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It is an intimidating and humbling experience to be standing here speaking to you this afternoon. As the time approached to give this speech, people would ask if I was nervous. In response, I paraphrased Woody Allen when he was asked if he was afraid of dying—"No, but I would rather not be there when it happens."

Each president, when it is his or her turn to speak at the national conference, brings a unique perspective and style to the podium. When I looked inward to find my voice, I became concerned about being too serious on the one hand and too whimsical on the other. After all, this is a serious occasion and the opportunity to pontificate on some arcane and profound subject does not often present itself.

On the other hand, it seems that part of my role in NCHC has been to act as a counterweight to the organization's natural tendency towards ponderousness. Complicating the question of voice was the nagging sense I had that I ought to connect my talk to the conference theme, "Explorations On the Edge."

I finally decided to relate two stories that by happenstance begin on mountains. Mountains are ponderous and weighty, and one can rightfully claim to be exploring the edge when viewing the landscape from atop one. The stories were selected to remind us that some of the numbers commonly used by honors practitioners, SAT or ACT scores, grade point averages, and class standing, for example, convey significance at first glance that does not hold up under more careful scrutiny.

Before I get to the stories, a little prologue may help set the stage. Long before I studied physics in college, I was fascinated with numbers and the power of quantification. At birth, I was probably genetically predisposed to empathize with the famous Victorian physicist Lord Kelvin, who said, "When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot express it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind."

Unfortunately, there are times when numbers are wielded like clubs to intimidate or to create a false sense of substance. There are good numbers, not so good numbers, and outrageous numbers. If someone, for example, tells me they have one dollar and eighty-two cents in their pocket, my inclination is to take that as a good number. Money comes in integer units that can be counted accurately. On the other hand, when I weigh myself after working out and get a number like 159.7 pounds on the digital electronic scale at the gym, I recognize that as a not so good number—at least not as good as it appears at face value. First, I have serious doubts about the scale’s ability to measure accurately to the tenth of a pound. But putting that concern aside, thinking about my weight to tenths of a pound is ludicrous. I weigh myself after working out but before my post-exercise drink of water. Is it an accident that this is the time during my visit to the athletic club that gives the smallest possible weight? After working out, I weigh about two pounds less than before—that is a change of 20 tenths of a pound! Since my weight fluctuates about two pounds while at the gym, taking the number on the liquid crystal readout at face value, that is to tenths of a pound, is foolish—yet regardless of my understanding of the silliness of measuring my weight to tenths of a pound, the neat little readout causes me to feel good if it is a few tenths smaller than yesterday or less good if it is a few tenths more! This is the perniciousness of numbers.

I have always been enchanted by numbers and their impact on people. As a teenager, I discovered that I could defend any proposition if I was willing to manufacture a statistic or number that bolstered my argument. Although I stopped fabricating numbers many years ago, let me give an example that fits into an honors context. Imagine being confronted by an honors prospect who appears to be a little tentative about participating. A fictional statistic nonchalantly interjected into the conversation—by the
way, did you know that students who participate in and complete an honors curriculum in college earn 47% more money over a lifetime than students graduating from the same school with comparable grades—could help persuade the prospect to sign on the dotted line. Although I left the manufacturing of numbers business years ago, I have never lost my fascination with the spell numbers can cast on people.

The first story is about a not so good number or at least a number not as good as advertised. The second story is a lovely tale of an outrageous number—an oft-quoted number with less substance than the numbers I used to manufacture in my youth. On to the first story.

In the summer of 1988, I hiked up Mount Whitney, the highest mountain in the contiguous forty-eight states, for the first time. The view from the top of Whitney is fabulous. But the thing that made the biggest impression on me was a National Park Service plaque commemorating the completion of the highest trail in the United States on September 5, 1930. On this plaque, Mt. Whitney's height is listed as 14496.811 feet—that was 14496 and 811 thousandths of a foot! At the time, I was flabbergasted that someone could think they had measured the height of a mountain to thousandths of a foot—one thousandth of a foot is about an eighthieth of an inch—approximately the thickness of two sheets of paper!

I completely forgot about the breathtaking view and tried to picture surveyors trekking approximately 200 miles from the Pacific Ocean to the top of Mt. Whitney keeping track of their altitude to a thousandth of a foot. The more I thought about it, the more unbelievable the number became. I have been to the top of Whitney three more times and always check the marker to make sure I wasn't hallucinating during that first trip.

This past spring, I asked a geologist friend of mine about the marker on Whitney. He suggested I contact the U.S. Geological Survey. So one afternoon, I called and spoke to someone at USGS who appeared to be knowledgeable about the altitude benchmarks on Whitney. He explained that there are markers about the marker moving toward the top of Mount Whitney. As they progressed up the mountain, they lost sight of the fact that the uncertainty in their reference altitude and the errors accumulated along the way made the final number much less meaningful than the accuracy implied by the number on the commemorative plaque. The surveyors ought to have heeded the words of Ishmael, the narrator of Moby Dick, when talking about the Sperm Whale skeleton that he measured: “I did not trouble myself with the odd inches; nor, indeed, should inches at all enter into a congenial measurement of the whale.” The same can be said for the odd fractions of a foot when measuring the height of a mountain!

Let me give you two reasons that reinforced my initial incredulity. It would take at least 200 individual measurements, assuming the measurements were a mile apart, to go from the Pacific Ocean to the top of Whitney. Each of the individual measurements would have to be accurate to a small fraction of a thousandth of a foot in order for the accumulated error to be a few thousandths of a foot. Imagine measuring a hundred-foot stretch along a trail using a six-inch ruler marked in sixty-fours of an inch. At the end of the measurement, after moving the ruler 200 times, you could read an answer to sixty-fours of an inch. But you would be unlikely to claim that you measured the whole length to that accuracy because the accumulated error in moving the ruler 200 times would be much larger than the sixty-fourth of an inch accuracy of the ruler. So writing the final result of this experiment as 99 feet 11 inches and 41/64 of an inch would be, putting it mildly, misleading.

Even more troubling to me was the starting point for determining the height of Whitney—mean sea level. What is mean sea level? I tried to picture someone standing on a beach in California determining something called mean sea level to an accuracy of one eightieth of an inch. And then I remembered that mean sea level was different on the two sides of the Panama Canal. Checking with my trusty colleague in geology, I learned that the difference is about 1/2 meter, with the Atlantic being higher. Consequently a mountain in Central America would be about 1.5 feet higher if measured above mean Pacific sea level than if measured with respect to mean Atlantic sea level. Although either measurement could be made with an instrument error of one thousandth of a foot, the meaninglessness of such measurements becomes apparent when you picture two bronze benchmarks on top of a mountain in Central America with engraved heights to one thousandth of a foot but differing from one another by one and a half feet!

The point here is obvious. The accuracy of the measuring instrument is not the same as the accuracy of the measurement. Surveyors, good careful surveyors, were making accurate measurements from marker to marker moving toward the top of Mount Whitney. As they progressed up the mountain, they lost sight of the fact that the uncertainty in their reference altitude and the errors accumulated along the way made the final number much less meaningful than the accuracy implied by the number on the commemorative plaque. The surveyors ought to have heeded the words of Ishmael, the narrator of Moby Dick, when talking about the Sperm Whale skeleton that he measured: “I did not trouble myself with the odd inches; nor, indeed, should inches at all enter into a congenial measurement of the whale.” The same can be said for the odd fractions of a foot when measuring the height of a mountain!
A more startling example of a number whose notoriety far outstripped its substance has roots going back to 1917, when Dr. Charles H. T. Townsend, a well-known entomologist who studied *Cephenemyia*, more commonly known as deer or botflies, wrote the following in an article in the *Journal of the New York Entomological Society*: “On several occasions I saw what I believed to be the female flies of this species passing with incredible swiftness....”

This is an early sign that Dr. Townsend was captivated by the speed of *Cephenemyia*. Nine years later, in an article in *Scientific Monthly*, the precursor to *Scientific American*, Dr. Townsend quantified the subjective phrase, “incredible swiftness,” by writing, Can the speed attained by *Cephenemyia* in flight be calculated with any degree of accuracy? The writer has endeavored to do this, having repeatedly witnessed what he considers both males and females of this genus in full flight. In extended flight their passing is of such incredible swiftness that one is utterly unable to initiate any movement whatever toward capture before they vanished from sight. Form is not sensed by the eye as they pass, but merely a blur or streak of color and only a fleeting glimpse of that. It may be safely estimated, in the opinion of the writer, who has given much thought to the subject, that these flies attain a speed of upward of 400 yards per second.

The following year, 1927, in the *Journal of the New York Entomological Society*, Dr. Townsend wrote, 

> [T]he gravid females are heavily laden with ova and young, which must make them slower than males. At 7000-foot levels in the Sierra Madre valleys of western Chihuahua I have seen gravid females pass while on the search for hosts at a velocity of well over 300 yards per second—allowing a slight perception of color and form but only a blurred glimpse. On the other hand, on 12,000-foot summits in New Mexico I have seen pass me at an incredible velocity what were quite certainly the males of *Cephenemyia*. I could barely distinguish that something had passed—only a brownish blur in the air of about the right size for these flies and without sense of form. As closely as I can estimate, their speed must have approximated 400 yards per second. It should be noted that four hundred yards per second is 818 MPH—that’s faster than the speed of sound. Thus began the fable of the supersonic fly! For years afterwards, the botfly or deer fly was attributed a speed of between 614 MPH for females (300 yds/sec) and 818 MPH for males (400 yds/sec). For example, Roy Chapman Andrew, Director of the American Museum of Natural History, in a 1937 article in *Natural History* magazine compared the speed of various animals. The article began with “Who or what, is the Speed Champion of the world? It is an insect rejoicing in the name of *Cephenemyia*. A rate of 400 yards per second or 818 miles an hour has been chalked up against him—him, because the female does not fly quite so fast for obvious reasons.”

I looked through the next 12 issues of *Natural History* to see if anyone questioned the contention that this fly could break the sound barrier. One astute reader wrote, “Honestly, I think that the estimate of 400 yards a second is beyond all reason.” But apparently for the most part, intelligent people took this information at face value even though the speed attributed to the fly was faster than a speeding bullet—400 yards/sec is one third again faster than the speed of a 45-caliber bullet leaving a Colt revolver!

One person who had been perplexed by the reports of the supersonic fly was Irving Langmuir, a Nobel prize-winning physicist. In 1938, Dr. Langmuir used his considerable skill and experience to deflate the exaggerated speed claimed for the fly. In an article in *Science*, he wrote, “About ten years ago, an editorial in *The New York Times*, in commenting on a new seaplane speed record of something over 300 miles per hour warned man not to be too boastful of his accomplishments, since the deer fly has a speed of 700 miles an hour. This speed, nearly that of sound, seemed to me so fantastically high that I was led to make some rough mental calculations....” Langmuir goes on to say, “I was curious also regarding the source of the data and the nature of the measurements, for the methods of measuring the velocities of revolver bullets are not easily applicable to deer flies.”

Langmuir continues, “About a year ago there was an editorial in a Schenectady newspaper giving the speed of the deerfly as 800 miles per hour. Since then I have met many people who have seen similar citations in various publications....I was therefore interested in a two-page diagram in the *Illustrated London News*, January 1, 1938, giving the comparative speeds attained by animals, fish, etc. The female deer fly was credited with 614 miles per hour, while for the male the record was 818 miles per hour.”

The article in the *Illustrated London News* had the reference that had eluded Dr. Langmuir for ten years—Dr. Townsend’s 1927 article in the *Journal of the New York Entomological Society*. Langmuir presented six independent arguments demolishing the deer fly’s speed. Although all six have merit, I will present only two of the arguments.

Langmuir estimated that the fly would have to eat one and a half times its body weight every second to create enough power; about 1/2 HP, to sustain a speed of 800 MPH. Langmuir would have been more surprised if he knew that these flies do not eat in the adult stage. Their amazing aeronautical prowess is derived totally from reserves carried over from the larval stage! As wonderful as the implication of this result is about the metabolism and the power output of the fly, my favorite argument is
much more elegant and requires no assumptions about the aerodynamics of the fly or its ability to convert food reserves into mechanical energy. In Langmuir’s own words, it is of interest to determine the speed of an object the size of a deer fly which would appear as ‘a barely distinguishable blur in the air.’ For this purpose I took a short piece of solder about 1 cm long and 0.5 cm diameter and tied it about its middle to one end of a light silk thread, holding the other end in my hand. With lengths of thread of from 1 to 3 feet it is easily possible to swing the weight in a circle in a vertical plane at the rate of 3 to 5 rotations per second;... In this way speeds from 13 to 64 MPH were produced. Observations in a room, with a brightly lighted white ceiling as background, showed that at 13 miles per hour the ‘fly’ was merely a blur—the shape could not be seen, but it could be recognized as a small object of about the correct size. At 26 miles/hr the fly was barely visible as a moving object. At 43 miles/hr it appeared as a faint line and the direction of rotation could not be recognized. At 64 miles/hr the moving object was wholly invisible. Dr. Langmuir concludes with “[t]he description given by Dr. Townsend of the appearance of the flies seems to correspond best with a speed in the neighborhood of 25 miles/hr.”

It turned out that Dr. Langmuir’s estimate for the speed was a little low because he underestimated the size of the fly by about 50%—mixing up the puny eastern deerfly with our more robust western relative.

Time magazine, Scientific American, and other high circulation journals immediately spread the word about Dr. Langmuir’s debunking the extraordinary speed claims of the deer fly. In spite of this, references to the deer fly as being the speed champion of the world continued to pop up at least into the 1960’s. For example, the 1959 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica states under botfly, “Cephenemyia, the deer bots, which attack deer in North America, are reputedly the speediest of animals: C.H.T. Townsend claimed a speed of 815 MPH.”

It is the astounding staying power of this completely bogus number that has fascinated me for years. This number took on a life of its own completely disproportionate to the substance that ought to have been attached to it. But being an extraordinary example does not make it alone. In our realm of academia there are many examples of numbers that are given weight far beyond that required by common sense.

The mere act of quantification does not make a complex issue simple or a multi-variate parameter one dimensional. But the urge to use numerical models to rate teaching proficiency, to rank people for merit and equity awards, to order students for admissions and scholarships appears to be overwhelming. Years ago, when I took the SAT examination the scores were reported to the nearest integer, 652 for example. Now the numbers reported by the SAT are rounded to the nearest ten, 650 instead of 652. Furthermore, the “SAT Student Score Report” explains in detail that the score 650 ought to be considered as the center of a range that goes from 620 to 680. The College Board warns us that a SAT score of 650 needs to be viewed as a number with a standard deviation on the order of 30 points. How many of us, when making academic decisions, take into account this admonition to discount the difference between 620 and 650 or 650 and 680 on the SAT exam? And of course, this statistical uncertainty says nothing about possible inherent biases in the SAT examination.

Many of us use SAT or ACT scores, high school grade point averages or class standing, and other information that can be quantified to make decisions about admissions and scholarships. The reason we do this is obvious—we want to be objective and consistent. If Mary gets a scholarship and Jimmy does not, it is very comforting to be able to explain to Jimmy’s parents that Jimmy scored lower on some numerical scale than Mary—ipso facto, Mary got the money and Jimmy did not! The difficult thing to keep in mind when using a list ordered numerically in some plausible but arbitrary manner is that the ordering implies more knowledge and certainty than is justified by the input data. On the output side, Mary is ranked higher than Jimmy. There is nothing certain about the order. Regardless of how small the numerical

A Retrospective on a New Honors Program

1. What is one measure of progress in your program?
2. How well does your current program resemble its original vision of it?
3. In three years, will your program look very much the same or different?
4. What kind of cooperation by whom has caused your program to evolve?
5. How well does your program reflect what is true of your institution at large?

from William L. Knox, Northern Michigan University
difference between two people on the list, the process of ordering will still put one ahead of the other. The ranking masks two incredibly important sources of uncertainty. First the input numbers are invariably treated as exact. For example, a 650 on the SAT is absolutely better than a 640 regardless of the admonition of the College Board people to consider a score as the center of a large range. Second, small and reasonable modifications of the method used to form the list would produce an ordering with some juxtapositions—the fewer juxtapositions the better the ordering scheme but changes are inevitable.

As a physicist, I would never advocate a ban on numbers and quantification or suggest that decisions ought to be made with Ouija boards or by using crystals hung from a string. Numbers have the power to be helpmates in making important and difficult decisions—but we ought not abdicate our powers of judgement when presented with numbers that imply more substance than warranted.

I wish I had some magic antidote to undermine the beguiling effect of numbers, but I don’t. Instead I have offered you two anecdotes with the hope that they will encourage you to be more skeptical of numbers and more willing to defend a generous dose of subjectivity when appropriate. There is tremendous pressure to surround complicated decision making with a maze of objective appearing quantification. Refuse to be intimidated by numbers—remember the supersonic fly! 

Scholarship Award Winner

Congratulations to Michael Andrew Gale, University of Florida, who has been awarded a Truman Scholarship and a Udall Scholarship. One of the seven finalists for the Florida College Student of the Year, Michael is a junior in zoology with wildlife ecology and music minors. He is also past president of the Honors Ambassadors, UFL, as well as a volunteer at the Florida Museum of Natural History. Michael is from Charleston, West Virginia, and plans to be a director of a zoo or wildlife conservation center after graduation.

WEB SITES FOR MAJOR SCHOLARSHIPS
British Marshall Scholarships
http://www.britishcouncil.org/usa/usabms
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Number Theory
By Margaret Brown
mcbrown@radford.edu

When we mean to build,
We first survey the plot, then draw the model;
And when we see the figure of the house,
Then must we rate the cost...

—Shakespeare

You can’t help but notice that this issue is full of numbers: financial reports, the last two reports from a survey of small colleges, the first part of a survey of NCHC-member institutions. Numbers with which to ground our ideas of our honors organization and NCHC honors programs and colleges.

I think that the numbers, numbers, and numbers—here and in recent issues—are a good sign if we can apply them to our own situation. If, for example, your honors program or college is housed at a major research university such as Virginia Tech or Texas Tech, you still have something to learn from Steinhauer’s five-part survey for NCHC’s Small College Honors Committee, the last two parts in this issue. Surely you can better evaluate an application for graduate school from a student who has actively participated in honors at her small college once you get a picture of what honors has most likely provided for her intellectual and personal growth at a small college.

Steinhauer’s five-parter speaks to honors programs at two-year schools, too. Knowing what your students can expect when they transfer to small colleges can guide you in tailoring your program for them. Their success after they transfer will be your honors program’s success, too, if you’ve kept track of them. (See Michelle Smith’s article here on “Tracking Honors Students.”)

Another benefit? The edge your future transfer students will have when they apply for admission. Your school’s reputation precedes them.

Research—right now, mainly collecting numbers—is another step in drawing models of honors. We have one excellent model already: “Basic Characteristics of a Fully-Developed Honors Program.” And Sedlack’s research echoes “Basic Characteristics”: honors programs are not one-size-fits-all. But we need more research. We need to define honors past the “I know it when I see it” stage. We need to construct a new discipline: honors.

Research has never been a high priority for the NCHC. Years ago, Ira Cohen, honors director (retired) at Southern Illinois (“Located in Normal,” he used to say with a wink) and a mentor to many of us, challenged the NCHC to promote and create research. In the Winter 1997 issue of the NHR, Cohen said, “for serious work about honors to count for our colleagues we must start to produce scholarship about honors. Some of it will be empirical, some not” (20).

Strength, I think, comes from the ground up. Strengthening each program strengthens the honors community. Research can create the benchmarks. It’s the numbers that create the benchmarks: salaries at schools considered equivalent in terms of size, mission, and depth of programs and degrees; administrative assistance in programs of similar budgets and sizes; reassigned time for directors of programs similar in budget and size. That’s what can help individual programs.

Apply the numbers. Take “Basic Characteristics” and all the numbers you can pull out of this issue to your boss. Use the numbers to get you something you didn’t have before: a work study student, additional reassigned time (don’t say release time), a new computer, ten new computers, ten thousand dollars, ten million dollars. Who knows?
WHAT KIND OF NUMBERS ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

Part I: “The Honors Director Survey: Nature of the Sample and the Honors Director’s Role”

by R. Guy Sedlack
Towson University retired

Introduction
This paper is the first in a series of presentations which grew out of the Director’s Survey conceived with some input from the membership concerning questions of interest. It contained 290 questions and generated, to-date, 283 variables. [Since there remain a few open-ended written responses that have not yet been analyzed, additional information may appear in the future; however, the bulk of the survey has been completed, coded, entered, and “data-cleaned.”]

Funded by the NCHC and mailed through the auspices of the Executive Secretary/Treasurer’s office, the survey was sent during the fall semester of 2000 to all the honors directors whose institutions were current members of the National Collegiate Honors Council. Replies were received from October 13, 2000 through June 30, 2001 from 160 member institutions.

The Research Committee would like to thank all 160 persons who participated in this study and also the NCHC National Office without whose help the measuring instrument could not have been duplicated and mailed.

The raw data were coded and entered into the SPSS Version 11.0 statistical program.

Notes: Throughout this paper, I will use the terms “honors director” or “director” as a generic reference to the person who filled out the survey or who runs the honors program. In truth, this person may have the formal title of “Honors Director” or “Honors Coordinator” or “Honors Administrator” or “Dean of Honors” or the like.

“I. General characteristics of the directors and their programs
Forty-eight (30.0%) of the schools were private and 111 (69.4) were public.1 Of the 48 private institutions, 20 (43.5%) were “denominational” and 19 (41.3%) were “non-denominational.” Five (10.9%) were identified as “denominational but not actively so,” two (4.3%) said they were “non-denominational, but Christian,” and two others did not reply to this item. One would expect that honors programs (and membership in the NCHC) are more prevalent in public rather than private institutions, and these data bear that out. Pleasantly, there was a sufficient number of private institutions in the sample to justify analysis of these institutions.

Twenty-seven (16.9%) institutions were two-year schools, while 131 (81.9%) were four-year schools. Two institutions had both a two-year and a four-year instructional program.2 This researcher would have hoped that a larger number of two-year institutions would have participated in the study, but the number who did is not too small to jeopardize the aggregate statistics.

Thirty-five (21.9%) institutions were classified as “major research,” 24 (15.0%) as “universities,” 43 (26.9%) as “comprehensive universities,” 29 (18.1%) as “four-year colleges,” and 27 (16.9%) as “community colleges.” One additional institution classified itself as “a four-year regional college” and one as a “specialized college in the SUNY system.” There is a good range of types of collegiate institutions represented, and it is somewhat surprising to see that the term “comprehensive university” seems to be catching on.

Relative to the institution’s locale, 69 (43.1%) are “urban,”

“To be a viable organization, the NCHC needs to appeal to a quite diverse audience that, often, has quite divergent needs.”
40 (25.0%) are “suburban,” and 33 (20.6%) are “rural” with two institutions having multiple campuses with mixed locales. Sixteen institutions declined to answer this item.

Institutional size can be, largely, a matter of perception. These data do not grossly misrepresent the facts, although one respondent’s claim that a 900+ undergraduate population was a “medium” institution seemed a bit far-fetched. Thus, 51 (33.3%) said they were “small,” 62 (38.8%) “medium,” and 40 (25.0%) answered “large” with seven respondents failing to answer.

“Generally speaking, the honors faculty are teaching at the same level as the non-honors faculty. This is a relationship to be considered.”

Looking at the relationship between the institution’s location and the number of part-time students, 47.1% of the urban schools had 50 or more part-time students, 37.9% of the suburban schools, and only 14.9% of the rural schools. Thus, of those reporting data, 85.0% of the schools with 50 or more part-time students were located in urban or suburban locales. This is not at all surprising, for rather obvious reasons. Further, after creating a new variable (TOTALSTU) by combining both the number of full-time and part-time undergraduate students and selecting only those institutions with less than 1000 total undergraduates students, only six small schools reported part-timers ranging from zero to 300 with a median of 43 students.

Of 139 cases for which there were valid data, the percentage of students living on the campus ranged from 0.0% (none) to 95.0%. The median was 33.0% and the mean was 34.9%. If one eliminates the 27 schools with no students living on campus, the remaining 112 schools ranged from a low of two per cent to ninety-three per cent with a mean of 43.3% and a median of 41.9%. And, again, ten of these 112 schools had residential percentages less than 10 per cent. Finally, of the 27 schools reporting that they had no residential students on campus, five (18.5%) were four-year institutions and 22 (81.5%) were two-year institutions. These statistics indicate that a significant majority of the sample was “mixed” with substantial numbers of students living on the campus as well as commuting to the institution.

Switching to the item on one’s honors membership category, all 160 respondents were members of the NCHC: (a) 154 had institutional memberships; (b) one had a professional membership only; and (c) five declined to answer. Twenty-one institutions had both institutional and professional memberships, while six schools had institutional, professional, and student memberships. Thirty-four schools reported that they were not members of an NCHC regional groups and one declined to answer, while 126 (78.8%) said they were. The regional breakdown was: (a) Great Plains 18 (11.3%); (b) Southern 35 (21.9%); (c) Mideast 7 (4.4%); (d) Upper Midwest 16 (10.0%); (e) Northeast 28 (17.5%); and (f) Western 20 (12.5%). One institution was a member of two regional honors organizations. If the 34 schools who were not currently members of NCHC regional honors organizations were to join one, one (2.9%) said they would join the Great Plains, five (14.7%) the Southern, three (8.8%) the Mideast, seven (20.6%) the Upper Midwest, 14 (41.2%) the Northeast, and one (2.9%) the Western with three (8.8%) not responding.

Sixty-seven (41.9%) replied that there was a state honors organization in their state, while 85 (53.1%) said that there was not.
Four respondents (2.5%) did not know and four left this item blank. Of the sixty-seven who knew of their state’s honors organization, fifty-nine (88.1%) were members of it, while eight (11.9%) were not. Asked if their institution was a member of any other honors organization, 139 (88.5%) said “No.” Of the remainder, three mentioned the National Association of African-American Honors Programs, and three reported the Honors Transfer Council of California. Single institutions reported a variety of other local or regional honors associations.

II. Summary of the general data

The statistics above tell the reader something of the climate in which the respondents to the survey fall. Most of the honors programs are in schools located in urban or suburban areas with a large majority educating significant proportions of both commuter and residential students. Most of the respondents represent public education and most have medium- to large-sized student bodies. Over eighty per cent of the respondents were four-years schools, although 27 institutions (16.9%) were two-year institutions. However, there were enough cases represented from rural areas, private colleges, and almost exclusively residential or commuter institutions to do analyses with these crucial categories.

One thing should be clear from the data above. The NCHC member institutions are quite diverse on a number of important dimensions, only some of which are listed above. To be a viable organization, the NCHC needs to appeal to a quite diverse audience that, often, has quite divergent needs. For example, while not yet discussed, some honors programs function with no budget and a very small number of students. Others function with budgets that are quite large and with an equally large number of students. These two groups have quite different concerns and the NCHC needs to be attune to the important needs of its quite different constituencies. The NCHC has tried “strands” before at the national meetings wherein sessions have been grouped and identified, for example, as appropriate to large honors programs or small honors programs. Perhaps, we might think about groupings devoted to budgeting or recruiting or the like, as the NCHC has, similarly, carved out time for “Beginning in Honors” and “Developing in Honors,” two programs which continue to be quite popular and very important to the membership.

“Therefore, the question does arise concerning the equality of the honors and the non-honors faculty role. In other words, should the honors faculty be entitled to a reduced teaching load as research faculty are so entitled in some institutions?”

III. The role of the honors director

In this section, we look at some of the roles of the honors director and some aspects of honors faculty members and the circumstances under which they do their work.

First, the expectations of faculty vary considerably from those institutions where teaching is of secondary importance to research to those where teaching is the only task of importance. One question on the survey dealt with the faculty teaching load. All but four institutions replied to this item. Twenty-four schools (15.4%) have one to two course teaching loads, 38 (24.4%) have three course loads, 63 (40.4%) have four course loads, and 25 (16.0%) have five or more course loads. Five schools had reduced teaching loads for designated research faculty or designated research departments. When asked if the honors faculty had the same teaching load as the non-honors faculty, 143 (91.1%) said “Yes,” while 11 (7.0%) said “No.” [Three schools had some honors faculty with the same load and some with different loads.]

Generally speaking, the honors faculty are teaching at the same level as the non-honors faculty. This is a relationship to be considered.

In many large institutions, large lecture halls, large student sections, objective exams, lack of papers, lack of student discussion, graduate assistants, and the like are the norms. Thus, faculty have little expenditure of their time on the teaching portion of their academic role. To the contrary, honors faculty, with a smaller class size, are nonetheless reading students papers, developing and monitoring student discussion, and interacting with some regularity during office hours with honors student who are often working on individualized class projects or papers. Therefore, the question does arise concerning the equality of the honors and the non-honors faculty role. In other words, should the honors faculty be entitled to a reduced teaching load as “research faculty” are so entitled in some institutions? The survey data do not admit a clear answer to this question. For example, it may very well be that a smaller and less research-oriented institution may have a four-course teaching load with an average of 30 students per course, while the research university faculty member may teach only two courses but with 100 students in each course. Thus, our hypothetical research professor is responsible for 200 students with a two-course load and the four-course professor is handling 120 students. So, some additional data are needed here, which this survey did not think to collect, which focuses on both the number of students taught and the nature of the teaching obligation —
i.e., lecture and objective exams graded by others as opposed to lecture/discussion, papers and written exams graded by the faculty member.

We also inquired about the nature of the academic term. A vast majority (95.0%) of the respondents said that they were on a semester schedule, while two institutions were on the trimester scheme, five were using the quarter system, and one institution had 10 1/2 week sessions. Since almost all (152 of the 160) of the schools are on the semester system, the analysis of the teaching load reduction question was considerably simplified.

Asking about compensation received for participating in honors, 151 persons said they were compensated, while nine were not. Two of these nine persons were clearly administrators, while a third one might have been; the remaining six were "honors directors" and, presumably, not compensated by salary or by reduced teaching load.

The next question asked if the compensation involved a salary. Thirty-seven respondents left this item blank, while 91 (74.0%) said they were and 32 (26.0%) said they were not. Quite frankly, this question was probably flawed or misinterpreted. While the previous question emphasized that we were interested in compensation as "Honors Director or Honors Dean," this researcher believes that part of the sample read this to mean, "Of course, I get a salary" rather than a specific additional amount for involvement in honors.

The next item focused on reduction of one's teaching load. Thirty-one persons declined to answer this question. Of the 129 who did, 116 (89.9%) said they did have some teaching load reduction and 13 (10.1%) said they did not receive any such reduction. Eleven of these thirteen (91.7%) said they received a salary, while one said "No" and one declined to answer. Therefore, one might conclude that the eleven persons who receive a salary but not a reduced teaching load were administrative rather than faculty persons.

Another question asked for the honors director's teaching load reduction in hours. This datum needed to be recast. For example, if the reply was six hours, then one might wonder if it was half of a twelve-hour load or forty per cent of a fifteen-hour load. Therefore, combining the response to the number of hours question with the nature of the academic year, these data were transformed into a percentage of the teaching load reduction. For example, 25 per cent means a one course out of every four or 67 per cent means a two-course reduction out of every three. Hence, of the 108 persons who answered this item, 36 directors (33.3%) had a fifty per cent teaching reduction for handling the honors program, and 16 (14.8%) had a 25 per cent reduction. The mean was 47.5% teaching reduction. Further, seven persons had a 67% reduction, seven directors had 75% reduction, and seven had a 100% reduction. Sadly, ten people had but a 20 per cent reduction or less. Put another way, 63 per cent of those who replied had a minimum of one-half of their teaching load reduced for assuming the directorship of honors.

Thirty-four (21.3%) of the directors reported that they did not have any type of clerical help, while 126 (78.8%) said they did. Of these 126, 120 (96.8%) said they had a secretary. When asked how many, 113 persons replied and 94 directors (83.2%) had the services of at least one secretary half-time and some had two full-time secretaries. The modal category was one full-time secretary which 63 directors (55.8%) had, while 16 directors (14.2%) had one half-time secretary. Nine directors (8.0%) had two full-time secretaries, while five directors (4.4%) had three secretaries. Clearly, most institutions recognize and support the director's need for clerical assistance.

Of the 158 persons answering, 68 directors (43.0%) said they had an assistant or assistant or associate director, while 90 (57.0%) said they did not. Of the 60 persons responding to the question of how many assistants, 38 directors (55.1%) had an additional person full-time, and 11 (15.9%) directors had two full-time persons. Note, however, that 88 (55.0%) of the directors replied earlier that they had no assistant directors.3

Finally, concerning paid student help, 98 directors (61.3%) had paid student help, while 62 (38.8%) did not. When asked how many students, five more directors reported for a total of 103. Of these 103 directors, 33 (32.0%) had one student, 26 (25.2%) had two students, and 12 had three students — all of the above full-time. Add one director with the equivalent of 2.5 students, and 72 directors (69.9%) had a minimum of one full-time paid student assistant or a maximum of three full-time paid students.

IV. The honors director's career advancement

There are some faculty who identify very strongly with their departmental affiliation, who, then, see honors (as well as interdisciplinary studies and similar foci) as secondary concerns and programs that take away faculty and resources from departmental teaching and research activities. On the other hand, there are those faculty who see honors programs as complementary programs which develop student skills which are generally lacking within a
departmental focus — e.g., interdisciplinary thinking. Finally, some faculty see the position of the Honors Director as the first stepping stone from a career in teaching and research as a faculty member to that of a full-time administrator. Therefore, in this section we focus on a number of survey items designed to elicit the honors directors’ feelings and experiences about their academic careers and their career advancement.

We asked whether the director was a full-time faculty member. All 160 respondents replied with 137 (85.6%) saying they were full-time faculty and 23 (14.4%) saying they were not. Of the 23 persons who said they were not faculty, clearly seven of them held administrative positions, as indicated by a subsequent question. Fourteen of the remaining sixteen persons identified themselves as “Honors Directors,” so their placement as faculty or administration was not possible.

When asked about their affiliation, a great number of departments were listed. Since most honors programs are so heavily invested in a liberal arts curricula, it was not surprising to find that 40 persons (29.4%) were faculty in English, 13 (9.6%) in history, and seven persons (5.1%) in Humanities, and two (1.5%) in Literature. Surprisingly, the social sciences were well represented in this survey as sociology (nine persons), psychology (seven), political science (five), economics (four), and anthropology (two) accounted for a total of 27 directors (19.8%). In all, 31 different departmental affiliations were reported.

We asked about the director’s current academic rank and the director’s rank at the time of appointment as director of honors. All 160 persons replied to this item, with 23 (14.4%) saying that this item was irrelevant. Sixty-five (40.6%) were full professors at both the time of the survey and at the time of their appointment as honors director. Thirty-one (19.4%) had been promoted while honors director and 34 (21.2%) had not been promoted. Seven persons (4.4%) did not provide enough information to determine their promotional record while serving as honors director.

“So, the empirical evidence to this point seems to indicate that being an honors director does not automatically hinder one’s chances for academic advancement.”

I focused on the 34 persons who were not promoted during their tenure as honors director. Of the 34, twenty-three persons were associate professors when they were appointed director of honors. Seventeen (73.9%) had been the honors director for three years or less, while six had been directors for a range of four to ten years. Further, these 34 had been at their present institutions for a range of five to thirty-one years with a mean of 13.96 and a median of 13. Finally, 69.6 per cent of these associate professors were located at major research universities, universities, and comprehensive universities, where, presumably, the pressures to publish and to be involved in disciplinary programs are greater.

Attention shifted to those who are currently assistant professors and who started their involvement as honors directors at that same rank. There were a total of eight persons in the survey with six (75%) who were directors for three years or less and six (75%) who were at their schools five years or less. Finally, 37.5% were at universities or comprehensive universities. Again, one sees that six of these eight were relatively “newcomers” to both their institutions and as directors of their honors programs, although a majority of them were working at four-year colleges or two-year community colleges, where, again, presumably, pressures to publish and disciplinary affairs may be less restricting.

Finally, there were three persons who were instructors at the time of their appointment as honors director and were currently instructors. One was located at a comprehensive university, two had been director for three years or less, but two had been at their institutions for ten and twenty-eight years, respectively.

In sum, it would appear that those faculty who have not been advanced in rank are mainly those who have served at their institutions for a limited number of years and have been honors directors for four to three years at the most. So, the empirical evidence to this point seems to indicate that being an honors director does not automatically hinder one’s chances for academic advancement.

Nonetheless, one should note that the majority of faculty members holding honors directorships were full professors at the time of their appointment. There are, however, a couple of additional factors to consider.

Turning to another item, we asked if the honors director was seeking tenure. Of the 149 responses, only 12 (8.1%) said that they were. Of these 149 persons, 102 of 124 said that they already had tenure when they became honor directors. Therefore, of the 137 persons who said that they were not seeking tenure, 102 already had it. If one plays around with the
mathematics here, the remainder of the sample could very well have been honors people working more as administrators (e.g., deans, associate provosts, and the like). Finally, of the 12 who said they were seeking tenure, five said they thought being an honors director would help them, two thought it would hurt their chances, four had no idea, and one declined to speculate. In sum, there did not appear to be enough cases, nor enough information to make a reasonable judgment concerning the relationship between involvement as an honors director and ease of gaining tenure. Indeed, it seems that the safest course is to have tenure prior to assuming the directorship of honors.

Finally, we looked at the publication variable. Of the total sample, 152 replied to this item. The range of publications was from zero to 148. Two respondents reported 148 and 147 publications, respectively, while one other person listed 100. If we drop these three (certainly to be admired and envied) over-achievers, then the range went from zero to 90 with a mean of 15.37 and a median of 9. Twenty persons had zero publications and half of the sample had nine or fewer publications. Seventy-five per cent of the sample had twenty-two or fewer publications.

Of the 125 persons who responded to the item asking how many publications came after becoming the honors director, 42 directors (33.6%) replied "zero" with 90.4 per cent of the sample having ten or fewer publications. The mean was four (largely due to a few individuals who continued high publication rates), and the median was one. To put it another way, 83 (66.4%) had two or fewer publications since assuming the leadership of their honors programs.

Finally, let's look at the publication variable in yet another way. If one eliminates the over-achievers mentioned above and one eliminates those respondents who answered "no publications" on the assumption that they were not interested in publication at all, then what remains are those faculty who are interested in publication and who have proceeded to do such at a more normal rate. Given these parameters, 128 persons responded with a mean prior to becoming the honors director of 17.88 and a median of 12, and a mean after becoming honors director of 4.06 and a median of 1 (one). The implications of the above statistics must be softened with the knowledge that most directors were full professors at the time of their appointment as honors director and, therefore, had not only already amassed the majority of their publications but also decided to focus on honors at that point in their academic lives. Even taking such caveats into account, however, assuming the directorship of an honors program clearly reduces the time that directors have to produce academic publications.

Finally, of interest relative to publications, excepting the twenty persons who have never published and the four persons who left this item blank, 75.9 per cent of the remaining 108 respondents have never published anything about honors with another 14.8 per cent have published one or two pieces about honors. Thus, nine out of every ten honor directors have published very little or nothing about honors.

Age is always a tricky variable; indeed, one respondent pleasantly castigated me for asking the question. Only four persons, however, declined to answer this item. Of those who did, honors directors range in age from 31 to 68 with the mean of 51 and the median of 52. Less than 10 per cent of the directors are under forty years of age. So, the directors are a "seasoned" lot, generally speaking, which also helps to explain the high proportion of full professors and the lessening of the publication rate.

Notes
1 The given percentages may not add to 100.0 (a) because of rounding errors or (2) because some respondents failed to answer the item. For example, in this case, one director declined to identify the institution as either public or private.
2 One institution was in the process of changing from a two-year institution to a four-year one.
3 There were times when this writer was tempted to answer missing items for the respondent. However, I did resist this temptation, letting each respondent answer as that person best saw fit. However, some of these statistics may be a bit faulty due to some degree of respondent bias. For example, "major research institution" seems to be a term used somewhat "loosely" in a couple of instances. I would argue, however, that such biases had minimal effects on these data due to the size of the sample. Should this not be the case, then an appropriate footnote will be added.

4 Of these 25 schools, all had a five course load except one with a seven course load.
5 For those of you following the mathematics carefully, note that some absolute numbers may not add to 160 because of a couple of "missing" responses.
6 What's in a name? It could be argued that those reporting "Humanities" and "Literature" could well be placed within the more standard "English" heading. But, all in all, a wide range of academic departments were represented.

[Editor's note: Guy is currently high atop Snaggy Mountain in Terra Alta, West Virginia, after having retired from Towson University. This is the first in a series of articles to be published from the Honors Director Survey sponsored by the NCHC and executed by the NCHC Research Committee. The NHR appreciates his commitment to honors even after retirement.]
In this, the fourth article in the series reporting on the results of the survey conducted by the Small College Honors Programs (SMACOHOP) section of NCHC in the fall of 1999, I would like to examine what the survey tells us about the nature of Honors graduation requirements and about the financial resources available to small-college Honors programs.

**Graduation Requirements** Honors programs differ greatly in the graduation requirements that they impose on students. In this section we will explore some of these differences. First, as Figure 1 makes clear, there is a wide range among schools in the proportion of required Honors credits in a participant’s undergraduate work. Specifically, the ratio of required Honors credits to total graduation credits among schools ranges from a low of 5% to a high of 41% with an average of 17%. The most striking thing about this finding is how few of our programs meet the NCHC’s suggested guidelines for a “well-developed honors program” which state that Honors credits be “a substantial portion of the participants’ undergraduate work, usually in the vicinity of 20% or 25% of their total course work and certainly no less than 15%.” However, 29% of our programs do not meet this 15% minimum and 73% do not meet the 20-25% normal expectation. This implies that either there are special factors that are systematically at work at small colleges that prevent us from offering “fully developed” programs or that the guidelines for full development are not realistic and need to be revisited. Certainly, the guidelines do not capture the current practice of most small-college Honors programs.

A second area in which programs differ significantly is in the minimum grade point average required for graduation with Honors, as can be seen from Figure 2. The minimum required gpa varies from a low of 3.0 to a high of 3.6 with an average of 3.3. Further, the distribution has three distinct spikes at 3.0, 3.2-3.25, and 3.5. Part of the differences among programs may reflect differences in philosophy about what distinguishes an Honors student, with some stressing high overall academic performance and others satisfactory performance in Honors courses or in meeting other Honors requirements. Also, these differences may reflect differences in grade point inflation among colleges. In particular, programs with lower required gpa’s may be located on campuses that have experienced lower overall grade point inflation over the years.
Honors thesis or other project, compiling a student portfolio, engaging in community service, participating in an exit interview, or presenting the results of a thesis or other project in a public forum. Of the five, completion of a thesis is the most often imposed additional requirement (63%) followed by community service (23%), and an exit interview (22%).

Financial Resources to Support Honors Activities The next set of survey questions tried to measure the financial resources that small-college Honors programs are provided to support Honors-related student activities. Figures 4-13 and Table 1 present the results from this section. For each possible area of support, Directors were asked to indicate whether they had funds regularly allocated in their own or other budgets to support this activity. If not, they were asked whether funds might be available "usually upon request," "occasionally upon special request" or not at all. Finally, if funds were provided, they were asked to indicate the average amount they received over the last three years. Although most (96%) directors provided information on the areas where funding was available, many did not provide data on the dollar amount they received. Therefore, for several possible areas of financial support, there was not enough data to provide meaningful dollar amounts.

The Honors activities for which regular funds are most commonly provided are social activities (81%), field trips (63%), student travel (57%) and speakers (54%). These are also the only activities for which we have enough data to report budgeted dollar amounts.
Although more schools have funds for social events than for any other activity, nonetheless 12% receive funds only occasionally or not at all for this purpose, and a majority of schools that do receive funds more regularly have only a modest budget for these activities. The average amount received is about $1,175 and 57% of the reporting schools receive less than $1,000. More information on budgets for social activities can be found in Figures 4 and 5 and in Table 1.

Field trips are the next most often funded Honors activity, but here too the degree of support at most schools is modest. 27% of schools have no funds or receive only occasional support for this activity, and of those who receive more regular support, the average amount received is just under $1,000, and no school receives more than $3,000 a year. More information on budgets for field trips can be found in Figures 6 and 7 and in Table 1.

Although only 57% of reporting small-college Honors programs regularly receive funds for student travel, those who do receive such money tend to be more generously provided with funds for this purpose than for any other area examined. For example, the average amount received by reporting schools was $2,267 and 53% receive at least $1,000 for this purpose. More information on budgets for student travel can be found in Figures 8 and 9 and in Table 1.

The last area for which at least 50% of Honors programs receive regular funding is for outside speakers. As in most other areas speaker budgets tend to be relatively modest. The average budget was $1,253 among reporting schools and 63% received less than $1,000 for this purpose. More information on budgets for outside speakers can be found in Figures 10 and 11 and in Table 1.
Far fewer schools regularly receive funds for the last two areas surveyed—retreats and service projects—than for the previous four areas discussed. In particular, only 25% have a regular line item for retreats and only 22% to support service projects. Interestingly, the 22% of schools that have regular funds for service projects is about equal to the 23% who require community service of Honors students. If you require community service, there ought to be funds in your budget to support this activity. Figures 12 and 13 provide more information about budgets in these last two areas.

Finally, directors were given the opportunity to list other areas where significant funds are regularly available to support student-related activities. The only area that was mentioned more than once was for funds to support cultural activities, which is a line item in at least four program budgets.

The conclusion we can draw from these budget numbers is that most Honors programs have moderate budgets to support at least some student-related activities. However, there are also programs at both extremes. For example, 14% of reporting schools receive regular support in at most only one of these areas while 23% have financial support in at least five of them.
Results from the SMACOHOP Survey of Small College Honors Programs: Part 5

Larry Steinhauer
Honors Director, Albion College

In this, the fifth and last article in the series reporting on the results of the survey conducted by the Small College Honors Programs (SMACOHOP) section of NCHC in the fall of 1999, I would like to examine what the survey tells us about the physical facilities provided for Honors programs and the nature of the courses and the capstone experiences that they offer to Honors students.

Physical Facilities The survey inquired about two different kinds of physical facilities that Honors programs may utilize in delivering their program: separate housing for Honors students and separate space for meeting the academic and social needs of students and for program administration. With regard to housing, directors were asked whether separate housing was provided for Honors students and if so, what type. The survey found that 32% of public but only 20% of private institutions provided such housing. A summary of the types of housing provided is given in Figure 1. The most popular Honors housing option is an Honors floor(s) in a dorm. The other two common ways to provide Honors housing is through a separate Honors dorm or Honors house(s). It is obvious that a dorm can provide housing for many more students than a house, which raises questions how many Honors students are accommodated in separate Honors housing and whether these students are primary first-year or upper-class students. Unfortunately, the survey did not investigate this area.

Only 55% of the responding small-college Honors programs have a separate physical space for their program even though NCHC identifies having such quarters as one of the characteristics of a “well-developed” program. Figure 2 looks at the types of spaces made available to these more fortunate programs. The most usual space turns out to be an Honors office or suite (71%). Only 22% of programs with a separate space, and only 12% of programs overall, have their own house or building. Finally there are a small number of programs that have been given other types of space such as a separate Honors classroom or an apartment for Honors student use.

In order for an Honors space to be “suitable quarters” for a “well-developed” program, NCHC suggests that it be student oriented and contain “an Honors library, lounge, reading rooms, personal computers and other appropriate décor.” In order to get a better idea of the kinds of facilities that are actually contained in small-college Honors spaces, directors were asked to check off the ones contained in their own space. A summary of their responses
appears in Figure 3. From the responses it is clear that Honors spaces are indeed more often oriented toward meeting student rather than administrative needs (although many Honors spaces accommodate both). In particular, the two most often included facilities in Honors spaces are for student social activities (72%) and student study space (69%) and 59% of Honors spaces contain room for both. Furthermore, 41% of Honors quarters have computers for student use and 28% provide for all three of these student-related needs.

The third most often provided facilities are for an administrative office (66%). Also, although only 42% provide space for a secretarial office, the number that provide such offices (36) corresponds closely to the number of programs that employ at least a part-time secretary (38). Finally, slightly more than 50% of Honors spaces contain an Honors classroom(s).

One last detail that emerges from the data involves the number of different functions included in a stand-alone Honors Center compared to those in any other type of Honors space. Honors Centers are more likely to be multi-purpose facilities that on average accommodate 5.5 of the 8 functions listed in Figure 3 while other types of Honors spaces are more likely to be more restricted in their facilities, accommodating on average only 3.3 of these functions. Taking all of these findings together, the conclusion that we can draw is that a majority of small-college Honors programs either have no or an inadequate physical space to meet the academic and social needs of their students and/or their administrative needs. This point is also driven home by the information displayed in Figure 4.

**Honors Courses** Non-Honors courses at reporting institutions have on average about 22.4 students per class. In contrast, Honors courses on average are only about 70% as large with about 15.8 students per class. However, schools differ greatly in the relative class-size. At one extreme there are schools where Honors class-size is less than 35% of non-Honors courses while at others Honors class-size is slightly larger than non-Honors courses. The distribution of class-sizes is displayed in Figure 5.
Several different types of courses are offered for Honors credit. For example, 91% of the responding Honors programs offer students some courses that are specially designed for Honors, 65% offer some Honors sections of non-Honors courses, while 48% offer some non-Honors courses in which students can elect an Honors option.

In addition to Honors courses, 46% of the survey programs offer students an independent study option for fulfilling at least some of their Honors Program requirements. When a student takes an Honors independent study or a non-Honors courses with an Honors option, the question arises as to whether an Honors contract is used to set the parameters for what must be accomplished to receive Honors credit. For courses with an Honors option, 89% of the schools use an Honors contract while for independent studies, 70% use such contracts. Finally, for programs that only offer specially designed Honors courses and/or Honors sections of non-Honors courses, one final question is whether non-Honors students are allowed to take these courses. For programs that only offer specially designed Honors courses, 23% admit non-Honors students to these courses. On the other hand, for programs that offer Honors sections of non-Honors courses 41% admit non-Honors students.

In more than 90% of programs it is the Honors director who is in charge of recruiting faculty to teach in Honors. The next most used option is to have department chairs recruit Honors faculty. This happens in about 5% of the programs. Once faculty members are recruited to teach an Honors course, if this course is not an Honors section of a non-Honors departmental course, the question arises as to whether they are released from other teaching responsibilities or teach Honors as an overload? Figure 7 indicates that 52% of schools reduce the departmental teaching load of Honors teachers, while another 35% use a combination of reduced departmental teaching and overloads to cover their Honors courses. Only 12% of schools depend exclusively on overloads to cover Honors courses. Finally, of the schools that used teaching overloads to cover at least some Honors courses, 82% always offer monetary compensation for this overload. For the 17 schools that reported overload compensation figures, the range was from $1,200 to 3,500 and the average compensation was $2,177. Finally, when a department loses some departmental teaching time as a result of Honors, is this department provided with funds for partial or full replacement of the teaching hours lost? In only 40% of institutions is such compensation provided and of those that receive compensation about two-thirds only receive enough funds for partial replacement.
Honors Capstones 78% of the surveyed Honors programs provide their students with some sort of capstone experience to end their Honors career. Figure 8 looks at the nature of this experience(s). The data in the figure indicate that an Honors thesis is clearly the most popular form of capstone. Of those programs with a capstone experience, 86% require a thesis, either alone or in conjunction with another capstone experience. A special senior seminar is the next most popular capstone, offered by 34% of these programs.

In the survey, programs that offer an Honors thesis as a required or optional experience were asked to describe the parameters of this experience in more detail. From their responses the following profile emerges. First, it takes students on average 1.73 semesters to complete a thesis. The distribution of average completion times is shown in Figure 9. Second, in virtually all programs (98%), a faculty member serves as the student’s thesis advisor. Third, 63% of programs require additional faculty thesis readers. The average number of additional readers is 1.84 and the range is from one to three. Fourth, only about 6% of programs make use of a thesis reader from outside the school. Finally, it is possible from the survey to estimate if requiring a thesis reduces the overall graduation rate from Honors programs. The answer turns out to be no. The average estimated graduation rate\(^1\) for all schools in the sample is 41.4%, while for those with a thesis requirement it is 41.3%.

\(^1\) The graduation rate for Honors programs in existence at least five years was estimated as the ratio of the number of students who graduated with Honors in 1999 to the size of the entering class in 1999. This measure is probably an underestimate of the true graduation rate since 41% are expanding their program while only 3% are contracting so that the entering class of 1999 is larger than the entering class of current seniors.
“Tracking Honors Program Data”

By Michelle R. Smith
Midwestern State University

Introduction
A year and a half ago, I was given the charge to direct, revise, and restructure our university’s Honors Program. It had existed on and off, more successfully or less successfully, since 1964 as a core-curriculum based Honors Program. My charge was to revise and restructure it into a university-wide Honors Program including: (1) a broad choice of university-wide courses at every level; (2) a wide range of extra-curricular opportunities and requirements; and (3) Honors housing, culminating in an Honors House offering a total living/learning Honors environment.

I had many years of teaching behind me, some business experience, and had once set up a Study Abroad Office on another campus; however, I had no prior experience in Honors. I therefore had a lot of learning to do, while everything needed doing. My initial task was to research existing Honors Programs on other campuses and select four or five successful programs at comparable universities with comparable goals as our models. An Ad Hoc Honors Committee was formed and we continued envisioning the new vision, researching models, and reading NCHC publications. I began visiting some other Honors Programs, one of them at the University of New Mexico, where I was delighted to find out, while meeting with Dr. Rosalie Otero, that I was visiting with the then President-Elect of NCHC. I knew then and I know now that that one crucial meeting with Dr. Otero at the beginning of my work in Honors was what set me on the right path as I began to understand and make my way into this new terrain.

Two aspects of Honors that did not take long to catch up with me were the stacks of paperwork that began to pile up and the interconnection of Honors with just about everything and everyone else on campus. In fact, I soon realized that everyone and everything and all the papers were somehow all connected and crying out for organization. With a half to three-fourths time teaching load to handle along with Honors and just one employee besides myself, my student Assistant, working 20 hours a week, I had to figure out fast what and who and how went with whom and what and why. So I resorted to my favorite modus operandi: LISTS.

The following is a list of what I’ve come up with in terms of tracking Honors data and generating Honors statistics. It took a little help from my friends on the NCHC Listserv and my Honors Committee, and a lot of help from my invaluable student assistant, Thomas Case, but just a little time to write it down. At this point in time I have submitted this list to Innovative Designs, a group of our BCIS Students, who is in charge of creating an Access database to collect most of the data and generate the statistics. So, while it’s a long list, many of the tasks on it will be efficiently accomplished by our new technologies. As you will see, much of the data can be kept in certain master “lists” (databases) that will then easily generate specific data, statistics, and graphs.

Another important thing I’ve learned is that every Honors Program is different. There is no one model that fits all. The same goes for my list of course, but maybe some of it will be useful to you as is, or can be tailored to fit your needs, or can prompt an idea relevant to your Program. Like any list, it will no doubt continue to be modified, as our Program grows and changes, and as I continue to learn from my experience and that of others.

THREE KINDS OF DATA TRACKING FOR HONORS PROGRAMS

There are three basic kinds of data tracking that an Honors Program should generate:

Informational Lists about the Honors Students: Before-During-After the Program.

Numbers and Percentages about the Students, the Program at Large, and Comparisons with University data.
**Correlations** to generate all of kinds of statistics and charts. Again, you can tailor these suggestions to your campus, your Honors Program, and your goals.

I. Informational Lists

A. Student Recruitment:
   1. **Prospective Honors Students List:** Name, Address, Phone Number(s), E-mail Address, Date of Contact, How Contacted (Event, Student Initiated, Parent Initiated, Faculty Initiated, Admissions Office Initiated, etc.), SAT/ACT/GPA, Name and Location of High School or College Attended, Date and Kind of Communication (ongoing update as necessary). Save to generate statistical data.
   2. **Specific Recruitment Lists:** Lists of Prospective Students who attended College Preview Day, Spirit Days, and list of Presidential Scholars.
   3. **Student Applicant and Acceptance Lists.**

B. Incoming Students, Retention, Graduation, Alumni:
   1. **Active Honors Students Contact List:** Name, Student ID Number, Address 1 (local), Address 2 (permanent), Phone Number(s), E-mail Address, Date and Kind of Communication (ongoing update as necessary).
   2. **Active Honors Students Names:** Alphabetical list of names only. Updated on an ongoing basis. This list is sometimes requested by Faculty and is a quick reference tool in the Honors Office.
   3. **Active Honors Students Names and ID Numbers:** Alphabetical with ID. Updated on an ongoing basis. This is another Honors Office quick reference tool when ID numbers are involved.
   4. **Honors Students by Major List:** Name, ID, Major/Undecided. Kept by semester, updated as necessary. Saved at end of semester; useful for statistics, charts.
   5. **Honors Students by SAT/ACT and Major List:** This gives Names, ID, SAT, ACT, and Major. A useful overview for the Honors Director and for generating statistics.
   6. **Honors Students by College, Department, Major, Classification and Advisor:** This list is in order of the Colleges comprising the University. Under each College are listed the respective Departments (alphabetically) with the names, classifications, and advisors of Honors Students in that Department. For example:

   College of Business Administration
   Jane Doe Accounting JR
   Dr. A. Smith

   This list is handy for Deans, Chairs, Advisors, and the Honors Office.

7. **Honors Students Status List:** Name, ID, GPA, Number of Honors Courses taken/contracted. Is the Student Provisional and Why? Is the Student on Probation and Why? GPA, no Honors Course, Less than C in an Honors Course, No Activities? Does the Student have a Course Waiver? Did the Student withdraw from the Honors Program? From the University? Did we remove the Student from the Program and Why? Previous Probation plus inadequate GPA, no course, no activities, less than C in an Honors Course? Date Modified. This list is updated on an ongoing basis per semester and saved at end of semester. It can generate secondary lists of Provisional Students, Students on Probation, Students Withdrawn, and Students Removed. Information updated as necessary. List saved for statistical purposes.


9. **List of Prospective Honors Graduates:** Name, ID, Major, Projected Graduation Date.

10. **List of Honors Graduates:** Name, ID, Major, in December (year), May (year), August (year)? Senior Research Project Title and Mentor.

**Master Lists of Active/Inactive Honors Students**: Many of the above lists can actually be generated from this Master List. Like all of these lists it can be tailored to fit your Program's needs. It should contain all of the most relevant informational categories, such as: Name, ID, Address, Phone, E-mail, SAT/ACT, GPA, Major, Classification, Status (Full, Provisional, Probation, Withdrawn, Removed), Number of Honors Courses/Contracts taken, Advisor, Projected Graduation date, last contact (item code)/date. Details would be found in the specific lists.

11. **Database Folder for Each Active/Inactive Honors Student**: Electronic Student Folders can be generated from all of the above lists.

C. General Program Information:
1. List of Honors Courses: Course Name, Number, Professor, Description.
2. List of Honors Faculty: Names, Courses Taught, Faculty Information including Publications, Awards, Recognition. Both 1 (above) and 2 by semester and saved.
3. List of Honors Staff: Names, Positions, Recognition, Awards, Publications, Conferences Attended/Presented at, and if Faculty, then Faculty Information. By semester and saved.
4. Lists of Conferences: List of Conferences that Honors Students attended or presented for. Compile and save by semester. You may want to keep a similar list for Honors Faculty. This tracks accomplishment and at the same time builds a database of Conferences.
5. List of Fieldtrips: List of Fieldtrips Honors Students participated in per semester. Beginning Honors Students often ask “What fieldtrips?” This provides an instant answer, while tracking Honors Student activities.
6. List of Community Service/Leadership: List where/what Honors Students did per semester. This list tracks Honors activities, provides information to new Students, and helps in promoting the Program to the community.
7. List of Awards, Scholarships, Honors, Publications of Honors Students per semester.
8. List of Honors Societies: List of Honors Societies in which Honors Students are members. While Honors Societies are distinct from the Honors Program, many Honors Students also belong to Honors Societies and mutually beneficial collaborative links can be established between the Program and some Honors Societies.
9. Evaluations: List of kudos from evaluations or other documented sources relating to any aspect of the Honors Program.

II. Program Numbers and Percentages:
For recruitment statistics, you may want to track much of 1-5 (below) for prospective Students, applicants, accepted Students, and actual incoming Students. You may also want to use some of the data to create a statistical profile of “This Year’s Honors Freshman.”
1. Recruitment Data:
   a. Attendance List for College Day Preview. How many came? How many applied? How many entered the Program and what percentage were they of total incoming Honors Students?
   b. Attendance List for Spirit Days Orientation. How many came? How many applied? How many entered the Program and what percentage were they of total incoming Honors Students?
   c. List of Presidential Scholars interested in Honors. How many? How many applied? How many entered the Program and what percentage were they of total incoming Honors Students?
   d. How many invitation letters sent and how many applications received? Percentage of applications received.
   e. Total Number of applicants, number accepted, number who joined the Program. Percent accepted and percent who joined.
   f. Number of NMSF’s. Percentage of total applicants/incoming.
   g. Number of Incoming Students on Financial Aid? Percentage.
   h. Number of Honors Students who are the first in their families to attend college.
   i. You may want to compare some of these percentages with those of the University at large.
2. Geographical Data:
   a. List of Students from local area (define). How many? Percentage of total.
   b. List of Students from impact area (define). How many? Percentage of total.
   e. Comparison with total University Percentages.
3. Gender/Ethnicity/Age Program Data:
   a. How many male Students in the Program?
   b. How many female?
   c. How many Ethnic Minorities?
   d. How many between 17-21; 22-30; etc.?
   e. Percentage of total Honors Students for each of the above categories.
   f. Comparison with total University Percentages.
4. Incoming Freshmen/Transfer/Non-Traditional:
   a. Number of Incoming Freshmen, percentage of total new Honors Students per semester, per year.
   b. Number of Transfer Students accepted per semester/year, percentage of total.
   c. Number of Non-Tradition Students accepted per semester/year, percentage of total.
   d. Percentage of total MSU Students in all categories.
5. Admissions Criteria Data:
   a. SAT List – Highest, Lowest, Averages of Applicants, Accepted, and Actual Students.
   b. ACT List – Highest, Lowest, Average of AAA.
   c. GPA List – Highest, Lowest, Average of AAA.
   d. Comparison with University Averages.
6. Academic Data:
   a. How many Honors Students per discipline?
   b. Percentage of total Honors Students in each discipline.
c. Classification of Students in each discipline. Percentages.

d. You may want to create a chart from a, b, c, above.

e. How many Honors Students in each Honors designated class?

f. How many Students doing Honors Contracts?

g. Student success in completing Honors Courses and Contracts.

h. If Honors Courses are open to other high-achieving Students, how many other Students are in them? Percentages.

7. Activities Data:

a. Number of Honors Students who did an Internship per semester/major.

b. Number of Honors Students who went on a Study Abroad Program (Mexico, Spain, France, London, other?) per semester/major.

c. Number of Honors Students who did a Senior Research Project per semester/major.

d. Percentages who did Internship, Study Abroad, or Senior Research Project.

e. Number and Percentages within majors.

f. Number, Percentages of Honors Students who participated in leadership, community service.

g. Number, Percentage of Honors Students who participated in Fieldtrips, and who attended/presented at Conferences.

h. Number, Percentages of Honors Students in other Honors Societies.

8. General Honors Statistics:

a. Number of Full Honors Students per semester.

b. Number of Provisional Honors Students per semester.

c. Number of Honors Students on Probation per semester.

d. Number of Honors Students who withdrew from Program per semester.

e. Number of Honors Students who withdrew from University per semester.

f. Number of Honors Students who received an Honors Course waiver per semester.

g. Number of Honors Students who received other Scholarships per semester?

h. Number of Honors Students who received Awards/Recognition per semester.

i. Number of Honors Graduates per semester.

j. Average SAT of incoming Freshmen per semester. Range.

k. Average ACT of incoming Freshmen per semester. Range.

l. Average GPA of Honors Freshman per semester. Range.

m. Average GPA of Honors Sophomores per semester. Range.

n. Average GPA of Honors Juniors per semester. Range.

o. Average GPA of Honors Seniors per semester. Range.

p. Number of Honors Students on Financial Aid per semester.

9. Retention Data Honors:

a. How many Honors Students left the Program per semester? Percentage of total. Number and percentage per year.

b. How many left per semester because they withdrew from the Program on their own? Percentage of those who left. Number and percentage per year.

c. How many left per semester because they were removed due to GPA? Percentage of those who left. Number and percentage per year.

d. How many left per semester because they didn’t take an Honors Course? Percentage of those who left. Number and percentage per year.

e. How many left per semester because they failed to do the activities? Percentage of those who left. Number and percentage per year.

f. How many left per semester because they withdrew from the University? Percentage of those who left. Number and percentage per year.

g. Number and percentage of Honors Students who left the University per year compared to general Student population.

10. Graduation Data:

a. How many Honors Graduates per Graduation?

b. How many Honors Graduates joined the Program as Incoming Freshmen?

c. How many Honors Graduates joined the Program as Transfer Students?

d. How many Honors Graduates joined the Program as Non-Traditional Students?

e. How many Honors Graduates were the first in their family to attend college?

f. How many Honors Graduates were local/Dallas/TX, out-of-state? International?

g. How many Honors Graduates were male? Female?

h. How many Honors Graduates were Ethnic Minorities?

i. Correlation of each category with general MSU Graduates?

j. How many and percentage of Honors Students who actually complete the Program within 4-5 years?

k. How many and percentage of Honors Students who graduate from MSU in 4-5 years (not necessarily having completed the Honors Program)?

l. Percentage of Honors Students (whether they stay in the Program or not) who actually graduate from MSU within 4-5 years, compared to general MSU Graduation rates.
11. Post-Graduation:
   a. Number and percentage of Honors Students going on to Graduate or Professional Schools.
   b. Number and percentage of Honors Students going to Graduate School at MSU, in TX, out-of-state.
   c. Number and percentage of Honors Students getting jobs after Graduation.
   d. Number and percentage we have no information about.

III. Correlations: From these numbers and percentages you can generate all kinds of statistics and charts. Again, you can tailor these suggestions to your campus, your Honors Program, and your goals.

Conclusion
WHO BENEFITS FROM HONORS DATA TRACKING?

The Honors Program:
1. Honors Program Administration: A clearer understanding of the components of the Program leads to greater accomplishment, accountability, visibility, and support and promotes Program quality and growth overall.
2. Honors Students: Participation in a Program clearly defined, monitored, and strategically planned by those running it increases the benefit of the Program to its members.

The University:
1. The Faculty: A better run Program that can document not only its mission but also its exact composition and performance semester by semester can attain greater levels of interest, participation, and commitment from the Faculty.
2. The Administration: A well-run Program with a clear sense of mission and the statistical data readily available to back up Program success can attain a greater level of administrative commitment to and support of the Honors Program as a Hallmark Program of the University.
3. The University at Large: A Hallmark Program, strategically planned, understood in depth, accountably developed, favorably viewed by Students, Faculty, Administration, Evaluators, and the Accreditation Board, will serve to promote the University, recruit better qualified Students, and thereby enhance the quality and prestige of the University at large.

Presidents of NCHC
2002 Rosalie Otero, UNM
2001 Hew Joiner, GA Southern
2000 Joan Digby, LIU-CW Post
1999 Bob Spurrier, Oklahoma St.
1998 Herbert Lasky, E. Illinois
1997 Susanna Finnell, Texas A & M
1996 Len Zane, UNLV
1995 Ada Long, UAB
1994 Julia Bondanella, Indiana U.
1993 Ron Link, Miami-Dade
1992 Sam Schuman, UNC-Asheville
1991 Ira Cohen, Illinois St.
1990 Ted Humphrey, Arizona St.
1989 Anne Ponder, Kenyon C.
1988 John Howarth, UMD
1987 Richard Cummings, U. Utah
1986 Jocelyn Jackson, Clark C.
1985 Samuel Clark, W. Michigan
1984 Wallace Kay, U Southern Miss.
1983 William Daniel, Winthrop
1982 C. Grey Austin, Ohio St.
1981 William Mech, Boise St.
1980 C. H. Ruedisili, U. Wisconsin
1979 Bernice Braid, LIU
1978 Andrew DeRocco, UMD
1977 Robert Evans, U. Kentucky
1976 Lothar Tresp, U. Georgia
1975 Catherine Cater, N. Dakota St.
1974 Carlyle Beyer, William & Mary
1973 Mark Lunine, Kent St.
1972 John Portz, UMD
1971 Joseph Cohen, Tulane
1970 John Eells, Winthrop
1969 Dudley Wynn, UNM
1968 V. N. Bhatia, Washington St.
1967 James Robertson, U. Michigan
WITH NEW SATELLITE SEMINAR SERIES, "THE DIMENSIONS AND DIRECTIONS OF HEALTH: CHOICES IN THE MAZE," NCHC AND PHI THETA KAPPA CONTINUE FRUITFUL PARTNERSHIP

by Billy Wilson
Phi Theta Kappa

As NCHC continues to strengthen its relationship with other organizations whose missions are similar to our own, several joint program initiatives are developing. Few have been more fruitful than NCHC's partnership with Phi Theta Kappa, the international honor society for two-year colleges.

The partnership was a natural. Like NCHC, Phi Theta Kappa is passionate about promoting excellence in honors education, and about finding new ways to enrich honors programs. Phi Theta Kappa was delighted with NCHC's emphasis on technology in honors through its satellite seminar, and NCHC was pleased that for years Phi Theta Kappa had been developing an annual multidisciplinary, issue-oriented Honors Study Topic, which was perfect for the satellite series.

So, in 2001, Phi Theta Kappa agreed to co-produce the "NCHC-Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar Series." Together the two organizations printed and distributed promotion materials and invited all Phi Theta Kappa and NCHC member colleges to subscribe for the very reasonable fee of $325 for the entire series.

A lot of people must have been impressed. The subscriptions zoomed to more than 200 from a previous high of 84 and the praise was generous for both the quality of the speakers and the attention to detail, which was evident in the production. Therefore, NCHC and Phi Theta Kappa will continue the things, which the subscribers found most praiseworthy, including:

1. A highly interactive format. Speakers will continue to pace their lectures so that there are several well-placed A & Asessions with students who call in from around the country.

2. A studio audience. The studio audience will again be made up of university, two-year college and high school honor students.

3. A skillful moderator. The satellite series will again feature Phi Theta Kappa Executive Director Rod Risley as moderator.

4. The Site Coordinator's Planning Packet. All subscribers will again receive a complete "how to" planning packet, with all of the information needed to organize a successful downlink program.

5. On Line Promotion Materials. Subscribers will receive all on-line promotional posters and sample press releases to assist them in promoting the satellite seminars and the events, which they organize around this series. Subscribers also receive presentation highlights and reading lists prepared by the speakers.

6. Program Guides. Phi Theta Kappa will publish a 32-page program guide complete with an overview of the topic, study questions, ideas for class or seminar orientation of the topic, and a complete bibliography divided among six important issues of the general topic "The Dimensions and Directions of Health: Choices in the Maze." Ten copies of these program guides will be sent to the site coordinator of each subscribing institution.

7. Connect with high school honor students. Once again Phi Theta Kappa will work with the National Honor Society to promote the Satellite Series. High school honor students will be encouraged by the Headquarters of the National Honor Society to accept your invitation to come to your campus and participate in this honors activity.
NCHC and Phi Theta Kappa will work hard to continue to provide our membership with the most knowledgeable speakers and most student-friendly format for our satellite seminar series. By doing so, we hope to again elicit comments like these which we received following the 2001 satellite series on the topic, "Customs, Traditions, and Celebrations: The Human Drive for Community."

"Congratulations on a WINNER series. Our student response was very positive—the sound and picture quality were first rate."

—Ann Raia, Former member of NCHC Executive Committee, Associate Professor of Classics, College of New Rochelle, NY

"The satellite seminar sponsored by NCHC and Phi Theat Kappa serves many purposes in the classroom at Oklahoma State University. It acts as an additional tool for the instructor to draw from and is used to re-enforce material. It stirs thoughts and prompts debate."

—Alisha Bacon, Business Major, Oklahoma State University

"The production was great, the tempo was perfect and the talent was well orchestrated. The students loved it—you've set another high standard."

—Dr. Virginia Stahl, Dean of Student Services, Scottsdale Community College, AZ

HONORS SEMESTERS

Honors Semesters are offered regularly to allow honors students from throughout the U.S. to gather for learning experiences away from their own campus. NCHC semesters offer a full load of transferable college credit. They combine field studies, research, internships, seminars, and a carefully planned living/learning environment that takes advantage of the locale. Honors Semesters have been offered in Washington, D.C., the Grand Canyon, the Texas-Mexico Borderlands, Appalachia, the Maine coast, the Iowa heartland, Puerto Rico, Morocco, the United Nations, and Czechoslovakia.

REGIONAL COUNCILS

The six regional councils generally meet twice a year, once at the NCHC national conference in the fall, and again at a centrally located site within a region in the spring. Regional meetings in the spring provide an opportunity for honors students and administrators to learn about and share mutual concerns. These spring meetings are held at an accessible location, and are shorter and less expensive than the national conference. Any school can join any regional honors council and may attend any or all regional meetings.

*Northeast
Maine, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, District of Columbia & Puerto Rico

*Southern
Virginia, Southern Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Arkansas & North Carolina

*Mideast
Southern Michigan, Eastern Illinois, Indiana, Northern Kentucky, West Virginia, Western Pennsylvania & Ohio

*Upper Midwest
Western Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Northern Michigan, North Dakota & South Dakota

*Western

*Great Plains
Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas & Texas
National Collegiate Honors Council
Phi Theta Kappa Honor Society

2002 Satellite Seminar Series

Institutional Subscription Agreement

The institution listed below wishes to subscribe to the 2002 NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar and thereby obtain the right to receive the transmission of the C-band/Ku-band satellite teleconferences, and to make one off-the-air videotaped copy of the teleconferences for the institution's own nonprofit educational use (with proper credit given to NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa as copyright holders). The institution agrees to pay a subscription fee according to the fee schedule below and becomes obligated to pay when its subscription is received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002 NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar Subscription Fee Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCHC Institutional Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Agreement Received by June 15, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Agreement Received after June 15, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A check or institutional purchase order made payable to “NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar” shall be received no later than June 15, 2002, and mailed to:
NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar
1625 Eastover Drive
Jackson, MS 39211

It is understood that information concerning the technical specifications for receiving the satellite signal, telephone number for live interaction during the teleconferences, the list of suggested seminar readings, and seminar exercises will not be made available to the institution until payment of the subscription fees or a valid institutional purchase order has been received.

NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa may substitute teleconference presenters if it becomes necessary to do so. NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa may cancel the 2002 Satellite Seminars for lack of sufficient receiving sites by sending written notice to subscribing institutions by September 1, 2002. In this event subscribing institutions shall be entitled to a full refund of any 2002 Satellite Seminar subscription fees paid.

If for any reason a subscribing institution experiences technical difficulty due to complications on the receiver’s end, a video of the program will be mailed to the institution upon request for a $10.00 fee, plus shipping. If a technical difficulty results from complications on the satellite sender’s end, the program will be rebroadcast for videotaping at a later date or a video will be provided to the subscribing institution at no charge.

To register, complete the form on the reverse side or register online at www.ptk.org/nchcss

Send this Subscription Agreement to:
NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar
1625 Eastover Drive
Jackson, MS 39211

Please direct subscription questions to Susan Booth at: susan.booth@ptk.org or 800.946.9995, ext. 521.
Name of Institution: ________________________________________________

Contact Person: __________________________________________________

Name: ___________________________ Name: ___________________________
Title: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
Address: ________________________ Address: ________________________
City: ____________________________ City: ____________________________
State: ___________________________ State: ___________________________
Zip: _____________________________ Zip: ____________________________
Telephone: ______________________ Telephone: _____________________
Fax: _____________________________ Fax: ___________________________
Email: __________________________ Email: _________________________

To avoid duplication of requests and orders, all communication with Phi Theta Kappa concerning the Satellite Seminars should be made by the designated Contact Person.

Billng Information (If Different)

Name: ___________________________ Name: ___________________________
Title: ___________________________ Title: ___________________________
Address: ________________________ Address: ________________________
City: ____________________________ City: ____________________________
State: ___________________________ State: ___________________________
Zip: _____________________________ Zip: ____________________________
Telephone: ______________________ Telephone: _____________________
Fax: _____________________________ Fax: ___________________________
Email: __________________________ Email: _________________________

Please provide the name, email address and telephone number for the technical representative from your campus who will be responsible for the Satellite downlink.

---

2002 NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar Subscription Fee Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCHC Institutional Members</th>
<th>Phi Theta Kappa Institutional Members</th>
<th>Other Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Agreement Postmarked by June 15, 2002</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription Agreement Postmarked after June 15, 2002</td>
<td>$425.00</td>
<td>$425.00</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of Payment

A check or institutional purchase order made payable to NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar must be received no later than June 15, 2002 to receive early registration fee.

Please check the appropriate box:

☐ NCHC Institutional Member  ☐ Phi Theta Kappa Institutional Member

(Circle One)

Check  Purchase Order  

College Purchase Order # ______________________________  Check # ______________

(must attach copy)

Card Number_______/_______/_______/_______  Expiration Date:_______/_______

Cardholder Name: ___________________________ Cardholder Signature: ___________________________

(please print)

Send this subscription agreement to

NCHC/Phi Theta Kappa Satellite Seminar
1625 Eastover Drive
Jackson, MS 39211

Or Fax to: 601.984.3507

Please indicate which satellite signal your institution will use to downlink the Seminar (circle):

☐ C-band  ☐ Ku-band

Signature of Person Authorized to Commit Institutional Funds: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

---

For Office Use Only

Date Received  F M P W  Date Entered  Invoice#  Notes
Honors Directors and Students Comment on Last Year's Satellite Seminar Series:

"Congratulations on a winner teleconference! Our student response was very positive - the sound and picture quality were first-rate!"
Ann R. Raia, Former member, NCHC Executive Committee
Associate Professor of Classics, College of New Rochelle, NY

"The new, more interactive format worked very well indeed; I especially liked involvement of the live studio audience. The speakers were animated and intellectually engaging, and certainly the presentation evoked good discussion."
Dr. Martha Wilson, Director of Honors Programs,
Macon College, GA

"The satellite seminar sponsored by NCHC and Phi Theta Kappa serves many purposes in the classroom at Oklahoma State University. It acts as an additional tool for the instructor to draw from and is used to re-enforce material. It stirs thoughts and prompts debate."
Alisha Bacon, Business Major, Oklahoma State University, OK

"Just when you think Phi Theta Kappa has reached the pinnacle in quality programming, they produce the NCHC Satellite Seminar Series. The quality of the production was excellent and the speakers outstanding. The series has led to some provocative discussions on our campus."
Leanne Jardine, Faculty Member,
Herkimer County Community College, NY

"The level of student participation and thinking is much more sophisticated. Thank you for your work, which is making such a difference for us out here in the classroom."
Pamela Louis, Honors Director,
Kansas City Kansas Community College, KS

"The production was great, the tempo was perfect, and the talent was well orchestrated. The students loved it - you've set another high standard!"
Dr. Virginia Stahl, Dean of Student Services,
Scottsdale Community College, AZ

"I strongly recommend these seminars! They are completely beneficial. I'd love to be in the studio audience next year."
Eric Galloway, Honor Student and Phi Theta Kappa Officer
Tarrant County College, TX

"The Satellite Seminars were a huge success on our campus. Our chapter members and their high school guests loved them. The high school students were very intrigued by the issues and the discussions."
Warren Jackson, Honor Student and Phi Theta Kappa Officer
Shawnee Community College, IL
"The Dimensions and Directions of Health: Choices in the Maze"

The National Collegiate Honors Council and Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society invite you to register your institution now to be your community's downlink site for a series of five interactive C-band/Ku-band nationwide satellite interactive video conferences on "The Dimensions and Directions of Health: Choices in the Maze." Energize your honors program, campus and community through lively discussions fueled by five dynamic scholars of substance:

**SATELLITE SEMINAR TIMES:**
- 7:30 pm - 8:30 pm Eastern Time
- 6:30 pm - 7:30 pm Central Time
- 5:30 pm - 6:30 pm Mountain Time
- 4:30 pm - 5:30 pm Pacific Time
- 3:30 pm - 4:30 pm Alaska Time
- 2:30 pm - 3:30 pm Hawaii Time

**TUESDAY, SEPT. 24**

Dr. Kenneth Olden

**TOPIC:** The Environmental Dimensions of Health

Dr. Kenneth Olden, Ph.D., has served as Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and Director of the National Toxicology Program (NTP) for the past 10 years.

Dr. Olden is a cell biologist and biochemist and has been active in research into the properties of cell surface molecules and their possible roles in cancer for more than two decades.

He was director of the Howard University Cancer Center and professor and chairman of the Department of Oncology at Howard University Medical School before coming to NIEHS.

**ISSUES INCLUDE:**
- Environmental concerns in First World countries and developing nations
- Causes and prevalence of disease clusters
- Environmental questions for homeowners and potential home buyers

Subscribe by June 15 for lowest rate: [www.ptk.org/nchcss](http://www.ptk.org/nchcss)

---

**TUESDAY, OCT. 22**

Dr. Gail Hughes

**TOPIC:** Emerging Infectious Diseases

Dr. Gail Hughes is currently Assistant Professor in the Department of Preventive Medicine-Epidemiology at the University of Mississippi Medical Center in Jackson, Mississippi.

She has extensive experience in public health care, community health and health education.

She has taught and served as a health consultant in California and Mississippi.

Dr. Hughes has developed community health programs and clinics in South America, India, South Africa and Cuba and has been especially involved with women's and minority health issues.

**ISSUES INCLUDE:**
- Emerging infectious diseases
- The appearance of new infectious diseases
- Use and misuse of antibiotics

**TUESDAY, NOV. 12**

Dr. Paul Lombardo

**TOPIC:** The Genetic Dimension to Health

Dr. Paul A. Lombardo is the Director of the Program in Law and Medicine at the Center for Biomedical Ethics of the University of Virginia where he teaches in the Schools of Medicine, Law, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

His teaching, research and writing build on an informed historical perspective to explore contemporary issues at the intersection of science and social policy. Lombardo's ongoing work takes current questions about the relationship of law to the burgeoning technology in genetics as points of focus.

**ISSUES INCLUDE:**
- Mapping the human genome and the effect on human health
- Future of gene therapy
- Pros and cons of eugenic experiments

---

**TUESDAY, OCT. 8**

Dr. Linda Hancock

**TOPIC:** How Lifestyle Choices Determine Human Health

Dr. Linda Hancock is the Assistant Director in the Office of Health Promotion and a Family Nurse Practitioner and Health Educator at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia.

Dr. Hancock is an expert on alcohol, drug and tobacco abuse. She initiated the Virginia College Co-op for Tobacco Use Reduction, and is Chair of the Richmond Advisory Board for the Tobacco Settlement Foundation.

Dr. Hancock is the author of the Tobacco Use Reduction Guide for Colleges and Universities and Women's Health: A Primary Care Clinical Guide.

---

**TUESDAY, NOV. 19**

Dr. Lori Arviso Alvord

**TOPIC:** The Mind/Body Connection

Dr. Lori Arviso Alvord is Associate Dean for Student and Minority Affairs and Assistant Professor of Surgery at Dartmouth Medical School.

Dr. Alvord is widely regarded for combining modern medicine with the traditions of her Native American heritage. Dr. Alvord trained in surgery at Stanford University Hospital, serving as chief resident in 1990-91. When her training was complete, the federal Indian Health Service assigned her to the job of general surgeon at the Gallup Medical Center in Gallup, N.M. Her book, The Scoalpe and the Silver Bear, relates her attempt to bring state-of-the-art medical skills to a Native American culture.

Dr. Alvord has served on several national government panels providing funding for research or setting standards and guidelines for health care.

**ISSUES INCLUDE:**
- Spiritual fulfillment as an enhancement to physical health
- Using spiritual healing in conjunction with modern medicine
- Prayer as a component of modern medicine
Executive Secretary/Treasurer's Report
Earl B. Brown, Jr.
June 2002

Financial Report
The books for the year ended 2001 have been closed. The NCHC received an unqualified opinion, the highest possible, as a result of the financial review. (The Finance Committee mandated an audit every six years or whenever a new Executive Secretary/Treasurer is elected and a financial review in the other years; our last audit occurred for the year ended 1997.)

For the year ended 2001 the NCHC showed a net deficit (excluding Honors Semesters) of $181,761:

General Fund surplus of $18,195
Operating surplus of $40,677
Reserve Fund net investment losses of $22,482;
Endowment Fund deficit of $125,020
Net investment losses of $77,347
Public Relations Firm expenses $40,483 (from Conf 99 surplus)
Honors Semesters and Portz Fund Support of $5,000 (from Conf 2000 surplus)
Presidential Leadership Award expenses of $2,190 (from Conf 2000 surplus);
Portz Fund surplus of $441
Conference Fund deficit of $75,377

All outstanding bills have been paid and Reserve Fund requirements have been met—[1/2 Conference 2002 Budget ($273,000) + 1/2 headquarters 2002 Budget ($122,000) = $197,500]. The total in Reserve Fund as of 12/31/01 is $262,745; despite the deficit, the NCHC will continue to award the annualized interest income for Scholarships, Prizes and Grants. (See Standing Orders under Scholarship, Prizes and Grants.) FYI, the total assets of the Endowment Fund as of 12/31/01 is $352,046 well below the $500,000 necessary to award special project Grants according to the Standing Orders.

Let me quickly review the procedure for handling excess. According to the principles established by the Investment Committee and approved by the Executive Committee, Conference and General Fund surpluses are to be used in the following manner: (1) pay outstanding bills; (2) add funds to the Reserve Fund, if necessary, so that it is, at least, at the minimum mandated level; (3) provide Scholarship Funds according to the NCHC Standing Orders; and then (4) any remaining funds are invested in the Endowment Fund.

In my Spring 2000 report I stated that then President Joan Digby proposed a different use for some of the monies earmarked for the Endowment Fund. The Executive Committee authorized the 1999 Conference surplus be used to hire Edward Howard and Co., a public relations firm. In Spring 2001, the Executive Committee voted to amend the Standing Order governing Conference surplus: any Conference surplus may be used to fund special projects at the discretion of the Executive Committee. (See Conference 1999 Surplus and Conference 2000 Surplus.)

Report on the 2001 Conference
The Conference realized a net loss of $75,377. Attached is Conference 2000-2002 Per-Person Costs that compares the expenses in 2000 with those in 2001 on an item-by-item basis, looking especially at per-person costs. The deficit is not easy to explain. Excluding refunds, the Conference exceeded projected revenues of $315,000 by some $83,000. But, many more registrants requested refunds. Forty-nine institutions requested refunds totaling $28,200. Only five requests (totaling $1,720) were denied. The NCHC refunded one half of the amount requested to each of those institutions requesting refunds because of terrorism. The total refunded in 2001 was $16,238 compared to $5,270 in 2000.

The Conference did not have as many contributions as it had in the past: contributions were $16,800 in 1999, $12,800 in 2000, and $3,500 in 2001. (See Conference Contributors.) The Palmer House
Hilton was not as willing to negotiate, according to CMS, because of their commitment to pay half of their surplus to the Minneapolis Hilton so that we did not have to pay a penalty for terminating our contract with Minneapolis for 2001. As part of this agreement with the Palmer House Hilton, the NCHC has contracted to return to that hotel for its 2003 Conference.


During the 2000 Conference Presidential Reception, there were complaints about the lack of food. Not running out of food this year was a concern of all the Officers. The cost for the Presidential Reception in 2000 was $5,327; the cost for the Presidential Reception and a Welcome Reception for new attendees in 2001 was $59,000.

Some suggested remedies:
1. A different method to analyze Conference expenses. In addition to the Conference Projection Worksheet that projects income and expenditures, I have created a document that looks at per-person costs in terms of fixed and variable costs. (See Conference Projection Worksheet and Conference 2000-2002 Per-Person Costs.) This should help to more accurately project expenses and allow for better planning. The NCHC cannot improve food quality just because more attend since food costs are always per-person. But if the fixed costs drop because of increased attendance, then the NCHC can provide better food, etc.

2. Stop referring to the Conference at Rosalie's or Donzell's or Hew's Conference. Instead, it is an NCHC Conference for which Rosalie or Donzell or Hew plan the Program. I recommend that the Finance Committee oversee the financial aspects of all Conferences. It will recommend a registration Fee and project an income for the approval of the Executive Committee. Within that projected income, the Conference Chair and the Program Planning Committee can allocate Conference funds.

3. The NCHC or its agent negotiate per-person costs for meals and Receptions and inform the Program Chair far enough in advance so that the Program Planning Committee can stay within the projected revenue approved by the Executive Committee. I also recommend that the NCHC ask all registrants to indicate which meals or events they plan to attend in order to get a more accurate count on food needs. (The 2002 Conference Registration booklet asks registrants to indicate their intentions.)

4. Limit the cost of audio-visual equipment by asking those who wish to use high cost technology to pay for some portion of it or be creative and find alternative means to visualize their presentation. The cost for using PowerPoint at the 2002 Conference in Salt Lake City is $795; that figure had been negotiated down from $1,400. The NCHC does not want to discourage technology but at the same time it desires to keep Conference Registration Fees as low as possible.

Quarterly Reports
The first quarter 2002 financial report was mailed to Members of the Executive Committee on April 23. Total dues revenues were 27% of the projected year's total and expenses were 23% of the budgeted year's total. In comparison to first quarter 2001, revenues decreased 1% and expenses decreased 4%. For the first quarter 2001 actual revenues were 26% and actual expenses were 28%.

Financial Concerns
1. Non-Profits. I would like first to clear up what may be a misunderstanding regarding the nature of non-profit corporations, such as the NCHC. According to the IRS, non-profits are organizations in which no part of their income is distributable to its Members, Directors, Officers, Stockholders, etc. Non-profits are not prohibited from making an excess of profit over revenue, just prohibited from distributing that income to Members, Directors, Officers, Stockholders.

2. Financial Solvency. Over the last year and a half, the Reserve Fund and the Endowment Fund have realized net losses because of the economy. As of 12/31/00 the fair market value of NCHC investments was approximately $670,000. As of 12/31/01 the fair market value was approximately $560,000. It may be time to rethink Standing Order III B 2 that states that the Conference is not designed to generate a surplus. The Executive Committee might also need to consider using those Conference surpluses to grow the Endowment Fund.
3. Revenues and Expenses and Membership Benefits. Although the number of Institutional Memberships continues to grow, that growth potential is quickly eroding, as Membership becomes saturated. Since 1996 the institutions that hold Membership have grown from 587 to 782. Since almost 90% of NCHC revenues come from Institutional Memberships, the NCHC must look for other sources of revenue or increase the cost of Institutional Memberships.

The Peterson's Honors Programs and Colleges, 3rd Edition accounts for a substantial portion of the increase in Institutional Memberships in 2002. In Spring 2002, 53 institutions rejoined, 18 institutions joined for the first time and four institutions changed their Membership from Professional Members from a Non-Member Institution to Institutional Memberships in order to be included in the 3rd edition.

But at the Finance Committee Meeting in April, the Finance Committee had to cut back on all but essential services in order to have a balanced budget for 2003. What that meant was that the NCHC could not support Honors Semesters and the Portz Fund at the level of funding both Committees have come to expect. The Finance Committee had to cut the Publications Board Operating Budget $500 and funding for monographs, limiting the Publications Board to one monograph for the year 2003 (although it has three in the pipeline). It also cut the Presidential Leadership Award for 2003 from $2,500 to $500, requesting that the Committee buy a bowl/plaque that the NCHC would add names to each year and give to the presidential winner a small replica of the item.

When institutions ask what benefits they receive for their dues, I point to NCHC publications, to Portz Fund Grants, to Honors Semesters opportunities for students and faculty, and to topical Workshops for faculty. But when budgets for these tangible items are cut, it appears that the only benefits that Members receive are the intangible benefits of a professional office. Portz Fund has lost the yearly support from the Portzes who are no longer mentally and physically able to contribute. That means the Portz Fund has lost 50% of its funding. The Portzes also provided scholarship monies for students participating in Honors Semesters and that, too, has been lost.

So for most of our Institutional Members, Membership is coming more and more to mean being able to save $125 per-person to attend the NCHC annual Conference. A survey done by the Long Range Planning Committee in conjunction with their work on a proposal for an Executive Director points out that fact in a rather glaring way. Our Conference Budget is more than twice that of the Conferences of any other higher education organization surveyed; yet our Operating Budget is considerably lower than most of those organizations.

But we will soon have to limit Conference expenses as well as raise Registration Fees. The Conference has been living on borrowed time—the per-person cost was an estimated $209 for 2000, and $236 for 2001. Yet Registration Fees have been $210 since 1999 and will continue at that rate through 2002. The NCHC is tightening its belt for the 2002 Conference in order to keep the $210 Registration Fee. (See Conference Financial History.)

The rise in Operating expenses without a concomitant rise in revenue means that we need to decide first what are the essential elements and activities that we wish to continue to fund—a task begun by the Finance Committee at its Spring 2001 Meeting. We then need to decide how to fund these activities within our Operating Budget. (See Membership Dues from 1980-2002.)

4. Other Financial Information. The NCHC Financial Statements include an amount for "in-kind contributions." This is the amount that Officers' institutions contribute to the NCHC. For headquarters at Radford University, this includes the Executive Secretary/Treasurer's salary and other expenses borne by Radford, such as the allocation of office space (five offices, access to a Conference room, and significant space for storage), computers (RU has purchased five computers for the NCHC), work study students (RU has provided two students for nine months and one student for the summer), access to phone lines, e-mail, websites and listservs, fax machine, and the time and work of the Grants and Sponsored Program office, the Accounting office that handles payments to NCHC staff, and the Purchasing department. For the other Officers, their individual institutions provide a relative amount of in-kind contributions, depending on time the Officer spends doing business for the NCHC.

The headquarters' institution and other Officers' institutions in-kind contributions exclude the in-kind contributions made by Committee Chairs (phone calls, faxes, some mailings, travel) and Committee Members who attend Committee Meetings. All of these expenses are borne by the home institution,
sometimes by the Honors Program, and sometimes by individuals who pay for their own travel.

This is just to remind the Membership of how dependent the NCHC is on the goodwill of individuals and institutions. The NCHC is, in every sense of the word, a volunteer organization. As such, the NCHC does not bear the expenses borne by many Members and their institutions. The recent proposal by the Long Range Planning Committee on restructuring the organization has provided some insight into the expenses that would be incurred if the NCHC goes to a permanent headquarters which is not located at a home institution.

Membership Report
As of 12/31/01, the NCHC had 1210 Members (782 Institutional Members, 328 Professional Members, 81 Student Members, 19 Complimentary Members). This is an increase of 68 over 12/31/00. More importantly, 30 of these are Institutional Members. This includes six who joined in order to be included in the 3rd edition of Peterson’s.

In 2000 we mailed out 97 starter packs. Of those, approximately 70% now hold Memberships (64 institutions and three non-Member professionals), approximately the same as last year’s percentage. Of the 64 institutions that joined, two were previously Professional Memberships from non-Member institutions; three were lapsed Members that rejoined; 29 joined with an application from the NCHC website; six joined because of their interest in appearing in Peterson’s, seven joined because of the contact made by Edward Howard and Co. (our PR firm), two joined because of information on the NCHC provided on Stamats QuickTakes (which provides insights into research, planning, and integrated marketing for colleges and universities published as an e-mail to subscribers), and the other 15 joined by filling out the invoice in their starter pack.

Other Information
1. Conference Attendance. A review of Conference attendance data revealed that some percentages have remained fairly constant—the percentage of student attendees and the percentage of student presenters; whereas, some have not—the number and percentage of institutions attending has increased while the number of non-Members attending has decreased. (See Conference Attendees 1996-2001.)

Conference Attendees 1996-2001 also provides information on the number of institutions that return to the Conference from one year to the next, the number of presentations during the Conference, and information on regional attendance at NCHC Conferences. For those interested, information is available on which institutions have attended in which years.

I don’t want to make more of these numbers than the fact that they give us some idea on how many institutions are returning year after year. As to whether we make changes dependent on that information is up to future Program Planning Committees. Given the number of returning institutions (between 65 and 77% from 1996 through 2001), the NCHC must be doing something right.

2. CMS’s Income and Expenses. The NCHC must keep in mind that all services performed for the NCHC by CMS that are not part of the contract must be negotiated with CMS. The NCHC agreed per contract to pay CMS 60% of late fees collected. When, therefore, the Interim Operations Board chooses to refund late fees, the NCHC is not just refunding the $40 but is taking $25 out of its own pocket. When we ask CMS to help select sites for the Retreat/Executive Committee Meetings, the fee is $500 a day plus expenses. Our current contract with CMS expires after the 2003 Conference in Chicago.

Conference 2002, Salt Lake City. Thanks to the efforts of Esther Radinger, we will hold our 2002 Conference at the Grand America Hotel & Towers in Salt Lake City, October 30-November 3.

Conference 2003, Chicago. CMS successfully negotiated with the Hilton Corporation to change our site for 2001 because we had outgrown the Minneapolis Hilton. The Palmer House hosted us in 2001 but had to rebate half of the profits to Minneapolis (so that we do not have to pay contract stipulated damages) with the stipulation that we return to the Palmer House in 2003.

Conference 2004, New Orleans. Thanks to the efforts of Jack White and the Site Selection Committee we will hold our 2004 Conference in New Orleans at the Hyatt Regency.

The dates are as follows:
2002 - Salt Lake City, Grand America Hotel & Towers (October 30-November 3)
2003 - Chicago, Palmer House Hilton (November 5-9)
2004 - New Orleans, Hyatt Regency (November 10-14)

4. Interim Operations Board Meeting—The IOB did not meet formally this year. Instead, the IOB has chosen to conduct business through conference calls approximately every two weeks. I sent all Members of the IOB year-end
2001 information concerning the Conference, the Budget, NCHC financial statements and other financial information as well as draft copies of minutes of the Executive Committee & Business Meetings.

5. Regional Conferences and Memberships-At the fall 1999 Conference, then President Bob Spurrier and other Officers met with Officers from the Regions to discuss NCHC representation at the Regional Conference. All Regions were eager to have such representation. Each of the Officers attended a different Regional Conference with Earl Brown attending two. I know that all Officers have held sessions discussing the relationship between NCHC and the Regions during the Regional Meeting. If we are to reap the benefits of attending Regional Meetings, then the Executive Committee needs to discuss/address the issues raised at the Regional Meetings.

Thanks to the efforts of the Regional Executive Secretary/Treasurer’s, I have been able to compile some data about Regional Memberships in the NCHC. What the data reveals is that, in many cases, more institutions hold Memberships in the NCHC than in their region. For instance, 20 institutions hold Memberships in the MidEast region. These same 20 also hold Membership in the NCHC. But an additional 62 institutions from the MidEast hold Memberships in the NCHC but not in their region. The Regional EST’s and I have exchanged this information. It is my hope that we can work together to promote honors on the State/area, Regional and National level so that all honors Programs can take advantage of opportunities to meet and discuss honors. (See Regional Memberships.)

---

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL
2002 Spring Meeting of the Executive Committee
Santa Fe, Hotel Santa Fe Friday and Saturday, June 21-22, 2002

I. Call to Order, Welcome, and Introductions - Otero
II. Approval of Agenda - Otero
III. Approval of Minutes of October 2001 Meeting - Brown
IV. President’s Report - Otero
V. Executive Secretary-Treasurer’s Report - Brown
VI. New Business – Otero
A. Motions concerning the organizational structure of the NCHC
B. Motions concerning hiring a conference manager for 2004
C. Report of the Finance Committee – Rodgers
D. Amendments to the Constitution, ByLaws, and Standing Orders - Spurrier
1. Motions from CB&SO (See hand-out.)
2. Motions from Finance Committee
3. Other Amendments/changes
E. Report of the Nominating Committee - Joiner
F. Report of the Conference Program Planning Committees
1. 2001 Chicago Conference (final report) - Otero
2. 2002 Salt Lake City Conference - Lee
3. 2003 Chicago Conference - Weiner
4. Other conference issues
   –Finance Committee oversee conference revenues/expenses
   –Conference Registration fee
G. Other Committee Reports Requiring Executive Committee Action or Attention
1. Site Consideration - White
2. External Relations Committee—Daniel, Digby
   –Discussion of the work of Edward Howard (PR firm)
   –Review work in progress
3. Honors Evaluation Committee – Grady/Mech
   –Discussion of follow-up to ad hoc Honors College Committee
   –Discussion of yearly workshops for site visitors
4. Honors Semesters Committee – Braid
   –Alumni reunion during the 2002 NCHC Conference
5. Long Range Planning Committee - Slavin
   –Executive Director
6. Pre-College Gifted Committee - Berglund
   –Appointment of liaison to The Associated for the Gifted (TAG).
   [Committee recommends Kathleen Kardaras, NE Illinois U]
7. Publications Board – Portnoy/Savage
   –Cost for higher quality publications
   –Advertising on the listserv (photo safari)
8. Student Concerns Committee - Goot/Hill
   –NCHC Student of the Year Award
   –Posting of links to NCHC Student Website
   (www.potsdam.edu/SPHPINCHC)
9. Two Year College Committee- McDonough/Rinne
   –Discussion of ad hoc Articulation Committee

VII. Old Business
A. Report on donor letters, process and forms - Shine
B. Finance Committee motion to increase dues for Institutional members to $300
C. Effect of distance education on honors
D. Change term of EST to four years
E. Partnerships with Teach for America and other partnerships-Weiner, Joiner
F. Class standing prerequisite for students to run for Executive Committee-Spurrier, Hill
G. Other Old Business

VIII. Adjournment
## CONFERENCE 1999 SURPLUS

FOR FUNDING NCHC PUBLIC RELATIONS (ENDOWMENT FUND-Expense Acct 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>YearEnd TotalPmts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAYMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Check No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>YearEnd TotalPmts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2001</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#104026,Apr'01 work</td>
<td>2,366.25</td>
<td>57,633.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2001</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#105030,May'01 work</td>
<td>3,095.88</td>
<td>54,537.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/26/2001</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#106049,Jun'01 work</td>
<td>4,370.52</td>
<td>50,167.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2001</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#107029,July'01 work</td>
<td>3,782.18</td>
<td>46,385.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2001</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#108029,Aug'01 work</td>
<td>7,383.72</td>
<td>39,001.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/2001</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#109048,Sept'01 work</td>
<td>5,336.43</td>
<td>33,665.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2001</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#110113,Oct'01 work</td>
<td>9,121.21</td>
<td>24,543.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2001</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#111038,Nov'01 work</td>
<td>5,027.35</td>
<td>19,516.46</td>
<td>2001 40,483.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/18/2002</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#112029,Dec'01 work</td>
<td>2,873.20</td>
<td>16,643.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2002</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#201031,Jan'02 work</td>
<td>8,345.84</td>
<td>8,297.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/2002</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#202028,Feb'02 work</td>
<td>871.08</td>
<td>7,426.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/2002</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Edward Howard &amp; Co.-Inv#203032,Mar'02 work</td>
<td>530.00</td>
<td>6,896.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PAYMENTS: $53,103.66 | 40,483.54

## CONFERENCE 2000 SURPLUS

FOR FUNDING SPECIAL PROJECTS (ENDOWMENT FUND-Expense Acct 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>YearEnd TotalPmts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$32,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PAYMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Check No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>YearEnd TotalPmts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2000</td>
<td>EF - DM</td>
<td>Frank Shushok, Jr (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$30,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2000</td>
<td>EF-1001</td>
<td>John S. Grady (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$29,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2000</td>
<td>EF-1002</td>
<td>Bernice Briad (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2000</td>
<td>EF-1003</td>
<td>Liz Beck (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$27,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2000</td>
<td>EF-1004</td>
<td>Bill Daniel (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$26,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2000</td>
<td>EF-1005</td>
<td>Ada Long (Honorarium-TopicalConf'00)</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$25,500.00</td>
<td>2000 6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2001</td>
<td>EF-1007</td>
<td>NCHC Portz (NoPortz'00Cntrbn,this subs for Prtz)</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2001</td>
<td>EF-1008</td>
<td>NCHCHonSemCrnte (NoPrtz'00Cntrbn,this subs for Prtz)</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$20,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2001</td>
<td>EF-1011</td>
<td>Tiffany &amp; Co [2001 Presidential Award(Dr. John Palms)]</td>
<td>$2,140.00</td>
<td>$18,360.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2001</td>
<td>EF-Chrg</td>
<td>SmithBarneyAnnualFeeForCheckWriting</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$18,310.00</td>
<td>2001 7,190.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PAYMENTS: $13,690.00 | 13,690.00

### APPROVED--NOT PAID:

EC Mtg Oct 31-Nov 4, 2001:
1) Portz Fund for calendar year 2002 | $2,500
2) Honors Semesters for calendar year 2002 | $2,500
3) Presidential Award for calendar year 2002 | $2,000
4) Pub Bd-create title index CD & web-no yr stipulated | $800

TOTAL | $7,800
## Conference 2000-2002 Per Person Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,300 est.</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixed Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 est</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>audio-visual costs</td>
<td>$12,225</td>
<td>$29,144</td>
<td>$16,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$13,488</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printing</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,196</td>
<td>$24,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer rental</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phones, photocopy</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$4,146</td>
<td>$6,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conf bureau temps</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,243</td>
<td>$1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city as text</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signage</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,623</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local adm/ trans</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bank serv charge</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertising</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,455</td>
<td>$4,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-conf expenses</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,633</td>
<td>$17,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program planner exp</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$4,061</td>
<td>$2,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ada compliance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$9,339</td>
<td>$7,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credit card fees</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,366</td>
<td>$4,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master class</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total fixed costs</td>
<td>$89,325</td>
<td>$108,254</td>
<td>$103,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **per person fixed**: $67.94
- **per person hotel food**: $86.00
- **per person variables**: $54.06

### Hotel Food Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 continental brkfst</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 banquet</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 receptions</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total per person 2002</td>
<td>$88.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hotel Food Costs 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 cont brkfst</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banquet</td>
<td>62,750</td>
<td>33,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 receptions</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>29,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total per person 2001</td>
<td>$91.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hotel Food Costs 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 cont brkfst</td>
<td>19,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banquet</td>
<td>63,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 receptions</td>
<td>28,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total per person 2000</td>
<td>$58.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variables Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 est</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gala</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$25.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name badge</td>
<td>$2,275</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cms per person fee</td>
<td>$24,700</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late fees</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
<td>$7.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variables Costs 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gala</td>
<td>$124,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name badge</td>
<td>$3,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cms per person fee</td>
<td>$35,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late fees</td>
<td>$11,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variables Costs 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gala</td>
<td>$135,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name badge</td>
<td>$3,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cms per person fee</td>
<td>$35,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late fees</td>
<td>$14,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The per person costs for 2000 and 2001 include comp registrations (2000 = 10 comps; 2001 = 45 comps—we invited prospective 2004 convention managers). The NCHC absorbs the comp registrations for hotel food and other variables, including CMS' per person fees.**

---

**This is a working document used for conference planning only.**
## CONFERENCE CONTRIBUTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Liberal Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University (Sch Phar &amp; Alld Hlth Prof)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Key Nat’l Honor Society</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Institute Hillsborough Comm Coll</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Beta Kappa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Kappa Phi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Fellowship Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New York Times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah-Honors Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Center</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drs. Irma &amp; Louis Weiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Complimentary registration fee not addressed this year.
B - $1,500 Contribution refunded to Golden Key, check no. 6157, 11/16/00 due to inappropriate behavior by Golden Key at Conference.
## CONFERENCE PROJECTION WORKSHEET

### INCOME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Income</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1300@210</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>398,505</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>1469 attended</td>
<td>1400@210</td>
<td>294,000</td>
<td>1522 attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Income</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5,384</td>
<td>17,760</td>
<td>18,080</td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>14,450</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>15,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund Expense</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>16,238</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>4,825</td>
<td>4,825</td>
<td>(6,035)</td>
<td>(6,035)</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>5,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL INCOME** | 0 | 273,000 | 388,971 | 315,000 | 440,233 | 294,000 | 346,484 | 311,067 | 262,479 | 219,463 |

### EXPENSES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lunches</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfasts (includes Idea Market)</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Rolls &amp; Coffee</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td>114,400</td>
<td>181,666</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>114,870</td>
<td>99,400</td>
<td>149,922</td>
<td>99,160</td>
<td>76,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception (Presidential)</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Caucus (snack)</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc lunches &amp; snacks</td>
<td>V 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Costs (Audio Visual)</td>
<td>F 88</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>29,144</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>16,780</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>11,377</td>
<td>11,634</td>
<td>6,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>F 89</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,488</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>8,975</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>6,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>F 90</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,196</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>24,880</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>12,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Printer Rental</td>
<td>F 93</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones/Fax</td>
<td>F 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>F 91</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,375</td>
<td>9,967</td>
<td>7,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>F 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>F 91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for Name Badges</td>
<td>V 92</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf.Bureau/Temp/Indep Contractors</td>
<td>F 93</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City as Text</td>
<td>F 94</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>F 95</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>3,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Arrangements (incl admis.trans)</td>
<td>V 97</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>V 97</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>124,321</td>
<td>68,500</td>
<td>1,935,975</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>19,334</td>
<td>101,051</td>
<td>54,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Function</td>
<td>V 97</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Service Charge</td>
<td>F 98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>F 99</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>5,765</td>
<td>5,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Planning &amp; Site Visit</td>
<td>F 100</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,633</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>17,202</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,127</td>
<td>12,446</td>
<td>12,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Wages</td>
<td>V 115</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>46,830</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,018</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,071</td>
<td>40,682</td>
<td>36,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Planner Fee (new acct 1999)</td>
<td>F 138</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>5,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>F 134</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>2,117</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>2,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA (compliance for deaf)</td>
<td>F 135</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>9,339</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>7,891</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Card Fees</td>
<td>F 136</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Adjustments</td>
<td>C 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENSES** | 0 | 273,000 | 464,347 | 314,300 | 407,872 | 293,000 | 286,253 | 308,157 | 233,249 | 197,360 |

**NET INCOME (LOSS)** | 0 | 0 | (75,377) | 700 | 32,361 | 1,000 | 60,230 | 2,910 | 29,230 | 22,103 |

---

**LEGEND**

- B-$A-Lane,Inc; $Creighton, $NYTimes; $PBK, $PKP, $Staf, $Sah; $WashCt $TShirts $StockSales.
- V-Variable Expenses
- Acct=Account; NCHC=accting software

---

**THIS IS A WORKING DOCUMENT USED FOR CONFERENCE PLANNING ONLY**
## Conference Financial History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Year/Hotel</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Reg fee*</th>
<th>Room costs</th>
<th>Rm Nights contracted</th>
<th>High Nights used</th>
<th>Room nights used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans 1989/Marriott</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$61 on average</td>
<td>1950 th/fr 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore 1990/Hyatt Regency</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$64.50 on average</td>
<td>2005 th/fr 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 1991/Palmer House</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$70 on average</td>
<td>1980 th/fr 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles 1992/Hilton</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$101s-$146d</td>
<td>1950 th/fr 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Louis 1993/Hyatt Regency</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$71s-$81d</td>
<td>1800 th/fr 425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio 1994/Hyatt Regency</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$125s-$145d</td>
<td>2005 th/fr 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco 1996/Hilton and Towers</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$170s-$195d</td>
<td>2350 th/fr 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta 1997/Hilton</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$126s-$140d + $15ea</td>
<td>2025 th/fr 550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 1998/Hilton</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$134s-$149dtq</td>
<td>2170 th/fr 600</td>
<td>2314 $99.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando 1999/Renaissance</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$169s/d + $20ea add</td>
<td>1700 fr 600</td>
<td>1686 $149.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 2001/Hilton</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$159s/$189dtq</td>
<td>2768 fr 765</td>
<td>2853 $181.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City 2002/Grand America</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>$159s/$189dtq</td>
<td>2380 th/fr 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 2003/Hilton</td>
<td>$176.25s (max)</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>fr 765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans 2004/Hyatt</td>
<td>$189s/d</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>fr 745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Room Nights**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Year/Hotel</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TU</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997 Atlanta (Hilton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Chicago (Palmer House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Orlando (Renaissance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Washington (Hilton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Chicago (Palmer House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>2853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Salt Lake City (Grand America)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Chicago (Palmer House)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 New Orleans (Hyatt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights contracted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room nights used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Until 1993 there was a student fee for registration, typically $20-35 less.

---

### MISSION OF THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE COMMITTEE

- Encourage and assist two-year colleges in the development of honors programs
- Develop a network of lower division honors programs
- Identify other organizations of similar concern working within the context of two-year colleges
- Develop a set of sessions for the annual conference
- Contribute to NCHC periodicals and occasional publications material upon two-year college honors programs
- Report regularly in writing to the Executive Committee

Check out the Two-Year College Committee's website at [http://2yr-nchc.nhmccd.edu/index.html](http://2yr-nchc.nhmccd.edu/index.html)
Membership Dues from 1980 -2002

Some history may be useful. The membership last voted to increase dues at the annual business meeting held in San Francisco November 2, 1996. Institutional Membership dues increased from $200 to $250 (with the proviso that this increase would allow the director and four faculty members to attend the conference at the member rate—all students could already attend at the member rate. In 1997 the Bylaws were amended to permit all faculty from a Member institution to attend at the Member rate). Professional membership dues increased from $35 to $50 for professionals whose institutions held active membership. Student dues were not increased at this time. A new dues-paying category was established for Professional Members whose institutions did not hold active membership. This fee was set at $125. Below is a visual representation of dues increases since 1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Effective date</th>
<th>Total (12/31) Membership</th>
<th>Institutional Membership (12/31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>January 1981</td>
<td>1980: 539</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981: 685</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$ 5.00</td>
<td>$ 7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982: 566</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>January 1985</td>
<td>1983: 660</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$ 25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984: 832</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$ 7.50</td>
<td>$ 12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985: 741</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>January 1990</td>
<td>1986: 925</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$ 25.00</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1987: 884</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$ 12.00</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1988: 948</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$ 15.00</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td>January 1994</td>
<td>1989: 1116</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a decision of the student members of the Exec Cmte.)</td>
<td>1990: 1091</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1991: 1011</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1992: 1089</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>January 1997</td>
<td>1993: 1129</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td>$ 50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994: 1211</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof (non-member Inst)</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995: 1028</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$ 35.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>remained the same</td>
<td>1996: 1153</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997: 1133</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998: 1141</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999: 1138</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000: 1142</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001: 1210</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note to Contributors

Send your articles or announcements over e-mail or on disk (Word preferred) to Margaret Brown <email mcbrown@radford.edu> or 606 Third Avenue, Radford, VA 24141. Use J-Peg for art. No faxes, unless hard copy for an article or announcement already sent electronically; fax 540-831-5004 in that situation only.

Articles can be 1000-5000 words, informal. For new-to-experienced honors deans, directors, faculty, and students. The practical aspect of honors: recruiting; advising & retention; curriculum; teaching & learning, including service learning; experiential learning & study abroad; preparation for internships, major scholarships, and post-graduate education; also honors space, budgets, staffing, honors student housing & associations. Announcements: three to four months’ lead-time. No paid or commercial announcements.

(Sorry, no poetry. Articles on “Best Course I Ever Taught/Took” discouraged. Formal, researched papers should be sent to Journal of the NCH, c/o Ada Long, University of Alabama, Birmingham; <email adalong@uab.edu> for information.)
### Conference Attendees 1996-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>members attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution(s)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee chairs [not in their name]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive cme members [not (i)]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers [not (i)]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorary lifetime members</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>former officers [not (i)]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional/affiliate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total members attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-members whose (i) is member</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-members attending</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guests</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complimentary/other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one day attendees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total attendees</td>
<td>1246 **</td>
<td>1479 ***</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1949 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presenters not listed as CMS' registrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(did not attend conference)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of institutions attending</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member inst attending as % of total inst attending</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>77.86%</td>
<td>82.06%</td>
<td>75.88%</td>
<td>77.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of inst attending (which attended previous yr)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of institutions returning</td>
<td>65.68%</td>
<td>71.73%</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
<td>68.71%</td>
<td>77.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of new directors attending (self-reported)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number new directors' institutions attending next conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% returning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student attendees, (%)</td>
<td>553 (44%)</td>
<td>687 (46%)</td>
<td>770 (47.5%)</td>
<td>700 (46%)</td>
<td>950 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of sessions/number of presentations</td>
<td>11/275</td>
<td>12/230</td>
<td>10/186</td>
<td>8/124</td>
<td>15/301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of presenters</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student presenters, (%)</td>
<td>358 (61%)</td>
<td>419 (64%)</td>
<td>331 (51%)</td>
<td>450 (64%)</td>
<td>693 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Attendance by Region</td>
<td>SAN FRAN</td>
<td>ATLANTA</td>
<td>CHICAGO</td>
<td>ORLANDO</td>
<td>WASH DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* approx 50 attended Honors Semesters reunion
** CMS gives official figure as 1205 but list of registrants totals 1246
*** CMS gives official figure as 1484 but list of registrants total 1479
**** CMS attendance list for 1999 did not designate student attendees. So, the numbers are an estimate.
***** CMS gives official figure as 1951 but list of registrants totals 1949

# 29 of these were agencies considering proposing to manage 2004 conference.
# 19 of these were individuals involved in the pre-conference summit; this does not include those requesting refunds who were on the program but did not attend.

**Individuals attending the national conference by region (based on a sample of 200 individuals)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>WR</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Fran</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
<td>28 (14%)</td>
<td>29 (14.5%)</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>200 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>59 (29.5%)</td>
<td>24 (12%)</td>
<td>28 (14%)</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>200 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash, DC</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td>56 (28%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>28 (14%)</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>200 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
<td>27 (13.5%)</td>
<td>27 (13.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>200 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regional Memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Regional Inst Members</th>
<th>NCHC Inst Members by Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in NCHC</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE-NCHC</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidEast</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 53 institutions in the NE-NCHC hold memberships in the NCHC but do not hold memberships in the NE-NCHC. Similar numbers occur in each of the other 5 regions, although the disparity is less.

OUR FRIENDS, THE PORTZES

John Portz and his wife Edythe, long time supporters of the NCHC, are in ill health and no longer able to contribute to the Portz Fund and Portz Scholars. John, formerly director of honors at the University of Maryland, served the NCHC in many capacities. He is a past Executive Secretary/Treasurer, founder of The National Honors Report, and its editor. Old friends can contact John through his nurse, Jeannine Balogh, 403 SW 29th Place, Cape Coral, FL 33991.

*To join the honors listserv at George Washington University, email <listserv@hermes.circ.gwu.edu> with the following command: <sub honors (put your name here)>.* The listserv will automatically pick up your email address.

*To post to the list after subscribing, mail your message to <honors@hermes.circ.gwu.edu>.*

*If you have problems with the listserv itself, contact the webmaster at <uhpom@gwu.edu>.*

*To remove your name from the listserv, send the command <unsubscribe honors your name> in the first line of the message box to <listserv@hermes.circ.gwu.edu>.*
The Finance Committee met in conjunction with the Great Plains Honors Conference in Ft. Worth.

Members present were: Liz Beck, Gary Bell, Ron Brandolini, Earl Brown, Jacci Rodgers, Philip Way

The committee had two agenda items:

I: Recommend a balanced revenue and expense budget for 2003.

II: Prepare a summary of estimated dues increases necessary to fund the position of Executive Director as proposed by the Long Range Planning Committee.

I: The committee approved a recommended budget, with the following changes to the Financial Requests received.

A) Increase projected revenues by $5,000

B) Reduce headquarters operating budget by $2,500 and headquarters travel budget by $2,500. This was done at the suggestion of a headquarters representative.

C) Reduce the Awards for Contribution in Honors budget by $2,000. The committee thought that a “travelling” award would be more cost effective.

D) Reduce Publications Board operating expenses budget by $500. The committee thought the board could meet at a regional conference, which would eliminate this expense.

E) Reduce Publications Board travel request budget by $1,000. The board may not be reimbursed for travel.

F) Reduce the Monograph Publication budget by $3,700. The organization cannot afford to publish two monographs this year.

In the course of examining the budget requests the committee also created a list of recommendations to go before the Executive Committee. These requests are:

A) to reconsider Standing Orders that constrain the Finance Committee

B) to rule that the Finance Committee must approve any and all request for monies before the Executive Committee votes on said requests

C) to reinstate the Investment Committee, or create a subcommittee within the Finance Committee to more closely oversee the organization’s investments and have at least quarterly conference calls with its investment manager

D) to give Finance Committee oversight of all the organization’s accounts, and how monies are spent from these accounts

E) to require that the respective outgoing and incoming EST/ED have audits performed

F) to authorize the Finance Committee to recommend conference registration and projected revenue for the Program Planning Committee. (The committee also identified some cost cutting measures in this area)

G) to reevaluate the Retreat and the expense of it

H) to investigate a progressive dues structure

II: The summary of the projected dues increase necessary to fund the office of Executive Director is attached.

Earl Brown, EST, will notify all committees/commissions that requested funding of the Finance Committee recommendations.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jacci L. Rodgers, Co-Chair Finance Committee

---

CALL FOR PAPERS
Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council

JNCHC is accepting articles for its next issue dedicated to “Technology in Honors.” The deadline for submissions is September 1, 2002. Submissions and inquiries should be directed to Ada Long, JNCHC, UAB Honors Program, 1530 Third Ave. South, Birmingham, AL 35294-4450. Phone: (205) 934-3228; Fax: (205) 975-5493; Email: adalong@uab.edu.
National Collegiate Honors Council
Report on Dues Increase to Support Executive Director
Prepared by the Finance Committee
April 19-20, 2002

The Finance Committee was charged by the Executive Committee to prepare an estimated dues increase that would be necessary to support an office of Executive Director. The creation of this position would eliminate the position of EST as it is currently defined. The proposed dues increase outlined below is in addition to the $50 dues increase that the Finance Committee recommended last year.

The committee went beyond the charge as it was given and prepared estimates for four different scenarios: 1) The position and location as defined by the Long-Range Planning Committee with the costs given; 2) The position and location as defined by the Long-Range Planning Committee, with costs the committee thought were more reasonable and inclusive; 3) The position as defined by the Long-Range Planning Committee, housed on a college campus; and 4) Continuing with an EST, with adjustments. Each of these scenarios, and its respective costs is shown below. For each scenario, the committee assumed that institutional memberships would bear the increase. Seven hundred and fifty institutional members were estimated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario One</th>
<th>Scenario Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRP Budget</td>
<td>Operating funds remain as currently figured. Fifty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less current headquarter funding</td>
<td>thousand dollar buy-out paid to host university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding needed</td>
<td>Additional funds needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$253,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000/750 = $167 increase</td>
<td>50,000/750 = $67 increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Two</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>Each of the scenarios requires a dues increase over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>and above the proposed $50 increase the Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Asst., Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>Committee thinks is necessary to maintain status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant, Salary and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget per Fin. Com.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$349,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less current headquarter funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$221,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221,000/750 = $295 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Three</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Salary and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Asst., Salary and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant, Salary and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget/ED on college campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less current headquarter funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*$15,000 to be paid from conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net funds needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132,000/750 = $176 increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for inviting me to be with you today. I understand the theme for this year’s conference is “Squaring the Circle: Tradition, Change, Development, and Honors.”

In pondering what I would say to you this afternoon that would connect to this theme, I thought about many issues facing honors education, especially in the South: lower state appropriations for higher education, a growing school age population, and keen competition to keep our honors students interested in staying in the South.

I could talk about the irony of excellent honors programs in a region famous for its anti-intellectualism. As the media and the popular imagination define us—at least until rather recently—our tradition is marked by a defiant ignorance, a proud disdain for education, within a culture steeped in racism and chauvinism. It is not a heritage that would seemingly be the best breeding ground for excellent honors programs.

Or, I could discuss the ridiculous idea, reflective of the changes in our culture, proposed by a writer from *U.S. News & World Report*, that honors colleges serve as “educational boutiques” in the “mega malls of higher education.”

On second thought, no, I couldn’t.

Instead, the topic unceremoniously came to me two weeks ago, when one of our brightest honors college seniors was killed and another seriously injured in terrible car accident. Four students traveling to Florida on Spring break, five minutes from their destination. The student who died was a young, vivacious, gifted woman whose life and career lay brilliantly ahead of her.

Suddenly, I no longer wanted to talk about statistics or the tasks we face in the South. While these are viable topics, they do not speak to the heart of what makes honors programs succeed. They do not account for why honors programs are so important for the future of our region and in the lives of our students and our faculty. But, I also didn’t want to come here and grieve with you, or lapse into sentimentalities that would simply objectify the sudden death of a young woman.

Instead, I want to focus on the response to this tragedy. Many of our other honors students spent their spring break trying to help the families involved, running errands, communicating information with the university, and consoling each other. The administration, staff, and faculty worked together to help create a plan to support these students, those immediately involved in the accident, and their families.

Rather than the paralysis that often comes from shock, the behavior of the students, as well as that of our faculty, honors college administration, and student services personnel, has been heartwarming and genuinely reassuring. It has demonstrated the strength and purpose of an honors college in a way that few other events or issues can.

Seeing these students reach beyond their own personal grief recalled to me a passage I read last year in David McCullough’s biography of John Adams. The passage comes from a letter Abigail Adams wrote in 1779 to her teen-ager son, John Quincy, as he prepared to accompany his father to France. She wrote:

> These are the times in which a genius would want to live. It is not in the still calm of life, or the repose of a pacific station, that great characters are formed. The habits of a vigorous mind are formed in contending with difficulties. Great necessities call out great virtues. When a mind is raised, and animated by scenes that engage the heart, then those qualities, which would otherwise lay dormant, wake into

---

*Editors Note: We appreciate Dr. Palms’ sharing his keynote address made at the Southern Regional Honors Council’s Thirtieth Annual Conference in Atlanta, March 22, 2002; with Gail S. Widner.*
life and form the character of the hero and the statesman.

Some features of these lines strike me as particularly relevant to any discussion of honors education.

Mrs. Adams first proposes "[i]t is not in the still calm of life, or the repose of a pacific station, that great characters are formed. The habits of a vigorous mind are formed in contending with difficulties." Learning is fundamentally active and definitely relational. Learning shapes character. These are the powerful keys to education, particularly honors education.

Second, she writes from a firm belief in the primacy of character and service as the ultimate goal of human life. After all, "great necessities call out great virtues" for a reason, and the hero and the statesman do not live in isolation.

All of us in this room, I believe, understand that genuine learning and growth are the product of interaction between two (or more) forces, forces contending with each other. Perhaps it is the mind struggling with a book, a theorem, or a research question. Honors colleges nourish such academic difficulty and rigor.

Through intense courses of study, research opportunities, fieldwork, and senior projects, honors students are required to contend with tough, and often interdisciplinary, intellectual issues and problems. Such a curriculum compels these students to confront primary information and data first hand, to evaluate hypotheses, test prior assumptions, and revise conclusions.

Looking back, my senior project at The Citadel enabled me to understand the value of "contending with difficulty." All seniors at The Citadel were required to produce a senior research project. We spent a year in the process, conferencing with faculty about the project’s scope and ramifications. The process was intense, cheering each successful step toward completion and helping each other through rough spots when the problem seemingly defied analysis. When we submitted our finished projects, the feeling of achievement was palpable.

Because learning relies on and is shaped by relationships, honors colleges must provide not only an atmosphere that necessitates contending with difficulties, they must also offer the support needed to do so successfully.

"Because learning relies on and is shaped by relationships, honors colleges must provide not only an atmosphere that necessitates contending with difficulties, they must also offer the support needed to do so successfully."

To this end, we know that students will not enroll in an honors college simply for its intellectual appeal. They do not want to be seen or treated simply as talented intellects trapped in bodies with troublesome appear. In recent years, studies have shown that students choose honors programs based on the level of direct, personal support they receive—from initial advisement to mentoring—and the quality of connection we provide.

A personal level of support is as important as the course schedule and selection. We see this support in the one-to-one relationships faculty have with students, a mentoring relationship that students repeatedly cite as the most important part of their learning. Honors programs promote this relationship through small class sizes, guided independent and senior research projects, and frequent occasions where faculty and students can get to know each other.

And, having been both mentee and mentor, I know that this relationship is also equally important to the established teaching scholar, who yearns for hungry minds who share the passion for the discipline and the style of thought it fosters. Only in teaching the new scholar, and in watching that scholar approach the discipline with a passion, can we see the future of our work.

This continual process develops and strengthens the mind AND the character. As Eric Ashby once noted, "The very discipline of scholarship carries its own ethical values…. Moral decadence, insincerity, [and] prejudice are incompatible with intellectual health." A vigorous mind reveres truth and tolerates difference. At the University of South Carolina, our motto, which was selected in 1803, also subscribes to this ideal. Our motto translates as "learning humanizes character and does not permit it to be cruel." A vigorous mind seeks understanding, connection, and application, and that search requires civility, honesty, and compassion.

Mrs. Adams also explains how learning occurs and forms character: "When a mind is raised, and animated by scenes that engage the heart, then those qualities which would otherwise lay dormant, wake into life." Character is forged, then, when the vigorous mind and personal experience are jointly acted upon by "scenes that engage the heart." When the intellect, experience, and emotion combine, character and learning result.

These ideas remind us of the importance of engaging the whole person in the learning process. By creating an environment that stretches students’ hearts as well as their intellects, honors programs
effectively educate the total person. Extracurricular activities, independent research, service learning, and cooperative learning opportunities are a few of the ways that honors programs are cultivating the whole student.

But Mrs. Adams does not end there. She concludes her statement with the idea that contending with difficulties and engaging the heart forge “the character of the hero and the statesman.” Not the hermit, not the loner, not the cynic. But, the hero and the statesman. As Mrs. Adams presents it, the habits of a vigorous mind are important not as ends unto them but because they protect and promote the health of our society.

I have already mentioned that learning is relational, that it does not happen with ease nor does it occur in isolation. And, I have already remarked on the fact that honors students evaluate the quality of life and support in choosing honors programs. And, in honors residence halls, we are able to see all of these forces at work: struggle, support, and fellowship. In their dorm, students live together, encourage each other, and teach each other. They learn to disagree, with civility. They learn to appreciate difference. They have poetry readings, musical performances, movie nights, study sessions, and all-night conversations. It is HOW great ideas are born.

These personal connections create a sense of community, of shared values and mutual caring, that gives a student the confidence to negotiate any difficulty with resolve.

In such an environment, the individual feels the responsibility to apply the intellect and the character to the community’s prosperity.

To help foster a larger sense of community, Honors College throughout the country are now adding service learning components. Offering service opportunities ensures that gifted students realize the significance of their talents and their participation. Whether delivering Meals-On-Wheels, serving as a Big Brother or Sister, reading to the elderly or tutoring elementary school children, each person can—and should—make a difference.

“Extracurricular activities, independent research, service learning, and cooperative learning opportunities are a few of the ways that honors programs are cultivating the whole student.”

Service learning reaffirms for our students their importance as individuals. And, it also reaffirms for them a direct awareness of belonging to something larger than themselves, their dorm, and their immediate families.

Honors programs can guide students toward knowing their individual value and their common duty. I say “duty” because we all share a responsibility to work for the good of the whole. As honors colleges, part of our responsibility to society is to help honors students shape their lives. We as a culture make this investment in the hope that one day these students will not only fulfill their personal ambitions but also lead our schools, businesses, universities, and communities. If the South is going to compete economically and improve the quality of life for all our citizens, then we need the gifts and the style of thought that honors students possess.

Again, we return to issues of character, relationships, and community. By offering rigor, mentoring, fellowship, and opportunities to serve, honors programs enable gifted students to recognize the close relationship among their talents, their individuality, and the larger community.

In their response to a classmate’s death, our students and our honors community acted with caring and compassion and a sense of service. At a terrible moment in their lives, these young adults did not implode or withdraw. They grew. That they did so tells us that Abigail Adams was right: contending with an overwhelming difficulty, a difficulty fraught with emotional impact, can call out greatness in our character. Seeing this response reassures me that this is indeed a time in which geniuses “would want to live” and that honors programs can show them how.

References
“Honors Professor as Honors Student”
By Norma Stratemeier
Johnson County Community College

Introduction
by Ruth Fox, Honors Program Co-Cordinator
Johnson County Community College

The Johnson County Community College Honors Program offers 165 honors contracts that are not stand-alone entities but are extensions of non-honors courses. The course outlines and the objectives for the contract are patterned from the non-honors course goals, but they typically allow students to focus on a particular area of study in a one-to-one mentoring situation.

Recently, our program had a unique situation when one of our own honors faculty members in our paralegal program, Norma Stratemeier, decided to take an honors contract with a course she was taking. When I asked her to write an article for our program newsletter, I received the strongest testimony I’ve ever heard. Having been on both sides of the contract experience gave Norma a new perspective of the process and program. Here is Norma’s account.

I was delighted by the invitation to serve as this month’s spotlighted mentor [at Johnson County Community College] because I think I have a unique perspective on the honors experience. Many times I’ve had the pleasure of acting as mentor to students who have enrolled in honors contracts along with my courses; recently, however, I was privileged to see the other side of the coin, and I’d like to share that experience with you.

Last semester, as a student myself, I enrolled in an honors contract here at Johnson County Community College. And while I have long appreciated the opportunities offered any student by the honors contract option, my own experience as an honors student has persuaded me of the unique and very special value of this offering.

For more than fifteen years, I’ve taught courses in two law-level programs here at Johnson County Community College (the Paralegal and the Legal Nurse Consultant Programs). Although my love for teaching law has in no way diminished, about three years ago, I developed an academic itch that drove me back into the classroom as a student. It took me a while to figure out what I was looking for. Then I discovered Forensic Anthropology and everything fell into place; this is the discipline where all my passions mesh. Because I need a few additional undergraduate courses before I can enter a graduate program in Anthropology, it appears I’ll be taking courses here at Johnson County Community College for a little while longer.

Last fall, I enrolled in Human Anatomy and its accompanying honors contract. I didn’t do it because I needed another hour of credit or because it would look good on my transcript. Already enrolled in seven credit hours (in addition to teaching my regular full-time course load), this additional burden of an honors contract was the last thing I needed. But the opportunity to explore this subject in a different way and to relate that study to my own particular interests represented an offer I couldn’t refuse. True to my expectations, satisfying the requirements of both the classroom course and the honors contract forced me to work my tail off, and I frequently wondered what had possessed me to think I could juggle all those demands. Nevertheless, I must tell you it was the richest and most rewarding academic experienced I have ever had, anywhere, and I wouldn’t have missed it for the world.

Every honors contract is different. Mine, for example, offered me the opportunity to learn more about the history of anatomical study, participate in a true hands-on examination of an anatomy-related rare book collection, visit a medical school human dissection lab, and observe an autopsy. My contract also required me
to research, write, and publicly present a paper on an anatomy-related topic. In my case, I selected a topic related to my interest in forensics and death investigations.

The result? Not only did I survive, I flourished. Semester’s end found me exhausted, yet immensely fulfilled. Any residual doubts that I was headed in the right direction were eradicated. I began the semester interested and motivated; I emerged impassioned and driven. I loved every minute of it, and was profoundly grateful for this opportunity to pursue an interest that had assumed compelling and consuming proportions.

How I wish each of my own students could experience the same thrill of discovery, the same sense of accomplishment and gratification. Who among the teaching community would not? For is this not the learning experience at its very best?

The honors contract is a well-honed (yet under-used) tool for stimulating student interest and enhancing the learning process. A well-crafted honors contract will provide the learners with the opportunity to seek and discover, to labor and be rewarded. An effective honors contract will require that the student perform certain instructor-defined tasks but will allow for the tailoring that will enable each individual student to address his own needs and interests. Optimally, the honors contract experience will enable the student to become more knowledgeable about one or multiple aspects of the subjects; to think independently, critically, and creatively; to develop good time-management and organization skills; to learn how to work independently; and to realize that one is responsible for one’s own education. Most important of all, the honors contract allows the student to experience the joy of learning.

Is the honors contract for every student? Can every student benefit? Of course not. We’ve all had students who are both astonished and horrified to discover they are expected to work for a grade. If you offer them an opportunity to do extra work, they will think you are crazy.

But I think we sometimes underestimate the number of students who hunger for enhanced intellectual challenge, who would embrace the chance to prove and improve their competencies, and would be grateful for opportunities to reach beyond the classroom material in a quest to address more personal interests. If we don’t respond to those needs, we cheat those students and ourselves. Like so many of my colleagues, I became a teacher because I wanted to make a difference. Encouraging students to use the honors contract option to address their individual academic needs can assist both student and teacher in moving closer to their respective goals. I do not believe that my own experience as an honors student was unique. I’m persuaded that many more students would take advantage of the honors contract option, were they more aware of its existence and benefits, and I believe many of us could be doing more to promote its use.

The number of Johnson County Community College courses offering honors contracts are impressive, but we could do better. More of us could develop contracts for additional courses. More of us could commit to mentoring honors students. Those of us who currently offer honors contracts could market them more enthusiastically and persuasively to our students. I’ve heard some of my colleagues remark that it’s too much trouble to design a good contract, too time consuming to mentor honors students. I agree that fashioning a legitimate honors contract is challenging and requires much effort, careful thought, and a measure of creativity. Mentoring honors students certainly requires a commitment of time and accessibility. But the pay-off, for both teacher and student, can be splendid.

As you can see, my own experience as an honors student has transformed me from a supporter to an advocate. Because I’ve been there, done that, I’m convinced the honors contract is one of the most valuable devices we have at our disposal for responding to those students who seek something extra, and that the contract offers the opportunity for a stimulating and gratifying academic experience. As a result, I’m rethinking and redesigning the honors contracts I currently offer. I’m also considering developing honors contracts for additional courses. I plan to be more aggressive in promoting the viability and benefits of these contracts. And I hope my colleagues will do the same.

And as a continuing student? I can’t wait to do it again.
The 2002 NCHC Annual Conference will be held at the Grand America Hotel in Salt Lake City, Utah October 30-November 3.

For conference registration information, contact the NCHC headquarters at (540) 831-6100 or nchc@radford.edu.

You can also access the information at the 2002 conference website at www.radford.edu/~nchc/
2002_NCHC_Conference_Website.htm.

Put these dates on your calendar

Future NCHC Conferences:

November 5-9, 2003: Palmer House Hilton, Chicago, IL
November 10-14, 2004: Hyatt Regency New Orleans, New Orleans, LA
What is the NCHC?

The National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC) was established in 1966 as an organization of American colleges and universities, students, faculty, administrators, and those interested in supporting honors education.

Historically, the honors movement has been a catalyst for positive change in American higher education. Many of its innovations (undergraduate research, study abroad, experiential learning) have become standard features of mainstream post-secondary curriculum.

NCHC members, both individually and together, continue to respond to the special needs of exceptionally talented and motivated students through a wide variety of programs and activities.

*NCHC encourages the creation of and renewal of honors programs by offerings popular annual workshops: Beginning in Honors, Developing in Honors, and Students in Honors.

*NCHC supports existing honors programs with a full slate of national, regional, and statewide conferences, forums, and workshops.

*NCHC promotes a better understanding of current issues and developments in honors education through its two publications, Journal of the NCHC, a scholarly journal, and The National Honors Report, a professional quarterly.

*NCHC creates new learning opportunities for students: theme-based Honors Semesters, in places like Appalachia, the Grand Canyon, and Greece; and Sleeping Bag Seminars when students from several institutions get together for a weekend of theme-based learning and socializing.

*NCHC sponsors a wide range of committees and programs that support specific constituencies, such as Large Universities, Small Colleges, Science & Math, Two-Year Schools, as well as committees and programs that address specific concerns of honors education, such as Teaching & Learning, Evaluation, and Research.

*NCHC provides grants through its endowed Portz funds to support undergraduate research and to support innovations in honors programs.

NCHC Publications


Honors Programs at Smaller Colleges (1999, 2nd ed.) by Samuel Schuman. For colleges with fewer than 3000 students.

Place as Text: Approaches to Active Learning (2000) by Bernice Braid and Ada Long. Information and practical advice on the experiential pedagogies developed within the NCHC during the past 25 years.

Interested in joining the NCHC?

Please use the application below to apply for membership. Mail your payment with the application to:

Earl B. Brown, Jr., Executive Secretary/Treasurer
National Collegiate Honors Council
Radford University
Box 7017
Radford, VA 24142-7017

Questions? Please call us at (540) 831-6100 or fax us at (540) 831-5004. You can also email us at nchc@radford.edu

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I wish to apply for the following membership (check one):

___ Student ($35)
___ Institutional ($250)
___ Faculty from member institution ($50)
___ Faculty from non-member institution ($125)
___ Affiliate Member ($50)

I enclose $_______________ in payment of a one-year membership.

Name (print or type)____________________________________________________________

Title__________________________________________
Institution_________________________________________________________________
Mailing Address________________________________________________________________
City, State, Zip________________________________________________________________

Telephone_________________________ Fax_______________________________
Email_____________________________