring, and how this event will impact our foreign policy with this region. I will also be volunteering for a local homeless shelter, and I hope to return to my high school job of teaching acting and improvisation classes to children. In June, I'll be in Washington, D.C. interning for Congressman Mark Amodei. This is an opportunity I am particularly excited for because I was offered an internship last summer with the Marshal's Office of the U.S. Supreme Court (also in D.C.), but had to turn it down because of financial reasons.

Next fall, I will be studying in Morocco, where I hope to develop my French language skills, and pick up a bit of Arabic. For a while, I have been toying with the idea of joining the Peace Corps after graduation, and this will be an excellent opportunity for me to get involved in international service (both the World Food Programme and World Bank have current operations in Morocco). I hope to finish up my research project during my time abroad, and hopefully get it published through the Martin Journal at the University next year.

I think that pretty much sums it up! I have very much enjoyed the courses I've taken through the Honors Program, and I look forward to returning next spring!

Cheers,

Micaela Iveson

-----------------

Audriana Sedgwick

Major: Psychology

Class Year: 3 (first semester junior)

This summer I'll be doing the UBM internship, an integration of mathematics and biology in collaboration with WSU. I've applied for Psi Chi since I'm now a junior, and have also applied to the McNair program for first generation, low-income students with research interests.

I've been doing research steadily since my sophomore year here, including work in Dr. Dyre's, Dr. Werner's and the late Dr. Bustamante's lab. For Dr. Dyre I work as a research assistant for Roger Lew, and I've been collaborating with Dr. Werner to do work on his GoCognitive website. In the future, the UBM internship should yield some presentable research, and the possibility of a publishable product as early as the end of summer. This opportunity and the subject matter is great for my future plan to get into a good graduate school and become a research cognitive neuroscientist.

2012 Honors Certificate Recipients (graduating seniors, 27 honors credits):

Nathan Dane Anderson, Spangle, Washington

Mathematics
I will be doing an internship this summer with Bayer Crop Science at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, where I will get to do studies that tie agriculture and meteorology together. I will then continue on to Norman, OK, pursuing a M.S. degree (with the possibility of continuing to a Ph.D.) in Meteorology at the University of Oklahoma. Last summer, I worked for Belcan (Bayer Crop Science) in Lincoln, NE doing grunt work and wheat breeding research (gathering basic data like height, disease, lodging, etc. of wheat varieties) in cooperation with the UNL faculty/facilities. I look forward to the excitement of upcoming travels to both of these locations, the intense storms of the great plains, and the opportunity to meet new people. I have enjoyed my time at the University of Idaho and the opportunity to be a part of the honors program. [Nathan received an outstanding senior award from his department.]

**Valerie Renee Barry**, Beaverton, Oregon

*Electrical Engineering*

This past semester I completed a special elective agreement to take senior design as an honors class. I’m actually extremely grateful we did this because it encouraged me to participate (as an individual and a team) in events such as the innovation showcase, the IEEE student paper contest, and presenting to the graduate colloquium. I am confident that I would have not participated in any of the above otherwise, because I’m always busy. I also wanted to let you know that our senior design team got third place at the Innovation Showcase and won both prizes at Expo (best presentation and best booth). This summer I will be working with Intel Corporation in Fort Collins, CO as an Analog Design Graduate School Intern (Electrical engineering intern). In the fall, I will be attending Stanford University to earn my Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering.

**Emily Kay Brookhart**, Idaho Falls

*English, International Studies*

Recipient of Lindley Award for Outstanding Graduating Senior in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. After graduation, I will be starting work for Teach For America. I will teach high school English to low-income students in the Las Vegas Valley.

**Esme Renee Busch**, Lewiston

*Finance, Production/Operations Management*

As for future plans, I am currently living the dream. I was married in November and my husband and I just bought our first house. I was given a job right out of college and am happily working.

**Thomas Jordan Howser**, Boise

*English-Professional Emphasis, Philosophy*

I’m moving to Portland and plan on pursuing writing internships either in journalism or marketing.

**Gentry Kip Jenkins**, Troy

*History*

I will be pursuing my MA in International Relations at the
University of Chicago beginning in the fall. I intend to continue on to receive a doctorate in either Political Science or History. Also, I received the 2012 Hackmann Outstanding Senior Award in the Department of History. Finally, I participated in a directed study this semester with Dr. Carlson of the Political Science Department. The research proposes a new linkage explaining the reasons why interstate wars follow revolutions. I am hoping to use this research as a starting point for my master's thesis at U Chicago or to have it published in an undergraduate journal.

Meaghan Elisabeth Jones, Nampa

Anthropology, Chemistry

Starting this fall I will be attending Boston University’s School of Medicine, working toward an M.S. in Forensic Anthropology.

Victoria Raye Kampfer, Wilsonville, Oregon

Mechanical Engineering

This summer I will be completing an internship at Wagstaff, a company that performs aluminum casting in Spokane. Next year I plan on attending graduate school to obtain a master's degree in mechanical engineering.

Megan “Micah” Kehrein, Dixon, California

Sociology

My future plans include a year (or several) of service in Seattle before attending graduate school.[update from last year]: Outstanding Junior Award, Outstanding Senior Award, Theophilus Award [considered by many to be the award for outstanding senior at UI—sf] Dean Vettrus Award; Idaho Leadership Certificate; 2011 Newman Civic Fellow for the University of Idaho (through Campus Compact); An article will soon be released through UI Marketing. I will forward the story to you. Intern at the UI Writing Center; Participation in Spring 2011 ASB to Phoenix, AZ; Activism for LGBTQ rights and sexual assault awareness through the Gay Straight Alliance, LGBTQ Office, Day of Silence, Take Back the Night, Safe Idaho March, Inland Oasis, and various other events. I have been featured in the Argonaut and on the front page of the UI website for these events.

Justin M. Knox, Saint John, Washington

Economics

I’m heading east to Virginia looking for a job and adventure!

Braden J. Lang, Boise

Economics

I accepted a public interest fellowship to spend 2012 with the Office of the Idaho Attorney General. I’ve been exposed to several different types of work but my personal focus has been on energy regulation and the Public Utilities Commission. I expect I will move to the private sector (read: law firm) and focus on either energy or life sciences work, [or I may] wind up in a more
general commercial litigation environment. I'm hoping to stay in the northwest, do the occasional triathlon, watch lots of soccer, travel and keep in touch with UI. [Braden also has a recent degree in molecular biology from Dartmouth University and a law degree from the University of Chicago.]

Paige Elizabeth Leffingwell Reid, Moscow

American Studies

My plans include moving to Portland, OR this summer and working as a soccer referee and waitress while earning a Teaching English as a Foreign Language license and studying for and taking the GRE. I look forward to exploring the city, spending time with my friends there, meeting new people, and pursuing various interests and hobbies. Then I plan to teach English abroad for a while before going to graduate school, but who knows?

Jessica Marie Morrow, Sandpoint


I'm moving to Olympia, WA to figure out what I want to do next.

Alex Shamus Nilson, Milton-Freewater, Oregon

Computer Science

Currently working at Cayuse Technologies in Pendleton, Oregon as a software tester.

Brendan Terence O'Donnell, Eagle

Philosophy

I plan on working as an elementary school teacher in Indianapolis as a member of Teach For America for at least the next two years.

Katherine Anne Phelps, Philomath, Oregon

Mathematics

Future Plans: Applying to medical school.[Katherine received her department's outstanding senior award].

David Henson Royall, Moscow

Marketing, Foreign Languages-Spanish Opt.

I am and will continue to do a full-time internship with Resonate Church in Moscow-Pullman as the International Missions Intern through May 2013, and am getting married on December 22!

Margaret Columbia Schoenfeld, Douglas, Alaska

Biology

I will be returning to Alaska to spend a year working in marine biology before, I hope, going to
grad school for marine biology.

Tasha Nicolette Thompson, Nikiski, Alaska

English
I am taking a year off (to work/travel/do something that is not school) and then going to law school. Tasha has accepted a two-year position as a career and college counselor, serving two high schools, and will then plan to continue her plans to attend law school.

Nicholas Anthony Weires, Eagle

Chemistry
I will be attending the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) beginning this fall to work toward my Ph.D. in chemistry. [Nick was recognized at commencement as the outstanding graduating senior in the College of Science, with the John B. George Award; he also received his department's outstanding senior award.]

--------------------

2012 Honors Core Award Recipients (graduating seniors, 19 honors credits):

Wendy Ann Banzhof, Kennewick, Washington

Civil Engineering
I will be attending grad school at Colorado State University with a teaching assistantship for Civil Engineering focusing in water resources. [Update from last year]: First, and probably the most relevant, is that I have begun some undergraduate research in Civil Engineering with Dr. Eric Coats. This involves working with wastewater treatment facilities (Moscow and Colfax) as well as ongoing research on turning "poop into plastic". This is a PHA reaction (that I can't really explain right now as I am still in the learning process) that takes manure and wastewater and forms plastic. In my opinion, it's pretty freaking cool. This will continue over the summer as my "job".

Also this year, my pride and joy was my concrete canoe. I was the captain this year (usually this is a senior position but there were no seniors involved to take the spot) and the core juniors and I struggled to make a beautiful canoe. This included me writing a pretty extensive technical paper (which I could also send if you would like to see it), giving a technical presentation, racing the concrete canoe and creating an aesthetically pleasing display. If you want to see the canoe it is on display in the BEL engineering lab and I have attached some pictures from conference competition in Portland, Oregon.

Kathryn Marie Barber, Mountain Home

Animal & Veterinary Sciences
I was accepted to Michigan State College of Veterinary Medicine so I will be going there. It should be an exciting time. I am glad for graduation to be here soon that is for sure!

Paige Holly Davies, Fairfield,
Anthropology, Psychology

I plan on entering AmeriCorps in August 2012 - August 2013. After that, I plan to obtain a dual Master's degree in Public Health and Medical Social Work, focusing in Women's and LGBTQ health.

Amanda Rose Downen, Emmett

Foreign Languages-Spanish Opt., Mathematics

This year I was on the U of I Homecoming Committee, was the New Member Education Chair for the Student Alumni Relations Board, and am a member of Kappa Kappa Gamma. As for awards, I received the Alumni Award for Excellence, was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa, and I will be receiving the Chair's Award for Excellence from the Mathematics Department. I worked part time as a Calc 160 Tutor at Polya and part time at Pullman Headcare on the weekends. Over spring break, I travelled to Tijuana with a group from Resonate Church to work with a local church. We demolished a shanty-house and built a new home for the owner, laid foundation for another home, painted three houses, leveled ground for a new foundation to be poured, taught English classes to local children in multiple neighborhoods, and led children church services.

Future plans include relocating and starting work for a software company called Fast Enterprises as an Implementation Consultant in June. [Amanda received the Chair's Award for Excellence, given to graduating seniors for academic excellence.]

Brian M. Hare, Oldtown

Physics

I’ll be going to grad school at the University of Florida in Gainesville; I’ll be getting my doctorate in physics, specializing in lightning. [Brian received his department's outstanding senior award.]

Douglas Michael Kipps, Buhl

Biological & Agricultural Engineering

My future plans include: (1) Moving to Twin Falls to begin work for Glanbia Foods, Inc. In March I landed a job as a Management Trainee with them and will be working at the corporate office located in Twin Falls, ID.; (2) Becoming a father. In March my wife and I were pleasantly surprised to learn that she was pregnant.

(3) Having a lot of fun and continuing my education either in business, management, or engineering.

Daniel Klismith, Park City, Utah

English

I’m planning on getting an MFA in creative writing at some point in the future.

Brady Wells McNall, Kuna

Materials Science & Engineering
I plan to attend Graduate school in Materials Science or a related field while working as a Material Science Engineer. I also plan to continue my work as a sustainability and energy efficiency consultant.

Shianne Marie Salvadalena, Pullman, Washington

Psychology

Currently I am working until I attend WSU in the fall for Counseling studies, which I’m quite excited to begin.

Samuel Mannix Schmoker, Fairbanks, Alaska,

International Studies

My future plans are to go back to China to continue learning the Chinese language.

Christina Ariel Sullivan, La Verne, California

Ecology & Conservation Biology

Last summer I was chosen for an internship and did my senior thesis project on the northern Idaho ground squirrel in response to prescribed burns. For three months during the summer, I collected my own data and presented the final results as a poster April 2012. I am in the Newingham Ecology Lab in the College of Natural Resources. I was able to present these results at the annual Society for Range Management Conference in Spokane, WA in February 2012, and the Idaho Chapter of the Wildlife Society annual conference in Boise, ID in March 2012. I was a part of the committee for the Student Chapter of the Wildlife Society Conclave, which hosted over 100 students and faculty from around the west for four days over Spring Break. I plan to do some honest trail work this summer to let my brain relax from school through Nevada Conservation Corps. In the fall, I will be continuing my education for 22 months in California in Moorpark College’s Exotic Animal Training and Management Program. After that, I plan to travel a bit and get involved with a rehabilitation and reintroduction facility for endangered species, and then the hope is to get a full-time job or graduate school later down the road.

Amanda Clare Williams, Boise

Microbiology

I will be applying to medical school in June. During the year-long application process, I will be living in Boise and working towards receiving my CNA. Upon completion of my certification, I hope to work in a hospital or nursing home as a nursing assistant, until, I hope, I head to med school. [Amanda received her department’s outstanding senior award.]

Hailey Catherine Woodruff, Sandpoint

Civil Engineering

My plans are to get married this summer (the weekend after graduation!), and then we will be going to the University of Utah to pursue Master’s degrees. I will be doing research in water resources and green roof technology.
Nathan Aaron Yergenson, Moscow

Chemical Engineering, Chemistry

I have accepted a job offer from Apex Manufacturing Solutions in Boise.[Nathan received the Merck and Company Award for scholarship, from the College of Science.]

-------------

A FEW MORE RESPONSES FROM UHP STUDENTS:

Meredith Bishop (bish0547@vandals.uidaho.edu)

I was a research assistant in Dr. Barton's Safety Research Lab in the Psychology Dept. last fall and am now doing a research project with Dr. Barton and one of his graduate students investigating expert and non-expert ability to recognize weapons vs. neutral stimuli. I recently received the Phil Mohan Academic Award for excellence from the Psychology Department for the research I’ve done with Dr. Barton. I am excited to return to Cincinnati Children's Hospital this summer to work in the Behavioral Medicine and Clinical Psychology Department. This summer, they are starting research on obesity in preschoolers in Ohio.

I am currently looking into Clinical Psychology PhD and masters programs and will be applying this fall. I am interested in clinical programs that have an emphasis in behavioral medicine or nutrition.

----------------------------------

Your Name: Karlee Kirking

major(s): International Studies and Spanish

class yr: Freshman

summary description of activities/efforts:

ASB Spring Break Trip to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi

Current co-president of International Affairs Club

Outstanding Freshman/Valkyrie Award

On the Committee to choose the common read

This summer I will be living in Beijing, China. I have an internship working with Larkin Trade International, a company that assists companies seeking entry into China with market research and trade compliance. While I am in Beijing I will also be taking a Mandarin Chinese language intensive course. I'm doing research through the Martin Institute of International Studies through their program for sophomores called the Martin Academy. This will result in either a presentation or a paper next fall.

----------------------------------

Name: Michael Solomon
Majors: Computer Science and Mathematics

Class Year: Senior

I recently got the paper "A Comparison of a Communication Strategies in Cooperative Learning" accepted as a full paper in GECCO 2012 (Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference). The authors are Michael Solomon, Terence Soule, and Robert Heckendorn. It uses evolutionary computation to study how (simulated) individuals learn to use communication in order to cooperate to solve a problem.

This is essentially the result of my research work last summer under Dr. Terence Soule (CS Department). I will be working for him again this summer (I graduate in December).

-----------------

Chelsea Bolicek

Psychology major

Sophomore

This year has been a busy yet exciting year at the University of Idaho for me. I am getting further in my education of psychology, and I have also worked for Campus Catering. It has been a great opportunity to get to know the catering staff. I am also busy with my sorority, Delta Delta Delta as the reference chair. I will be busy this summer with recruiting new members to our chapter! I also will be working as a swim instructor over the summer through Boise State’s Kinesiology program. On campus, I recently joined the Student Foundation in support of donors and alumni. For fun, I am in jazz choir 1 which has been an amazing experience! We traveled to Couer d'Alene for a concert too, in a beautiful concert hall. I look forward to the summer, and then my junior year here at the UI. I hope to be in more Honors classes and continue being a part of the program.

_______

Your Name-Kaylee Kosareff/major(s)-International Studies, Elementary Education, Minors: French, Political Science

class year-sophomore

summary description of activities/efforts. I am currently serving as a representative for the College of Education on the Student Grant Program Committee, hold the position of Vice President in my sorority, as well as recently applied for a Student Coordinator Position with ASUI. I am a member of Phi Eta Sigma, National Society of Collegiate Scholars, as well as the Golden Key International Society. This summer, I have an internship working as a camp counselor on a military base in Livorno, Italy!
TO: Honors Program Committee
    Kerri Vierling, Chair
    Avery Worrell, President, HSAB
    Stephan Flores, Director
    Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
    Steve Beyerlein

Dale Graden
Andrew Nutting
Laura Putsche
Mario Reyes
Dev Shrestha
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held October 28, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 11:33 a.m. by Kerri Vierling, with the following members present: Stephan Flores, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Andrew Nutting, Laura Putsche, Dev Shrestha, and Cheryl Wheaton. Alton Campbell arrived midway through the meeting as he instructs a group of Honors students at the same time.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introductions: new and continuing committee members. With a brief explanation from Kerri as to why she was not at the first meeting, followed swiftly by Stephan’s reiterated apology for inadvertently leaving her email off the committee’s email distribution list, Kerri began the meeting by asking Committee members to once again introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes. Kerri asked that the minutes of the September 23, 2011 meeting be approved. Steve Beyerlein moved that the minutes be approved, Andrew Nutting seconded; minutes unanimously approved.

3. Consideration of proposal designating honors courses beyond general education seminars. Stephan Flores began by explaining the various contexts by which the proposal submitted to the committee had developed (see attached). The first had been prompted by a conversation with the College of Engineering to help identify possible honors courses within their curriculum. In that same context, last year the president of the Honors Student Advisory Board, Alex Bowman, and faculty in Engineering had discussed the possibility of those courses being courses within the curriculum that could be offered as Honors courses. In addition, discussions had been held with Professors Stanek and McCollough in the Department of Business to create an honors sequence of the marketing classes which they instruct. In the larger context, there emerges the question of larger departments offering honors courses and the issues involved in doing so.

Stephan pointed out that the question might be raised about what the difference is between offering such suggested courses in Engineering and Business when a course such as Chemistry 111 is offered without question. Chemistry is a General Education course and is considered a course that meets the spirit of the honors curriculum (see attached proposal); moreover, most honors curricula follow the tradition of fostering a liberal education in the arts and sciences, rather than providing for specialized coursework in professional and technical programs. An Honors section of a non-general education course would need to be approved by the Honors Program Committee.

Comments from the committee members followed, with some members expressing agreement that the proposal would enable students to be able to take courses they would find of interest that could still allow them to participate in the program, and giving students the ability to broaden their opportunities to explore other topics. Others voiced concerns with implementing the policy. Dale Graden questioned the ability of departments to set their own criteria to allow students to take the courses offered by those departments. Steve Beyerlein suggested that such a policy might be effective as a recruitment tool to encourage students to join the program who might otherwise not be interested either because they didn’t find course work offered to be of interest or fulfilling requirements for their major.

Laura Putsche wondered about limiting the number of credits that students might take of these courses, to which Stephan cited points #5 and #6 of the proposal addressed the issue. He noted that although students could use credits earned via such courses to satisfy determination of good standing in the program and to count toward priority registration privileges, only three HON-designated credits from such non-general education courses within a particular major/discipline would count toward credits to earn the UHP Core Award; and no more than six HON-credits from such courses would be counted toward the UHP Certificate.

Stephan brought to the committee’s attention a significant aspect of the proposal: this is the provision that creates an exception for these particular kinds of courses of the program’s general requirement that students must be in the program in order to take honors courses. Again, Dale Graden posed the question regarding departments determining course criteria, to which Stephan replied that they certainly could set the criteria for the course. Dale pointed out that within his department enrollment caps for honors courses have been honored where caps for regular course work have been removed. He is concerned about students being separated out who might not have access to a course with such criteria required by the program. Stephan shared with the committee that at larger universities departments have their own honors courses which are offered only to their majors. At the Davidson Honors College at the University of Montana, honors courses are open to all students. He noted that this type of arrangement may work if there is strong self-selection among the applicants so that only students well-prepared to succeed in honors courses enroll in those courses.

Steve wondered if in considering this type of proposal the program was seeking a certain number of students to become members and if it should be used as part of the program’s recruitment. In advising students, he finds that some students don’t see that the program curriculum fits with their major requirements. Steve often suggests to those who meet the criteria that they consider joining and sees that the program fits if you want to reach out to high caliber students. He didn’t feel that just offering a particular course was enough (to recruit the prospective students). Stephan pointed out that part of offering such courses answered the question of retention for some. Kerri wondered if honors courses were at capacity, to which Stephan responded that they were close to capacity, keeping in
mind that the UI is down in enrollment, which is also reflected in the enrollment in Honors course work, particularly in light of the data released earlier by the UI, indicating that enrollment of freshmen non-residents with a 3.0-3.5 gpa was down 66%.

Other observations included an affirmation from Dev that he thought offering such courses would be good, especially for those in engineering. Andrew Nutting felt the 3.5 minimum gpa criteria was valid. Members asked if the course in question, Engineering 210, would be offered and Stephan replied that no matter the committee’s determination, Bob Stevens would offer the course to the cohort of first-year Engineering Scholars, part of whom (16 of the 39 scholars) are members of the Honors Program. Engineering wants to be supportive of the program, but at the same time sees the Engineering department and its students as their first concern.

The committee determined that it was more important at this time to consider the actual course to be offered and to revisit the proposal at another time.

4. Proposal for inclusion of Engineering 210 as an honors course for spring 2012. The proposal (see attached) described the features of the course necessary to make it in the spirit of an honors course. As pointed out earlier, 16 of the 39 engineering scholars are in the honors program and that number could be higher if those not currently in the program decide to join at semester. All of the scholars were invited to join the program as they all met the criteria. An honors section would be created to accommodate those in the program once registration has been completed. Only scholars and those in the honors program will be allowed to register.

Steve suggested that feedback from those taking the course would be most helpful to both Maria and Bob. He further suggested that the course be offered as a “pilot” course on a one-time basis. Once the students are interviewed (he stressed this should be done during the course) it could be decided about the future of the course. Committee members agreed that this would be the best plan.

Steve Beyerleia moved that Engineering 210 be offered as a pilot course for honors program students; Dale Graden seconded the motion. Discussion included clarification that there would be two sections set up, with one as an honors section. The motion was unanimously approved. Stephan will confer with Bob Stevens to look into how best to assess the course through student evaluations or a similar mechanism.

The next meeting to consider Honors seminar proposals will take place next Friday, November 4, at 11:30 am in Room 327 of the Idaho Commons.

Meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

Cc: Douglas Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
    Scott Wood, Dean, College of Science
    Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
    Katherine Alken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
    Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
    Paul Joyce, Chair, Faculty Senate
    Kanton Bird, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Gail Eckwright, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
Begin forwarded message:

From: "Nutting, Andrew" <anutting@uidaho.edu>
Date: November 10, 2011 12:39:52 PM PST
To: "Flores, Stephan" <SFLORES@uidaho.edu>
Subject: RE: Honors Program Committee seminar proposals for review

Stephan—

I approve the minutes for the 10/28 meeting.

Andrew W. Nutting
Assistant Professor
University of Idaho
College of Business and Economics
Phone: (208) 885-6204
Fax: (208) 885-5347
anutting@uidaho.edu
Dear HPC,

I want to confirm and remind you that the committee meets this Friday Oct. 28th, 11:30am-12:20pm in room 327 Commons.

We’ll take up/consider a revised version of the curriculum proposal (see attachment), and I hope to have a proposal from Bob Stevens (Engineering) regarding an enhanced section of Engr 210 Statics, to be taught this spring to a cohort of that college’s first-year "Engineering Scholars" (and this group of 39 students includes 16 UHP first-year members). Bob submitted a draft description of the course to me a couple of weeks ago (in conversation that began last June), and I met with Bob and interim dean Larry Stauffer last week for further discussion. Prof. Stevens plans to tweak his description this week, and get that to me by Wednesday, so that I can forward it to you.

Looking bit further ahead, we hope to meet again on Nov. 4th to consider honors seminar proposals.

Stephan
To: Honors Program Committee  
From: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program  
Re: [revised version] Designating honors courses beyond general education or seminars  
Date: 23 October 2011

This proposal is to consider enabling selective approval by the Honors Program Committee to designate honors sections of courses that exist outside the university’s general education (core) curriculum, and beyond current honors seminars (and the Call for Honors Seminars Proposal process). This proposal introduces the prospect of honors sections of such courses to provide students with opportunities for honors education that may dovetail more directly with degree plans, minors, or primary interests that arise from or are housed within particular majors, minors, and colleges.

To open the conversation via this proposal, here are some thoughts about designating honors sections of such courses.

1. An Honors section of a non-general education course would need to be approved by the Honors Program Committee, as meeting the spirit of the honors curriculum (for example, see appended further below statements copied from the National Collegiate Honors Council site on Honors Course Design and Honors Teaching) and serving the needs of the program and a sufficient subset of UHP students. Two subpoints: a) the proposal for such a course would require a brief course description and course goals (including probable readings, texts, content covered, and types of written work, assignments or activities) to indicate, in particular, what facets of the course—including any changes or differences from nonhonors sections—distinguish the course as an “honors” course; b) typically before any such course would be proposed to the committee, conversations and some data analysis would occur to determine the likelihood of the course serving some viable subset of honors students—a minimum number (15?) that warrants offering the course and anticipates it might be repeated with some frequency.

2. Such courses would be open to current UHP students during initial enrollment and also to nonhonors students who have at least 3.3 or higher UI institutional or transfer GPAs who enroll by permission of the instructor/department. A 3.5 minimum GPA would already be in accord, however, with the program’s minimum standards for inviting nonhonors students to apply to the program, so perhaps the 3.5 GPA is preferable. These nonhonors students would only be considered members of the UHP if they apply separately to the UHP for admission to the program. An alternative/exception to this procedure could be the case of Engineering Scholars, who were invited to that cohort based on a minimum GPA and test score index that aligns with the UHP’s minimum criteria, and who would be in their first semester at UI when preparing to register for spring coursework; moreover, in this instance, Engineering Scholars—including a subset who are members of the UHP—would be the first to register for a special section of Engr 210 Statics, and if spaces remain, other UHP members would be allowed to register for that section. In general then, if a UI semester GPA is not available (such as for students in their first semester at UI), then the student would need to meet the minimum index correlation between HS GPA and standardized test scores (available on Admissions page of UHP website), and have completed English 102 or its equivalent prior to the start of the course, have placement credit for English 102, or be enrolled concurrently in English 102 during the semester that the course is offered.

3. Course enrollment limits should be set so that no more than 30 students are permitted to enroll in a 100-200 level course, and no more than 22 students in an upper-division course.

4. Determination of instructors for such courses should include conferring with the director of the UHP; professorial or research faculty with terminal degrees are preferred for these classes, rather than lecturers; graduate students are not permitted to teach honors courses.
5. In terms of the UHP membership/program, HON-designated credits earned via such courses will be counted toward determination of good standing in the program, and also will count toward priority registration privileges.

6. Only three HON-designated credits from such non-general education courses within a particular major/discipline, would count toward credits to earn the UHP Core Award (min. of 17 HON crs for that award); and no more than six HON-credits from such courses would be counted toward the UHP Certificate (and these would need to be in addition to the regular minimum of 20 HON credits from the regular UHP curriculum, of the 27 credits required for the certificate).

For your information, here are current UHP criteria for good standing and for priority registration:

**Good standing:** A member in good standing of the University Honors Program must maintain a University of Idaho 3.3 cumulative, institutional GPA, and complete a minimum average of
- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 9 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester,
- 12 HON-designated credits by the end of the sixth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the seventh semester in residence on the Moscow campus.
- Fifth-year seniors must have completed 14 HON-designated credits by the end of their eighth semester.

*Notes: (1) HON credits are those designated as such in the course title and appear with this designation in the official academic transcript—not honors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining good standing; (2) only one credit of honors service learning may count toward determination of good standing; (3) semesters that students may spend studying abroad or on domestic exchange are not counted against the determination of good standing.

**Priority registration:** To receive permission to register with the first group of seniors, honors students must maintain a 3.3 cumulative/institutional GPA and have completed prior to the current semester a minimum average of
- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 7 HON-designated credits by the end of the third semester,
- 10 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the fifth semester.
- Also, new UHP members who enroll for at least three HON-designated credits during their first semester in the program qualify for priority registration.

*Note: nonhonors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining priority registration.

**UHP Core Award Requirements**
Completion of at least 17 HON-designated credits, with additional HON-designated credits, Honors Elective Agreement credits, or UHP volunteer service points as needed to reach 19 credits/points, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework, and a cumulative/institutional GPA of 3.3 or above upon graduation.
UHP Certificate Requirements

Within the requirements listed below, students must complete six upper division [300-400 level] honors credits, and complete courses from at least three different disciplines within the social sciences and humanities. Either or both semesters of a Core Discovery sequence or a semester of an Integrated Seminar course (ISEM 101) may count toward the three discipline requirement.

Requirements:

- Three honors humanities credits;
- Three honors social science credits;
- Three honors science credits;
- Three credits in analytical and quantitative reasoning, satisfied by honors Math 315, or via Honors Elective Agreement used in conjunction with Philosophy 202, or with agreement of professor (not lecturer) of Statistics 251 or Statistics 301;
- Additional elective credits, including up to three UHP volunteer service points, to total 27 credits/points: the 27 credits/points must include at least 20 credits with the HON course designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an institutional cumulative GPA of 3.3

[Notes on Certificate: (1) overall cumulative GPA of 3.2 or above for those entering fall 2001-fall 2007; (2) the categories of humanities, social science, and science refer primarily but not exclusively to lower-division university general education core curriculum coursework—a student who may have completed university core requirements by having completed nonhonors courses may, by approval, substitute an appropriate honors seminar course to count towards the certificate—an honors history seminar on China, for example, would count toward the social science category but a history seminar on science might very well count toward the science category; an honors literature seminar counts toward humanities, or an honors seminar such as the Chem 400 "Energy Issues" course, which is on a topic in the sciences or technology, can be used for the science category].

Designing an Honors Course [http://www.nchhonors.org/honorscoursedesign.shtml]

Every Honors instructor is different and every Honors course is different. Still, there do seem to be some characteristics that are common to many, if not most, Honors courses. Below are some guidelines that you may find helpful. In the words of one Honors faculty member, the finest instructors are those who are "willing to share the responsibility for teaching and learning with their students. The key to a successful Honors program is not the intelligence of the student or the subject matter of the course, but the attitude and approach of the instructor."

Objectives

Most Honors courses will have the following five objectives, or some variation:

- To help students develop effective written communication skills (including the ability to make effective use of the information and ideas they learn);
- To help students develop effective oral communication skills (while recognizing that not all students are comfortable talking a lot in class);
- To help students develop their ability to analyze and synthesize a broad range of material;
- To help students understand how scholars think about problems, formulate hypotheses, research those problems, and draw conclusions about them; and to help students understand how creative artists approach the creative process and produce an original work;
- To help students become more independent and critical thinkers, demonstrating the ability to use knowledge and logic when discussing an issue or an idea, while considering the consequences of their ideas, for themselves, for others, and for society.

Let us consider each of these briefly.

Developing written communication skills

Discussion and writing are the hallmarks of Honors classes. Students become better writers (Objective 1) by using writing, both in class and out, as a means to express their ideas. Therefore, Honors courses should emphasize papers and essays, not multiple-choice exams, and emphasize ideas and active learning over information and lectures.
How Honors faculty choose to help students develop written communication skills will depend on the discipline and on the instructor's individual views about teaching and learning. Instructors can help students develop written skills through traditional writing assignments or through other methods such as journals, creative writing, reports, critiques, reviews, in-class writing, or the use of writing as a preliminary to discussion of issues. (In fact, the latter works extremely well to stimulate discussion. Students who have written something ahead of time are more willing to share their ideas and are less likely to talk off the top their heads in class.)

Developing oral communication skills

Students become better speakers (Objective 2) by participating in class discussion and, where appropriate, by leading class discussion. Therefore, Honors program courses should be discussion-oriented rather than lectures. Students benefit most from discussion when they are given the topic several days in advance and are asked to prepare their responses in writing ahead of time. The instructor might wish to provide some background to inform the discussion, which can then be used as a springboard to other ideas.

Developing the ability to analyze, to synthesize, and to understand scholarly work

Students develop the ability to think about a broad range of ideas (Objective 3) and come to understand how scholars and artists work (Objective 4) by reading and responding to primary source material, by exploring issues and problems in depth rather than quickly and superficially, and by being carefully exposed to and guided through the methods of many disciplines. Therefore, Honors courses should try to explore with students the questions and methods common to all intellectual endeavors and those that differentiate the disciplines, to give students real-world, hands-on problems to explore, and to help them understand the place of intellectual pursuit in the greater society.

The use of primary sources allows students to develop their own interpretations instead of relying on someone else's. Cross-disciplinary readings are especially valuable, in that they give students the opportunity to synthesize ideas. But primary sources are not necessarily limited to published texts or original documents. They can, for example, be the students' own experiences, the results of surveys or questionnaires, works of art or music, films, videos, and the like. What is important is that students have an opportunity to be engaged by primary material.

Exploring issues and problems in depth may mean that the course covers less material than conventional courses. In many courses, the amount of material covered is less important than the way the material is handled. Students need to learn to see the broad implications of each issue, as well as learning to analyze and synthesize the material. In this way, students will be able to apply what they have learned to other situations.

Helping students become independent and critical thinkers

Students become independent thinkers and critical thinkers (Objective 5) by working independently, yet under the guidance of responsive teachers. Therefore, an Honors course should give students a great deal of opportunity to think, write, and produce on their own (and in collaboration with their classmates) - as with papers and projects - and should give their work on-going feedback and encouragement. Honors courses should help students learn how to utilize their ideas in a broader social context - by helping them understand the origins, consequences, and principles underlying their ideas.

Honors courses should also create a classroom environment that is open to many perspectives and points of view, where students are encouraged to take intellectual risks and feel safe doing so, where they learn to respect each other (although not necessarily each others' ideas), and where they are taught to consider both the immediate and long term consequences of their own ideas.
When students become active learners through direct involvement with an issue, they develop attitudes and habits which may make them more active in the intellectual and cultural life of the community. It also makes them more aware of the political and social realities of that community.

But for students to become truly active participants in their learning, they must become intellectual risk-takers. Therefore, Honors instructors themselves should be willing to take risks - to teach in a different manner, to be open to challenges from students, to be willing to let the classroom discussion roam freely yet fruitfully.

While Honors courses need to help students develop intellectually, instructors also need to hold them responsible for meeting the course requirements. Honors students may be brighter than the average student - more intellectually skeptical and (usually) highly motivated - but they are not necessarily better organized, better informed, or better prepared for their classes. Just like other students, they need to learn good work habits. Still, it would be unfair to hold them to a higher standard in this regard; most are, after all, 18 to 21 years old. Also, when designing an Honors course, it is important to remember that Honors courses are not meant to have more work for the sake of more work or harder work for the sake of harder work. The amount of work and its difficulty should serve a legitimate pedagogical purpose.

Honors Teaching [http://www.nchchonors.org/honorsteaching.shtml]
In general an Honors program or college is designed to ensure that the most academically motivated students are challenged to achieve at their highest potential as individuals while preparing for their responsibilities to the community. Although each Honors program and course is unique, all Honors courses are expected to develop Honors students’ ability to think critically, and many if not most also emphasize critical reading and effective writing.

Honors curricula encourage students to pursue active learning experiences, such as independent study, undergraduate research, and study abroad, or to seek learner-centered courses that fall outside of the typical curriculum, such as field study, seminars, mini-courses, or internships.

What is the student profile for Honors? Honors students tend to be highly motivated and high achievers. They respond with intensity to ideas, classroom discussions, and problem-solving. They can be highly creative and innovative. They are frequently willing to take on difficult and in-depth projects. They are often involved in the campus community to a greater extent than other students.

Honors courses tend to be both reading- and writing-intensive. Therefore, it is appropriate to include numerous writing assignments of varying lengths and types: formal analytical essays perhaps 5 to 8 pages in length; literature analysis and synthesis and research papers from 10 to 20 pages in length; book reports; reports appropriate to specific scientific disciplines; reaction papers; in-class writing; informal writing (1-to-3 page assignments that have students explore a particular topic, answer a specific question, or accomplish particular objectives set by the instructors); and revisions of any or all of the above. Other components could include small group work and write-ups, oral presentations, or community service components that tie in to class concerns.

Honors instructors should assess student writing with the goals of honing each student’s skills in such things as composition mechanics (grammar, spelling, punctuation); analysis and logic; style (sentence structure and diction); thesis construction; writing effective introductions; paragraph development; and the use of supporting evidence; as well as the skills to write for particular "genres" of writing, such as literary analysis, historical analysis, scientific studies and reports, film reviews, analysis of art, and so on.

You will find many Honors students very capable in the classroom: they are eager to talk, to contribute their ideas, and to critique the ideas of others. Therefore, the quality and nature of your discussions
become central to the success of your course. Many instructors opt to use one or a mixture of the following kinds of discussions to enhance the flow of ideas in the classroom: call and response (the Socratic method) led by the instructor, free-flowing discussions led by the students, small-group discussions within the class room that are focused on particular issues, structured debates and student-led discussions prepared ahead of time through student-generated lists of questions or topics relevant to the reading materials.

Because many Honors students can be very verbal, it may be useful to establish guidelines for communication, sharing the floor, respect for the speaker, and so on.

Outside the classroom, you may want to encourage your students to participate in the larger academic community: university lectures, films, and so on. Consider building some extracurricular events into the syllabus of your courses; or have students attend lectures or events on an extra-credit basis.

Students often enjoy meeting and socializing with their instructors outside the class setting. You might think of hosting a pizza evening at your home or arranging an informal get-together to discuss the class's issues in another venue besides the classroom.

Many instructors assign office conferences as part of their syllabus requirements. Students find it particularly helpful to attend conferences on their writing assignments, drafts, or research.

It is very important to set high expectations for your Honors students and to do so in a timely fashion, e.g., at the beginning of the term. Difficulties that arise in any given semester, and in any given Honors class, often have to do with particular expectations not being clarified at the outset. In Honors classes, it might be helpful to immediately convey to students that the course will be enriching and challenging; that it will spend considerable time honing the students' abilities in critical thinking, analytical writing, close reading, cogent speaking, and attentive listening; and that students are, to a large extent, responsible for the quality of the learning experience that they will have. They will be expected to participate thoughtfully and fully in all aspects of the class.
In follow up to my recent email, here is the proposal from Bob Stevens for an enhanced Engr 210 Statics course, schedule to be taught spring 2012 to the cohort of first-year Engineering Scholars, with interest to enable UHP members who are part of that cohort (16 students) and other UHP members to be able to take this course in a section with an HON-designation (but both sections taught as one course).

Stephan
ENGR210

Proposal for Inclusion as Honor Course spring 2012

Current Course Description:

Principles of statics with engineering applications; addition and resolution of forces, vector algebra, moments and couples, resultants and static equilibrium, equivalent force systems, centroids, center of gravity, free body method of analysis, two and three dimensional equilibrium, trusses, frames, and friction.

Typical class size currently: 50-70

Suggested class size: 25-30

Classical topics presented in the course description will continue to be taught. This is a typical textbook class, and is traditionally the first true “engineering” class most students from the various engineering disciplines take. As the proposed instructor for the section, I believe the following items will distinguish the course as an “honors” course.

1. Class size from 50-70 to 25-30 allowing the benefit of close contact and discussion with the instructor.
2. As an experimentalist in engineering, I have an experimental research laboratory that can be utilized to perform simple experiments and visual aids to enhance the students’ understanding of the various topics presented in the above course description.
3. I have been involved in a number of courses at the freshman and sophomore level in engineering where students engage in various hands-on experiments that include testing, analysis, and reporting. I will extend these similar facets within the statics topics.
4. Having taught ENGR210 several times over the past 20 years, I have a thorough understanding of the material and believe I have the ability to present the material in a manner where the students can identify with the specific cases I present.
5. As a private consultant in the area of mechanical design, I have been exposed to hundreds of design cases. I plan to present many of these cases to the students, where we will evaluate the design, propose changes, etc.
6. I have been the primary contact person in the Mechanical Engineering Department regarding recruitment and retention and believe I have a good understanding of what tactics can be employed to provide students with an enriched learning environment.
7. I am the Engineering Scholars Student Advisor and feel my energy, knowledge of the field, and desire to elevate the level of learning for the enrolled students will distinguish this course as an honors course.
8. Even though this is a textbook class, I believe I will be able to satisfy the main objectives for most Honors classes. While many of the assignments will be problem solving, the students will be expected to develop and work on their written communication skills through journaling and reports, with an occasional writing assignment regarding historical aspects where statics concepts apply (i.e., building of the pyramids, forces regarding ‘Leaning Tower of Pisa,’ wedge effect of zippers, etc). I have always encouraged oral communication and discussion of current events as they apply to the topic at hand, and anticipate this course being no different. I will encourage students to look at the ‘big picture’ and to analyze and synthesize the various aspects related to the subject matter. With my engineering design experiences, I will help students become independent and critical thinkers, and put them in situations where they are responsible for applying their knowledge and logic when discussing a topic or application.

9. I believe I can successfully deliver an Honors Course through my experience and passion as a teacher, my experience and knowledge as an engineer, and my desire to challenge a premiere group of students so they achieve their highest potential

Bob Stephens, Ph.D., PE

Professor, ME
TO: Honors Program Committee
   Kerri Vierling, Chair
   Avery Worrell, President, HSAB
   Stephan Flores, Director
   Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
   Steve Beyerlein

   Dale Graden
   Andrew Nutting
   Laura Putsche
   Mario Reyes
   Dev Shrestha
   Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held September 30, 2011

   The meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m. by Stephan Flores, with the following members present: Avery Worrell, Stephan Flores, Steve Beyerlein, Dale Graden, Andrew Nutting, Laura Putsche, Mario Reyes, and Cheryl Wheaton. Alton Campbell arrived midway through the meeting. Additional note: Stephan had arranged this meeting date with Kerri Vierling, but forgot to update the email distribution list completely, and so Kerri did not receive confirmation of meeting sent in mid-September, or the follow up reminder—deep apologies sent out by Stephan to committee for this oversight and mistake.

   AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introductions: new and continuing committee members. Committee members introduced themselves and Stephan Flores pointed out that the meeting was being held in the Honors Program Lounge, space newly dedicated to the program. He said it was hoped that more furnishings would be forthcoming and that ASUI, in their future remodeling, might have furniture they no longer would want and that the Honors Lounge could make use of it. It is uncertain what the time frame for those decisions might be.

2. Enrollment data and update on recent/upcoming events. Stephan reviewed with the committee the fall data recently compiled, comparing 2011 information with data collected at the same time last year (see below* and also attached). He explained to the committee how the index correlation works for admitting students and noted the average index for incoming students this fall, 90, was strong and rarely, if ever, lower than that. The ACT and SAT test scores were solid, noting the average SAT score of 1234, although high, had been as high as 1340 in previous years, and that the average ACT composite of 28 compares to a typical prior average of 28-29. There are fewer new students enrolled in the program, matching somewhat the decline in new students at the UI this fall (down 7% overall at UI in new freshmen). There are fewer new transfers (down nearly 34%) at UI, perhaps due in part to the limited number of WUEs available to students. With the reconfiguration done by Student Financial Aid, the prior “add-on” value has been taken from awards made to incoming Idaho residents in the program, and the prior funding level of full or substantial waivers of nonresident tuition is no longer available to help to recruit, support, retain, and connect students to the program.

   Andrew Nutting asked how the WUEs came into play in the awards process in the Honors Program. Stephan explained that in the past, approximately 45 full out-of-state tuition waivers had been made available to HP students; these waivers were then reduced by the university to $10,000 and were subsequently eliminated this year. The university provided 50 WUEs total, and designated 25 of them for students in the program. Unfortunately, students were then faced with the choice of accepting the Discover Idaho award (up to $8,000), which carries a 3.0 minimum GPA requirement, or the Honors WUE for another approximately $1500 added to the $8000, but with the Honors requirement of a 3.3 minimum GPA requirement. The student and parent are faced with the dilemma of accepting the WUE and then, if the minimum GPA is not met, losing the WUE and not being able to fall back to the Discover Idaho, leaving the student with no financial aid to cover the portion of nonresident costs. Laura Putsche asked what the rationale for this might be and although Stephan gave his own reasons to speculate on reducing expenses and providing for consistent budgeting, and on behalf of the program he appreciated against this condition, he really didn’t know the ultimate rationale for that decision.

   Stephan also surmised that because the program was able to offer just two ISEM courses as opposed to the three Core Discovery courses offered previously, that there might not have been enough courses offered that would allow new students to be active in the program, and that reduced somewhat the number of incoming freshmen in honors.

   Avery Worrell was asked to give the committee an overview of the activities planned by HSAB for the semester. He explained that the Honors Student Advisory Board (HSAB) had adopted the idea of building community and noted the following upcoming events to help support that goal: Movie Night with a professor (Matt Wappett was suggested); Open Mic Night, with one per month, one having already occurred; the semester retreat, usually focused on Leadership, but this semester’s retreat will revolve around finding ways to create a more cohesive, shared community between Scholars LLC and McCoy Halls (Theophilus Tower), hoping to find ways to make them stronger living groups. Stephan added that there had been an opening social, sponsored by Tom and Carrie Bitterwolf, at the Kenworthy Theater, with free drinks and popcorn and a showing of the film, “Young Frankenstein.” A group of Honors Program students performed folk music prior to the showing. Other events during the semester will include the continuing monthly “Food for Thought” luncheons and the Fireside Chat series is also underway. The first of these was held outside and led by Lee Vierling. Gary Williams and Karen Harpp will also deliver “chats” this semester. The program may also sponsor an evening of ice skating and, using gift monies, tickets have been purchased for 45 students to attend the national Broadway touring production of “Beauty and the Beast” in Spokane this January.

3. Course proposal from Rodney Frey for spring 2012. This course proposal is unusual in two respects. First, it is not offered to the committee as part of the seminar proposal process. Rodney Frey is proposing that a three-credit course, capped at 24 with eight of those 24 being Honors Program members (see proposal attached) be offered spring 2012. The course, “Turning of the Wheel: A Humanities Exploration” would be offered in conjunction with the Interdisciplinary Colloquium, which is also offered as an Honors section. The second unusual aspect of this course is that it would be offered to both Honors and non-Honors undergraduate students, as well as graduate students. Typically, students enrolled in an Honors course must be in the program. However, because of the nature of the course and the fact that it is to be offered only once, fear of it setting a precedent for future course offerings is not a
concern. Also the course will have a selection process. Committee members wondered what criteria Rodney would use to select students for the course and why eight students, rather than six or ten, was the number he selected for each of the groups allowed to enroll. Dale Gradan also wondered if Honors students might be upset because there were only eight seats available for that population. Stephan said that Gary Williams—as the inaugural Distinguished Humanities Professor—had offered a similar non-Honors course, providing a limited number of seats to students in the program, that it had seemed to work well, and that taken in context of ratio of students in the program versus students in the undergraduate population, this number of seats provides a solid opportunity for honors students.

Steve Beyerlein moved that the proposal be accepted; Mario Reyes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Course proposal from Matthew Wappett for spring 2012. Matthew Wappett taught the Core Discovery course “Monsters We Make” and was approached by students to teach a course that would pursue further study of the course material. He is teaching an ISEM Honors Monsters course and is proposing a one-credit course both for students who participated in the “Monsters We Make” Core Discovery class as well as newcomers to expand upon the ethics and ideas they began to explore in that course (see attached). He had suggested offering it as a three-credit course but because there were already several three-credit courses in the spring curriculum, Stephan felt it best to be offered as a one-credit class. Averly was asked about his experience with the Monsters class and was more than enthusiastic in his response, stating that it would be one of those courses that would rank highest and be the most influential in his college experience. He described Matt as a folk hero and gave high praise for the TA, Dusty Fleener, who was and would be an integral part of the instruction. Stephan noted that the initial Monsters class had been started as an Honors Seminar by Dean Panttaja and had always been a popular Honors Core Discovery course.

Mario questioned whether the chair of Matt’s department had given permission for him to teach the course, to which Stephan replied that he could not confirm this. Stephan also noted that although Matt had requested money for Dusty, the program would be willing to pay $600 for the course, but that no additional money would be available from the program.

Stephan said that there was room in the spring semester honors curriculum to offer a one-credit course, giving some students who might need such a course that option. Laura questioned if honors courses in general are wait-listed or if they were under enrolled. Stephan replied that most courses have good enrollments and that one course offered this fall had a large enough wait list to have been able to open another section. Laura responded that this did show the need was there for such a course. In looking ahead at the curriculum, Stephan also stated that there still might be an honors Geography 165 this spring and that Mark Warner would be teaching an ISEM “Contemporary American Experience.” Unfortunately, Econ 202 will not be offered spring 2012 and it is hoped it will return to the curriculum in the near future. He is working with John Mihelich to see if a general education Sociology or Anthropology course is available and suitable to be designated as an Honors section if the program is able to provide enough funding (potentially $4,000) for either of the two courses. That would be for this spring only as the program would not be able to sustain a permanent funding increase. Stephan said that he understood such need for substantial offset funding and is concerned that some departments are unable to provide with honors courses because they must meet general education and other course requirements in their disciplines, and that in recent years, as with this year, some departments have been hard pressed or unable to release faculty to teach honors sections, both in terms of available faculty and also in terms of the low offset funding level provided by the UHP for honors courses ($1500-1800 per three-credit course at the lower-division level).

Mario Reyes moved that the proposal be approved, on condition that permission also is granted by the department chair. Dale Gradan seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.

Stephan stated that the other agenda items could be taken up at a later time. The committee agreed that another meeting was in order and it was determined that a meeting is definitely needed in early November, and that November 11 would be acceptable to those in attendance, and that October 29th may also be scheduled for the next upcoming meeting. These dates are tentative, and Stephan will check with Kerri to learn if she is available on the October 28 and November 11.

Meeting adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
    Scott Wood, Dean, College of Science
    Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
    Katherine Aiken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
    Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
    Paul Joyce, Chair, Faculty Senate
    Kenton Bird, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Gail Eckwright, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
Dear Honors Program Committee,

A reminder about the meeting scheduled for this Friday, and several proposals for your review, via attachments to this email. These include a special (one-time) opportunity course proposal from Prof. Rodney Frey—in his position as Distinguished Humanities Professor, he is organizing a series of lectures as well as this proposed course, under his Turning of the Wheel topic/theme: http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/humanities/index.htm

Also included is another special one-time course opportunity, from Prof. Matt Wappett.

And then, following conversations between the UHP and a couple of UI colleges (Engineering and Business), I've developed a proposal to open the conversation on process for designating non-general education courses/sections, as honors sections.

As you can see from the agenda, we'll also have a quick update on enrollment figures, recent activities/events, and conclude by inviting further agenda items.

-Stephan

-------------

Agenda for 2011-2012 Meeting #1
Friday, September 30, 2011 11:30am-12:20pm, (327 Commons, just down hall from Honors Center)

Agenda
1. Introductions: new and continuing committee members
2. Brief UHP overview with fall semester enrollment data and update on recent/upcoming events etc. (Avery Worrell, president invited to contribute to this update)
3. Course proposal from Rodney Frey, for spring 2012
4. Course proposal from Matthew Wappett, for spring 2012
5. Curriculum proposal from Stephan Flores, regarding potential nongen-ed honors courses
6. New business/new agenda items
7. Adjourn
To: Honors Program Committee
From: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
Re: Designating honors courses beyond general education or seminars
Date: 27 September 2011

This proposal is to consider enabling selective approval by the Honors Program Committee to designate honors sections of courses that exist outside the university’s general education (core) curriculum, and beyond current honors seminars (and the Call for Honors Seminars Proposal process). This proposal introduces the prospect of honors sections of such courses to provide students with opportunities for honors education that may dovetail more directly with degree plans, minors, or primary interests that arise from or are housed within particular majors, minors, and colleges.

To open the conversation via this proposal, here are some thoughts about designating honors sections of such courses.

1. Honors section of non-general education courses would need to be approved by the Honors Program Committee, as meeting the spirit of the honors curriculum and serving the needs of the program and a sufficient subset of UHP students. Two subpoints: a) the proposal for such a course would require a brief course description and course goals (including probable readings, texts, content covered, and types of written work, assignments or activities) to indicate, in particular, what facets of the course—including any changes or differences from nonhonors sections—distinguish the courses as an “honors” course; b) typically before any such course would be proposed to the committee, conversations and some data analysis would occur to determine the likelihood of the course serving some viable subset of honors students—a minimum number (15?) that warrants offering the course and anticipates it might be repeated with some frequency.

2. Such courses would be open to current UHP students during initial enrollment and also to nonhonors students who have at least 3.3 or higher UI institutional or transfer GPAs who enroll by permission of the instructor/department. A 3.5 minimum GPA would already be in accord, however, with the program’s minimum standards for inviting nonhonors students to apply to the program, so perhaps the 3.5 GPA is preferable. These nonhonors students would only be considered members of the UHP if they apply separately to the UHP for admission to the program. Engineering, to take an example, might well decide that once UHP engineers register for Engr 210, and if space remains available, then nonhonors engineering majors might be permitted to enroll with a 3.5 GPA or higher (on a case by case basis), or at minimum, a 3.3. GPA. If a UI semester GPA is not available (such as for students in their first semester at UI), then the student would need to meet the minimum index correlation between HS GPA and standardized test scores (available on Admissions page of UHP website), and have completed English 102 or its equivalent prior to the start of the course, have placement credit for English 102, or be enrolled concurrently in English 102 during the semester that the course is offered.

3. Course enrollment limits should be set so that no more than 30 students are permitted to enroll in a 100-200 level course, and no more than 22 students in an upper-division course.

4. Determination of instructors for such courses should include conferring with the director of the UHP; professorial or research faculty with terminal degrees are preferred for these classes, rather than lecturers; graduate students are not permitted to teach honors courses.
5. In terms of the UHP membership/program, HON-designated credits earned via such courses will be counted toward determination of good standing in the program, and also will count toward priority registration privileges.

6. Only three HON-designated credits from such non-general education courses within a particular major/discipline, would count toward credits to earn the UHP Core Award (min. of 17 HON crs for that award); and no more than six HON-credits from such courses would be counted toward the UHP Certificate (and these would need to be in addition to the regular minimum of 20 HON credits from the regular UHP curriculum, of the 27 credits required for the certificate).

For your information, here are current UHP criteria for good standing and for priority registration:

**Good standing:** A member in good standing of the University Honors Program must maintain a University of Idaho 3.3 cumulative, institutional GPA, and complete a minimum average of

- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 9 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester,
- 12 HON-designated credits by the end of the sixth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the seventh semester in residence on the Moscow campus.

- Fifth-year seniors must have completed 14 HON-designated credits by the end of their eighth semester.

*Notes: (1) HON credits are those designated as such on the course title and appear with this designation on the official academic transcript—nonhonors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining good standing; (2) only one credit of honors service-learning may count toward determination of good standing; (3) semesters that students may spend studying abroad or on domestic exchange are not counted against the determination of good standing.

**Priority registration:** To receive permission to register with the first group of seniors, honors students must maintain a 3.3 cumulative/institutional GPA and have completed prior to the current semester a minimum average of

- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 7 HON-designated credits by the end of the third semester,
- 10 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the fifth semester.

- Also, new UHP members who enroll for at least three HON-designated credits during their first semester in the program qualify for priority registration.

*Note: nonhonors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining priority registration.

**UHP Core Award Requirements**
Completion of at least 17 HON-designated credits, with additional HON-designated credits, Honors Elective Agreement credits, or UHP volunteer service points as needed to reach 19 credits/points, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework, and a cumulative/institutional GPA of 3.3 or above upon graduation.
UHP Certificate Requirements
Within the requirements listed below, students must complete six upper division [300-400 level] honors credits, and complete courses from at least three different disciplines within the social sciences and humanities. Either or both semesters of a Core Discovery sequence or a semester of an Integrated Seminar course (ISEM 101) may count toward the three discipline requirement.

Requirements:
- Three honors humanities credits;
- Three honors social science credits;
- Three honors science credits;
- Three credits in analytical and quantitative reasoning, satisfied by honors Math 315, or via Honors Elective Agreement used in conjunction with Philosophy 202, or with agreement of professor (not lecturer) of Statistics 251 or Statistics 301;
- Additional elective credits, including up to three UHP volunteer service points, to total 27 credits/points: the 27 credits/points must include at least 20 credits with the HON course designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an institutional cumulative GPA of 3.3

[Notes on Certificate: (1) overall cumulative GPA of 3.2 or above for those entering fall 2001-fall 2007; (2) the categories of humanities, social science, and science refer primarily but not exclusively to lower-division university general education core curriculum coursework—a student who may have completed university core requirements by having completed nonhonors courses may, by approval, substitute an appropriate honors seminar course to count towards the certificate—an honors history seminar on China, for example, would count toward the social science category but a history seminar on science might very well count toward the science category; an honors literature seminar counts toward humanities, or an honors seminar such as the Chem 400 "Energy Issues" course, which is on a topic in the sciences or technology, can be used for the science category].
Honors Course Proposal

Title: "Here There Be Monsters": Advanced interrogations of monstrous archetypes and ethical questions

Course Description: For several years we have discussed putting together an "Advanced Monsters" class for students who participated in the "Monsters We Make" Core Discovery class to expand upon the ethics and ideas we begin to explore in that class. This "Advanced Monsters" course would primarily target former Monsters students, but would certainly be accessible and of interest to other students who did not participate in the Core Discovery program or who took a different Core class. We would like to structure the class as a 1-credit offering over the course of 1 semester. Although we could do it as a shorter block class, we feel that the readings and discussions are weighty and engaging enough to warrant a full semester.

The primary focus of the course would be on the tension between society and the individual, alienation and inclusion, idealism and materialism, and how these tensions force us to confront important ethical questions about what it means to be a "hero" or a "monster". We look at how philosophy, ethics, and literature use the monster as an allegorical archetype, and how the counterpoint of the monster is necessary to highlight morality and meaning. We deconstruct the monster in order to construct a more holistic picture of the hero, which in turn provides guidance on how to be a "good person". We are particularly interested in highlighting the parallels between the texts we have chosen and contemporary socio-political debates about what it means to be a good citizen of the United States and the world. This course will create a shared understanding of how the discursive framework of heroes and monsters continue to shape our everyday lives and social realities.

Instructors: Dr. Matthew Weppet and Dusty Fleener. (N.B. - Dusty has been my T.A. for "The Monsters We Make" Core Discovery class for the past 4 years. He is currently an M.S. student in Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Studies where he is researching ethnologies of "othering" among various U.S. subcultures, a research topic that was explicitly derived from his experience in the Monsters class. Most students would tell you that Dusty has been an integral part of the Monsters experience and I would like to keep it that way. I would be the lead instructor for this course, but would like Dusty to be listed as my co-instructor and, if possible, provide him with a small stipend for his assistance and contribution to the class.)

Course to be offered under Intr 404, Pass/Fail, with an initial enrollment limit of 16, with upper limit of 20.

Readings: I have selected the following books for their diversity of issues and historical scope. (I am open to other recommendations if there are specific texts that the Honors program would like to see included)

- Candide by Voltaire
- 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea by Jules Verne
- The Time Machine by H.G. Wells
- Wicked by Gregory Maguire
- We will also supplement the readings with various film adaptations and extensions of these texts.

Assignments: There will be two primary assignments for this seminar:

1) Each student will keep a weekly reflective reading/discussion journal that will inform class discussion, but will also require students to find a more personal meaning and application in the ideas we cover.

2) Each student will be required to be a "Discussion Leader" for at least one class session. I will expect a short presentation that summarizes the main ideas in the readings for that week, outlines the unique ethical implications/challenges, and then 3-4 discussion questions for the class to consider. It will be important to plan ahead since I would like to send out the discussion questions 1 week prior to your assigned class session so other students can read with your questions in mind.
### FALL 2011 HONORS PROGRAM STUDENT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Entered U of I</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Enrolled in at least one honors class</th>
<th>Not in an honors class</th>
<th>On international exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2007</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>413</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FALL 2010 HONORS PROGRAM STUDENT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Entered U of I</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Enrolled in at least one honors class</th>
<th>Not in an honors class</th>
<th>On international exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993-2008</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>437</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing fall 2011 with fall 2010, the total number of students in good standing decreased by 5%—a gross loss of 24 students. The total number of students enrolled in at least one honors course decreased by 4%—a gross decrease of 11 students. For fall 2011, 61% of the total number of students were enrolled in one or more honors courses; for fall 2010, 61% also were enrolled.
*TOTAL HONORS STUDENTS ON 9/7/11—414 (ON 9/7/10—437)
FINAL COUNT ON 9/20/11—413 (9/20/10—437)
Total enrolled in one or more honors courses on 9/20/11—256—(9/20/10—267)

Average Index (produced by algorithm correlation of HS GPA and test scores): 90
Average GPA: 3.91
Average ACT: 28
Average SAT: 1294
68% Idaho resident
32% Nonresident

Number of Students taking
4 Honors courses - 3
3 Honors courses- 20
2 Honors courses- 56
1 Honors course - 177

Average number of students in lower division Honors courses: 21.21
Average number of students in regular upper-division Honors courses (Math 315 plus two seminars): 17
TO: Honors Program Committee
    Diane Prorak, Chair
    Alec Bowman, President, HSAB
    Stephan Flores, Director
    Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
    Rick Edgeman

John Foltz
Andrew Nutting
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Sandra Reineke
Dev Shrestha
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held March 2, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Diane Prorak with the following members present: Alec Bowman, Alton Campbell, Stephan Flores, Rick Edgeman, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, Laura Putsche, Sandra Reineke, and Cheryl Wheaton.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Review/consideration of Dr. Bill Smith’s one-credit course seminar proposal. Stephan Flores began by explaining to the committee the unusual circumstance for consideration of the proposal at this time. Dr. Smith submitted the proposal after the deadline and because it was late into the fall semester; Dr. Flores felt that the committee could act on it after the spring semester began. He had hoped to have a meeting sooner than today in order to bring it to the committee but that was not the case. He went on to say that Dr. Smith had taught a seminar in fall 2008: “Multilateral Policy Formulation.” This seminar will focus on global policy formulation.

   Alec Bowman stated that, although the Honors Student Advisory Board hadn’t seen the proposal, he felt members of the board, who are always in favor of something unusual, would be in favor of offering the course. He noted that courses with creative titles always seemed to be worthwhile and the creativity comes through in the teaching of the course. Stephan noted that in a recent survey of students in the program, asking what courses they might like to see in the curricular and faculty they would like to see teaching courses, Dr. Smith’s name was often suggested as a faculty member. Rick Edgeman, who supported offering the course, suggested it might be interesting to see an umbrella of perhaps three similar courses offered throughout a semester, each a 1 credit course complementing the other two courses.

   Rick Edgeman made a motion to accept the course, “The Zombie Apocalypse and International Issues” to be offered fall 2011. Sandra Reineke seconded the motion. Motion unanimously approved.

2. Review/consideration of Dr. Flores’s proposed revisions to UHP criteria (see attachment, appended to these minutes).

   Definition of a Member in Good Standing in the UHP

   Stephan began by saying that the purpose of revising the definition of a member in good standing was, in part, a way to address managing and tracking student progress in the program. In order to track good standing in the program, a shift from the labor intensive tracking and, to some extent, also the inequities between students in levels/rates of participation in the curriculum required for maintaining good standing was seen as necessary. Andrew Nutting wondered about keeping the language of graded throughout the revision, however Stephan explained that the lower-division three-credit courses are graded, eliminating the need to use that term at all levels. Rick wondered what the impact might be with the revisions if the university reduces its requirements from 128 to 120 credits. Stephan stated that there might be something lost by the reduction but that, with future revisions, especially to the university’s general education Core, there might be something gained back with one-credit course opportunities at the upper-division level.

   Andrew Nutting moved that the proposed revised definition for good standing in the program be accepted; seconded by Laura Putsche. Motion unanimously approved.

   Priority Registration Privileges

   Stephan explained that priority registration was implemented to support strong participation in the curriculum; as students continue to accumulate HON credits, they are not hindered by students new to the program taking space in courses that are needed in order for the student to work toward completion of the Core Award or Honors Certificate. The revision provides for a cushion in the third semester in the program for those students who aren’t able to fit a three-credit honors course into their schedule but who want to continue membership in the program, staying on pace to complete a three-credit course the following semester. Alec noted that he considered priority registration to be a privilege and that a student should have to work for it in order to receive it. He also emphasized that he supported the 13-credit requirement by the end of the fifth semester. Rick returned to the idea of offering one-credit courses which students could take at various intervals throughout a semester to allow them to satisfy the requirement. Stephan pointed out that often times courses are offered as an overload, which is not always convenient for a faculty member. Alton Campbell noted that he thought these types of accelerated courses should be considered and that one-credit classes might be good incentives for both faculty and students. Stephan added that monetary incentives might also produce an interest in offering such one-credit courses.

   Diane Prorak moved that the revised criteria for priority registration be approved; seconded by Andrew Nutting. Motion unanimously approved.

   UHP Core Award Requirements

   Changes to the current requirements include going from 16 to 17 HON credits to encourage further participation in HON courses and
this change therefore backs away from specific, broader categories of courses in the Social Sciences, Humanities and Sciences. Many students who come to the university already have completed many courses in these categories but may be missing a category and are looking for courses of interest to fulfill the requirement. Andrew wondered if students in the sciences had difficulty in finding courses and if students should be designated into different tracks or groups. Stephan responded that those students do have more difficulty but that dividing students into different groups would be a difficult process to undertake, particularly when students continue to shift colleges and majors, and would be best to offer them other options rather than to identify students by their majors.

Laura Puttsche moved that the revisions to the Core Award be approved; seconded by Alec Bowman. Motion unanimously approved.

**Honors Service Learning Points and the Certificate & Core Award**

The revision is a minor change, allowing for completion of the service project to extend, if necessary, over two semesters. Many students who volunteer do so for an hour a week, which means they are able to accumulate only half of the required hours (32) in a semester. Sandra mentioned that most places want a year’s commitment of time from the student. Rick suggested establishing a 503C to enable students seeking community service to be able to work through the program. Laura pointed out that doing that meant additional paperwork as it had to be filed for each year or status would be lost. Rick’s concern is that a small number (6%) of students don’t know how to go about finding service projects in which to engage. Stephan stated that Alton had suggested establishing a one-credit, one-time, honors course for service learning. He then asked Alec to talk about the Service Committee, something that had emerged from the HSAB Leadership Retreat.

Alec reported that the Service Committee, consisting of 12 members, was already very active and engaged in selected activities to include: Microfinance Loans (KIVA program), Pennies for Peace, Relay for Life, Community Tables at Troy, and volunteers at Orphan Acres. He didn’t know how many students outside the committee had worked on the activities but said participation in such events as the Community Tables at Troy had been excellent, with students making Valentines for the diners as it had been held on Valentine’s Day.

Diane Prorak made the motion to accept the change to the Honors Service Learning points; seconded by Andrew Nutting. Motion unanimously approved.

Stephan directed the committee’s attention to the new Honors Program website, commenting on its stronger, clearer presentation and its up-to-date look more in line with the university’s website requirements. He especially liked that it will streamline “navigation” of the site and make managing student contacts more efficient.

Rick told the committee that he enjoyed being on the Honors Committee and that it was, in his opinion, one of the more important university committee’s because of what the committee members are able to do and accomplish, with substantive discussions of academic curricula and related educational goals. Laura pointed out that often times the committee members often are what make serving on a committee more enjoyable.

Alec was asked to report on any new activities of HSAB and he shared his enthusiasm for the successful leadership retreat, held in early January. He was pleased that President Nellis was able to attend and that the president has asked about space for the group. Alec was able to go into some detail about the need for sufficient, additional space designated to the program, and especially to address the needs of its students, to which Nellis indicated that he would look into possibilities.

Meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost  
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Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students  
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Paul Joyce, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Peter Haggart, Interim Faculty Secretary  
ASUI President  
Special Collections, Library
18 February 2011

TO: Honors Program Committee
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program

Here is a tweaked/revised proposal to adjust/revise criteria for definition of member in good standing, for priority registration privileges, and for the UHP Core Award, and minor adjustment to the service points form/criteria. All students entering the program in their first semester fall 2011 and thereafter, would be under these revised guidelines. Current/continuing students would be grandfathered in for the revised good standing requirements; the priority registration requirements would take effect for current 2010-2011 freshmen in fall 2012 (the fall semester of their junior year); continuing juniors would be able to follow the prior guidelines for priority registration.

Definition of a Member in Good Standing in the UHP

Proposed revised definition for good standing (see current policy further below):
A member in good standing of the University Honors Program must maintain a University of Idaho 3.3 cumulative, institutional GPA, and complete a minimum average of
- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 9 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester,
- 12 HON-designated credits by the end of the sixth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the seventh semester in residence on the Moscow campus.
- Fifth-year seniors must have completed 14 HON-designated credits by the end of their eighth semester.

*Notes: (1) HON credits are those designated as such in the course title and appear with this designation in the official academic transcript—nonhonors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining good standing; (2) only one credit of honors service learning may count toward determination of good standing (3) semesters that students may spend studying abroad or on domestic exchange are not counted against the determination of good standing; (4) in practice, seniors who have not enrolled in sufficient honors credits to complete 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the seventh semester will not lose good standing and will therefore not be made ‘inactive’ in the program until the end of that seventh semester; this also provides for the possibility that such students may elect to register for honors courses in their eighth semester.

Rationale for revision to criteria for good standing: The current policy relies upon counting courses, rather than the proposed revision which count credits; counting courses produces differences (to some extent, inequities) between students in levels/levels of participation in the curriculum required for maintaining good standing; moreover, the “allocation” of attention of UHP staff to examining each individual transcript for the over 400 students in the program in order to count courses/semesters can be alleviated by determining good standing largely in terms of counting HON-designated credits completed (with data in an Excel spreadsheet provided by Student Reports from the Registrar). With recent, increasing workload/tasks assigned to the program, this also helps to redirect staff attention to pressing responsibilities, recruitment, advising, and other projects. In addition, the proposed revision establishes a stronger degree of commitment to the honors curriculum in the student’s sophomore year and junior year, while still being arguably reasonable/manageable in terms of minimal credits to be completed within the specified time frames. Put differently, another concern and limitation of the current criteria is that it may support insufficient consistent participation in the UHP curriculum (especially discipline-based 3-5 credit honors courses, given the increased number of one-credit HON courses. Thus the new policy also recognizes the relatively recent practice of several nongraded 1-2 or honors courses having been added to the curriculum, and so does away with the requirement of graded credits for purposes of determining good standing, and it also allows for students who have completed 12 HON credits by the end of their junior year to remain active in the program via a minimum avenue of a one-credit HON course in their senior year.

Current policy: A member in good standing of the University Honors Program must be registered at the UI, maintain a University of Idaho 3.3 cumulative/institutional GPA, and complete a minimum of three graded honors credits in the first semester, and at least six graded honors credits by the end of the second semester; thereafter, students must complete, on average, one honors course every second semester.
Priority registration privileges [that enable a subset of UHP students to register with seniors]:

Proposed revision to criteria for priority registration (see current policy further below):
To receive permission to register with the first group of seniors, honors students must maintain a 3.3 cumulative/institutional GPA and have completed prior to the current semester a minimum average of

- three HON-designated credits* in the first semester,
- six HON-designated credits by the end of the second semester,
- 7 HON-designated credits by the end of the third semester,
- 10 HON-designated credits by the end of the fourth semester, and
- 13 HON-designated credits by the end of the fifth semester.
- Also, new UHP members who enroll for at least three HON-designated credits during their first semester in the program qualify for priority registration.

*Note: nonhonors credits earned via the Honors Elective Agreement do not count for purposes of determining priority registration.

Rationale for revised criteria for priority registration: Similar to reasons cited above for revisions to the criteria for good standing, the proposed criteria shift from counting graded courses to counting HON-designated credits, and establishes a stronger foundation and commitment to the honors curriculum while providing a bit of cushion in the third semester (fall semester of sophomore year) for those students who might have difficulties taking more than one honors credit that semester; this revision also supports the original intent of providing priority registration for students who are making strong progress, especially in position to achieve the core award or certificate. This shift likewise enables UHP staff to track students’ progress via the data provided from Student Reports, so that instead of examining each student’s transcript each semester, we can ‘capture’ those who are in each of the core award or certificate in time to advise those students to completion of those distinctions.

Current criteria for priority registration: Students in the program in good standing (including a cumulative institutional GPA 3.3 or above) who have completed an average of at least one graded honors course each semester prior to the current semester, shall be allowed to register with the first group of seniors. Also, new UHP members who enroll for at least one graded honors course during their first semester in the program also qualify for priority registration.

**UHP Core Award requirements**

Current criteria:
UHP Core Award requirements:

- Three honors humanities credits;

- Three honors social science credits;

- Three honors science credits;

- Additional credits as needed to reach 19 credits/points, including at least 16 credits with the HON designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and with an overall cumulative GPA of 3.2 or above upon graduation for those entering fall 2001-fall 2007, or an overall GPA of 3.3 or above upon graduation for those entering the program fall 2008 and later.

*Approved Honors Electives—May be satisfied by lower or upper-division courses from the Honors Curriculum (HON designation), by occasional offerings of special honors sections of classes—typically courses that meet UI General Core Studies requirements—through directed study coursework, subject to the UHP Director’s approval, or through credits granted through study abroad or a domestic exchange at another university. Students absent from campus for an exchange at a U.S. or a foreign university may qualify for reduction of three or four credits per semester (maximum of 7 credits total over two semesters) in the 27-credit Honors Certificate requirement, with these exchange credits typically used to satisfy upper-division credits within the honors curriculum. These credits from such domestic or study abroad exchange may be applied to the 19-credit Core Award. Where possible, substitutions should be of other honors courses at the host institution. Prior to going on exchange, students must meet with the program director in order to make provisional arrangements for which UHP requirements will waived in lieu of appropriate courses at the other university.

Proposed revised UHP Core Award requirements:

Completion of at least 17 HON-designated credits, with additional HON-designated credits, Honors Elective Agreement credits, or UHP volunteer service points as needed to reach 19 credits/points, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework, and a
cumulative/institutional GPA of 3.3 or above upon graduation.

Rational for revising core award criteria:
The new criteria is straightforward in counting a slightly increased baseline of HCN credits (increased from 16 to 17), to encourage further participation in HCN courses and to dovetail more neatly with maximum of two honors service points/credits to reach 9 credits/points. The revision also may have an effect on students who have studied abroad for a year having more difficulty achieving the core award, but this may be “counter-balanced” by increased incentive for those who have studied abroad for one semester to continue to take HCN courses and perhaps even those who have studied abroad for two semesters to strive for the core award. As with other proposed revisions, the new criteria makes the laborious process of tracking students’ progress more streamlined, with the counting of HON-designated credits via a spreadsheet from Student Reports/Registrar, instead of examining each student’s transcript and identifying sufficient number of credits across different categories. The revision does not guarantee that those who achieve the core award will have completed honors coursework within specific categories (such as science, social science, humanities), but some of our students have so many AP and dual-enrollment or transfer credits in the sciences and social sciences, or they are in degree paths that stipulate particular courses in the sciences for which there are no honors sections (such as physics, or microbiology and biology), that it puts the core award nearly out of reach for such students, in terms of good/efficient progress toward degree.

Honors Service Learning Points and the Certificate & Core Award

Minor change to following to allow for projects that take two semesters (rather than the current stipulation of one semester) which can easily be the case when students volunteer one hour per week—revised language: • Each Honors point constitutes a minimum of 32 hours of focused service (to be completed over one or two semesters).

Honors Service Learning Points and the Certificate & Core Award
University Honors Program
Honors Service Learning Points Guidelines

Agreement form submission deadlines: Sept. 20 (fall), Feb. 20 (spring)

1. Prior to activity, complete Honors Service Learning Points Agreement form
• Points are not awarded retroactively
• Points are not awarded for class requirements
• Points are not awarded for paid activities
• Points credits vary for each activity
• Each Honors point constitutes a minimum of 32 hours of focused service (to be completed over one or two semesters).
• Accumulated 3 points maximum during Honors career
• Up to 3 “Honors Service Points” may count toward the 27-credit Certificate
• Up to 2 “Honors Service Points” may count toward the 19-credit Core Award
2. Consult with Honors Program Director or Associate Director prior to the submission deadlines, and submit form with proper signatures by September 20 or February 20 for Director’s approval
3. Complete Honors points service activity as outlined on agreement form
4. Honors Program verifies project completion with project sponsor and a UHP staff member will meet with the student to discuss the service learning experience
5. Submit 4-5 page reflective essay on the service learning experience (see separate guidelines for this assignment) by December 20 or May 20: essays will not be accepted after these dates

Further Information and Guidelines on Earning Points

Service Learning Points: Service learning is a combination of service with learning beyond the classroom. Honors students use their abilities and talents to demonstrate a commitment to an ethic of civic responsibility by engaging in an activity that benefits both the student and the community. Students are awarded Honors service points for volunteer community service in which honors students engage in meaningful, reciprocal action in local communities, preferably with a single sponsor or agency, typically for a non-profit or public institution. Examples: the volunteer tutor program that UHP students staff at McDonald Elementary School, the Moscow Mentor Program within the public schools, or serving on a significant university level, organized outreach project.

Resource site for opportunities and Information about agencies: see the ASUI Center for Volunteerism and Social Action

University Honors Program
Honors Service Learning Points Agreement (hard copy available in UHP office)
Honors points activities and projects must be pre-approved by the Director of the Honors Program. No Honors points will be awarded retroactively. The fall semester deadline is September 20th. The spring semester deadline is February 20th.

Student's Full Name_________________________ Phone________________ E-mail________________
Student's ID#_________________________ Phone________________ E-mail________________
Current semester and Year: Fall 20____ Spring 20____
Major(s)____________________________________
Title of Activity____________________________________
Sponsor's Name/Agency__________________________
Sponsor/Agency Address__________________________
Sponsor's Phone_________________________ E-mail________________
Sponsor's Website address_______________________
Brief description of the Honors points service activity or project and timetable for completion:
THE ZOMBIE APOCALYPSE and INTERNATIONAL ISSUES  
Or, How World War Z Illuminates Global Topics  
MRTN 404, Fall 2011  
W 3:30-4:20, Admin 338D

Instructor: Bill L. Smith, Ph.D.  
Office: Martin Institute, Admin 338C  
Office Hours: W 3-3:30 (I am here most of the time regardless!)  
Phone: 885-2815 (Martin Institute at UI), 334-0340 (home before 9 p.m.)  
E-mail: bills@uidaho.edu

Course Description:

The framework for this section honors seminar involves three aspects. Weeks 1-4 will be comprised of a theoretical overview of how the “family of nations” we know today might react in a zombie epidemic. Next, during weeks 5 through 11 will focus on tangible examples as suggested by Max Brooks’ book World War Z. Finally, weeks 12 through 15 will comprise the section of the course when you apply what we have discussed to a problem relevant to your own area of study, culminating in an MRTN 404 “plan of action” for what we suggest be done internationally in case of a zombie uprising.

Of course, the use of zombies and a zombie uprising as the framing device is designed to facilitate a discussion of how the global community “acts and interacts,” and how issues and projects gain traction and attention. Through our efforts this semester, you will receive a framework of who the major actors are in formulating policy, learn about the applicability of the model to your major, and tackle a series of questions of policy outside of your area of training, with a zombie pandemic as the backdrop.

Course Learning Outcomes

The following two learning outcomes represent my main goals for the seminar as an instructor. Each handout for particular assignments will contain a section on how that assignment assesses progress towards those learning outcomes. These are:

1) Have an emergent understanding of how multilateral policy is formulated  
2) Have an emergent understanding of the international dimensions of your major field of study

Preliminary Course Reading List:

Drezner, Daniel “Night of the Living Wonks: Toward an International Relations Theory of Zombies,” Foreign Policy, Jul/Aug 2010  
Gill, Victoria “Attack of the Rats,” BBC’s Science in Action, 19 Nov 2010  
Preliminary Film and Videos:

*Rat Attack*, Nova 2009

**Provisional Course Breakdown:**

- IR Theory and Zombies disc. 10
- Reading annotations 25 (5 each x 5)
- Book review 10
- Roundtable discussions 20 (10 each x 2)
- Attendance and participation 10
- Final presentation 15
- Engagement in other presentations 10

100 points possible

**Provisional Course Outline:**

**Section One: Theoretical Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topics, Readings, and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>W 8/24</td>
<td>Defining zombies and identifying the global threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>W 8/31</td>
<td>The international system (stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W 9/7</td>
<td>International relations theory and zombies (Drezner discussion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>W 9/14</td>
<td>Securitizing non-traditional security issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Two: Practical Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topics, Readings, and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W 9/21</td>
<td>World Health Organization and sovereignty issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W 9/28</td>
<td>Illicit trafficking in human organs and health tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W 10/5</td>
<td>Migrants and refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>W 10/12</td>
<td>Outer Space treaties, satellites, and the view from above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>W 10/19</td>
<td>The nuclear world (of submarines, treaties, and hospitals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W 10/26</td>
<td>Sustainable development and resource depletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W 11/2</td>
<td>Odds and ends from World War Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Three: Creative Thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Topics, Readings, and Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>W 11/9</td>
<td>Roundtable One: Your major and international policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W 11/16</td>
<td>Roundtable Two: Your major and the zombies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W 11/30</td>
<td>Final presentations 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>W 12/7</td>
<td>Final presentations 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honors One Credit Seminar Proposal, Fall 2011
Dr. Bill L. Smith, Director
Martin School of International Studies

When Max Brooks had his 2006 book *World War Z* published, it opened up the possibility of an Honors seminar based on the ideas contained therein. In the four years since, additional scholarly writing on or related to the conflict has meant that the possibility of a seminar is more tangible than ever: *World War Z* is ripe for exploration.

That’s a Z, not a 2; the Z stands for Zombie. As the dust jacket for Brooks’ book reads, “We survived the zombie apocalypse, but how many of us are still haunted by that terrible time? We have (temporarily?) defeated the living dead, but at what cost? Told in the haunting and riveting voices of the men and women who witnessed the horror firsthand, *World War Z* is the only record of the plague years.” The book spans the globe and touches on a whole host of international issues germane today, from the way that the World Health Organization interacts with the global community to protect us from pandemics such as influenza to sustainable development.

Of course, there has been neither a World War Z nor a zombie apocalypse. This Honors seminar follows a trend of using hypothetical events to highlight real world issues. In this case, a zombie uprising provides a useful lens through which to consider many international issues, and to consider how they are solved (or aren’t). Through weekly discussions mixed with lecture, some fun and illuminating reading, and a series of group and individual projects, class members will be exposed to and think critically about all sorts of important topics.
Email sent 3/1/11

Dear HPC,

Two things:
1) reminder that we meet tomorrow: 10:30am-11:20am, (Wellspring Room, Commons)
2) based on several comments of expressed concern from members of the Honors Student Advisory Board (who met last night), I've made an additional revision to one aspect of the proposed criteria, so that the criteria for priority registration remains flexible or provides a bit of a window in the fall semester of the sophomore year.

See what you think and see you tomorrow: I've attached an updated version of the proposed criteria in the "ProposedRevisions4UHP criteria2011.docx" document.

all best,

Stephan

P.S. A new UHP website will "go live" soon: here's the draft version on sitecore if you are curious:
https://sitecore.uidaho.edu/honors

There are still follow up additions of new photos to add/swap out and gradual 'migration' of some profiles of students and faculty that will continue to proceed after the site is live, but the new site is nearly ready in most other respects, and should prove clearer in its presentation etc.
TO: Honors Program Committee
   Diane Prorak, Chair
   Alec Bowman, President, HSAB
   Stephan Flores, Director
   Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
   Rick Edgeman

RE: Minutes of meeting held November 10, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Diane Prorak with the following members present: Alec Bowman, Alton Campbell, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, Sandra Reineke, Dev Shrestha, and Cheryl Wheaton.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Self-introduction of members. Committee members introduced themselves to the newest committee member, Dev Shrestha. Diane then asked the committee to approve the minutes of October 13, 2010; minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Review and selection of honors seminars for 2011-2012. Stephan asked that Alec Bowman, President of the Honors Student Advisory Board, present to the committee the board's selection and preference for the seminar proposals. Alec gave the results of the board's selection as follows: Energy Issues, 12 votes; Gangs in American Society, 12 votes; History in Music and Film, 12; Banned Books, 11; Literature of Addiction, 1. Alec further clarified that the board had a preference for the Banned Books seminar over the Literature of Addiction because the addiction seminar had already been taught and also because Professor Leavitt's seminar would be taught at the same time as the Energy seminar and if some students had taken both they wouldn't be able to take either. If there was a fifth spot, 11 members approved Literature of Addiction. Stephan clarified that Michele Leavitt could only present one seminar during the year. He also stated that the program would be able to support four of the seminars for 2011-12. The board had no objections to HSAB's recommendations.

   Stephan then opened the discussion of seminars to the committee. Diane expressed that she was "very excited" about the Banned Books seminar being offered as it would open up discussion on many issues and she also thought the library would be able to offer assistance to Michele in providing various resources for the class. Sandra Reineke observed that all of the proposals were non-specific about graded assignments or ways in which the instructor intended to evaluate the students' progress in the course and that it might be something to consider in future proposal requirements. Stephan reviewed with the committee the wording in the call for seminar proposals, which includes a request to indicate readings and kinds of assignments, and then took up discussion of suggested requirements to include in the proposal. He stated that in future the committee might consider holding the line on the submissions containing the requested details on readings and assignments, should the submissions increase in number. Alec felt that with the unique teaching styles found in the honors courses, grading guidelines would have to be subject specific for mid-term assessments. Both he and Sandra agreed that it would be helpful for the proposals to include course assignments and methods of evaluating the students. Sandra also felt there should be attention to make clear that the seminars must be academically rigorous. Diane suggested that the committee take up the discussion of requirements for future proposals at the next meeting.

3. Update on events/activities, including comments from Alec Bowman, HSAB president. Stephan asked for comments from Alec regarding recent program activities. Alec reported that HSAB had visited the Corn Maze, a project sponsored by the College of Agriculture & Life Sciences; Alec offered a French cooking class, though attendance had been disappointing; an Open Mic Night was held in the Education Kiva, with about 40 participants and enthusiasm to repeat the event on a monthly basis; this weekend there will be a "Remember the Good Old Days" built around nostalgia of the elementary school period. Stephan mentioned there had been a "Climb the Wall" night rock-climbing social at the Student Rec Center, and there will be another "Food for Thought" luncheon this Friday. Following Sandra Reineke's suggestion, students are asked to bring a topic for discussion as "payment" for their meals. Alton noted that Jim Clark would be presenting at the next Fireside Chat.

4. Space Needs. Although there was not much new to report on the need for more program space, Stephan asked Alton and Alec to make observations about the progress to date. Alton said that it was difficult to find the program's location, now tucked away in a corner of the Idaho Commons. He mentioned that HSAB had made a video that it presented at New Student Orientation to show students where to find the program office. Alec emphasized that although other programs had space, students needed to identify with their space and couldn't do it if it were space specific, rather than being of a more neutral nature (such as the space specific to particular living residences or to particular colleges, rather than space dedicated to the UHP). Although Dean Scott Wood, Vice President Brian Johnson, program students, Stephan and Alton met to discuss space needs, an appropriate location hadn't been identified. Stephan noted that a formal request for space could be submitted but in order to do that another space would have to be identified in the request.

5. Undergrad research options/Ideas for honors curriculum. Stephan asked Alton to discuss the informal proposal and form distributed to committee members (see attached). Alton began by saying that there had been a push by the president and upper administration to develop undergraduate research, which in turn lays the groundwork for better applicants for major scholarships. Small attendance was seen at two presentations on undergraduate research by the program; those in the sciences tend to dwindle away.
from the program as honors course offerings in their majors decrease. In order to provide an incentive for students in the program to participate in undergraduate research, the program is exploring whether it may be appropriate for honors credit to be given to students who participate in such research. Based on information Alton gathered from various websites, two options were presented as ways to award that credit, along with an example of an application form developed by the University of Florida's Honors program.

Stephan pointed out that option 2 was similar to the current Honors Elective Agreement and that tracking might be an issue as there would be no way on the system to designate the work done as Honors in nature. Andrew Nutting questioned whether the ability to register for a course such as this should be restricted, perhaps to only those in the sciences. Others on the committee objected to this restriction and Sandra Reineke felt this kind of offering was definitely worth considering for all students. However, she also pointed out that it would probably be impossible to get faculty to work on an individual basis with undergraduate students on specific research projects, if such projects were an addition to the faculty member’s work and course load. She felt the proper title for the nature of the work and credits should be "directed" rather than "independent" study/research and that being a research assistant might be a more viable way for the student to work with a faculty member in an open-ended research project. Dev Shrestha asked if a student who was on work study, i.e., a student receiving pay for research-type work, could also receive credit for that work. Most agreed that this would not be appropriate; however, the notion of paid internships where students also receive credit was cited, such as students who are Martin Scholars and receive stipends along with credit for their overall scope of work. Alton then stated that committee member responses indicated that the members are in favor of the proposal and that there needed to be a bit more homework done and then a formal proposal developed for the next meeting.

6. **New business/new agenda items.** Future agenda items will include further discussion on wording of the requirements for future Honors Seminars, a formal proposal for Undergraduate Research in Honors, and information on the UHP now supporting and overseeing both Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi honor societies.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
Scott Wood, Dean, College of Science
Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
Katherine Aiken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Dan Eveleth, Chair, Faculty Senate
Paul Joyce, Chair, Committee on Committees
Peter Haggart, Interim Faculty Secretary
ASUI President
Special Collections, Library
IDH 4917
REQUEST FOR HONORS INDEPENDENT RESEARCH CREDIT

Return completed form to the Honors Office in 343 Infirmary. 1. Fletcher Dr. Applications are due prior to the beginning of the drop/add period of the semester during which you intend to receive credit. Please allow up to one week for the course to appear on your schedule. Normal course fees will apply. Near the end of the semester your instructor will be reminded via e-mail to submit your grade for the course. Students may register for a maximum of six credits of IDH 4917 during their undergraduate career. Direct any questions to Carol Blankenship at cblankenship@honors.ufl.edu.

STUDENT INFORMATION:

Name ___________________________________________ Phone Number ____________________________
Email ___________________________________________ UFID ________________________________

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION:

Name ___________________________________________ Phone Number ____________________________
Email ___________________________________________

REGISTRATION INFORMATION:

During which semester would you like to receive credit? ___________ Year: ___________ Semester: ___________
(If summer, designate A, B, or C)
Enter the number of credit hours sought: _____________
Will final grade include a research paper? Yes: ___________ No: ___________
Will final grade include an examination? Yes: ___________ No: ___________
Other required projects: ___________________________________________

Description of Research


SIGNATURES:

Student ___________________________________________ Instructor ____________________________
Honors Director __________________________________ Date Approved ________________________
Reminder on today's meeting:

TO: Honors Program Committee Members
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
       Diane Prorak, Honors Program Committee Chair
SUBJ: Agenda for 2010-2011 Meeting #2
       Wednesday, November 10, 2010 10:30am-11:20am, (Wellspring Room, Commons)

Agenda
1. Review and selection of honors seminars for 2011-2012 [see prior email with PDFs]
2. Honors space needs
3. Undergrad research options/ideas for honors curriculum [see below]
4. FYI: UHP now to support and oversee Phi Kappa Phi and Phi Beta Kappa
5. New business/new agenda items
6. Adjourn

[undergrad research options/ideas prepared by Alton with minor revisions by Stephan]

1. As background on undergrad research:
   - Push by president/upper administration on undergrad research
   - Push for UI to get more major/national scholarship awards (describe to HPC the UHP's workshops and coordination on these efforts)
   - Student Expo to be held in spring to highlight grad and undergrad research and other scholarly activities

2. Two undergrad research presentations were scheduled this fall to encourage student to get more involved in undergrad research:
   - "How to Get Involved in Undergrad Lab Research" Thursday, Sept. 30 at 5:00, in TLC room 028. Tom Bitterwolf and 3 students involved in undergrad research.
   - "How to get involved in Undergrad Social Science/Humanities Research" on Tuesday, Oct. 12 at 5:00 in TLC 146 with Bill Smith and Stacey Camp and two students.

3. Trying to develop an incentive to get more of our honors students participating in undergrad research. From reviewing web sites, it seems to be quite common for Honors Programs to give honors credit.

4. Options for possible implementation using an application process/form for honors undergrad research
   a. Open one to several INTR HON 400-level sections at varying credit levels for undergrad research. A student completes an application for "Honors undergrad research credit" that needs to be signed by the mentor and Honors Program Director/Assoc. Director. Then, student has permission to register. And we would credit them with up to 3-4 crs total (possibly cumulative, over repeated enrollments) upper division research
credits toward the Certificate and up to 2 cr? toward the Core Award? UHP associate director could supervise and make sure faculty turn in grades. Example form from Univ. of Florida Honors Program: [http://www.honors.ufl.edu/forms/idh4917.pdf](http://www.honors.ufl.edu/forms/idh4917.pdf)

b. An honors elective "agreement type form" signed by faculty mentor and Director/Associate Director and the student signs up for non-honors course credits in their home dept, and we would credit them with up to 3-4 upper division credits toward the Certificate and 2 cr? toward the Core Award?

c. Other options?
TO: Honors Program Committee
Diane Prorak, Chair
Alec Bowman, President, HSAB
Stephan Flores, Director
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
Rick Edgeman

John Foltz
Andrew Nutting
Laura Putsche
Sandra Reineke
Dev Shrestha
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held October 13, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Stephan Flores with the following members present: Rick Edgeman, Alec Bowman, Alton Campbell, John Foltz, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, Laura Putsche, Sandra Reineke, and Cheryl Wheaton.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Self-introduction of members. Chair Diane Prorak invited committee members to introduce themselves.

2. Brief UHP overview with fall semester enrollment data. Stephan Flores presented the committee with current statistics on the honors student population. On September 7 and again on the 20th, there were 437 students in the program; total number of students enrolled in one or more honors courses on 9/20/10 was 267. Of that number, five students were in four honors courses; 30 were in three; 70 were in two; 162 were in one. The average number of students in lower division honors courses for fall 2010 was 23.85 students; the average number of students in upper division honors courses was 15.8. Stephan noted that the students who were part of the upper division course dealing with mentors in honors were not part of the count as that course was developed under different circumstances from the other upper division honors courses, with a selective, restricted enrollment. Other statistics provided by Stephan included the comparison of fall 2010 with fall 2009 and that the total number of students in good standing decreased by .002%--a gross loss of 1 student. The total number of students enrolled in at least one honors course increased by 3%--a gross increase of 10 students. The number of new freshmen at the university for fall 2010 is just over 1750 students; 120 of those new students are members of the program. For fall 2010, 61% of the total number of students were enrolled in one or more honors courses; for fall 2009, 58% were enrolled--an increase of 3% for fall 2010. Rick Edgeman asked if the number of students enrolled in courses came into play with funding, to which Stephan replied that the increase did not translate into dollars.

Andrew Nutting wondered if the GPA of students in the program in non-honors courses differed from their GPA in honors course work. The numbers were not readily available but are known and indicate that students’ GPAs are higher in their honors courses than non-honors. Laura Putsche suggested that the higher GPA could be a result of the faculty expectation for an honors class versus a non-honors class and the student’s expected performance in an honors course. Stephan offered a series of suggestions, including enrollment caps and close support in the honors courses provide conditions for students to do their best work, the expectation that students’ work in honors courses is not to be evaluated in a severe manner relative to nonhonors courses such that participating in honors courses routinely undermines a student’s GPA, and the baseline selectivity of the program along with the students’ self-selection within those courses also were contributing factors. It also was noted that GPAs vary by college and majors.

3. Update on events/activities, including comments from Alec Bowman, HSAB president. Prior to introducing comments from Alec, Stephan mentioned that student activities can now be viewed on the Google calendar set up by Alec and available on the UHP website: http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/honors_program/uhevents.htm Stephan also sends a similar list of upcoming UHP as well as selected campus events and workshops for a two-week time frame on a weekly basis. He then asked Alec to comment on the activities of the Honors Student Advisory Board. Alec began by saying that in the recent past, HSAB hadn’t been as active as it presently is and that the board has one or two activities each week in which program members may participate and that attendance at those events has been good. He cited such activities as the third student leadership retreat held earlier in the semester as an example where 25-30 students participated and Deans Scott Wood and Kathy Aiken attended and led sessions on leadership. Other such activities include Fireside Chats (Matthew Wappett will speak this evening), free ice skating provided by Tom and Carrie Bitterwolf, and a French cooking lesson given by Alec at the end of the month to members of the program. Each week the board plans at least one activity for program members, a suggestion made at the fall retreat and being acted upon by HSAB. John Foltz wondered if these activities were not only of a fun nature but also educational, to which Alec replied that many of the activities were designed to be educational (such as the French cooking lesson), as well as service oriented activities (Homecoming Recyling day and Make a Difference Day).

Stephan asked Alton Campbell to share with the group other activities that members of the program could take part in and which HSAB had helped to organize. Alton stated that HSAB had been working very hard and that it was very important for students to connect with the UI not only through academics but with the social activities offered by HSAB. He cited other events such as weekly Bridge Nights where as many as 18 students had participated. The course this fall for freshmen which was developed and is being mentored by students in the program was successful in drawing in one-third of the entering students to the program. Student mentors meet with a group of 6-8 mentees on a weekly basis to discuss topics developed by the student mentors. Rick Edgeman suggested that the mentor course might be taken a step higher and add a mentor’s mentor to the overall makeup of the group. Alton acknowledged that he essentially acted as a mentor’s mentor but that it was a good idea. Diane asked about attendance by members in the activities to which Alec replied that it had been very good and that the whole idea is to get the new freshmen introduced to these activities so that
they will continue to attend over time. It was noted that an honors alternative spring break of service was in the planning stages.

4. Anticipated developments in honors/general education, other curricular possibilities. Undergrad research is an important area that the program would like to foster through coordinated efforts to take part in campus-wide resources in order to explore research opportunities. Honors program student Ashley Vincent was selected (one of five students nationally) for the Fullbright Summer Institute at the Newcastle University International Summer School in Newcastle, England this past summer is an example. Helen Fleming, a representative from Newcastle, was so impressed with Ashley that Ms. Fleming paid a personal visit to UI in order to perhaps recruit future university students to the program and forge a connection between the institutions. Alton added that two seminars had been presented this fall on how to get involved in undergraduate research. Although turnout was low (8 students participated in the first seminar on undergraduate laboratory research led by Dr. Tom Bitterwolf, and UIPH members Jacob Bow, Caroline Campbell, and Danielle Green; 4 students attended the seminar with Dr. Stacey Camp and Dr. Bill Smith and students who offered their perspectives and advice on undergraduate research in the social sciences and humanities) the seminars are worthwhile and students are interested in such opportunities.

Alton also shared that there are five groups of students who gather to discuss "Things That Matter" throughout each week. Some groups meet at his home, others on campus. Students select the topics and then spend two hours each week discussing the chosen topic. Alec added that he was in one of the groups and that they had discussed what honors students do when they fail, something most honors students don't deal with frequently in their academic lives. He said topics are multi-disciplinary and that the discussions are held in order to help students make important life decisions. John Foltz wondered how the groups were selected, to which Alton replied that he sends out a message to invite anyone who is interested to join a group. He received 36 replies to his invitation this fall and from that, three new groups were formed; two groups are continuing from last year. The groups meet from 7:30 to 9:30 pm and students come up with their own topics. John asked if there were group moderators. Alec replied that at times the discussion would wander and that the group would have to be reminded to return to the topic under discussion. Alton noted that he had acted as moderator but tended to let the discussion run itself. Alec stated that the goal of the groups was to keep it a "deep discussion." Both John Foltz and Rick Edgeman emphasized that this was a good example of the group process and Rick wondered how this might impact the program's retention. Stephan also suggested that sustainability of members might also be considered a factor to track over time. Rick also thought that mentoring of non-honors students might result from the group process. Stephan acknowledged that this hasn't happened other than honors students tutoring at schools such as McDonald Elementary in Moscow, working as well with the Moscow Mentors program in the public schools, and working through Career Services to tutor public school students in the Plummer schools.

Continuing with agenda items, Stephan mentioned the "Food for Thought" luncheon sponsored by the program. The first one of the fall semester brought Michele Leavitt and Sandra Reineke together with 10-12 students with no particular topic of discussion, which has been the practice of past luncheons. Following the luncheon, Stephan, Michelle, and Sandra agreed that in future it might be worthwhile to have one or more topics in mind in order to keep the discussion focused and involve as many participants as possible in a meaningful exchange of perspectives.

Finally, Stephan discussed the program's involvement with coordinating and advising on national scholarships. Each semester he offers a workshop for students on major scholarships—based on student interest, he will offer a second workshop this semester as well as meeting individually with students. He is the advisor for the Marshall Scholarship and said that an honors student, Marett Mabbitt, had been put forward as the applicant from UI for the scholarship. Alton continues to chair the Goldwater committee and Stephan coordinates with faculty advisors on other national scholarships.

Curriculum in the program this fall has included seminars taught by Sandra Reineke and Eric Aston. Spring semester courses will include English 258 taught by Gary Williams; Economics 202, taught by Andrew Nutting; two sections of Philosophy 103 with 18 in each, taught by Janice Capel Anderson as an experiment to offer a course that more closely models the spirit of an honors course; Music History 201 taught by James Reid; Anthropology 220 taught by Stacey Camp; Chemistry 112 taught by Tom Bitterolf; three sections of Core Discovery; the University Colloquium will be offered again this spring as it was this fall; seminars offered by Ellen Kittell ("Honors Africa in Rebellion") and Michele Leavitt ("Honors Literature of Resistance").

Stephan is offering a one-credit course this fall, "How We Decide," a topic developed with recent research outside his primary area of study; the course incorporates insights from behavioral economics, neuroscience, and "happiness studies" in psychology, along with opportunities to discuss public policy and current events to enable each student to reflect on connecting this research on decision making to their own decisions as they work to develop a personal statement that may be used in interviews, proposals, or applications to graduate schools or for major scholarships.

As a way to summarize the program's curricular foundation, Stephan stated that it is influenced by the university's overall plan for general education—the strengths of the sections of honors courses in general education build upon the strengths of the university's core curriculum. He has made an effort to keep apprised of ongoing discussion regarding the core curriculum in general education. Stephan encouraged program members to go online and weigh in on the proposal put forth by the Undergraduate Committee for General Education. An example of a possible change in curriculum is the suggested implementation of a one-credit upper-division great issues course, which also might translate into an honors course of the same nature being offered. He also mentioned that Alec has been in conversation with the College of Engineering regarding the development of future foundational honors courses offered by the college. Alec provided the committee with information about a lower division statics course as a possible honors course. Any proposed course being considered for the honors curriculum would be channeled through the program committee first. Laura wondered on what basis or criteria might the committee evaluate or oppose a proposed course to be part of the curriculum, to which Stephan answered that it would be necessary to make sure that the course met the standards set up for honors courses and that it be
acceptable to both those on the program committee as well as the faculty from which the course would be offered. He used the example of Calculus being denied by the Math faculty as an honors course as they saw no way at the time it was being proposed in which to add enough to the course content to set it apart and make it distinctively an honors course in the time allotted and material covered.

6. **New business/new agenda items.** Future agenda items will include the space needs of the program and other suggested items by the committee. One such possible item might be to recognize student undergraduate research, either by awarding points such as is done now for service activities, or to explore a way in which students' work could translate into credits received for their research. Rick wondered if development could be added to research. When asked what he meant by development, he suggested such things as product development. John wondered about the possibility of an undergraduate research fair, perhaps university wide in nature. Alton offered that the Research Expo would be coming back, so a venue will return for display of undergraduate research. Rick asked that another agenda item might be discussion to have a table set aside at future career fairs for representatives to interview honors program students.

The next meeting will be November 3, 10:30 a.m. and the following meeting, November 10 at 10:30 a.m., will be held to discuss and select the seminars for 2011-12. Stephan encouraged committee members both to solicit proposals from colleagues and to submit seminar proposals.

Stephan will send a link for the new Honors Program website to committee members. The site is still under construction and not yet ready to go "live."

Meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

c: Douglas Baker, Provost
Scott Wood, Dean, College of Science
Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
Katherine Aiken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Dan Eveleth, Chair, Faculty Senate
Paul Joyce, Chair, Committee on Committees
Peter Haggart, Interim Faculty Secretary
ASUI President
Special Collections, Library
UHP curriculum and policy are determined by the Honors Program Committee, a standing committee of the University Faculty. The function of the committee is to recommend policies for the program, including admission requirements; act on changes in the program; act on petitions for exceptions to the requirements of the program.
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UI MEMORANDUM [PROVISIONAL AGENDA--MAY BE UPDATED PRIOR TO MEETING VIA EMAIL, AND COPIES OF AGENDA WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE MEETING]
TO: Honors Program Committee Members
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
       Diane Prorak, Honors Program Committee Chair

SUBJ: Agenda for 2010-2011 Meeting #1
       Wednesday, October 13, 2010 10:30am-11:20am, (Wellspring Room, Commons)

Agenda
1. Introductions: new and continuing committee members
2. Brief UHP overview with fall semester enrollment data
3. Update on events/activities, including comments from Alec Bowman, HSAB president
4. Anticipated developments in honors/general education, other curricular possibilities
   3. Honors space needs
   4. New business/new agenda items [a longer list forthcoming, including items you suggest]
3. Adjourn
TO: Honors Program Committee  
Sandra Reineke, Chair  
Alec Bowman, President, HSAB  
Stephan Flores, Director  
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director  
Eric Aston  
Andrew Nutting  
Diane Prorak  
David Roon  
Kerri Vierling  
John Hasko  
Cheryl Wheaton  

RE: Minutes of meeting held February 1, 2010

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Stephan Flores with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alec Bowman, Alton Campbell, Stephan Flores, John Hasko, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, Sandra Reineke, David Roon, Kerri Vierling and Cheryl Wheaton. Dean Scott Wood, College of Science, was also in attendance.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Re-introduction of members and approval of minutes. Chair Sandra Reineke invited committee members to introduce themselves to Alec Bowman, a new committee member and president of the Honors Student Advisory Board, and Dean Scott Wood, College of Science, who was recently appointed to oversee the Honors Program. Sandra Reineke then asked for a motion to approve the minutes of December 7, 2009. Eric Aston made a motion to accept the minutes as presented, with a second from Andrew Nutting. Call for a vote on the motion was made; unanimously approved with no further discussion.

2. Welcome to Dean Scott Wood. Stephan welcomed Dean Wood and asked him for comments and observations regarding the new reporting structure for the program. Dean Wood began by explaining that a “Virtual College Council” (Dean Wood, Kathy Aiken, Bruce Pitman, Jeannie Christiansen) is now overseeing Honors and the Core. Dean Wood will directly supervise Stephan and Kathy Aiken will supervise Jean Henscheid (the Core). Neither Dean Wood nor Dean Aiken asked for the responsibility but the provost determined that he would like to try a new structure to get more people involved. Because the College of Science and CLASS have the largest numbers of majors in the Core and Honors, those two deans were asked to oversee the two programs. Wood pointed out that for items such as the budget, approval would come from the entire council, not just Wood. Sandra Reineke inquired if the new Council will meet on a regular basis to which Wood replied that it would meet once a month, and more often if needed or in case of an emergency. He noted that he and Dean Aiken are planning to smooth the transition for doing evaluations--he will meet with Stephan and Jeanne. Stephan wondered about policy making in that the Program Committee is the mechanism for faculty governance for the university that enacts policy changes for the Honors Program. Such examples as curricular restructuring and student retention criteria are part of the committee purview, but it doesn’t have a direct say in the budget. Stephan recognizes that there is a linkage and hierarchy of administration among the committee, program staff, and now Dean Wood and the new General Education Council (the provost’s title for the Virtual College Council mentioned by Dean Wood, see attached memo from Provost Baker) and Stephan wondered where the authority for these kinds of policies would now reside. Dean Wood responded that he sees no major changes. Just as the deans provide an overall direction for the college, he sees that faculty governance plays an important part just as the program committee does for the Honors Program; he is not there to take away any of the power, rights or responsibilities of the committee. John Hasko asked if Dean Wood had an occasion to look at Stephan’s communication to others regarding this new structure (see attached) and that there seems to be a sense from those who responded that this structure provides an extra level of bureaucracy that shouldn’t be there. Dean Wood replied that the council is replacing a single person. It’s now more a shared group, with a council of four replacing a single person. In some ways one dean has more influence on a dean colleague than someone in Jeanne’s position where she is by herself.

3. Review Dr. Bill Smith’s course proposal. Sandra asked the committee to consider the proposal made by Dr. Smith (see attached), which he would like to offer as a summer course. It consists of two proposals, one course for the summer and the second in the fall. Sandra added that she felt comfortable to speak for the proposal as she had been the faculty member who offered the fall 2009 course for the Martin Scholars Internship. The student must apply to be in the summer course and, if accepted, will become a Martin Scholar for the fall, with accompanying obligations for further studies and related educational opportunities. John asked if Bill Smith is the one who decides who will be admitted. Sandra said she believes that Bill will pick those who are to be considered, with the instructor and the associate director of the Institute also involved in the selection. Sandra suggested that it be investigated. She also added that this course was as close to a graduate seminar as any she’s taught. Stephan pointed out that something different about the course proposals is that there will be a mix of honors and non-honors students, which international studies majors in the summer course, then another 3-5 honors students who are non-international studies majors will complete the total number selected for the course. The precedent is seen in the Interdisciplinary Colloquium as well as the Honors Elective agreement where honors students are in settings or courses with non-honors students. Another of Stephan’s concerns is the number of credits to be awarded for the summer course, which is online and doesn’t really take on the full classroom-based aspects of an honors course. He stated that the fall semester course of study speaks more to an honors experience and that perhaps one credit could be awarded for the summer course and recorded as such internally and once the fall research component is completed the other two credits would be awarded. The committee discussed the various options for awarding the summer and fall credits. Stephan pointed out that Bill Smith would offer the summer course for no less than 3 credits. David Roon asked if there had been other proposals of this nature to which
Stephan said there hadn't been, but that there have been students who ask about the possibility of earning Honors credit during the summer. He noted that there are about 50-60 Honors students who take summer course work, which speaks to the possibility of those students taking an Honors course. Alec Bowman wondered if the summer course would be offered as an Honors only course. Keri Vierling wondered if Alec would be interested to take this type of course to which he replied that with a full schedule and his lack of interest in the subject matter, he really wouldn't be interested to take it. Sandra wondered if the course should be offered as a three credit course and that it lacks some of the work found in a three credit course. (Sandra later clarified this observation by saying that this was another way of supporting the idea of giving just one honors credit for the summer course). Stephan said that Sandra’s observation supports his suggestion that the honors component of the summer work be counted only for one credit and to then consider the full research, added to the course completed in the summer, as completing the remaining two honors credits. Alec liked the notion that the full course is more flexible, with office hours set by the students. Dean Wood wondered about how the stipend would be utilized. Stephan clarified Bill Smith's plan to offer it for not less than three credits because the way the class is conceived for the summer component warrants three credits and that it is also necessary to offer the three credit class to generate the fees. Offering the summer course to give the students an opportunity to see if they might be interested in the topic, the cost of the summer course, and also the smaller number of students being considered for the course in the summer were issues several committee members addressed.

A motion was called for by the chair. Eric Aston made the motion to accept the proposal on the condition that the Honors Program would grant the student, in its internal accounting of the students' progress within the Honors curriculum, one credit at the successful completion of the summer course and give an additional two honors credits upon the completion of the Martin Scholars' fall semester study and research commitments. Keri Vierling seconded the motion. As clarification, it would be a matter of accepting the proposal but informing Bill Smith about how the Honors Program is going to accept those credits. Motion passed unanimously.

4. New business/new agenda items. Additional information/update after the 10th day was distributed by Stephan (see attached). Enrollment figures for Spring 2010 classes: 206 seats occupied in lower division honors courses, average of 25.75 per section in lower division courses, average of 17.6 in upper division courses; 259 seats occupied over 11 courses for an average of 23.5 students per course. GPA Data: Fall 2009 class Overall GPA 3.67; Honors Only GPA 3.73; Non-honors 3.65. In the fall freshman class, 17 of 111 freshmen in the program had GPAs below the 3.3 minimum for remaining in good standing. They have been contacted regarding their standing. Students in all years have been contacted who are below the required GPA. Students have one semester of probation and are allowed to continue taking course work and will remain eligible to remain in the program and take course work if their GPA raises to the required minimum 3.3 GPA. Overall, the GPA of Honors students in the program at the end of the fall 2009 semester is 3.61 and the overall GPA of their Honors courses is 3.71, which is encouraging and expected.

Keri asked if a student is out of the program, is he permanently out. Stephan explained that if a student has become inactive because of GPA or lack of sufficient honors course work, he or she may ask to be reinstated upon meeting the criteria of the program.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 22 and Stephan hopes that Stephen Mulkey will have one or both of his proposals, "Misunderstanding Climate Change" and the "Neurobiology of Desire and Decision-making" seminar for the committee to consider. Stephan will not bring forward a proposal that he invited and encouraged from Mary Ann Judge for an honors section of English 402, Internship in Tutoring Writing. Mary Ann remained concerned about another mixed course model as she did not want to give priority to Honors students and perhaps exclude non-honors students in the English department, or graduate students who continue to show more and more interest in taking this type of class. She intends to raise the GPA requirement to a 3.3 and Stephan will encourage Honors students, as he does each semester, to consider enrolling in that course. The possibility will still be in place that students in the program who take the 402 class and then tutor the following semester could then have the option to get a service point for tutoring in the Writing Center if they didn't get paid.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
Scott Wood, Dean, College of Science
Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
Katherine Aiken, Dean, College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences
Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Faculty Senate
Dan Eveleth, Chair, Committee on Committees
Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
ASUI President
Special Collections, Library
Wheaton, Cheryl

From: Reineke, Sandra  
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2009 1:22 PM  
To: Hasko, John; Aston, Eric; Flores, Stephan; honors  
Cc: Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary  
Subject: RE: FYI/consideration: proposal to shift Honors Program reporting line to College of Science

I fully agree with the statements made by the other committee members.

Regards, Sandra

Sandra Reineke, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Political Science and Public Affairs Research Women's Studies Program  
University of Idaho Administration Building 205 Moscow, ID 83844 USA  
Phone: +1.208.885.7618  
Fax: +1.208.885.5102  
Email: sreineke@uidaho.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Hasko, John  
Sent: Mon 12/14/2009 5:00 PM  
To: Aston, Eric; Flores, Stephan; honors  
Cc: Reineke, Sandra; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary  
Subject: RE: FYI/consideration: proposal to shift Honors Program reporting line to College of Science

My sense is that the main value of the UHP is its emphasis on being able to bring together students from different disciplines. The current arrangement, in my opinion, makes that happen better than the proposed reporting plan.

--John

From: Aston, Eric  
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2009 3:30 PM  
To: Flores, Stephan; honors  
Cc: Reineke, Sandra; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary  
Subject: Re: FYI/consideration: proposal to shift Honors Program reporting line to College of Science

__All:
__
The Honors Program is a University-wide program and is therefore not appropriate (or eligible even?) for inclusion under a college administrative unit. Further, this idea is in direct conflict with the spirit of true interdisciplinarity, of which the UHP is arguably the prime example at the UI.

Best regards,

-Eric

D. Eric Aston, Assoc. Prof.
BEL 301, Chemical Engineering
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83844-1021
208-885-6953
http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/~aston/aston.htm

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Flores, Stephan <mailto:SFLORES@uidaho.edu>
To: honors <mailto:honors@uidaho.edu>
Cc: Reineke, Sandra <mailto:sreineke@uidaho.edu> ; Aston, Eric <mailto:aston@uidaho.edu> ; Nutting, Andrew <mailto:anutting@uidaho.edu> ; Prorak, Diane <mailto:Prorak@uidaho.edu> ; Roon, David <mailto:droon@uidaho.edu> ; Vierling, Kerri <mailto:kerriv@uidaho.edu> ; Hasko, John <mailto:jhasko@uidaho.edu> ; Campbell, Alton <mailto:ALTONC@uidaho.edu> ; Hourihan, Mary <mailto:mhourihan@vandals.uidaho.edu>

Sent: Monday, December 14, 2009 2:56 PM

Subject: FYI/consideration: proposal to shift Honors Program reporting line to College of Science

Honors Program Committee

Dear members of the committee,

For your information, and as the following proposal from the provost receives a broader 'hearing' across different contexts on campus, I invite your perspectives and advice.

This is to let you know that Provost Baker is 'floating an idea/notion' in various quarters--as a process for review and consideration for response and feedback--to shift the 'operational' reporting line of the University Honors Program from Academic Affairs (the UHP director currently reports to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) to the dean of the College of Science.

Provost Baker also suggests that an advisory council comprised of the dean of Science, dean of CLASS, dean and vice president of Student Affairs, and the vice provost for Academic Affairs be created to coordinate in some capacity of advice and oversight for the program--
these ideas are not wholly clear to me in some respects, as you can see from my response to the provost's proposal, copied below.

I have also copied, immediately below, the description of the functions of the Honors Program Committee, in part because I am unsure about how the proposed functions of the Honors/Core Council suggested by the provost might relate to the functions and representation (from different colleges as well as from the 12 member Honors Student Advisory Board) of the Honors Program Committee.

Several of you may already have learned about this proposal: I learned that the provost presented the concept to the Undergraduate Committee for General Education--the other aspect of the proposal entails shifting the reporting line of the director of the core curriculum from Academic Affairs to the dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences.

As you can see in my response to the provost, my concerns and judgment are aligned in part with the evaluation and perspectives of the various honors deans and directors quoted further below, and with the best practice "characteristic" identified by the National Collegiate Honors Council, which states:

* The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.

I hesitate to speak for the provost's rationale, but to give you some idea, he expressed an interest in providing a structure for alleviating the workload of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who has been directed or tasked with several commitments/projects, and thereby also to increase internal and external visibility and attention to the UHP, and perhaps to enable the development officers of Science and CLASS to aid in the program's fundraising efforts.

I realize that this is late in the semester; the provost has indicated that he hopes to move forward with consultations on this idea, and will bring it to the provost's council for discussion this week.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

sincerely,

Stephan

Stephan Flores, Director
University Honors Program
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----------

[response to Provost Baker following initial meeting regarding potential shift in reporting line and development of an Honors/Core Council]

To: provost
Subject: follow up comments on Honors Program reporting line

Provost and Executive Vice President Doug Baker

Dear Doug,

Following our meeting, I sought perspectives and advice on potential effects of a shift in the reporting line for the University Honors Program, and as you anticipated, additional questions and concerns also occurred to me.

First, I want to express that whatever arrangement is determined, I will continue to work diligently on behalf of the UHP and the university; in the particular case of Dean Wood--as I expressed to you in our meeting--I had a good meeting with the dean and associate dean this past summer and was impressed by their sharp observations and supportive sentiments.

I spoke briefly with UHP staff, and I had planned to confer with the Honors Program Committee but expect that you would appreciate a prompt follow up reply to our meeting. I also posted a query to the National Collegiate Honors Council listserv, to ask about the rationale for the NCHC's guideline that "The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution" and to solicit perspectives from other honors directors and deans. I immediately received 12 replies to my query; I have copied half of the replies below. Each respondent spoke from experience to raise substantial concerns about shifting an honors reporting line to a particular college, further away from a central/university-wide administrator. Their advice and advocacy, on behalf of one of the goals that you expressed--to seek to raise the internal and external profile of the program--direct my preference that the program report either directly to you (with 'regular' consultation and management, perhaps, with Jeanne Christiansen and/or the 'council' of dean-level advisors that you described, and as suggested by Bob Spurrier below), or that the current reporting line to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs be maintained. Here is a synopsis of issues and advice from other deans and directors.

Bob Spurrier and Rosalie Otero (past presidents of NCHC and co-authors of the monograph Assessing and Evaluating Honors Programs and Honors Colleges), write: "Assuming that honors is an institution-wide academic program, the appropriate reporting line is to the chief academic officer. While it is not uncommon to have the actual supervisory authority rest with an associate provost (or some similar administrator), it is quite important that the honors reporting line be to the central administration rather than to a subsidiary unit on campus for both budgetary and campus perception reasons." See their full comments below. I would echo the statement made by James Ruebel, Dean of the Honors College at Ball State (member of the NCHC Board of
Directors), who writes, "every filtering layer between me and the Provost is a measurable disadvantage." See his full comment below.

I am concerned about the best arrangement for longer term stability and visibility for the program, including the outcome of future external program evaluations and the possibility that if current national movements toward accreditation standards for honors programs and colleges are established, a reporting line to central administration would be a key component for accreditation, as Doreen Marcus notes in her description of the state of Massachusetts's guidelines that stipulate a reporting line for honors directors to a provost or vice provost (see below).

The main other common concern expressed is to wonder why the UHP would be aligned to report to any one college, including the College of Science. A good number of honors courses are staffed by faculty and departments within CLASS, but also in Science and in CBE, and by faculty in other colleges; nearly a third of entering UHP freshmen are in the College of Engineering, and the program's nearly 450 students are in majors across all undergraduate colleges. How would budget allocations or potential reductions or protection from cuts be managed for the UHP within the context of a particular college? Despite a series of repeated cuts to the program's budget (reducing its OE by nearly a third), I nevertheless get the impression that at times Academic Affairs has managed to 'cushion' some of the potential cuts to honors, and I wonder if any one college might be able or willing to do the same. I realize that a particular dean or council of advisors might be able to advocate on behalf of the UHP to fellow deans, but this is different than such representation voiced from a position that is central to the university and identified as university-wide in its mission and purview.

I have additional questions and concerns, but will wait to learn if you decide to continue to explore a different reporting line, and learn how other deans, chairs, faculty, and students and constituents on campus and beyond might react to such a move. I am particularly interested to learn more from Dean Wood about his perspective on this question.

Sincerely,

Stephan

-----------------------------
Stephan Flores, Director
University Honors Program

[copies/excerpts from NCHC listserv]:

Dear Stephan and Other Honors Colleagues,

Because this is an issue that I have encountered on several occasions during external honors program review site visits, I assume that it is of sufficient interest to the larger honors community to justify posting my reply to the listserv. My starting point almost always is the National Collegiate Honors Council's "Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program" followed by a somewhat more detailed
rationale. What appears below is from the preliminary text of the forthcoming second edition of NCHC's monograph, Assessing and Evaluating Honors Programs and Honors Colleges [by Spurrier and Otero]

---

* The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.

Assuming that honors is an institution-wide academic program, the appropriate reporting line is to the chief academic officer. While it is not uncommon to have the actual supervisory authority rest with an associate provost (or some similar administrator), it is quite important that the honors reporting line be to the central administration rather than to a subsidiary unit on campus for both budgetary and campus perception reasons.

In many, and perhaps most, institutions the chief academic officer is better positioned to fund, support, and protect honors than the head of any subsidiary unit—thus contributing to the budgetary support noted above. In addition, if the honors administrator reports to an academic dean (for example, the dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences), the perception on campus tends to be that honors is a wholly-owned subsidiary of LAS and that the other deans and colleges need not have a stake in its success.

Another important benefit derived from reporting to the chief academic officer is that the honors administrator has a seat at the proverbial table when it comes to resource allocation. While some directors participate in meetings of deans, others do not do so. In part this may be a matter of campus history, but it may also reflect the considered decision of the honors administrator that the program is better served by his or her being "below the radar screen" rather than being overtly present at the meetings of the deans on an ongoing basis.

I hope that this information is at least somewhat helpful to all concerned.

-------------------------------------

Bob Spurrier
Director of The Honors College
Oklahoma State University
Dear Colleagues:

Massachusetts is the only state where a state of "quasi accreditation" exists for Honors Programs in public higher education across community colleges, state colleges, and the university campuses. Programs that meet criteria set by the Commonwealth Honors Council--and pretty consistent with NCHC guidelines--are awarded the designation "Commonwealth Honors Program" by the MA Dept of Higher Education. CHP status has benefits for our students and is noted on official transcripts. In addition, the directors of these programs find support in the consortium and have noted the importance of using membership criteria to leverage university wide resources. Several of us presented on this model at the recent NCHC conference as a potential guide to considering accreditation nationally.

That the Honors director reports to the office of the chief academic officer (i.e., directly to the Provost or to a Vice Provost) is one criterion for CHPs. So, this criterion is not only an NCHC recommendation, it is a clear requirement for the only body imposing accreditation like standards on its programs.

Doreen Arcus, Ph.D.

University of Massachusetts Lowell

Director, Honors Program

Hello, everyone,

Not one model works best for all institutions. But I think Bob has it in a couple of nutshells. The key pieces are: what conversations are you a part of; and who gets to prioritize your work? If you are meeting with collegiate deans, this is not just a perception matter: it means you can contribute to and benefit from discussion of campus-wide importance. When budgetary issues are being decided, for example, do you find out about them, like department chairs, or do you participate in them? If you are reporting to another dean (or director), you are unlikely to be that dean's highest priority; perhaps one dean will hold Honors in a special place, but that person will retire or leave the institution and you have yet another person's perspective to worry about. This issue occurs at the Provost's level, too, but once you've established a history of working with other deans in a productive, collaborative way, it's unlikely that a new person is going to change anything for the worse. You are part of the apparatus, not a visitor or spectator.
When I came to Ball State I reported to the Associate Provost; she was a wonderful person and great to work with, and remains a good friend; but Honors was not her priority, as became clear over time. (She thought of us as "not broken.") After some administrative shuffling, five years ago I began reporting to the Provost (I am now on my second Provost). My experience in this process has led me to a simple conclusion: every filtering layer between me and the Provost is a measurable disadvantage.

~~~

James S. Ruebel

Dean, The Honors College

Ball State University

... I reported to a dean when I was at Northeastern Illinois and it was not good structurally. Your program works with students and faculty from across your university and if you report to the dean of one college, your program is marginalized in the remaining colleges. That can be disaster. You need to report to someone in the provost's office so that you have communication, clout, whatever you need in all colleges. Your Provost's plan only works if you will be an Honors Program only for students in the College of Science. I'm guessing that is not his/her intent.

Ricki J. Shine

Associate Director of the Calhoun Honors College

Director of Major Fellowships

Clemson University

1. Why "Science"? I'm mostly interested in how faculty and students from outside that college will perceive Honors.

2. Advantages of reporting to the Provost (yes, I know you never did) are

   a. a seat at the table when decisions are made

   b. a chance to know what is really going on at the University
c. the perception by others (including those external to the University) of the importance of Honors

3. Disadvantages of reporting to the Provost

a. jealousy among other directors who don't and deans who do
b. no cover
c. no champion

b & c are related -- when I reported (before we were a college) to the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education (in another incarnation his title was Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) and he took a budget cut, I didn't always have to absorb the whole thing. Now, as the Dean of a College, I report to the Provost and take precisely the same percent cut as the other colleges do.

Charlie Slavin

Dean, The Honors College at the University of Maine

My situation here at CSU has me reporting to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (who reports to the Provost). This is not a good arrangement, as the VP also has responsibility for advising, tutoring, and a variety of other activities, most of which have little to do with Honors. It also means that I'm rarely in the room when discussions among Deans/Chairs are occurring -- it's as if I'm a vice-chair or something. The Director used to report directly to the Provost, which was better in some ways, but meant that the Honors program had to make a lot of noise to get noticed (since the provost's office has so many other things to think about.)

I'd be nervous about reporting to the Dean of a college, since that would tend to skew the program towards that college's needs and interests. It would also place you in competition with chairs (rather than having you collaborating with them from outside) for the Dean's attention and for college resources. What would happen if you had needs involving music majors or business students if your supervisor were the Dean of Science?

Peter Meiksins

Director, Honors Program

Cleveland State University
TO: Honors Program Committee  
Andrew Nutting  
Diane Prorak  
David Roon  
Kerri Vierling  
John Hasko  
Cheryl Wheaton

Mary Hourihan, President, HSAB  
Stephan Flores, Director  
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director  
Eric Aston

RE: Minutes of meeting held December 7, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 10:33 a.m. by Sandra Reineke with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alton Campbell, Stephan Flores, John Hasko, Mary Hourihan, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, Kerri Vierling and Cheryl Wheaton.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Re-introduction of members and approval of minutes. Stephan Flores invited committee members to introduce themselves since two members had been absent from the first meeting. Sandra Reineke then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Eric Aston wondered if there had been changes to the minutes prior to the meeting and it was noted that a name had been misspelled, requiring a second set to be emailed to the committee. Eric then made a motion to accept the minutes as presented, with a second from Diane Prorak. Discussion followed, with Stephan explaining that the seminar proposal submitted by Stephen Mulkey was still uncertain and that he wasn’t sure if Stephen planned to resubmit, and that Stephen was busy at the moment working under deadline for grant proposals. Stephan explained that he had contacted Stephen regarding the committee’s request but that Stephan seemed not to realize the difference between what he had submitted and what the actual seminar proposal outline requested. Stephan told him that the committee would be willing to reconsider the proposal at their meeting in January (following the meeting, Stephan received an email from Stephen Mulkey indicating that he is “happy” to revise the seminar proposals over the holiday break, if the committee would be interested to reconsider those in January). Sandra asked how those who submitted seminars will know when theirs will be offered. Stephan replied that some faculty express a preference for when their seminar is offered while others have a greater flexibility to offer either semester. He indicated that Sandra’s seminar Genes and Justice: Biotechnology and Biomedical Policy Formation in Global Perspective, and Stephan Mulkey’s seminar (if approved), would be offered fall of 2010 while Eric Aston’s Nanotechnology and the Microcosm and Ellen Kittell’s Africa in Rebellion: The Movements for Independence would be in spring 2011. Call for a vote on the motion was made; unanimously approved.

2. Seminar size enrollment limit. Stephan stated that the topic of seminar size and enrollment limits had been prompted by specific issues for next spring but that he had also had cause to reflect upon enrollment in seminars prior to this and from time to time in consultation with the instructor, has agreed to increase enrollment, but usually capped it at 18 for seminars. Currently the seminars for spring have wait listed students and, in the case of Greg Moller’s Molecules of Death seminar, Greg would like to allow all those on the wait list to be allowed into the course. Greg feels that he can accommodate as many as 25 without altering the course structure. He would like as many as possible to be able to take the course as it may never be offered again.

Although Stephan understands Greg’s position, he stated that the honors seminars represent a certain kind of experience for the students and that to increase enrollment would not necessarily enable the student to have that experience. Stephan cited information gleaned from the National Honors listserv as well as excerpts from the Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload prepared by the National Council of Teachers of English and also from the Associated Departments of English which support a policy of limiting enrollment to between 15 and 20 students (see attached). Although he pointed out that the honors courses were not writing courses, they have a writing-based component that aligns them with writing classes. He noted that he and Alton Campbell had differing views on the policy and appreciate consulting the committee about the current policy. Stephan then invited committee members, particularly those who have taught seminars, to give their views on enrollment limits for seminar courses.

Eric Aston commented that he felt that in order to fulfill the intent of the course it must have a structured part where everyone regularly participates, which is less feasible with more than 15 students in the course. He suggested that in order to accommodate more students, as an example, a two-credit course of 15 could be increased to three credits with an enrollment limit of 18, thus allowing more in-class time. Diane asked if students had been asked their opinion on enrollment limits, to which Stephan said they hadn’t. Mary Hourihan added that she preferred the enrollment limit of 15 be left in place and added that often times if students are in a larger class they tend not to interact like they do in smaller settings, using her business classes as an example where enrollment size is usually set at 20-25 and students tended not to speak up like they do in the honors seminars.

Sandra spoke on how she feels the university as a whole does not have a good concept of when to offer a course as a seminar versus a lecture class. She feels the honors program has a distinct goal to provide the students an opportunity to experience this kind of class setting and that to keep the limit at the current amount would show there is a real need to have this kind of course to allow for focused intellectual exchange and exhibit a true distinction. John Hasko wondered if it might be feasible to designate an enrollment limit of 15 for two-credit seminars and a limit of 18 for three credits. Committee members were not as supportive of this structure and Stephan noted that it would probably be more acceptable to increase limits at the discretion of the director, in consultation with the instructor, than to set such limits. Mary wondered how wait list determinations were made, to which Stephan replied that although with priority...
registration everyone was able to register for courses on the first day, priority was given to juniors and seniors in the seminars and that freshmen and sophomores could be bumped from them if a junior or senior ended up on the wait list during the initial day of registration, which does sometimes happen. She wondered if determination is made based on class year, which is the case.

Alton Campbell added to the discussion by saying that he initially was responding to Greg's request to allow as many as possible to the seminar but that he had been with the program just one year and he understood the policy and reasons given by the committee for keeping lower enrollment limits. Stephan reiterated that Greg strongly confident that he was able to teach a larger group and that he would like to try to accommodate as many as possible, while Stephan supports enrollment that adheres more closely to the 15-18 limit.

Stephan asked the committee if they might be willing to make a motion to support a policy of enrollment limits for seminars. Further discussion followed with Andrew Nutting suggesting that enrollment limits might be set based on the type of course being offered. He felt that a seminar in economics might be offered in a different manner than a course in literature; Stephan replied that the goals of the course must be considered in this type of situation and that Math 315 (with an enrollment of 28-32 students) is an example of a course where student participation is different than a seminar course. Mary wondered if a decision should be delayed until the current university policy regarding class size (not less than 15 students per course) is in place next year. Diane observed that when she attended the external review sessions last year, students indicated that class size was quite important to them. Finally, Kerri Vierling offered that there were differing opinions about what a seminar size should be, but that at some point an upper limit may be useful to determine.

Eric Aston made the motion that for next fall, enrollment limits for seminars should be set at 17 students and, at the discretion of the director, in consultation with the instructor, have a maximum limit of 20 students. John Hasko seconded the motion. With no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

3. Program update and an invitation. Stephan asked if the committee would like to have an update on program activities for the semester, to which they responded in the affirmative. He also invited committee members to provide suggestions for agenda items for the upcoming semester.

Honors Program activities for fall 2009 have included:

- An increased opportunity for faculty/student interaction such as "Food for Thought," a monthly activity where 8-10 students meet with a couple of faculty over lunch. The ASUI and Commons meal vouchers are used to enable students and faculty to have lunch at no charge.
- Monthly fire-side chats are held at Scholars LLC. Alton Campbell has organized all but the last, which was Tom Bitterwolf's Energy seminar, coordinated by Brady McNall, and had about 43 participants; other speakers have included James Murphy from music (8-10 participants), Kim Barnes, English (25), and Kathy Aiken (8-10).
- Mary reported on the Leadership Retreat, held early in the semester, with 23 participants gathered to discuss leadership skills, student-led participation in the program, and program activities.
- Stephan and Alton provided a session for the 6th annual ACADA Advising Symposium at UI.
- A group of 45 students were taken to see "The Lion King" in Spokane using gift monies.
- Priority registrations are continuing with University Residences in order for students in the program to be able to secure a reservation in either McCoy Hall or Scholars LLC.
- About 50 participants enjoyed ice skating at the local rink, sponsored by Tom and Carrie Bitterwolf.
- On-going advising, recruitment, and student interaction has continued throughout the semester by program staff.

4. English 402. The possibility of offering an honors section of English 402, Internship in Tutoring Writing is being investigated with Mary Ann Judge and Gary Williams. It is an opportunity for honors students to tutor writing and possibly strengthen the class across the disciplines. An honors section would be offered next fall and each fall following. It is hoped that a proposal will be ready for consideration by the committee in late January.

Committee members were reminded to attend the Honors Program Open House for graduating seniors on Friday, December 11, from 1-5 p.m. in the Honors Center, Commons Room 315.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Faculty Senate
Dan Eveleth, Chair, Committee on Committees
Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
ASUI President
Special Collections, Library
From: Flores, Stephan
Sent: Friday, December 04, 2009 12:15 PM
To: Reineke, Sandra; Aston, Eric; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary; honors
Subject: Reminder and information for Honors Program Committee mtg. Monday Dec 7, 10:30am-11:25am, Crest room

TO: Honors Program Committee Members
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
Sandra Reineke, Honors Program Committee Chair

SUBJ: Agenda for 2009-10 Meeting #2
Monday, December 7, 10:30am-11:25am, Crest Room, fourth floor of the Commons

Agenda
1. seminar size enrollment limit (currently 15, see additional statements and comparative information below)
2. possibility of an honors section of English 402 Internship in Tutoring Writing (proposal by late Jan. 2010--see nonhonors info below)
3. New business/new agenda items
4. Adjourn

"Recommendation: College English teachers should not teach more than three sections of composition per term. The number of students in each section should be fifteen or fewer, with no more than twenty students in any case. . . . Honors courses and seminars that require students to conduct research and to produce sustained critical essays should be restricted to fifteen students because close individual guidance is essential" (pp.89-90 Associated Departments of English Bulletin Nos. 147-48 Winter-Spring 2009).

Oregon State Univ. Honors College: 12-20 students in each honors section

Univ. Montana Honors College: max. of 20 per honors course

Eastern Illinois University: max. of 18

Univ. Utah Honors College: max of 30 but average across classes of 17 students per course

Univ-Eau Claire: max. of 20 except for the First-Year Seminar which is limited to 15 per section.

Eastern Ky Univ: max. of 20

West Georgia: max. of 16 unless the faculty member agrees to overload the section and the classroom or lab will accommodate more than 16, but never over 20 students in an Honors section.

Excerpt from Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: Prepared by the National Council of Teachers of English College Section No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15. Students cannot learn to write without writing. In sections larger than 20, teachers cannot possibly give student writing the immediate and individual response necessary for growth and improvement.
[excerpt from Writing Center site]
Becoming A Writing Tutor

Spring Semester 2009
English 402: Internship in Tutoring Writing TR 2:00-3:15
CRN: 51421

The Writing Center is looking for excellent students with a strong background in writing and the ability to work well with other students. To become a writing tutor, students must first enroll in English 402: Internship in Tutoring Writing; students enroll in the Internship in Tutoring Writing by permission only. The minimum qualifications are completion of the first-year writing requirement (English 102) and a minimum GPA of 3.2. Preference is given to juniors and seniors.

If admitted, students enroll in a three-credit course (with reading and writing requirements) that meets 150 minutes a week, as does any three-credit course. Beginning the fourth week of the semester and continuing through the last week of class, students also work in the Writing Center for five hours a week as part of the course requirements. After completing English 402, students are eligible for a part-time paid position as a writing tutor.

-----Original Message-----
From: Aston, Eric
Sent: Mon 11/16/09 7:36 AM
To: Flores, Stephan
Cc: Reineke, Sandra; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary; honors
Subject: RE: Reminder: Honors Program Committee mtg. Monday Nov. 16th, 10:30am-11:25am

Stephan et al.

Since I will not be there today, I would like to suggest now that the seminars be kept initially at 15 enrollment limit. Realizing that the small number of seminars next year may cause more scheduling difficulties than usual, perhaps instructors could add up to a certain number of students (e.g., 1-3 more?) by written form if needed in some specific cases. I would prefer the smaller class, but of course we are already at the "magic number" for the Provost's desired counting scheme.

-Eric

D. Eric Aston, Assoc. Professor
Chemical & Materials Engineering
TO: Honors Program Committee
   Sandra Reineke, Chair
   Mary Hourihan, President, HSAB
   Stephan Flores, Director
   Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
   Eric Aston

RE: Minutes of meeting held November 16, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 10:31 a.m. by Stephan Flores with the following members present: Alton Campbell, Stephan Flores, John Hasko, Mary Hourihan, Andrew Nutting, Diane Prorak, David Roon, Kerri Vierling and Cheryl Wheaton. Eric Aston and Sandra Reineke were not present as their seminar proposals were being decided upon for course offerings for 2010-2011.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Introductions of new and continuing members. Stephan Flores invited committee member to introduce themselves.

2. Discussion of Honors Seminar proposals and approval of seminars to be offered fall 2010 and spring 2011. Following introductions, Stephan asked that Mary Hourihan, President of the Honors Student Advisory Board, give the committee HSAB’s observations and rankings of the seminar proposals. Mary offered brief comments and stated that the seminars were ranked as follows: 1) Genes and Justice: Biotechnology and Biomedical Policy Formation in Global Perspective; 2) Africa in Rebellion: The Movements for Independence; 3) Nanotechnology and the Microcosm; 4) Misunderstanding Climate Change. Mary noted that the board found the alternate possibility on neurobiology suggested by Stephen Mulkey more appealing than the proposal on climate change. Stephan added that Stephen’s initial choice had been to teach a seminar on the neurobiology of desire and decision making, but in consultation with Stephen, thought the “Misunderstanding Climate Change” proposal would be most appealing and useful to the widest range of students. Mulkey may be able to draw more readily upon faculty to participate in the climate change course. Stephan noted that a short deadline before the proposals were due was a factor in making the choice of which seminar to propose and supposed that he might be able to go back to Mulkey to request that he develop the neurobiology proposal if the Honors Committee felt that would be helpful. Mary observed that the neurobiology course would be something new and different and that many students take seminars because they are so different from their major studies. Stephan also pointed out that there is no undergraduate course introducing students to neuroscience. Committee members felt that for now, they would need to proceed with considering what had been presented—the climate change proposal.

Stephan wondered if it would be necessary to rank the proposals by the committee since there were so few and asked for observations. Stephan was asked how many proposals normally are submitted to which he responded that in the past there have been more, usually six or seven, with three offered each semester, and that sometimes not all proposals have been accepted. Kerri Vierling thought that Mulkey’s proposal was not as well developed as the others and David Roon suggested it was just a sketch of the actual course. When asked if there was a deadline for determining the choice of seminar proposals, Stephan said that it might be possible to extend consideration of Mulkey’s proposal because of Mulkey’s flexibility as director of the Environmental Science Program. Other faculty need to be notified during this semester. Andrew Nutting asked if there were usually this many science seminars offered, to which Stephan replied that it was a bit unusual to have as many science oriented seminars offered and proposed, but that it was good to have them since it’s often difficult for research scientists to make time in their schedules to offer undergraduate course work. He also pointed out that over half of the entering students in the program are in the sciences and in technical fields.

John Hasko made a motion to accept the proposals ranked 1 through 3 by the Honors Student Advisory Board. The motion was seconded by David Roon; motion unanimously carried.

Hasko then made the motion, with a second by Mary Hourihan, to invite Stephen Mulkey to resubmit a fuller, more descriptive proposal on climate change and, if possible and feasible, also to submit a proposal on the neurobiology of desire and decision making. Motion unanimously carried.

To enrich education through diversity, the University of Idaho is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.
Kerri wondered if Michelle Leavitt’s proposal (North American Literature of Resistance) might be considered along with Mulkey’s resubmitted proposal. Stephan replied that he felt he must be cautious in considering both for next year. David asked about guidelines for submitting seminar proposals and Stephan reminded the committee that the topic had come up during last year’s committee meetings and that he had modified the wording of the invitation to submit proposals to include specific suggestions and examples, but that he hesitated to be too restrictive in requesting a set format for submissions for fear that faculty simply would not submit proposals. He will request that Mulkey include more specifics in his revised proposal.

Mary Hourihan was asked and confirmed that HSAB, through email exchanges, had found Leavitt’s proposal acceptable but had not ranked it because it was received after the deadline. In noting that Leavitt’s proposed seminar draws upon some issues and texts related to legal decisions, Stephan gave a brief overview of the business in medicine course offered last year and his interactions with Steven Perez in the College of Law to explore the possibility of offering a similar course in that discipline. The main concern with a one-credit law seminar would be who would anchor it, if the class drew upon a range of faculty with expertise in law. Stephan told the committee that Michelle had been a trial lawyer and suggested that experience could be incorporated into such a course. Diane suggested that we consider Leavitt’s proposal, given that the program would seek to fund up to five proposals anyway—others agreed.

Kerri Vierling made a motion to accept Leavitt’s Literature of Resistance seminar proposal; Roon seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

3. Program data. Stephan presented program information as follows: as of Sept. 21, there are 438 members in good standing; 111 new freshmen (123 new freshman in 2008); the average high school GPA is 3.91, ACT composite is 29.1 and SAT combined verbal and math scores is 1294; there are 13 National Merit Finalists and one national merit finalist transfer student in the program. Finally, there are, on average, 27.54 students in the lower division courses and 17.6 enrolled in upper-division honors courses.

John Hasko inquired about the criteria for entry into the program to which Stephan replied that, for example, students who have received a 28 ACT composite score, or a 1260 SAT combined critical reading and math score, and a 3.77 unweighted high school GPA meet the initial minimum criteria. The correlation is based on a sliding scale: students with test scores higher than those noted above may have GPAs below 3.77 and still meet the minimum criteria, and students with higher GPAs may have test scores lower than those cited. Stephan also spoke to the decline in new students, suggesting that among multiple factors, it might due in part because, with a shift to a hybrid on-line application, students may now view the criteria to determine whether they can apply and, through self-selection, decide not to seek letters of recommendation if they don’t meet the criteria.

4. New business/new agenda items. Seminar size and enrollment limits for seminars are items to be considered at a future committee meeting. Also to be considered will be ways in which to manage the wait lists for seminars, to which Stephan will assemble information for the committee. He also would like the committee to consider an honors section of English 402, Internship in Tutoring Writing. The committee determined that the next most convenient time to meet would be on December 7 at 10:30 a.m. (probably in the same location). Stephan will check with Honors Program Committee Chair Sandra Reineke to see if she is available and will then contact committee members.

Meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
    Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
    John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Faculty Senate
    Dan Eveleth, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
Wheaton, Cheryl

From: Flores, Stephan
Sent: Sunday, November 15, 2009 1:29 PM
To: Reineke, Sandra; Aston, Eric; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; Hourihan, Mary; honors
Cc: Reminder: Honors Program Committee mtg. Monday Nov. 16th, 10:30am-11:25am

A reminder to Andy, Diane, David, Kerri, John, Mary, Alton, and Cheryl, of tomorrow's meeting (to discuss proposals of Aston, Reineke, Kittell, Mulkey, and Leavitt).

TO: Honors Program Committee Members
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
       Sandra Reineke, Honors Program Committee Chair

SUBJ: Agenda for 2009-10 Meeting #1
       Monday, November 16th, 10:30am-11:25am, Wellspring Room, Commons

Agenda
1. Introductions: new and continuing committee members
2. Discussion of proposed Honors Seminars and approval of seminars to be offered fall 2010 and spring 2011
4. New business/new agenda items, including scheduling of next meeting (Dec. 4 or 7th?) and at least following agenda items: (1) seminar size enrollment limit (currently 15); (2) possibility of an honors section of English 402 Internship in Tutoring Writing
5. Adjourn

Stephan Flores, Ph.D.
Director, University Honors Program
Associate Professor of English
University of Idaho
http://www.uidaho.edu/class/english/stephanflores.aspx
http://www.uidaho.edu/honors_program/director3.htm

On Nov 3, 2009, at 11:31 AM, Flores, Stephan wrote:

Dear members of the Honors Program Committee,

I would like to schedule a meeting for (a majority of) you to review honors seminar proposals to determine seminar offerings for next year. The Honors Student Advisory Board shall meet this Wednesday to evaluate and rank the four proposed seminars, and given the number of proposals, I expect our discussion will consider HSAB's comments and advice, ensure that each proposed seminar is acceptable to be offered, and consider if we have further questions/concerns/advice regarding each proposed course.
What follows provides a background/compilation of a series of conversations and varied points of view on the shift in the University Honors Program reporting line and the composition of a "General Education Council" (as noted in the provost's memo of January 7, 2010, or as referenced below, an Honors/Core Council). The email exchanges are listed in chronological descending order, beginning with the original late December 2009 message from the UHP director to Provost Baker, followed by six additional exchanges that include responses from members of the Honors Program Committee and also Dean Scott Wood, College of Science. The reference in the provost's memo to an "Honors Advisory Council" is assumed, by the UHP director, to refer to the Honors Program Committee.

---------------------

(1) [UHP director's response to Provost Baker following initial meeting regarding potential shift in reporting line and development of an Honors/Core Council]

> To: provost
> Subject: follow up comments on Honors Program reporting line
>
> Provost and Executive Vice President Doug Baker
>
> Dear Doug,

> Following our meeting, I sought perspectives and advice on potential effects of a shift in the reporting line for the University Honors Program, and as you anticipated, additional questions and concerns also occurred to me.

> First, I want to express that whatever arrangement is determined, I will continue to work diligently on behalf of the UHP and the university; in the particular case of Dean Wood--as I expressed to you in our meeting--I had a good meeting with the dean and associate dean this past summer and was impressed by their sharp observations and supportive sentiments.

> I spoke briefly with UHP staff, and I had planned to confer with the Honors Program Committee but expect that you would appreciate a prompt follow up reply to our meeting. I also posted a query to the National Collegiate Honors Council listserv, to ask about the rationale for the NCHC's guideline that "The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution" and to solicit perspectives from other honors directors and deans. I immediately received 12 replies to my query; I have copied half of the replies below. Each respondent spoke from experience to raise substantial concerns about shifting an honors reporting line to a particular college, further away from a central/university-wide administrator. Their advice and advocacy, on behalf of one of the goals that you expressed--to seek to raise the internal and external profile of the program--direct my preference that the program report either directly to you (with 'regular' consultation and management, perhaps, with Jeanne Christiansen and/or the 'council'

> of dean-level advisors that you described, and as suggested by Bob
Spurrier below, or that the current reporting line to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs be maintained. Here is a synopsis of issues and advice from other deans and directors.

Bob Spurrier and Rosalie Otero (past presidents of NCHC and co-authors of the monograph Assessing and Evaluating Honors Programs and Honors Colleges), write: "Assuming that honors is an institution-wide academic program, the appropriate reporting line is to the chief academic officer. While it is not uncommon to have the actual supervisory authority rest with an associate provost (or some similar administrator), it is quite important that the honors reporting line be to the central administration rather than to a subsidiary unit on campus for both budgetary and campus perception reasons." See their full comments below. I would echo the statement made by James Ruebel, Dean of the Honors College at Ball State (member of the NCHC Board of Directors), who writes, "every filtering layer between me and the Provost is a measurable disadvantage." See his full comment below.

I am concerned about the best arrangement for longer term stability and visibility for the program, including the outcome of future external program evaluations and the possibility that if current national movements toward accreditation standards for honors programs and colleges are established, a reporting line to central administration would be a key component for accreditation, as Doreen Marcus notes in her description of the state of Massachusetts's guidelines that stipulate a reporting line for honors directors to a provost or vice provost (see below).

The main other common concern expressed is to wonder why the UHP would be aligned to report to any one college, including the College of Science. A good number of honors courses are staffed by faculty and departments within CLASS, but also in Science and in CBE, and by faculty in other colleges; nearly a third of entering UHP freshmen are in the College of Engineering, and the program's nearly 450 students are in majors across all undergraduate colleges. How would budget allocations or potential reductions or protection from cuts be managed for the UHP within the context of a particular college? Despite a series of repeated cuts to the program's budget (reducing its OE by nearly a third), I nevertheless get the impression that at times Academic Affairs has managed to 'cushion' some of the potential cuts to honors, and I wonder if any one college might be able or willing to do the same. I realize that a particular dean or council of advisors might be able to advocate on behalf of the UHP to fellow deans, but this is different than such representation voiced from a position that is central to the university and identified as university-wide in its mission and purview.

I have additional questions and concerns, but will wait to learn if you decide to continue to explore a different reporting line, and learn how other deans, chairs, faculty, and students and constituents on campus and beyond might react to such a move. I am particularly interested to learn more from Dean Wood about his perspective on this question.

Sincerely,

Stephan

----------------------------------
Stephan Flores, Director

University Honors Program

[copies/excerpts from NCHC listserv]:

Dear Stephan and Other Honors Colleagues,

Because this is an issue that I have encountered on several occasions during external honors program review site visits, I assume that it is of sufficient interest to the larger honors community to justify posting my reply to the listserv. My starting point almost always is the National Collegiate Honors Council's "Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program" followed by a somewhat more detailed rationale. What appears below is from the preliminary text of the forthcoming second edition of NCHC's monograph, Assessing and Evaluating Honors Programs and Honors Colleges [by Spurrier and Otero]

- - -

* The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.

Assuming that honors is an institution-wide academic program, the appropriate reporting line is to the chief academic officer. While it is not uncommon to have the actual supervisory authority rest with an associate provost (or some similar administrator), it is quite important that the honors reporting line be to the central administration rather than to a subsidiary unit on campus for both budgetary and campus perception reasons.

In many, and perhaps most, institutions the chief academic officer is better positioned to fund, support, and protect honors than the head of any subsidiary unit—thus contributing to the budgetary support noted above. In addition, if the honors administrator reports to an academic dean (for example, the dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences), the perception on campus tends to be that honors is a wholly-owned subsidiary of LA&S and that the other deans and colleges need not have a stake in its success.

Another important benefit derived from reporting to the chief academic officer is that the honors administrator has a seat at the proverbial table when it comes to resource allocation. While some directors participate in meetings of deans, others do not do so. In part this may be a matter of campus history, but it may also reflect the considered decision of the honors administrator that the program is better served by his or her being "below the radar screen" rather than being overtly present at the meetings of the deans on an ongoing basis.

I hope that this information is at least somewhat helpful to all concerned.
Bob Spurrier

Director of The Honors College

Oklahoma State University

Dear Colleagues:

Massachusetts is the only state where a state of "quasi accreditation"
exists for Honors Programs in public higher education across community
colleges, state colleges, and the university campuses. Programs that
meet criteria set by the Commonwealth Honors Council--and pretty
consistent with NCHC guidelines--are awarded the designation
"Commonwealth Honors Program" by the MA Dept of Higher Education. CHP
status has benefits for our students and is noted on official
transcripts. In addition, the directors of these programs find
support in the consortium and have noted the importance of using
membership criteria to leverage university wide resources. Several of
us presented on this model at the recent NCHC conference as a
potential guide to considering accreditation nationally.

That the Honors director reports to the office of the chief academic
officer (i.e., directly to the Provost or to a Vice Provost) is one
criterion for CHPs. So, this criterion is not only an NCHC
recommendation, it is a clear requirement for the only body imposing
accreditation like standards on its programs.

Doreen Arcus, Ph.D.

University of Massachusetts Lowell

Director, Honors Program

Hello, everyone,

Not one model works best for all institutions. But I think Bob has it
in a couple of nutshells. The key pieces are: what conversations are
you a part of; and who gets to prioritize your work? If you are
meeting with collegiate deans, this is not just a perception matter:
it means you can contribute to and benefit from discussion of campus-wide importance.
When budgetary issues are being decided, for example, do you find out
about them, like department chairs, or do you participate in them? If
you are reporting to another dean (or director), you are unlikely to
be that dean's highest priority; perhaps one dean will hold Honors in
a special place, but that person will retire or leave the institution
and you have yet another person's perspective to worry about. This
issue occurs at the Provost's level, too, but once you've established
a history of working with other deans in a productive, collaborative
way, it's unlikely that a new person is going to change anything for
the worse. You are part of the apparatus, not a visitor or spectator.

When I came to Ball State I reported to the Associate Provost; she was
a wonderful person and great to work with, and remains a good friend;
but Honors was not her priority, as became clear over time. (She
thought of us as "not broken." ) After some administrative shuffling,
five years ago I began reporting to the Provost (I am now on my second
Provost). My experience in this process has led me to a simple
conclusion: every filtering layer between me and the Provost is a measurable disadvantage.

James S. Ruebel

Dean, The Honors College

Ball State University

... I reported to a dean when I was at Northeastern Illinois and it
was not good structurally. Your program works with students and
faculty from across your university and if you report to the dean of
one college, your program is marginalized in the remaining colleges.
That can be disaster. You need to report to someone in the provost's
office so that you have communication, clout, whatever you need in all
colleges. Your Provost's plan only works if you will be an Honors
Program only for students in the College of Science. I'm guessing
that is not his/her intent.

Ricki J. Shine

Associate Director of the Calhoun Honors College

Director of Major Fellowships

Clemson University

1. Why "Science"? I'm mostly interested in how faculty and students
from outside that college will perceive Honors.

2. Advantages of reporting to the Provost (yes, I know you never did)
are

   a. a seat at the table when decisions are made

   b. a chance to know what is really going on at the University

   c. the perception by others (including those external to the
University) of the importance of Honors

3. Disadvantages of reporting to the Provost

- jealousy among other directors who don't and deans who do
- no cover
- no champion

b & c are related -- when I reported (before we were a college) to the
Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education (in another
incarnation his title was Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) and he
took a budget cut, I didn't always have to absorb the whole thing.
Now, as the Dean of a College, I report to the Provost and take
precisely the same percent cut as the other colleges do.

Charlie Slavin

Dean, The Honors College at the University of Maine

My situation here at CSU has me reporting to the Vice Provost for
Undergraduate Studies (who reports to the Provost). This is not a
good arrangement, as the VP also has responsibility for advising,
tutoring, and a variety of other activities, most of which have little
to do with Honors. It also means that I'm rarely in the room when
discussions among Deans/Chairs are occurring -- it's as if I'm a
vice-chair or something. The Director used to report directly to the
Provost, which was better in some ways, but meant that the Honors
program had to make a lot of noise to get noticed (since the provost's
office has so many other things to think about.)

I'd be nervous about reporting to the Dean of a college, since that
would tend to skew the program towards that college's needs and
interests. It would also place you in competition with chairs (rather
than having you collaborating with them from outside) for the Dean's
attention and for college resources. What would happen if you had
needs involving music majors or business students if your supervisor
were the Dean of Science?

Peter Meiksins

Director, Honors Program

Cleveland State University

(2) [UHP director's message to the Honors Program Committee, to share information and to invite views to be expressed]

From: "Flores, Stephan" <SFLORES@uidaho.edu>
Date: December 14, 2009 2:56:42 PM PST
To: "honors@uidaho.edu"
Cc: "Reineke, Sandra" <sreineke@uidaho.edu>, "Aston, Eric"
<aston@uidaho.edu>, "Nutting, Andrew" <anutting@uidaho.edu>, "Prorak,
Dear members of the committee,

For your information, and as the following proposal from the provost receives a broader 'hearing' across different contexts on campus, I invite your perspectives and advice.

This is to let you know that Provost Baker is 'floating an idea/notion' in various quarters--as a process for review and consideration for response and feedback--to shift the 'operational' reporting line of the University Honors Program from Academic Affairs (the UHP director currently reports to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs) to the dean of the College of Science.

Provost Baker also suggests that an advisory council comprised of the dean of Science, dean of CLASS, dean and vice president of Student Affairs, and the vice provost for Academic Affairs be created to coordinate in some capacity of advice and oversight for the program--these ideas are not wholly clear to me in some respects, as you can see from my response to the provost's proposal, copied below.

I have also copied, immediately below, the description of the functions of the Honors Program Committee, in part because I am unsure about how the proposed functions of the Honors/Core Council suggested by the provost might relate to the functions and representation (from different colleges as well as from the 12 member Honors Student Advisory Board) of the Honors Program Committee.

Several of you may already have learned about this proposal: I learned that the provost presented the concept to the University Committee for General Education--the other aspect of the proposal entails shifting the reporting line of the director of the core curriculum from Academic Affairs to the dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences.

As you can see in my response to the provost, my concerns and judgment are aligned in part with the evaluation and perspectives of the various honors deans and directors quoted further below, and with the best practice "characteristic" identified by the National Collegiate Honors Council, which states:

* The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of
  the institution.

I hesitate to speak for the provost's rationale, but to give you some idea, he expressed an interest in providing a structure for alleviating the workload of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, who has been directed or tasked with several commitments/projects, and thereby also to increase internal and external visibility and attention to the UHP, and perhaps to enable the development officers of Science and CLASS to aid in the program's fundraising efforts.

I realize that this is late in the semester; the provost has indicated that he hopes to move forward with consultations on this idea, and will bring it to the provost's council for discussion this week.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

sincerely,
Stephan

Stephan Flores, Director
University Honors Program

Faculty Staff Handbook 1640.53
HONORS PROGRAM COMMITTEE
A. FUNCTION
A-1. To recommend policies for the University Honors Program, including admissions requirements.
A-2. To act on changes in the program.
A-3. To act on petitions for exceptions to the requirements of the program. [The committee's actions on petitions may be appealed as stated in FSH Section 2500.] B. STRUCTURE. Six faculty members to represent a broad spectrum of the UI community, an academic dean from one of the six colleges representing the honors curriculum (college representation to rotate on an annual basis), chair[president] of the Honors Student Advisory Board or designee, and (without vote), director of the University Honors Program (UHP), associate director of the UHP, program advisor of the UHP (staff). The latter serves as secretary. One of the six appointed faculty members serves as chair.
[rev. 7/06]

(3) [responses from members of the Honors Program Committee]:
[excerpts from several members from several colleges on the Honors Program Committee]:

All:

The Honors Program is a University-wide program and is therefore not appropriate (or eligible even?) for inclusion under a college administrative unit. Further, this idea is in direct conflict with the spirit of true interdisciplinarity, of which the UHP is arguably the prime example at the UI.

Best regards,

-Eric

D. Eric Aston, Assoc. Prof.
BEL 301, Chemical Engineering

Concise and to the point. I agree with Eric.

David Roon

Yes, very well put, and I also agree completely with Eric.

Diane [Prorak]

My sense is that the main value of the UHP is its emphasis on being able to bring together students from different disciplines. The current arrangement, in my opinion, makes that happen better than the proposed reporting plan.

--John [Hasko]
I fully agree with the statements made by the other committee members.

Regards, Sandra

Sandra Reineke, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science and Public Affairs Research Women's Studies Program

Hi all,

I, too, agree with points made by the other committee members on this topic.

Kerri

*******************************************************************************
Dr. Kerri Vierling
Department of Fish and Wildlife
*******************************************************************************

(4) [UHP director's message to Dean Scott Wood, College of Science]
> From: Flores, Stephan
> To: Wood, Scott
> Subject: FYI/consideration: proposal to shift Honors Program reporting line to College of Science
>
> Dean Scott Wood
> College of Science
>
> Dear Scott,
>
> For your interest and information please see first, the forwarded message further below, that I sent to the members of the Honors Program Committee, and immediately below (out of order)[note:now listed above], the responses that I've received thus far from HPC members, regarding the provost's proposal to shift the reporting line of the UHP from Academic Affairs to the College of Science. This is to let you know my views on this question, and to provide a fuller range of perspectives as noted.
>
> Stephan

> Stephan Flores, Ph.D.
> Director, University Honors Program

*******************************************************************************
(5) [Dean Scott Wood's reply to Stephan Flores] On Dec 15, 2009, at 3:16 PM, Wood, Scott wrote:

> Dear Stephan,
>
> Thank you for providing this information. I respect your viewpoint and that of the honors committee members. I suspect that some of the concerns expressed arise from not having a complete picture of how the proposed arrangement would work and the motivations for proposing the change. Here are some points that may be helpful:
>
> 1) Neither Kathy Aiken nor I sought the extra duties that would be involved in the proposed change. However, we are willing to participate in the proposed arrangement because we see an opportunity to better support Honors and Core Discovery. Our motivation is to take a great program and try to find a way to allow it to move to the next level of excellence.
2) I know when changes like these are made, there are always budgetary concerns. I have proposed, and I think the Provost is OK with, a policy whereby neither Kathy nor I can increase or decrease the Core or Honors budget unilaterally. It would take agreement by the four-person council and the Provost to make such a change.

3) I think it incorrect to see this move as Honors being placed into the College of Science. Policy issues would be dealt with by the council, whereas the respective deans would only deal with operational issues. As an example, I would be responsible for coordinating the annual performance review of any honors employees, but the entire council would have input.

4) We feel that this move will increase the visibility and viability of Honors and the Core because of the four-person council structure and because the college deans have direct control over human and financial resources that the Vice Provost does not. This need not be considered a permanent change. If after giving the arrangement a couple of years, it doesn’t work, we can always change back or to something better.

5) As you know from our meeting I am a very strong proponent of a healthy and vibrant honors program. I was one of those overachieving students who craved the challenge of honors courses and the like, and I know how important it to have such a program to retain the best and brightest students, including all our National Merit Scholars. I would rather cut off my left arm than to endanger the honors program at UI.

> Scott
>
> Dr. Scott A. Wood
> Dean of Science
> College of Science
> University of Idaho
> E-mail: swood@uidaho.edu
> 
> ------------------------
> ----Original Message-----
> (6) [Stephan Flores's reply to Dean Scott Wood]
> From: Flores, Stephan
> To: Wood, Scott
> Cc: Baker, Doug
> Subject: University Honors Program reporting line and council

Dear Scott,

Thank you for these further points of information and reasoning, and your willingness to serve in such capacities. As I expressed in conversation with the provost, I can readily envision positive, pragmatic aspects and outcomes for closer consultation with college deans, particularly the deans of CLASS and Science. Your point about the degrees of control and influence over financial and human resources that college deans exert is important, and may prove vital in advancing the program in relation to particular departments, course offerings, and relationships with other colleges. I find your comments about the budgetary conditions of this arrangement encouraging; I deeply appreciate your sentiments of strong support for sustaining and developing the UHP.

I remain concerned about the necessity of shifting the reporting line, and the larger, longer term questions this may continue to prompt, both across campus and beyond--the selection and role of the proposed council also prompts consideration, especially in relation to the role and function of the Honors Program Committee.

Sincerely,

Stephan

Stephan Flores, Ph.D.
Director, University Honors Program
(7)[additional response from Honors Program Committee member (and UHP alum) Dr. Eric Aston, following the UHP director's update to the Honors Program Committee, of the exchange of views with Dean Scott Wood]:

Thanks for the updates! My comments are longer than I feel should be sent to all. But you may forward whatever you feel appropriate to whomever:
FYI, I had not gone as far in my assumptions about the matter as to expect any dubious or even nefarious intentions from anyone. Maybe I'm naive.

I do think all the positive, pragmatic actions mentioned by Doug and Scott should and can be aggressively pursued by and on behalf of the UHP.... but within the CURRENT administrative structure.

In reference to Scott's point below:

1) If it were me, I would much rather donate my efforts as a college dean to this (#1) but NOT have an additional, official responsibility for which I would be evaluated for my performance review, as he alludes.

2) Why couldn't the Honors Committee, w/ the Honors Director, just as easily or even MORE easily approach the Provost directly on budgetary matters? It is overall a simpler system that puts the responsibility where it should be without diluting and thus complicating functionality and effectiveness.

3) If UHP would NOT be under CoS, then why would the Dean of Science be performing staff evaluations?

4) Are those on the 4-person council going to have no other duties than this? Or none more important than this? Why should we think they would be able to make the needed change/improvement/however you want to view it within the scope of all the other responsibilities they have on campus? Who would have the power to return the UHP to its original, or better, placement within the UI if it doesn't work? Who decides that the change is not effective? How soon?

5) What happens when someone else becomes Dean of Science?

My apologies for not being as concise as I was in my first e-mail on this subject! Hope your finals week is going well otherwise.

-Eric

-------------------------------
D. Eric Aston, Assoc. Prof.
Department of Chemical Engineering
-------------------------------

---

[12-25-09 reply from Provost Baker to Dean Scott Wood, cc: Stephan Flores]

Scott, thanks for this response. I am in agreement with your observations and see this as a way to strengthen the programs. Kathy, Jeanne, and Bruce are of the same mind.
Happy holidays.
Doug
Date: January 7, 2010
To: Provost's Council
CC: President's Cabinet
From: Doug Baker, Provost and Executive Vice President
Subject: General Education Council

We are moving into the new year with some strategic opportunities to strengthen and enhance what the University of Idaho provides to its students. Many of the Request for Innovation proposals contained recommendations to strengthen the educational experience of our undergraduate students. This supports and is consistent with our current emphasis on increasing student retention and success. Critical components of that work will be to have an engaging first-year experience, including a successful core curriculum, a strong Honors Program, student support services and an effective assessment/transformation system.

As we work to attain these goals, we need an organizational structure that supports the breadth and depth of student experiences as they enter the University and engage in their general education experience. After discussion over the fall semester with Faculty Senate, Provost’s Council, President’s Cabinet and the leadership from the relevant units and offices, I am asking Kathy Aiken, Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences; Scott Wood, Dean of the College of Science; Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; and Bruce Pitman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs to formalize a General Education Council. The council will work with deans to:

1) Strategically align initiatives for general education, learning in and out of the classroom and across academic programs, with attention to interdisciplinary learning experiences, and academic and student support;
2) Facilitate implementation of effective academic and student engagement practices;
3) Implement assessment strategies across the core curriculum, shaped by our University learning outcomes and;
4) Continuously improve program and services for undergraduate students.

This charge complements work Vice Provost Christiansen has been asked to lead in the founding of a Strategic Initiative teaching and learning center to support faculty.

This model of integrated programs and services will involve some organizational changes. Deans Aiken and Wood will share leadership for the academic components of the student experience including core curriculum and the Honors Program. Specifically, the operational reporting line for core curriculum will go to Dean Aiken and the Honors Program to Dean Wood, with a clear intention of continuing the university-wide focus of the programs guided by the council and in partnership with the faculty-led University Committee for General Education and the Honors Advisory Council. The Council will be responsible for recommendations of any major policy and budgetary issues.

I am pleased to have the strong leadership of these four individuals as we move forward to address the interests and needs of our students and of the faculty and staff who will guide them through their undergraduate degree program.
DRAFT PROPOSAL

The Martin Academy, Summer-Fall 2010

Proposal: Accept a small number of Honors students into a summer “Martin Academy” consisting of a directed study-type three credit seminar focused broadly on “The International System.” These students need not be in Moscow but need to be available for periodic email-based discussions with each other and the instructor. This is designed for (but not limited to) students in majors other than International Studies and Political Science in an attempt to “internationalize” their disciplinary-specific training. Students completing the summer academy will be accepted as Martin Scholars for the fall semester.

Summer term: The summer term introduces students to the major actors in global policymaking. This general overview is designed to prepare students to accurately study subject(s) in their own field of study. Students need not be in Moscow but will need to be available for email or Blackboard discussion for a few days during weeks 1, 3, 5, and 7.

Fall term: Each student successfully completing the Summer term will be named a Martin Scholar. Students selected as Martin Scholars work closely with the Martin Institute staff, meet in a series of roundtable sessions with the other Martin Scholars, receive a stipend of $500, and hold designated office hours in a dedicated office in the Admin Building. The Martin Scholars study and conduct research on a topic related international policy pertinent to their major field of study, with a document called a white paper produced at the end of the term.

Publishing Opportunity: The Journal of the Martin School of International Studies was launched in December 2009 (volume 1, issue 1). It is both a print and online journal, written and edited by undergraduates at UI. Material produced by Martin Scholars is automatically submitted to the editors of the following volume, and evaluated for inclusion in the journal.

Applications: Interested Honors students may apply on a space-available basis from March 1 to the beginning of the summer term by contacting Dr. Bill L. Smith (bills@uidaho.edu) or visiting the Martin Institute, Admin 338 (885-6527). The priority deadline is April 7.
The Martin Academy, Summer 2010
MRTN 404, The International System (3 credits)

Learning Outcomes:
1) To foster an intermediate understanding of the major “actors” in the international community, including the UN and other IGOs, NGOs, sovereign states, and developed/developing nations; 2) To prepare the student to participate in the Martin Scholar program during the Fall 2010 semester dealing with policy formulation on a subject related to her/his major field of study.

Assessment methods:
Four discussions, two academic book reviews, two “stakeholders and perspectives” charts, and answers to a series of questions on one assignment.

Grading:
Each component of the class will be worth one-sixth of the grade.

Common Readings:
Ahmed, Shamima and David Potter, *The Role of NGOs in International Politics* (Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 2006).
“Commitment to Globalization Index,” Center for Global Development.
“Synthesis Report,” Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Subject/Materials/Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17-23 May</td>
<td>S: Overview and Concept M: “What Is the International Community?” A: Discussion with professor and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>24 May-6 June</td>
<td>S: Developed and Developing national perspectives M: “Commitment to Globalization Index,” other library materials per conditions of assignment A: Assignment sheet (question prompts), discussion with professor and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>21 June-3 July</td>
<td>S: Non-governmental Organizations M: <em>The Role of NGOs in International Politics</em> A: Academic book review, discussion with professor and peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-11 July</td>
<td>S: The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment M: MEA reports (online) A: Stakeholders and perspectives chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>12-25 July</td>
<td>S: Student’s choice (external to your field) M: As needed A: Stakeholders and perspectives chart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Martin Academy, Fall 2010
MRTN 498, Martin Scholars Internship (0-2 credits)

Learning Outcomes:
To foster a community of undergraduate scholars at the Martin Institute; 2) To provide each student with an opportunity to recommend a policy solution to a problem related to her/his major field of study. Students may enroll in internship credits if they wish, but are not required to do so.

Requirements:
Individual Martin Scholars will maintain a minimum of two scheduled office hours each week in the Scholar’s office (Admin 327) to conduct research; students will maintain a regular schedule of reporting to the Martin Institute Director; students will meet monthly for a roundtable discussion at the Martin Institute with their fellow Martin Scholars; students will produce a white paper and present their research to a public audience.

The White Paper:
Although these come in various forms, the main thrust is the same: to consider various policy options/business strategies and recommend a course of action. Martin Scholar white papers all follow the same general format. Each will identify the problem, identify all potential solutions to the problem, and then present a recommended course of action, with supporting documentation and arguments. Such documents are simultaneously comprehensive and succinct, as each section must fit within prescribed lengths (for example, identifying the problem is limited to 1.5 pages of double spaced text, while each potential solution is limited to .75 pages).

Final Presentation:
Each student will formally present their research in a session during Dead Week or Finals Week. These will be 20 minutes in length, followed by a question-and-answer period. Martin Institute staff and seniors in International Studies will be invited, as will the Honors Program staff, in addition to anyone else the presenter cares to invite.

Stipend:
Martin Scholars receive a stipend of $500, payable upon successful completion of the semester’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week #</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity (office hours and research are assumed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23-27 Aug.</td>
<td>Meeting with Dr. Smith, discussion of possible topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14-18 Sept.</td>
<td>Round Table session (5 paragraph paper distributed in advance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11-15 Oct.</td>
<td>Round Table session (5 paragraph paper distributed in advance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8-12 Nov.</td>
<td>Round Table session (5 paragraph paper distributed in advance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 Dec.</td>
<td>White Paper due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6-10 Dec.</td>
<td>Presentations (Finals Week a possibility as well)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Class GPA averages Fall 2009:  
1993 - 2007 Entering Classes (21)  
Overall - 3.79  
Honors - 3.14  
Non-Honors - 3.80  

1998 - 2007 Entering Classes (28)  
Overall - 3.68  
Honors - 3.49  
Non-Honors - 3.68  

2005 Entering Class (69)  
Overall - 3.65  
Honors - 3.89  
Non-Honors - 3.57  

2006 Entering Class (71)  
Overall - 3.66  
Honors - 3.67  
Non-Honors - 3.66  

2006 Entering Class (101)  
Overall - 3.58  
Honors - 3.92  
Non-Honors - 3.44  

2007 Entering Class (110)  
Overall - 3.55  
Honors - 3.74  
Non-Honors - 3.54  

2007 Entering Class (134)  
Overall - 3.60  
Honors - 3.67  
Non-Honors - 3.58  

2008 Entering Class (125)  
Overall - 3.56  
Honors - 3.72  
Non-Honors - 3.55  

2008 Entering Class (122)  
Overall - 3.67  
Honors - 3.74  
Non-Honors - 3.57  

2009 Entering Class (111)  
Overall - 3.67  
Honors - 3.73  
Non-Honors - 3.65  

TOTAL OF ALL CLASSES  
FALL 2009:  
Overall - 3.61  
Honors - 3.71  

FALL 2008:  
Overall - 3.63  
Honors - 3.76  

*These figures do NOT reflect students who were on exchange during the Fall 2009 semester.
Agenda
1. Welcome to Dean Scott Wood
2. Review Dr. Bill Smith’s course proposal
3. New business/new agenda items
4. Adjourn (next meeting Feb. 22, 10:30am-11:20am, Wellspring Room)

On Jan 22, 2010, at 11:46 AM, Flores, Stephan wrote:

Dear HPC members,

In addition to conversing with Dean Wood, who asked to visit both for conversation/exchange and also to get a sense of the committee’s function and work, an item for discussion/review for our Feb. 1 meeting (10:30am, Wellspring room) is included in the attached document. This is a proposal from Bill Smith, to provide an opportunity for a small number of UHP students (3-5 students) to enroll in a three credit international policy formation course this summer, and then to become Martin Scholars this fall semester. Dr. Smith had been scheduled to teach a similar one-credit honors course for this past fall, but had to cancel that when he assumed additional duties in chairing the dept. of Foreign Lang. and Lit. He has taught that course before, and now proposes a 3 credit summer option.

I have a concern about granting three honors credits for the summer component (perhaps one credit for summer, given the online mode), but I could see granting the full three credits once the students complete the fall semester Martin Scholar obligations--of course my comments will be clearer once you have a chance to review Bill Smith’s proposal.

I have also attached the provost’s memo announcing the shift in reporting lines. You’ll see that the memo refers to an Honors Advisory Council, and by that, I think he means the Honors Program Committee. A copy of this memo, with that phrase corrected, was supposed to have been sent to faculty and staff two weeks ago. I don’t know why there’s been a delay, since the provost’s office indicated the intent to send it out. I find the reference to a “Council” in the last line of the memo ambiguous (in the sentence regarding recommending policy and budgetary issues), because I’m not sure if the provost is referring to the new four person council or to the HPC, and we can ask Dean Wood about that.

all for now,
Dean Wood  
College of Science  

Scott,  

This is to confirm that the Honors Program Committee will meet at 10:30am Feb. 1 in the Wellspring room. I've forwarded a couple of recent messages that I've sent to members of the committee, and here's an online link describing the committee and list of its members:  
http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/honors_program/uhpcomm.htm  

all best,  

Stephan

-----Original Message-----
From: Flores, Stephan  
Sent: Fri 1/22/10 11:46 AM  
To: Reineke, Sandra; Aston, Eric; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; sleichowman@vandals.uidaho.edu; honors  
Subject: agenda item for Honors Program Committee mtg. Feb. 1  

Dear HPC members,

In addition to conversing with Dean Wood, who asked to visit both for conversation/exchange and also to get a sense of the committee's function and work, an item for discussion/review for our Feb. 1 meeting (10:30am, Wellspring room) is included in the attached document. This is a proposal from Bill Smith, to provide an opportunity for a small number of UHP students (3-5 students) to enroll in a three credit international policy formation course this summer, and then to become Martin Scholars this fall semester. Dr. Smith had been scheduled to teach a similar one-credit honors course for this past fall, but had to cancel that when he assumed additional duties in chairing the dept. of Foreign Lang. and Lit. He has taught that course before, and now proposes a 3 credit summer option.

I have a concern about granting three honors credits for the summer component (perhaps one credit for summer, given the online mode), but I could see granting the full three credits once the students complete the fall semester Martin Scholar obligations--of course my comments will be clearer once you have a chance to review Bill Smith's proposal.

I have also attached the provost's memo announcing the shift in reporting lines. You'll see that the memo refers to an Honors Advisory Council, and by that, I think he means the Honors Program Committee. A copy of this memo, with that phrase corrected, was supposed to have been sent to faculty and staff two weeks ago. I don't know why there's been a delay, since the provost's office indicated the intent to send it out. I find the reference to a "Council" in the last line of the memo ambiguous (in the sentence regarding recommending policy and budgetary issues), because I'm not sure if the provost is referring to the new four person council or to the HPC, and we can ask Dean Wood about that.
all for now,

Stephan

P.S. I'm waiting to see if Mary Ann Judge will have a proposal for an Honors section of Engl 402 ready for us by Feb. 1. Given the proposal by Bill Smith, we may simply defer Mary Ann's proposal and Stephen Mulkey's until Feb. 22.


-----Original Message-----
From: Flores, Stephan
Sent: Wed 1/20/10 5:33 PM
To: Reineke, Sandra; Aston, Eric; Nutting, Andrew; Prorak, Diane; Roon, David; Vierling, Kerri; Hasko, John; Campbell, Alton; alecbowman@vandals.uidaho.edu; honors
Subject: Honors Program Committee mtgs. Feb. 1 and 22

Dear members of the Honors Program Committee,

A very quick save the date for two upcoming HPC meetings, with the day/time slots determined by when the most members can meet (all but one can make these time frames):

Monday Feb. 1, 10:30am-11:20am (Wellspring room, agenda forthcoming and also you are invited to suggest agenda items/topics for this semester--Dean Scott Wood has asked to join us for this meeting)

Monday Feb. 22, 10:30am-11:20am (location TBD, probably Wellspring room)

all for now, but more possibilities for agenda to be sent out soon, and also after I receive any replies back from you.

best wishes as this semester is underway,

Stephan

Stephan Flores
Director, University Honors Program
Associate Professor of English
University of Idaho
http://www.uidaho.edu/honors_program/people.htm
Two of the proposals are from HPC committee members, Sandra Reineke and Eric Aston, so I think it would be appropriate for Sandra and Eric to be 'excused' from this meeting and deliberation over proposals, and the remaining six voting members can weigh in. I shall send the four proposed seminars to the HPC members who will be discussing the proposals. In addition to Eric's proposed course on nanotechnology and Sandra's proposed seminar on biomedical ethics, Ellen Kittell (History) has proposed a seminar on Africa in Rebellion and Stephen Mulkey (Director of Environmental Science) a course on Misunderstandings of Climate Change.

On behalf of the University Honors Program, I want to express deep appreciation for these proposed seminars, and to the members of the Honors Program Committee for your service. Thank you.

Please let me know if you are able to attend this (particularly important!) meeting:
When: Monday Nov. 16th, 10:30am-11:25am
Where: Wellspring Room, just off the Commons food court

all best,

Stephan

________________________________________
Stephan Flores
Director, University Honors Program
Associate Professor of English
University of Idaho
http://www.uidaho.edu/honors_program/people.htm

________________________________________
Honors Program Committee Meeting

Wednesday Dec. 3, 1:30-2:30 p.m.

Panorama Room

Agenda

Approval of November minutes

Discussion Items:

1) External Reviewer's report regarding strategic planning
   (Eric Aston's suggestions distributed via email)

2) Curriculum
   Revision of Honors Program Certificate requirements (Stephan
   Flores's Revision proposal distributed via email)

   Honors Service subcommittee proposal (Subcommittee's Proposal
   distributed via email)

   Undergraduate thesis option, research, capstone,
   international experience, etc.

3) Student Life
   Space
Fellow Honors Committee members,

If possible, we would like to meet soon after break to discuss the agenda items below. The alternate date is Dec. 10. Would you please respond to this email if you cannot make the Dec. 3 meetings?

Thanks, Pat

Wednesday, December 3, 1:30-2:30 p.m., (Wellspring Room, Commons)

Agenda

1. Committee Members' Observations in Response to External Reviewers' Report
2. Subcommittee proposal on honors volunteer/service learning points option
3. Director's upcoming proposal to amend UHP Certificate requirements
4. New business/new agenda items
5. Adjourn

Patricia Hart
School of Journalism and Mass Media
Administration Building 337
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83844-3178
psh@uidaho.edu
TO: Honors Program Committee
Patricia Hart, Chair
Lauren McConnell, Chair, HSAB
Matthew Brookhart, Vice Chair, HSAB
Stephan Flores, Director
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
Eric Aston

Mary DuPree
Mark Nielsen
Diane Prorak
Sandra Reineke
David Roon
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held December 3, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair Hart with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alton Campbell, Mary DuPree, Stephan Flores, Matthew Brookhart, Pat Hart, Mark Nielsen, Diane Prorak, Sandra Reineke, David Roon, and Cheryl Wheaton. Pat Hart asked if there were additions/corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. Hearing no response she declared the minutes approved.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. External Reviewer’s report regarding strategic planning. Committee members agreed to proceed with the order of the new agenda. Eric Aston explained the prepared notes he emailed the committee (email enclosed) regarding the External Review Report. He emphasized that all programs, to include the Honors Program, would be remiss if they didn’t participate in the RFI in an aggressive manner and that it should be seen as an opportunity for increased participation in the university’s transformational process. Mark Nielsen added what he termed a cautionary view by explaining that from his viewpoint as an associate dean he strongly felt that the RFIs should be revenue negative and that although the program might want to present innovative proposals that mirror the recommendations of the external review, he didn’t feel the proposals would be acceptable if they were not revenue generating or cost-saving in nature. He suggested that the program might want to present a cost-saving proposal where other units of the university might fit in with the Honors Program. An example might be that if the university determines that the current Core Discovery curriculum cannot be sustained university wide, its distinctive strengths could be preserved in the honors curriculum, or even incorporated into an Honors Liberal Arts College. Stephan Flores remarked that the RFI process provides an opportunity to make a bold move to advocate for the program. He noted, however, that it also is very difficult to know what might be determined differently without being provided some of the basic facts and data sets from the administration, so that one could propose particular cost-savings and reconfigured resources with specific figures. Mark again stated that at this point it isn’t known what the final outcome will be and that nothing has been removed from the table. Mary DuPree offered a counter-proposal to the notion of the Honors Liberal Arts College by suggesting that a centralized interdisciplinary program be established. Perhaps event planning could also be part of the consideration, so that different programs could draw upon a centralized system of support for events and programming needs.

Stephan suggested that in the time remaining Eric might want to discuss the points that he presented in his email. Sandra Reineke remarked that although it might be a good idea, having honors faculty meet three times a semester was perhaps too much. She felt that one or two meetings a semester would be sufficient, with the university committee and the program directors providing the support that faculty might need in their course development. Eric countered that he felt it really wasn’t a problem for faculty to meet at least three times a semester and he felt it important that they do meet that often. Others suggested that getting faculty together even once in a semester was a difficult task.
Pat suggested that many of the points could be taken up as curriculum issues. Committee members were reminded that RFIs are due January 12 and Pat asked that any member wishing to propose one should email it to the director as soon as possible.

Before discussing the next agenda item Stephan announced to the committee that there will be an honors section of Stat 251 in the curriculum for fall 2009. Alton Campbell spoke initially with Rick Edgeman about the possibility, and when Alton and Stephan met with Rick, Rick also was willing to teach honors Stat 301 in the spring of 2010. He plans to organize the course around a theme and then by having students work in groups, learn stats through sub-topic case studies related to the overall course theme. Mark Nielsen wondered if both courses need to be or even should be taught since a student is not able to take both. Why not, suggested Mark, offer only honors Stat 301, particularly if students who might otherwise take Stat 251 could substitute Stat 301 for requirements in their majors? Stephan expressed that offering both courses may serve a broader population of students, since some disciplines, such as Engineering, require Stat 301, while others require just Stat 251, and though a good number of honors students may have completed the Math 175 prerequisite for Stat 301, there would still be a fair number of students in the humanities and social sciences who do not meet that prerequisite. In addition, once we see a course description sketched out by Dr. Edgeman, expected in January, the committee can learn more about the “honors” conception and ideals expected from both courses.

2. Curriculum.

a) Revision of Honors Program Certificate requirements (see proposal enclosed). Pat asked that Stephan discuss with the committee the proposed revision. Stephan explained that increasingly students enter the university with college credit and are in some cases also placed on State Board Core. Revising the requirements for the Honors Certificate will allow more straight-forward flexibility with advising students as they work to meet both core requirements in the Social Sciences (SS) and Humanities and to sustain ready progress toward the certificate by enabling them to take more upper division course work and at the same time resolve some of the scheduling issues that students face when trying to incorporate some of the lower division courses into an already full course load. The proposed revision is intended to sustain a sound basis for the overall number of core social science and humanities credits required (down to 9 credits from 12) and also retain breadth in the distribution requirement by requiring at least one course from each category (SS and Humanities), with a third course from either category. The minimum number of regular honors credits would remain at 20, allowing students to use the remaining 7 credits for study abroad, use of the Honors Elective Agreement, or incorporate the points earned from a possible future service-learning component or other form of outside of class activity.

Discussion on the proposal included support from Matthew Brookhart, who liked the possibility of being able to take more upper division courses when transferring into the university. Others felt that the revision definitely would accommodate scheduling conflicts. Mark Nielsen questioned the use of the Core Discovery credits of either or both semesters counting toward two of the disciplines. Stephan countered that because Core Discovery courses are designed to introduce students to several disciplinary perspectives he felt they should be included in the requirements. Pat added that she had taught a Core Discovery course and that it had been very interdisciplinary, however, as David Roon also noted, the range of multi-disciplinary perspectives is very course dependent, and the nature of the course is also influenced by its instructors and their individual disciplines. Sandra Reineke observed that because of the enrollment limits set for the Core Discovery she felt it was more advantageous for a student to take the Core Discovery sequence rather than a discipline-based social science or humanities course with a much larger enrollment, and that therefore the proposed revision helped to support not only flexibility for taking upper division honors courses but also support for the completion of a Core Discovery sequence. She emphasized that the restriction allowing freshman only for the Core Discovery be kept.
Pat asked if there was an urgency in having a motion regarding the revision. Stephan replied that there was time for further discussion and it was determined to make it a future agenda item.

b) Honors Service Subcommittee proposal (see proposal enclosed). Alton Campbell presented the subcommittee’s findings, noting that he had researched several Honors Programs and the example that the subcommittee found most useful was from the University of Nevada/Reno. They found that most programs had a service requirement in their programs but that they were not a part of the requirement for certificates or degrees. Alton felt that this component would involve a small number of students and that it wouldn’t necessarily have to be a course. If it were designated, it could be an interdisciplinary offering. Diane Prorok wondered if the students who did tutoring in the Moscow schools received credit, to which Stephan replied that they do not. She felt that by receiving credit it would make the experience even more meaningful and could attract more students. Mark emphasized there would be a cost involved, namely supervision of these students and their completed work, including the reflective essay component. Sandra pointed out that there is a Service Learning program on campus and that grants are available to offset funding costs—perhaps this would be a resource to explore to offset the “costs” that might be involved. Stephan mentioned that initially he had hoped that ASUI already tracks the hours spent by students in volunteer work but later learned that this isn’t being done. It was noted that service learning is a selling point for the university.

Chair Hart called for a motion to approve the general direction of the proposal. Mary DuPree made the motion, seconded by David Roon. Motion approved. Alton will work on developing a course syllabus. Pat noted that for future course consideration, 40 hours of service learning equal one credit hour.

Meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
    Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
    Karen Guilfoyle, Chair, Faculty Council
    John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
Eric's note for Honors Committee Meeting Dec 3, 2008.

I. Develop and discuss a strategy and plan of action to be a program that is invested in by the President and Provost through the RFI process.

- Include key points and justifications for institutionalizing the Honors Program as the most highly interdisciplinary program at UI.
- Outline a goal and reasoning for the total budget increase, including 100% FTE for Director, etc.
- Integrate existing Honors courses into a cohesion, interwoven and comprehensive curriculum, with embedded and uniform assessment protocols at the course and program levels that are neither onerous to implement nor ambiguous in outcome. [Consider how the Honors curriculum is like and unlike traditional and interdisciplinary (major/minor/option/emphasis/specialization/certification) degree programs.]
- Add the “thesis” option, which encompasses study abroad, engineering design, business plan and pitch, internship, traditional lab research or fieldwork, and other capstone activities and performances.

II. Other, briefer items

- New Honors faculty orientation incorporated with Honors faculty to meetings
- Honors faculty meeting three(?) times per semester – pre-, mid- and post-(dead week?) semester.
- Website criticality – taking the next step(s) in advancing external profile and informational accessibility; this may be a key detail in the RFI proposal above.
- Survey of Honors Seminar offerings for “off hours,” perhaps one night per week such as a typical lab meeting (even for 3-credit courses), with the purpose of adding schedule flexibility for faculty and students. If student response is overwhelming in the positive, seminar proposals should be specifically targeting this option as desirable.
- Encourage/solicit student submissions to Scribindi (on-line, UNM) and other competitions for creative and scholarly work in a more directed and coordinated programmatic effort.
- Consider directors to visit key regional high schools for recruiting IF their positions increase to 100% FTE positions.
- Pursue alumni development – how to prime the alumni base with or without the development office’s help in the beginning?
Wheaton, Cheryl

From: Flores, Stephan
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2008 10:03 PM
To: Hart, Patricia; Campbell, Alton; Wheaton, Cheryl; Aston, David; DuPree, Mary; Contact-llemconnell@vandals.uidaho.edu; Nielsen, Mark; Prorak, Diane; Reineke, Sandra; Roon, David
Subject: RE: UHP Cert. Reqs. Revision/Honors Program Committee meeting this Wed., Dec. 3, 1:30 p.m.
Attachments: revCert.docx

Colleagues,

Here's what I have in mind for reconsidering the UHP Certificate requirements.

Stephan

---------------------------------------------------

[current] University Honors Program Certificate requirements:
Six honors humanities credits and Six honors social science credits, selected from at least three different disciplines; Three honors science credits; Math 315 or honors Philosophy 202 (via Honors Elective Agreement*); Six upper-division [300-400 level] honors course or seminar credits (note that Math 315 carries upper-division credits); Additional credits as needed to reach 27 credits, including at least 20 credits with the HON designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an overall cumulative GPA of 3.2 or above for those entering fall 2001-fall 2007, or an overall GPA of 3.3 or above upon graduation for those entering the program fall 2008 and later.

Rationale for revision: an increasing number of freshmen have AP, transfer, or dual-credit coursework that carry social science or humanities core credits; rather than take ‘extra’ core credits not strictly necessary for degree, some students seek permission to count seminar level credits to satisfy part of the UHP certificate’s six humanities credits and six social science credits requirement. The proposed revision ‘streamlines’ and provides a bit more flexibility in the SS/HUM requirements so that the need for this kind of substitution may be less frequent. This is accomplished by adjusting the total honors social science and humanities credits from 12 to 9, and by retaining the distribution requirement by requiring at least one course from each category (SS & HUM), with a third course from either category. Because Core Discovery courses are designed to introduce students to several disciplinary perspectives, either or both semesters of a Core sequence may count toward the three discipline requirement. But, for example, a student could not satisfy the three discipline requirement by taking honors English 257 and 258, and honors History 101 and 102. Further observation: the minimum number of regular HON credits for certificate remains at 20, which may provide some incentive for students, in future if an honors points system for service-learning or for recognizing other forms of outside of class work is developed and approved, to include such ‘points’ in the elective seven credits (for example, a student with 20 HON credits in appropriate categories might then study abroad for a semester, use the Honors Elective Agreement for another three credits, and then satisfy the criteria for one-honors point—or some variation among these options).

Proposed Revision

University Honors Program Certificate:
The requirements listed below, students must complete at least six upper division honors credits, and must complete courses from at least three different disciplines within social sciences and humanities. Either or both semesters of a Core Discovery sequence may count toward the three discipline requirement.

Requirements:
Three honors humanities credits;
Three honors social science credits;
Three honors credits from either the humanities or social sciences; Three honors science credits; Three credits in analytical and quantitative reasoning, satisfied by Math 315, or honors Philosophy 202 (via Honors Elective Agreement*) [or soon Stat 251 or Stat 301?];
Additional elective credits [including up to three honors points?] as needed to reach 27 credits, including at least 20 credits with the HON designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an institutional cumulative GPA of 3.3.

[additional clarification]:
Honors elective credits may be satisfied by courses from the Honors Curriculum (HON designation). In addition, students absent from campus for an exchange at either a U.S. or a foreign university may qualify for a reduction of 3 credits per semester (maximum of six credits total over two semesters) in the 27 credit Honors Certificate requirement, with the exchange credits typically used to satisfy upper-division credits within the honors curriculum. Students on domestic exchange are encouraged to explore the possibility of enrolling in one or more honors courses at the host university.

*Elective credits may also include arranging to use the Honors Elective Agreement in order to receive honors credit for an upper-division course outside the major; if a student has more than one major, the elective may be from one of the majors; students must consult with the Director or Associate Director prior to enrolling in a non-honors course or directed study course for which they wish to use the Honors Elective Agreement to receive credit towards the HHP curriculum (three credits maximum). An elective course that is not designated as part of the honors curriculum is subject to the final approval of the Director; the instructor shall also confirm in writing that the course fulfills the spirit of an honors course. Such an elective will include an exploration of the subject in substantial depth; coursework may culminate, for example, in a critical essay, project, or presentation.
Honors Committee,
Below is the brief proposal from the Service sub-committee that we will discuss tomorrow.
Alton

Honors Service Sub-Committee: Our meeting was held on Oct. 20 with Steve Janowiak, Marie Mustoe, and Alton Campbell in attendance. Sandra Reineke was unable to attend due to an illness in the family

Proposal
The Honors Service sub-committee proposes that the UI Honors Program provide students with the option to earn credit toward their Certificate and Core Awards by using “significant” experiential activities that complement their traditional Honors academic course work as described below:

- “Honors Service Points,” would count toward the degree and certificate as modeled after the University of Reno program (see text below from their web site)
- Up to 3 “Honors Service Points” would count toward the 27-credit Certificate and up to 2 “Honors Service Points” would count toward the 19-credit Core Award.
- An application/agreement form would be completed and approved by the Director, preferably before the activity was started or at least before the activity evolved to become a significant project.
- Each Honors point would constitute a minimum of 32 hours of service with a 3-4 page, self-reflection essay

From Honors Web Page, University of Nevada Reno

*Honors Points* - Each semester, in additional to Honors courses, the Honors Program offers many opportunities for Honors students to earn Honors credits. Termed “Honors point” activities, these non-traditional units are earned for significant, recognized activities that provide enrichment for general non-classroom education. There are two options for earning Honors Points. The first option is **service learning**, a combination of service with learning beyond the classroom. Honors students use their abilities and talents to demonstrate a commitment to an ethic of civic responsibility by engaging in an activity that benefits both the student and the community. (One point for each 30-40 hours of service.) The second option is **attendance or organization of scholarly activities and academic programming**. Honors students engage in research or organize Honors programming, then share what they have learned with others. Examples of activities for either option can be found on the **Honors Points form**.

**NOTE:** No Honors points are awarded retroactively. No points are awarded for activities required for membership in an organization or club or credit in other classes. The minimum time commitment for an activity is 3 weeks. Points are not awarded for activities where students are paid.
To earn Honors points, an Honors student must fill out the Honors Points form and write a 2-3 page typed self-reflection essay reacting to the learning experience. Essays are graded pass/fail. In order to earn the honors point, an essay must receive a "pass." If an essay receives a "fail," the student has the opportunity to rewrite the paper for a "pass."

A passing essay is one that is fully developed, exhibits significant thought into the analysis, and contains no grammatical or typing errors. The paper should demonstrate 1) familiarity with the content of the material/event, 2) a critical analysis of the material, 3) the application of a personal perspective, and 4) relevant insights. A failing essay is one that lacks analysis and depth. Additional criteria is listed on the Honors website."
Dear Honors Committee Members,

As we finish out the year, please find attached the last two meetings' minutes. Please send any amendments or corrections by Friday, April 24. If there are changes or corrections, I will send another copy for your approval.

Please also send along items that we can recommend for further discussion—not with the intention of setting the next agenda, but so that important items don't get dropped. Further discussion of the Honors thesis is one topic, and there could be others.

Thanks so much,
Pat

Patricia Hart
School of Journalism and Mass Media
Administration Building 337
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83844-3178
psh@uidaho.edu
Fellow Honors Committee members:

Please set aside Monday, April 13, for an Honors Program committee meeting, 10:30am-11:25am, Wellspring room, Commons.

Tentatively the agenda will include continuing discussions on honors points and the UHP certificate, including consideration of use of the Honors Elective agreement for Stat 251 and 301.

This will likely be our last meeting this semester (although it might be possible to squeeze one more in early May), so please send other agenda items for inclusion.

Thanks,
Pat
TO: Honors Program Committee  
Patricia Hart, Chair  
Lauren McConnell, Chair, HSAB  
Matthew Brookhart, Vice Chair, HSAB  
Stephan Flores, Director  
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director  
Eric Aston  

Mary DuPree  
Mark Nielsen  
Diane Prorak  
Sandra Reineke  
David Roon  
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held April 13, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 10:33 a.m. by Chair Hart with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alton Campbell, Mary DuPree, Stephan Flores, Lauren McConnell, Pat Hart, Mark Nielsen, Diane Prorak, David Roon, and Cheryl Wheaton. Pat Hart suggested that with this perhaps being the last meeting of the committee there be a wrap up of decisions that had been made during the academic year as well as discussion of any on-going agenda items that will need to be considered by next year’s committee members. She noted that this could be accomplished at a future meeting or by email, whichever was most convenient for members.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Honors Service Points Proposal. Stephan Flores led off the discussion by noting that the Honors Service Points proposal hadn’t received full approval by the committee and so he had taken the liberty to use both the committee’s recommendations as well as borrowing/tightening the model used by Nevada Reno to present a somewhat revised proposal to the committee for further discussion and perhaps approval from the committee. Stephan explained that he had reviewed all points considered by the sub-committee and then added details on how the proposal might work out. Some of the minor details might change (such as proposed dates that realistically might not work), but these are things that wouldn’t change the overall proposal. Discussion followed on the various points of the proposal with two major areas of concern emerging. Members of the committee felt that the 5th point of the agreement form, stating "Each Honors point constitutes a minimum of 32 hours of service" should be changed to read, "...a minimum of 32 hours of focused service." Regarding the description of Service Learning Points, the third sentence in the paragraph might better read, "Students are awarded Honors service points for volunteer community service in which honors students engage in meaningful, reciprocal service activity with a single sponsor/agency, typically for a non-profit or public institution." The Service Points Agreement form was discussed, with recommendations made that the Activity Address be changed to the Sponsor’s Address; the Sponsor’s Email and/or Website be listed; some form of de-briefing be part of the agreement so that the student might be able to give feedback on the project activity, both its positive and negative effects and outcomes.

As a way of comparison between the proposed self-reflective essay and an actual example, Stephan asked Alton Campbell to give feedback to the committee on the self-reflective essay that he required of the students who participated in the Honors Alternative Spring Break to Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Alton first summarized the group’s trip, emphasizing that he found evening reflections by the trip goers to be most astounding and that rather than half hour sessions, the participants often engaged in two to three hour discussions, covering a range of topics, and that students had found the trip to be a very meaningful experience. He asked participants to write in-depth, self-reflective essays on how the trip had affected each student. He noted that although they hadn’t encountered others that there were 600 Alternative Spring Break students in Cedar Rapids while they were there.
Mark Nielsen wondered about the possible number of students who might submit the self-reflective essays, to which Alton responded that he anticipated perhaps five to 10 students who would participate. Lauren McConnell suggested that, in order to save time and since the essays wouldn't be graded, the student submissions might be placed on the HSAB's online "Looking Glass" publication for other students to read and comment upon, a suggestion that other committee members found interesting and worth considering. Mary Dupree inquired about the Center for Volunteerism and whether it might be a clearinghouse for possible Service Learning activities. Stephan responded that he had looked into the Center, hoping that it might track students' progress while working on service projects but found that they don't keep track of the students' participation. The Center, however, would certainly be a good option for students seeking appropriate community service opportunities.

The motion was made by Mary DuPree and seconded by Diane Prorak to accept the Honors Service Learning Points proposal as presented. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Proposed Revisions to UHP Certificate and Core Award. Stephan explained the rationale for revising the certificate requirements, noting in particular that the revisions would 'streamline' and allow for more flexibility in the social science/humanities areas with the outcome being less frequent substitutions for HON courses/credits. The total number of honors social science and humanities credits would be adjusted down from 12 to 9 credits, retaining the distribution requirement of those credits between one course in social science, one in humanities, and the third course coming from either of those categories. The minimum number of HON credits remains the same (20 credits), perhaps providing students the incentive to include 'points' in the remaining seven elective credits earned through service-learning "points" or other forms of learning occurring outside of class that might be developed and approved. The revisions also include Stat 251 and 301 as Elective Agreement course options, along with Phil 202, which serves as a substitution for Math 315. (See proposed revision in handout included.)

Honors elective credits may be satisfied by courses from the Honors Curriculum (HON designation). Study Abroad credit may be received and typically counts toward no more than 6 upper division course credits (3 per semester) within the honors curriculum.

Finally, as part of the revisions proposal, use of the Honors Elective Agreement for courses that are not designated as part of the honors curriculum and which are typically outside the student's major was changed in nature from 3 credits (the maximum for one course) to a maximum of 4 credits for two courses outside the honors curriculum (see enclosure for complete description of the Honors Elective Agreement). Several committee members spoke about the proposed change from 3 to 4 credits. Lauren stated that she had a problem with awarding 1 credit for work completed by one student while another student might receive 3 credits for the same work completed (because that student hadn't received previous Honors Elective Agreement credits); she felt this difference was not fair, and that students therefore might not choose to make use of the elective agreement in a three credit class yet receive only one credit within the honors curriculum. Lauren suggested that it might be better to simply award the full credit, making a maximum of six credits of non-Honors elective course credits possible. Mark voiced strong objection to a student receiving too many credits for non-Honors course work and Alton Campbell said that he, too, struggled with the three and one point designation and felt that there would be misunderstanding among the students regarding that. He felt there was a simpler way in which to designate the points/credits, but wasn't sure what that might be. Mark once again objected to going to a six credit option for non-honors course work and wondered if students could receive honors credits for taking Math 315 multiple times since its title and content changed from year to year. Stephan pointed out that because the course is already very popular it might present a different kind of problem if students taking the class for a second time ended up squeezing out students who had not yet had a chance to take the class.
After further discussion Stephan stated that he would be willing to remove the language revising the Elective Agreement from the proposal and reinstate its original language that limits the maximum credits for one course to three credits. Mark suggested that the language be changed to points, rather than credits, to describe the kind of work earned. Stephan questioned the need for such language change. Mary DuPree asked if a sub-committee should be appointed to study the revision to the Honors Elective Agreement, to which Stephan replied that he would rather remove the revised language in order to have the other and main aspects of the proposal come to a vote, and have the committee return to the discussion of the Elective Agreement at a later time. Several committee members agreed that more work and discussion was needed before changing the language of the Elective Agreement.

Eric Aston moved to accept the proposal to modify the Honors Certificate requirements as stipulated, minus the language referencing the Honors Elective Agreement, and that the language revising the Honors Elective Agreement be removed from the proposal. The motion was seconded and Chair Hart called for a vote. Approval was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
    Jeanne Christiansen, Vice Provost
    Karen Guilfoyle, Chair, Faculty Council
    John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
University Honors Program
Honors Service Learning Points Guidelines

Agreement form submission deadlines: Sept. 20 (fall), Feb. 20 (spring)

1. Prior to activity, complete Honors Service Learning Points Agreement form
   - Points are not awarded retroactively
   - Points are not awarded for class requirements
   - Points are not awarded for paid activities
   - Points credits vary for each activity
   - Each Honors point constitutes a minimum of 32 hours of focused service
   - Accumulated 3 points maximum during Honors career
   - Up to 3 “Honors Service Points” may count toward the 27-credit Certificate
   - Up to 2 “Honors Service Points” may count toward the 19-credit Core Award

2. Consult with Honors Program Director or Associate Director and submit form with proper signatures by September 20 or February 20 for Director’s approval

3. Complete Honors points service activity as outlined on agreement form

4. Honors Program verifies project completion with project sponsor and a UHP staff member will meet with the student to discuss the service learning experience

5. Submit 4-5 page reflective essay on the service learning experience (see separate guidelines for this assignment) by December 20 or May 20: essays will not be accepted after these dates

Further Information and Guidelines on Earning Points

Service Learning Points: Service learning is a combination of service with learning beyond the classroom. Honors students use their abilities and talents to demonstrate a commitment to an ethic of civic responsibility by engaging in an activity that benefits both the student and the community. Students are awarded Honors service points for volunteer community service in which honors students engage in meaningful, reciprocal action in local communities with a single sponsor or agency, typically for a non-profit or public institution. Examples: the volunteer tutor program that UHP students staff at McDonald Elementary School, the Moscow Mentor Program within the public schools, or serving on a significant university level, organized outreach project, such as the UI War on Hunger campaign
University Honors Program
Honors Service Learning Points Agreement

Honors points activities and projects must be pre-approved by the Director of the Honors Program. No Honors points will be awarded retroactively. The fall semester deadline is September 20th. The spring semester deadline is February 20th.

Student’s Full Name

Student’s ID# ___________________________ Phone ___________________________ E-mail ___________________________
Current semester and Year: Fall 20____ Spring 20____
Major(s) ________________________________

Title of Activity

Sponsor’s Name/Agency

Sponsor/Agency Address

Sponsor’s Phone __________________________ E-mail ___________________________
Website address __________________________

Brief description of the Honors points service activity or project and timetable for completion:

Student’s Signature ___________________________ Date ___________
Activity/Project Sponsor Signature

Honors Program Director Signature

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE ACTIVITY/PROJECT SPONSOR BY THE DATE THAT GRADES ARE DUE.
Did the student complete the activity or project to your satisfaction? __________________________
Comments:

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

Activity/Project Sponsor Signature __________________________
Date ___________
University Honors Program Certificate requirements:
Six honors humanities credits and
Six honors social science credits, selected from at least three different disciplines;
Three honors science credits;
Math 315 or honors Philosophy 202 (via Honors Elective Agreement*);
Six upper-division [300-400 level] honors course or seminar credits (note that Math 315 carries upper-
division credits);
Additional credits as needed to reach 27 credits, including at least 20 credits with the HON
designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an overall
cumulative GPA of 3.2 or above for those entering fall 2001-fall 2007, or an overall GPA of 3.3 or
above upon graduation for those entering the program fall 2008 and later.

Rationale for revision: an increasing number of freshmen have AP, transfer, or dual-credit coursework
that carry social science or humanities core credits; rather than take ‘extra’ core credits not strictly
necessary for degree, some students seek permission to count seminar level credits to satisfy part of the
UHP certificate’s six humanities credits and six social science credits requirement. The proposed
revision ‘streamlines’ and provides a bit more flexibility in the SS/HUM requirements so that the need
for this kind of substitution may be less frequent. This is accomplished by adjusting the total honors
social science and humanities credits from 12 to 9, and by retaining the distribution requirement by
requiring at least one course from each category (SS & HUM), with a third course from either category.
Because Core Discovery courses are designed to introduce students to several disciplinary perspectives,
either or both semesters of a Core sequence may count toward the three discipline requirement. But,
for example, a student could not satisfy the three discipline requirement by taking honors English 257
and 258, and honors History 101 and 102.

Further observation: the minimum number of regular HON credits for certificate remains at 20, which
may provide some incentive for students, in future if an honors points system for service-learning or for
recognizing other forms of learning that occurs outside of class that might be developed and approved,
to include such ‘points’ in the elective seven credits (for example, a student with 20 HON credits in
appropriate categories might then study abroad for a semester, use the Honors Elective Agreement for
another three credits, and then satisfy the criteria for one-honors point—or some variation among these
options).

Finally, this revision also extends the use of the Elective Agreement to Stat 251 and 301 for use in the
category within the honors curriculum that now is limited to Phil 202 Symbolic Logic, and the Honors
course Math 315 Topics in Pure Mathematics. The demand/need for such an option is considerable,
because Math 315 is offered once a year, and because Stat 251 and 301 fulfill requirements for so many
different majors. The chair of Statistics, Dr. Rick Edgeman, has agreed to accommodate honors
students in his Stat 251 section who wish to make use of the Honors Elective Agreement, and we
expect appropriate assignments also to be developed for students in Stat 301 sections.
Revision:

University Honors Program Certificate

Within the requirements listed below, students must complete six upper division honors credits, and complete courses from at least three different disciplines within the social sciences and humanities. Either or both semesters of a Core Discovery sequence may count toward the three discipline requirement.

Requirements:
Three honors humanities credits;
Three honors social science credits;
Three honors science credits;
Three credits in analytical and quantitative reasoning, satisfied by honors Math 315, or via Honors Elective Agreement* used in conjunction with Philosophy 202, Statistics 251, or Statistics 301;
Additional elective credits, including up to three UHP volunteer service points, to total 27 credits/points: the 27 credits/points must include at least 20 credits with the HON course designation, with an average GPA of 3.0 or above in honors coursework completed, and an institutional cumulative GPA of 3.3.

[additional clarification]:
Honors elective credits may be satisfied by courses from the Honors Curriculum (HON designation). In addition, students absent from campus for an exchange at either a U.S. or a foreign university may qualify for a reduction of 3 credits per semester (maximum of six credits total over two semesters) in the 27 credit Honors Certificate requirement, with the exchange credits typically used to satisfy upper-division credits within the honors curriculum. Students on domestic exchange are encouraged to explore the possibility of enrolling in one or more honors courses at the host university.

*Elective credits may also include arranging to use the Honors Elective Agreement in order to receive honors credit for an upper-division course outside the major; if a student has more than one major, the elective may be from one of the majors; students must consult with the Director or Associate Director prior to enrolling in a non-honors course or directed study course for which they wish to use the Honors Elective Agreement to receive credit towards the UHP curriculum (three credits maximum). An elective course that is not designated as part of the honors curriculum is subject to the final approval of the Director; the instructor shall also confirm in writing how the course fulfills the spirit of an honors course. Such an elective will include an exploration of the subject in substantial depth; coursework may culminate, for example, in a critical essay, project, or presentation.
Fellow Honors Committee members:

Please set aside Monday, March 9, for an Honors committee meeting, location TBA. We'll be meeting at a new time, 10:30.

Tentatively the agenda will include continuing discussions on honors points and the UHP certificate, and consideration of a course description for the new course Honors Stat 251.

Pat

Patricia Hart
School of Journalism and Mass Media
Administration Building 337
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83844-3178
ps@uidaho.edu

Wellspring
Cancelled
online admissions process. Tying admission to the UI to the Honors Program application process was discussed, with the possible outcome that Banner would enable a stronger coordination of students applying to the university and then to the program. The desire to retain a component of the current application process, which includes more direct contact and written communications with the student, is still important. Dr. Flores noted that although he had hoped there might be a way for the Honors Program to tie in directly to the general university application process he learned from the meeting that it would be necessary to secure some type of programming services to enable the program application to interface with the current Banner module used by Admissions.

Mark Nielsen asked Dr. Flores how many applications are processed over the summer. Dr. Flores and Cheryl Wheaton responded that well over 400 initial applications are received throughout the year. Dr. Nielsen asked how many completed applications are processed, to which Dr. Flores responded that about 200-250 essays are read each year. It was agreed that was a large number to read, however Dr. Flores stated that the essay responses accomplish several things. First, the directors’ responses provide a recruiting and advising connection to every new student; also, requiring an admission essay, in addition to enabling more information on which to base a decision to admit students relative to the program’s criteria, prompts a clear interest and commitment to the program by the student, and in turn provides a personal response to each student’s expressed interests. Dr. Nielsen asked what percentage of students who were eligible to join the program actually applied and wondered if there was perhaps an asymmetry with students in the sciences and math who did not like to write and therefore were not joining the program because of the essay requirement. Dr. Flores responded that he wasn’t able to answer that question directly but that over a year ago there had been a self-study done which was presented to the committee, and which guided the revised admission criteria. He stated that both the University and the Honors Program share similar sentiments that graduates of the program have solid competencies in writing and communication. In last year’s self-study, data indicates that a sub-set of students with academic profiles comparable to entering honors students who chose not to apply to the program despite repeated invitations to apply for admission, suggest a self-selection process. This included a smaller group with high GPAs and satisfactory test scores, and it also includes a larger group with high GPAs and much lower test scores (for example, over 100 points lower on the combined reading and math SAT scores than entering UHP students); this latter group, in particular, suggests a self-selection decision not to respond to invitations to apply, despite the reasonable prospect that these students’ strong high school GPAs may serve as a fairly good predictor of success at the university.

The discussion moved on to curriculum matters in the program. In spring 2009, Biology 115 will return to the curriculum, team-taught by Dr. Joe Cloud and two other faculty. A new, one-credit course, “Business and Medicine,” is also on the schedule. This course, taught by Dr. Rolf Ingerman, Dr. Dan Schmidt, MD, a local physician, and several different panelists, is the result of Dr. Flores’ desire to take advantage of the distinct medical and legal programs at the UI and to introduce these kinds of courses into the curriculum. It is hoped that a course related to law is another future offering of the program curriculum. Other courses in the curriculum for spring include two seminars, “Hollywood Remakes France,” taught by Prof. Joan West, and “Understanding Communist China,” taught by Prof. Pingchao Zhu. The Interdisciplinary Colloquium will again be offered. History 102 will not be in the curriculum for spring due to reduced faculty in that department.

Dr. Flores stated that University Residences has agreed to designate priority registration for students in the program who wish to live in McCoy Hall or the Scholars LLC. They have also agreed to adjust the GPA requirement for those entering McCoy Hall (freshmen) from 3.5 to a 3.7 high school GPA, and for those wishing to live in Scholars LLC from 3.0 to a 3.3 UI GPA, making the GPAs in line with the Honors Program criteria for entering students and for continuing students in the program.
Dr. Flores called upon Dr. Campbell to share with the committee his work with the living groups and other activities with which he's been involved since assuming his position with the program. Alton spoke briefly about his role with the living groups and that he would meet on alternate weeks with McCoy and Scholars LLC residents to serve as an advisor to encourage both groups to think and talk about academic, cultural, and social bonding. He has been able to start a bridge group with several honors students and plans to have student sessions in the LLC. He has planned and facilitated a study-abroad panel with students and will present two other student panels, one on undergraduate research, and a third on graduate school. Dr. Campbell also is serving as the institution’s faculty representative for the national Goldwater Scholarships, including coordinating the committee membership and nominations for that competition. Pat Hart wondered if it might be possible for the Honors Program Committee to be notified when these are held so that committee members might attend. Dr. Flores enthusiastically endorsed this request.

Cultural activities for the semester will or have included the new student orientation at the beginning of fall semester, as well as the annual scavenger hunt which is organized by the Honors Student Advisory Board. The program has arranged for a bus to transport 45 students to Spokane to attend a production of "Phantom of the Opera" in October. Cost to students will be $10, with the remainder of the expenses subsidized by the Honors Program. "Climb the Wall Night" at the Student Rec Center was once again a success with 25 program students participating. Other events in which students may participate include free vouchers to attend the Auditorium Chamber Music Series performances, the Commons & Union Foreign Films and ASUI Vandal Entertainment Blockbuster and Indie Films Series, and free tickets to see various performances staged by the Department of Theatre and Film.

Another event initiated by the director that is new this year is the monthly "Friday Food for Thought" luncheons, to which 10 or so students and two faculty are invited to converse together over lunch in the Commons Food Court. Funding for this is provided by the Commons "Food for Thought" program, instituted some time ago, with additional funding by the UHP.

Students in the program are engaged in Community Service and are again helping with the tutoring program at McDonald Elementary School and with the Moscow Mentors program in the public school district. Another group of students assisted with the construction of the playground at West Park Elementary School, and UHP member Mariah Banghart chairs the UI’s War on Hunger campaign. Initial discussion has occurred regarding a group of students working on an alternative spring break community service project.

3. Upcoming UHP External Program Review, October 5-7, 2008. Dr. Rosalie Otero, Director of the Honors Program at the University of New Mexico and associate dean at UNM (also past president of the National Collegiate Honors Council and co-author of a monograph on evaluating honors programs and colleges) and Dr. Tamara Valentine, Director of the Honors Program at the University of Nevada, Reno, will arrive on October 5 for an external review of the program. Dr. Flores has prepared documents for their review, to include the 2007-2008 Annual Report (and an earlier, pre-publication copy of the report sent to reviewers one month in advance of their visit), several recent annual reports and documents (which included information resulting from the last formal external program review conducted by Frank Hartigan in 1998), and a 193 page compilation of program information—these documents have been sent to each of the reviewers and Flores will also prepare a cover document, a "Summary Introduction and Overview of the UHP Self-Study and External Review Materials," to be sent to reviewers and over 60 faculty and administrators concerned most directly with the review, prior to the reviewers’ arrival. In addition, this document includes citation of the National Collegiate Honors Council’s executive committee’s recent summary discussion on the benefits of honors education, and also makes reference to the NCHC’s list of Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program.
Flores noted that the UHP curriculum retains much of the traditional, liberal arts strengths in the arts and humanities, social sciences, and sciences devised by the program’s founding director, Dr. Marvin Henberg (chair of the Department of Philosophy, former Rhodes Scholar). This curriculum includes such courses as the world history sequence History 101 and 102, Literature of Western Civilization I and II (English 257-258), Economics 272, and Philosophy 103 Ethics. Moreover, the curriculum offers a highly successful Honors Chemistry 111-112 sequence, a team-taught Biology 115 honors course, and a unique course in the intellectual history of mathematics, Math 315. In addition, it is helpful to keep in mind not only the program’s rich and selective original curriculum, but also the ongoing development and expansion of its course offerings over the past ten years, including a wider array of social science core courses. Also, a substantial portion of the expansion of the honors curriculum has occurred in coordination with and through the leadership of university faculty who have developed the university’s General Core Studies curriculum.

Mark Nielsen asked Stephan what message he would want the reviewers to have for the Provost and Vice Provost at the exit interview. Stephan replied that he would want the visitors to consider a review of the written material provided them. He feels that the recent budget cuts cannot be seen as building strength in the program. There are two areas that he sees as possible concerns of the reviews. The first is how long departments will be willing to offer courses with funding as it now stands. The second is the staffing ratio, with directors being given more release time and a greater number of staff in the program. A third item is more political in nature and asks the question of what is the institution’s and administration's philosophy toward the program. Mark noted that the timing is fortuitous, with a new president who is looking at all aspects of programs and their potential funding; Dr. Flores agreed.

4. New business/new agenda items. With time running short, Pat Hart made a motion to end the meeting (no seconds). Dr. Flores noted that there were other agenda items that the committee needed to address and that perhaps the next meeting could occur Oct. 15. Pat is not able to make a meeting on that date and Oct. 8 was suggested as the next date to meet.

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost  
Karen Guilfoyle, Chair, Faculty Council  
John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Committee on Committees  
Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary  
ASUI President  
Special Collections, Library
Dear HPC members,

Here is an update to some of the data that I shared yesterday (please see below).

And though I’ve apologized to her in person just now, I want to note that I made a mistake and left Sandra Reineke off the email list that I created for sending messages to the committee, so although she knew a meeting was coming up, she never received the several messages that I sent out. Again, deeply sorry.

Because Pat Hart cannot attend a meeting that I had thought we might schedule for Oct. 15, and because Alton Campbell and I will be attending the National Collegiate Honors Council Conference in San Antonio the following week, it might be good to try to meet again as soon as Wednesday October 8th, 1:30-2:30pm, if you can manage that.

Please let me know if that will work.

all best,

Stephan

Stephan Flores
Director, University Honors Program

Fall 2008 entering University Honors Program freshmen
124 new frosh, each enrolled in at least one honors course (comparison: 125 frosh fall 2007, but 110 enrolled in at least one honors course last fall)
3.897 average high school GPA (comparison: 3.93 GPA fall 2007)
29.13 average ACT composite score (comparison: 28.45 ACT fall 2007)
1334 average SAT reading and math combined score (comparison: 1281 SAT reading & math combined score fall 2007)
72 female (58.06%)
52 male (41.9%)
72 Idaho residents (58.06%)
52 nonresidents (41.9%)
30.64% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Engineering 30.64% of UHP freshmen have majors in CLASS (to 32.25% when counting two College of Education with secondary ed in CLASS, 30.64% figure also includes two Environmental Science majors with emphases in science) 15.32% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Science 10.4% of UHP freshmen have majors in the College of Business & Economics 54.03% of UHP freshmen have majors in the sciences and in engineering List of all members in program: http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/honors_program/uhpmembers.htm

Overall fall 2008 honors classes: 340 seats occupied; 483 total members in good standing in UHP (total # of students in program)
28.22 average enrollment in 100-200 level honors courses
16.8 average enrollment in 300-400 level "funded external" honors courses (this average drops to 14.5 when director Stephan Flores's special one-credit honors course with three students is factored in)
Fellow Honors Committee Members,

Below is an agenda for this Wednesday's meeting. Attached in PDF form are all of the proposals, with the addition of a new one-credit study abroad proposal from Bob Neuenschwander. Minutes of the previous meeting are also attached.

Agenda for 2008-09 Meeting #3

Wednesday, November 12, 1:30-2:30 p.m., (Wellspring Room, Commons)

Agenda
1. Determine Honors Seminar Offerings for 2008-2009 (including report on HSAB's evaluations/ranking of proposals)
2. Committee Members' Observations in Response to External Reviewers' Report
3. Look Ahead to Upcoming Subcommittee proposals/reports on honors points and thesis options
4. New business/new agenda items
5. Adjourn

Thanks,
Pat
TO: Honors Program Committee  
Patricia Hart, Chair  
Lauren McConnell, Chair, HSAB  
Matthew Brookhart, Vice Chair, HSAB  
Stephan Flores, Director  
Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director  
Eric Aston  

Mary DuPree  
Mark Nielsen  
Diane Prorak  
Sandra Reineke  
David Roon  
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held November 12, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chair Hart with the following members present: Eric Aston (arrived later), Alton Campbell, Stephan Flores, Steve Hanna (HSAB Representative), Pat Hart, Mark Nielsen, Diane Prorak, Sandra Reineke, David Roon, and Cheryl Wheaton. Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Determine Honors Seminar offerings for 2008-2009. Stephan Flores began the discussion of the proposals by introducing the representative from the Honors Student Advisory Board, Steve Hanna. Stephan noted that Lauren McConnell, Chair of HSAB, hoped to be able to make the meetings second semester; Matthew Brookhart was unable to attend today's committee meeting. He asked Steve to inform the committee of the board's selection of seminar proposals and rankings. Stephan also explained that the responsibility of the Honors Program Committee was to consider the comments and determinations of HSAB and then to make a motion to accept or amend the board's recommendations and rankings which will help to provide feedback to faculty who have submitted the proposals. Diane Prorak wondered if the number of seminars was limited and Stephan replied that there are usually three offered each semester and that because some of the proposals are just one credit and that students have requested more upper division courses, he would be willing to fund all the proposals, if possible, though there is some uncertainty about the optimal number of seminars to offer in relation to numbers of students who will choose to enroll and be able to enroll. Mark Nielsen concurred that it is a matter of optimization of seminars offered in relation to potential enrollment and hoped that enrollment would be solid in those that were offered.

Steve then explained to the committee the way in which the board had arrived at its rankings, and that board members discussed each of the proposals with the following selected in this rank order.

1. Energy Issues (3 credits)--Tom Bitterwolf
2. Music in Film (3 credits)--James Murphy
3. Molecules of Death (3 credits)--Greg Möller
4. Literature of Addiction (3 credits)--Michele Leavitt
5. The Uncommon Traveler (1 credit)--Bob Neuenschwander
6. War, Environment and the Visual Arts (1 credit)--Gary Machlis and Sally Machlis

Steve pointed out that the board was most excited about the first three proposals because they felt these seminars address the issue of the need for more upper division courses in the sciences. Steve went on to explain that the last proposal was not as appealing to the board because of the seeming lack of melding of the title topics and that a lower division Core Discovery course was being offered on a similar topic, which might discourage program members from taking the seminar. Other comments offered by Steve regarding the board's lower ranking of the visual arts
seminar included the board's unfamiliarity with the instructors and that although the content was intriguing, the title was not as compelling.

Several members of the program committee offered observations and comments in support of the seminar on War, Environment and the Visual Arts. They found it to be very well-conceived and thought out, providing good learning outcomes, and taught by well-known, highly motivated faculty members. Stephan pointed out that although members of HSAB might not be interested in taking the course, there are hundreds of members in the program, including some who might feel quite the opposite. Other committee members pointed out that several of the seminar proposals were submitted with far less course content and hadn't been as precise and well laid out as the Visual Arts proposal. Each committee member provided their own ranking of the seminars, placing the Visual Arts proposal above other seminars in almost every instance. The semester in which each seminar would be offered was noted as follows: Energy Issues, Fall; Music in Film, Spring; Molecules of Death, Spring; Literature of Addiction, Fall or Spring; The Uncommon Traveler, Fall and Spring; War, Environment and the Visual Arts, Spring. In addition, Sean Quinlan's "Gender and Science" seminar (three credits), approved last year but not able to be offered this year, will be offered in fall 2009.

Pat Hart wondered if the committee would be able to see further course development of the proposed seminars, to which Stephan replied that though suggestions to strengthen the proposals are communicated to the respective faculty, usually the work of the committee was completed once the proposals were accepted. There was some further discussion regarding revision of the seminar proposal flyer to indicate faculty might need to supply more documentation, to which Stephan cautioned the committee that although this might be considered, he did not want to discourage faculty from submitting proposals by making the process too involved.

Stephan again pointed out that he would be willing to fund all the seminars, regardless of the ranking and asked the committee to move to either accept the ranking of the seminars by HSAB or to make their own recommendations for the proposals. Diane Prorak made the motion to accept the proposal rankings provided by HSAB; motion seconded by David Roon. With no further discussion regarding the vote was called for and the motion was passed unanimously. Following the vote, David Roon wondered how the visual art course might be marketed in order for it to be more appealing. Steve Hanna suggested a more creative title might be appropriate. Stephan noted that one-credit courses such as this were often quite popular.

2. **Committee members' observations in response to external reviewer's report.** Stephan Flores wondered to what extent the committee is in accord with the report, what it sees in the report that might need to be addressed or what action might be appropriate by the committee and the administration. As a point of information, Stephan indicated to the committee that among the most pressing issues in terms of the near future, he would be following the recommendation of the external reviewers to plan to no longer oversee the university-wide Convocation event. Stephan, along with the external reviewers and the UHP Associate Director, feel the Convocation is not the program's primary responsibility and should be handled by someone else. Stephan has already expressed in the UHP Annual Report and again recently to Vice Provost Jeanne Christiansen a determination to cancel the Convocation until its future oversight by others is decided, and he will confer again soon with the Vice Provost about this. Pat Hart wondered if the program committee should play a role in this; Stephan pointed out that though historically the Convocation has been coordinated by the program, the event is not a charge of the program and also not of the program committee. Diane Prorak wondered if there was student input on the matter, to which Stephan responded that while many students appreciate the event, nearly every honor society, for example, offers an induction ceremony that provides individual attention and recognition to those honored. He also noted that participation in the Convocation by advisors, faculty members and deans had continued to decrease over the years, despite invitations that stressed that this is a university-wide event presided over by the president. Moreover, nearly half
of honor society advisors last year did not respond to repeated inquiries for information and the invitation to participate in the Convocation. In the near term, Stephan will suggest that with the upcoming process for university reprioritization, the Convocation is best put on hiatus and deferred until it is decided who might oversee such an event, and whether an alternative event might be preferred. He feels that in addition to questioning the over $12,000 devoted to a one-hour event, staff members (including the substantial time devoted to the event by the program advisor) need instead to attend directly to recruitment and retention efforts over the months spent in preparation for the Convocation, and that Moms' Weekend could be a time to channel the energies of the program to another, more manageable event directed specifically to highlight the program and its members. Pat suggested that any comments the committee members might want to offer about the external reviewers' report should reach Stephan sometime in the next week, and the committee can continue to discuss the reviewers' report at a future meeting, along with other upcoming items on the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl Wheaton

cc:  Douglas Baker, Provost
Karen Guilfoyle, Chair, Faculty Council
John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Committee on Committees
Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
ASUI President
Special Collections, Library
Dear colleagues,

Hasty reminder and quickly developed agenda for tomorrow's meeting. Appreciation again to everyone who has been participating in the external review. The reviewers have had a good opportunity to speak with a range of folks and to consider much in the way of materials provided.

all for now (off to teach Shakepeare and to apologize to class for not yet having their essays graded!)

Stephan

================================
=UI MEMORANDUM [PROVISIONAL AGENDA--MAY BE UPDATED PRIOR TO MEETING VIA EMAIL, AND COPIES OF AGENDA WILL BE AVAILABLE AT THE MEETING]================================

TO: Honors Program Committee Members
FROM: Stephan Flores, Director, University Honors Program
       Patricia Hart, Honors Program Committee Chair

SUBJ: Agenda for 2008-09 Meeting #2
       Wednesday, October 8, 1:30-2:30 p.m., (Wellspring Room, Commons)

Agenda
1. Update on UHP External Program Review, October 5-7, 2008
2. Preliminary conversation on honors curriculum, including exploring capstone or thesis project option
3. Preliminary conversation on exploring option to grant points for volunteer or service learning . . .
4. New business/new agenda items
5. Adjourn
October 9, 2008

TO: Honors Program Committee
   Patricia Hart, Chair
   Lauren McConnell, Chair, HSAB
   Matthew Brookhart, Vice Chair, HSAB
   Stephan Flores, Director
   Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
   Eric Aston

   Mary DuPree
   Mark Nielsen
   Diane Prorak
   Sandra Reineke
   David Roon
   Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held October 8, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chair Hart with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alton Campbell, Matthew Brookhart, Stephan Flores, Pat Hart, Mark Nielsen, David Roon, and Cheryl Wheaton. Minutes of the previous meeting were moved (Eric Aston) and seconded (Matthew Brookhart) to be accepted. Approval was unanimous.

NOTE: Sandra Reineke was present as well.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Update on UHP External Program Review. Stephan Flores, along with Matthew Brookhart, Eric Aston, Mark Nielsen and Mary DuPree, offered several quick impressions of their encounters with the external reviewers, Dr. Rosalie Otero, Director of the Honors Program at the University of New Mexico and associate dean at UNM (also past president of the National Collegiate Honors Council and co-author of a monograph on evaluating honors programs and colleges) and Dr. Tamara Valentine, Director of the Honors Program at the University of Nevada, Reno. Some of these observations included the following remarks. The reviewers expressed great pleasure and had very positive remarks about meeting with the students at the Living and Learning Center forum (attended by about 20 students) and at the Honors Student Advisory Board luncheon (11 students). Stephan stated that at the conclusion of their visit, they were not yet prepared to offer a summary of their views, and that he didn’t know how they would conceptualize their findings from the visit. They found the faculty to be very dedicated and the curriculum to be excellent. They were impressed by the amount and kinds of materials provided to them, including the UHP annual reports, saying that it was the most comprehensive range of documents and data they’d ever been given for a site visit. The reviewers also observed that the students in the program would like more and better space for honors students, more honors classes, and that it was likely that more funds would be needed to offer the additional courses. It was suggested that students, if so motivated, should approach the upper administration with their concerns. Mark Nielsen interjected that if that approach were taken, it might be worthwhile for a delegation of the UHP National Merit finalists to approach the administration. The issue of elitism became part of the discussion at the forum held on Tuesday, attended by faculty and others. Although some felt that the physical presence and housing of the program and its students was very important, its perceived exclusivity and visibility might not be the “Idaho way.” Dr. Flores interjected that he and Alton Campbell had approached the director of University Residences, Ray Gasser, about possible space in the Scholars LLC, but were discouraged by Gasser’s response that giving space to departments reduces the revenue for residence halls and that he couldn’t see how that might be managed or afforded. Stephan also pointed out that by providing a space in the LLC, where only some of our students reside, it might discourage a feeling of belonging by the 400+ other students who were not a part of that housing arrangement, which can accommodate approximately 60 residents.

Pat Hart asked with whom the reviewers met at the exit interview. Stephan replied that the meeting took place with the provost and vice provost. Pat also wondered when the report would be received. Stephan stated that they would draft a written review and that the program would
have the opportunity to correct any factual errors, after which the final report (due by November 12) will be sent to the provost, vice provost, the university’s External Review Committee, and the Honors Program.

Pat asked if the reviewers’ report would include recommendations. Stephan replied by first explaining the selection of the external reviewers, noting that along with Rosalie Otero, Bob Spurrer, Director of the Honors College at Oklahoma State, had been asked to be a reviewer but because he could not join a review team until spring, he declined the invitation. The desire of program staff and Jeanne Christiansen was to not wait and so it was determined that Tamara Valentine should be invited. Rosalie is very experienced in doing site reviews, and it is thought that she and Tamara Valentine will present recommendations in a broader context that includes the reviewers’ range of knowledge about different honors programs and colleges. Sandra Reineke stated that she hoped the report wouldn’t be shelved, but read. Stephan observed that he hoped such details such as the director’s release time be taken into consideration, and several committee members expressed concerns that the report’s findings not be lost with the coming of a new president and administration, and they also speculated that this might be an opportune moment for the review, given the university’s current process of determining strategic priorities and allocations.

2. Preliminary conversation on honors curriculum, including exploring capstone or thesis project option. This discussion is prompted by Eric Aston’s suggestion this past summer to explore the possibility to have a capstone or thesis project as an option in the honors curriculum for those achieving the Honors Certificate. Stephan noted that the idea also had been suggested by the external reviewers during their visit. He suggested that a sub-committee (3 people) be established to craft a proposal for a 3-4 credit senior project or capstone course. Eric pointed out that the con side of a project or capstone course was that there were departments that did not require that of their seniors. If that presents a barrier, would the program consider offering a thesis project for the students? Mark Nielsen pointed out that there might be administrative resistance to this kind of proposal. Several other committee members contributed to the discussion with concerns expressed about the requirement of more faculty time with a thesis, detracting students from courses in their majors to complete a thesis requirement in the program, and that sustaining such a requirement across time might be rather difficult. Stephan agreed with and recognized the potential weight of such concerns, and offered an additional example of how departments are increasingly careful about restricting the number of directed study credits that faculty take on, given their other teaching, service, and scholarship commitments. Among other considerations and reasons, because of the program’s staffing level and also the university’s reduced numbers of faculty and budgetary constraints, Stephan has not proposed adding a thesis option or requirement, but perhaps now is a good time to review this issue further. Mary DuPree observed that a pro to the argument might be that there are some students who want to be able to expand upon their work and would welcome the ability to do so through a senior project or capstone course in the Honors Program. Stephan also shared sentiments expressed by several honors faculty from the one-to-one interviews conducted last June, that indicate the interest and willingness of some faculty to guide students through honors capstone projects. Stephan noted that whatever work the student did would go on their transcript and that it may be important to develop a capstone project as an option within the curriculum, so that it would not be required of all students, and to have an understanding that regulates or restricts and protects faculty and their respective departments and colleges from becoming overburdened by such opportunities. Sandra Reineke noted that rewarding faculty for participating with an honors student on a project or capstone course might be a way to encourage the faculty. Mark Nielsen replied that rewarding faculty in various non-monetary ways was an ongoing issue for promotion and tenure in almost all areas.

Alton Campbell felt that the idea should be explored, that students should be encouraged to
participate, and a subcommittee formed. Mark wondered where the recommendations from that committee would go—perhaps to UCC. Stephan pointed out that because Honors is not a degree-granting program it isn’t necessary to put the proposal before UCC, because with one exception, honors courses are designated sections of courses that already exist within the university’s core curriculum or as departmental and interdisciplinary special topic and seminar offerings. In contrast, for example, within the honors curriculum, only one course required routing through a department and UCC (Math 315), and presumably that too would be the case if a unique course was developed that would appear regularly in the university catalog, so then it too would need to be routed through UCC. Stephan then asked Eric to join him on the sub-committee to work on a proposal, which would then be directed to David Roon for review, given his experience in coordinating capstone projects. The proposal would then be brought before the whole committee. Pat asked about a time line for the proposal and Stephan replied that it would probably be after the external review report had been received. The sub-committee will look at other institutions as well as the National Collegiate Honors Council website for examples and suggestions. Stephan, for instance, has an example of substantial guidelines for an honors thesis project. Once the proposal is completed it will be taken to the students, who might be surveyed so that the program may learn students’ views, including numbers of students who might be interested in completing an honors project.

3. Preliminary conversation on exploring option to grant points for volunteer or service learning. Stephan Flores lead the discussion, pointing out that there are places in the Honors curriculum where academic credit is granted to students to count toward the certificate requirements, such as study abroad. Also, the Elective Agreement (subject to the approval of the instructor and the UHP director) allows up to 3 credits for an upper-division course taken outside the student’s major providing the course is offered “in the spirit of an honors course,” including the kind of work requisite to the regular honors curriculum. With that in mind, Stephan suggested that the committee consider exploring the option to offer credit toward the certificate for volunteer and related leadership work, such as the kinds done in the LEADS Program and in the ASUI Center for Volunteerism and Social Action, where the hours and kind of work could be tracked. If this were accepted it might mean that students would take fewer honors courses, but more students might be encouraged to work toward the certificate and to participate in these service activities. Matthew Brookhart agreed that it might provide more opportunities for students.

Alton was asked about the LEADS program, described on its website as follows: “The Idaho Leadership Education and Development Series is the University of Idaho’s newest and most comprehensive leadership program. Idaho LEADS seeks to educate and develop University of Idaho students through an extensive program of interactive workshops and leadership activities that will challenge students to go beyond the classroom to develop a broad vision of their role on their campus and in their communities. The Idaho LEADS Program is free and open to all students.” Alton said it is not an academic certificate program and that no credit is given for participation. Jon Reardon is the coordinator.

Stephan acknowledged that it might be difficult to track the various kinds of volunteer work done by students, some of which may not have sufficient oversight in terms of then determining a basis for granting points toward the certificate. Pat agreed that it might be difficult to give credit for all the different kinds of work done by students. Cheryl Wheaton suggested that perhaps students who participated in volunteer work be given 1 credit toward their work, satisfying the desire by the program to reward the student for their work, yet not over-reaching the number of credits assigned to that work, especially relative to academic credits and coursework. Alton volunteered to steer a sub-committee, with Matthew agreeing to take the request for a student from HSAB to work on the committee to the next meeting. Alton will talk with Steve Janowiak, Director of Student Activities and Leadership, regarding the LEADS program and will talk with
Sandra Reineke once he has gathered the information.

4. **New business/new agenda items.** Stephan told the committee that he had asked Pat Hart's advice about students in JAMM classes who might participate in the program's efforts produce more honors profiles. Pat has conferred with JAMM instructor Vicki Rishling to arrange for the 20 or so students in Rishling's Feature Writing class next semester to develop profiles on students and faculty in the honors program. Committee members were reminded that seminar proposals for 2009-10 are due November 3 and that the call for seminars flyer is on the UHP website and was in the Oct. 3 Register, with reminders appearing in the Oct. 17th and 31st issues as well as at the Today@Idaho Faculty/Staff Announcements site. Pat reminded the committee that agenda items for the year needed to be developed fairly quickly so that the request from Faculty Council requesting these agendas can be met.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mary DuPree, seconded by Pat Hart.

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl Wheaton

cc: Douglas Baker, Provost
    Karen Guilfoyle, Chair, Faculty Council
    John A. "Jack" Miller, Chair, Committee on Committees
    Rod Hill, Faculty Secretary
    ASUI President
    Special Collections, Library
October 8, 2008

TO: Honors Program Committee
    Patricia Hart, Chair
    Lauren McConnell, Chair, HSAB
    Matthew Brookhart, Vice Chair, HSAB
    Stephan Flores, Director
    Alton Campbell, Assoc. Director
    Eric Aston

Mary DuPree
Mark Nielsen
Diane Prorak
Sandra Reineke
David Roon
Cheryl Wheaton

RE: Minutes of meeting held September 24, 2008

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. with the following members present: Eric Aston, Alton Campbell, Matthew Brookhart, Stephan Flores, Pat Hart, Mark Nielsen, Diane Prorak and Cheryl Wheaton.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Welcome to new committee members. Self-introductions were made by committee members and Stephan Flores welcomed new committee members as well as the new Associate Director Alton Campbell.

2. Brief overview of University Honors Program including statistics. Handouts were distributed to the committee. Dr. Flores briefly mentioned the upcoming program review and provided program numbers to members as follows: 124 registered new freshmen for fall ‘08, which is the same figure as last year, which at first appears unchanged or flat, but with the new criteria which last year’s committee approved, the enrollment figure is acceptable. Dr. Flores noted there were 14 more students in honors classes this fall than last. The corollary with the freshman numbers is that of the 133 freshmen who were accepted to the program, 9 students have been made inactive because they did not enroll for an honors course. They will be given an opportunity later this fall to become active again if they wish to register for an honors course for spring. Other program statistics offered by Dr. Flores: see copy of email distributed to program committee members which includes more comprehensive data assembled by the director following the meeting.

In relation to courses offered which are unfunded, Stephan mentioned that in place of the usual Vacation Reading class offered each year by one of the directors, he had developed an upper division course, “Engagement and Community,” which he hoped would begin to strengthen a sense of community for those in the program. The students in the class are currently facilitating student to student and faculty profiles to be displayed in various ways, such as on the UHP website, and which might be used by others such as University Communications and Marketing to promote the program.

Dr. Flores again welcomed Dr. Alton Campbell who, after an internal search, was hired as the new Associate Director, replacing Dr. Mark Warner. Dr. Warner left the position to become chief archeologist for the Sandpoint project and returned to his faculty position in Sociology/Anthropology/Justice Studies.

The Honors Program has moved to an hybrid online admissions process, developed this summer to accommodate changes in the program criteria. Once at the Honors Program website, students are directed to the admissions screen to verify criteria using test scores and GPA and if the criteria is met, instructed on how to apply. The program staff met with Director of Admissions Dan Davenport and Assoc. Director Melissa Goodwin to discuss ways to further streamline the