Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

University of Kansas, Lawrence

October 22-24, 1966

Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

University of Kansas, Lawrence

October 22-24, 1966

Edited by
WALTER D. WEIR
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Preface

The National Collegiate Honors Council held its first annual meeting on the campus of the University of Kansas, October 22-24, 1966. The proceedings of that meeting are contained in this volume.

This new association is a response to the expressed desire of many hundreds of educators throughout the country that, when the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student (ICSS) was terminated in 1965, a national organization of individuals as well as institutions be formed. The new organization would carry on some of the functions of ICSS but would be free also to develop in ways appropriate to the present status of honors over the country. In addition to sponsoring the first annual meeting, the council has distributed copies of remaining newsletters of the ICSS (there are still available many issues at 20 cents a copy), encouraged regional meetings on honors, and distributed a summary of honors programs prepared by Robert Johnson and M. Jean Phillips of the University of Illinois.

It was fitting that the NCHC membership elected Dean James H. Robertson as the first president and Professor Emeritus Joseph W. Cohen as honorary past president at the Lawrence meeting. Dean Robertson has been active on the Honors Council and the Executive Committee of the College Honors Program at the University of Michigan, a member of the original steering committee of June, 1957, which led to the formation of the ICSS, and a member of the ICSS executive committee from its beginning in 1958 to its end in 1965. Joseph W. Cohen of the University of Colorado was a member of the committee which founded the Colorado Honors Program in 1930, a director of that program, and the director of the ICSS from 1958 to 1963. Professor Cohen's energy, enthusiasm, devotion, and experience sparked the ICSS contribution to the national honors movement. He edited the book, *The Superior Student in American Higher Education,* which summarized the experience of

honors in this country. It was also fitting that the first meeting of the new association, the NCHC, be held at the University of Kansas, for George R. Waggoner, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, had been one of the most active members of the ICSS executive committee. The NCHC has a glorious inheritance and, hopefully, a fruitful future.

The council has received an enthusiastic reception and it will, no doubt, continue to grow. This association of faculty, administrators, and others interested in honors now has 194 institutional and 303 individual members. It is important that all those concerned with honors programs and excellence in our undergraduate schools continue to communicate their experience and thus improve our respective institutions.

The program for this first meeting of the NCHC was largely due to the truly heroic efforts of Dean Francis H. Heller of the University of Kansas and Professor Vishnu N. Bhatia of Washington State University.

WALTER D. WEIR
National Collegiate Honors Council
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Contents

Program

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22

3:00 p.m. Meeting of the temporary Executive and Planning Committee, Regents Room, 229 Strong Hall.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 23

12:30 p.m. Luncheon and Opening Session, Big Eight Room, Kansas Union.
Francis H. Heller, Associate Dean of Faculties, University of Kansas, presiding.
Official Welcome by Dr. W. Clarke Wescoe, Chancellor of the University of Kansas.
Address by Hon. Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

2:00 p.m. General Session, Forum Room, Kansas Union.
Robert D. Clark, President, San Jose State College, presiding.
"Selection of Honors Students," M. Jean Phillips, Assistant Director, University Honors Program, University of Illinois.
"Selection of Honors Teachers," Harold D. Hantz, Coordinator of Honors, University of Arkansas.
"Administration of Honors Programs," Vishnu N. Bhatia, Coordinator of the Honors Program, Washington State University.

3:30 p.m. Discussion of Papers.
Discussion Group I, Jayhawk Room, Kansas Union.

Catherine F. Titus, Director of Honors, Central Missouri State College, chairman.
"Selection of Honors Students."
Discussion Group II, Room 306, Kansas Union. John Lovell, Jr., Coordinator of Honors, Howard University, chairman.
"Selection of Honors Teachers."
Discussion Group III, Pine Room, Kansas Union. Mary H. Marshall, Director of Honors, Syracuse University, chairman.

6:00 p.m. Dinner Meeting, Big Eight Room, Kansas Union.
George R. Waggoner, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, presiding.
Panel of Honors Students. Aldon D. Bell, Director of Honors, University of Kansas, moderator.
Business Meeting of the National Collegiate Honors Council. Philip I. Mitterling, Professor of Social Sciences, University of Colorado, chairman.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 24

9:00 a.m. General Session, Forum Room, Kansas Union.
Dudley Wynn, Director of Honors, University of New Mexico, presiding.
"Motivating Students in Honors Colloquia," Walter D. Weir, Director of Honors, University of Colorado.
"Motivating Students in Honors Courses," James Karge Olsen, Dean, Honors College, Kent State University.
"Motivating Students in Honors Independent Study," J. Douglas Mertz, Colorado College.

10:30 a.m. Discussion of Papers.
Discussion of Group IV, Jayhawk Room, Kansas Union. Father Thomas L. O'Brien, S.J., Head, Honors Program, Seattle University, chairman.
"Motivating Students in Honors Colloquia."
Discussion Group V, Room 306, Kansas Union. Samuel J. Jasper, Director, Honors College, Ohio University, chairman.

"Motivating Students in Honors Courses."
Discussion Group VI, Pine Room, Kansas Union. "Motivating Students in Honors Independent Study."

12 Noon — General Session, Forum Room, Kansas Union. James H. Robertson, Associate Dean, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan, presiding.
Address by Hans Rosenhaupt, National Director, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

12:30 p.m. — Buffet Luncheon, Big Eight Room, Kansas Union.
Meeting of the new Executive Committee, Regionalist Room, Kansas Union.

* * *

NCHC Program Committee:

Vishnu N. Bhatia
Harold D. Hantz
Francis H. Heller
Walter D. Weir

Local Arrangements:

Francis H. Heller
L. O. ("Bill") Chestnut

Business Meeting

1. Delegates approved the proposed Constitution and By-Laws of the National Collegiate Honors Council.

2. The following officers of the NCHC were elected:

   President: Dr. James H. Robertson, Associate Dean, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, University of Michigan.

   Vice President: Professor Vishnu N. Bhatia, Coordinator of the Honors Program, Washington State University

   Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Professor Walter D. Weir, Director of Honors, University of Colorado.

3. The following members of the Executive Committee were elected:

   Three-Year Terms:

   Marjorie Adams, Kansas State University
   Ned Bryan, Office of Education
   Warner Chapman, University of Indiana
   Joseph W. Cohen, Tulane University
   Harold D. Hantz, University of Arkansas

   Two-Year Terms:

   John Eells, Winthrop College
   Otto Graf, University of Michigan
   John Hague, Stetson University
   John Lovell, Jr., Howard University
   James Karge Olsen, Kent State University

   One-Year Terms:

   Aldon D. Bell, University of Kansas
   Robert D. Clark, San Jose State University

Fred Jackson, New York University
Robert Johnson, University of Illinois
Father Thomas L. O'Brien, Seattle University

4. The following motion electing Professor Joseph W. Cohen, former Director of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, as Honorary Past President of the NCHC was passed.

Whereas: Professor Joseph Cohen devoted most of his energies during the past fifteen years to the definition of Honors, its acceptance and its establishment on many of the college and university campuses of the nation,

Whereas: the successful inauguration of the concept has taken place throughout the United States, and the viability of Honors is further demonstrated by this conference, and a growing number of institutions both large and small are still responding to his inspiring leadership,

Be it resolved: that in recognition of Professor Joseph Cohen's great services to higher education, he be named by popular acclamation, the Honorary Past President of the National Collegiate Honors Council.

5. Notes

a. Over 200 faculty members and administrators attended this first meeting of the NCHC. We expect an even larger attendance at our next meeting to be held in Washington, D.C., Saturday and Sunday, October 21 and 22, 1967.

b. Professor C. Grey Austin, Director of the Honors Program at Ohio State University and Editor of the *Journal of Higher Education* has asked me to make the following announcement:

> The *Journal of Higher Education* welcomes manuscripts on Honors programs and philosophies. Potential contributors should be aware that the audience consists primarily of college teachers and administrators, and that the best way to ascertain appropriateness of content, style, and format for publication is to browse through a few recent issues and to heed the following note from the masthead:
>
> "Manuscripts submitted for publication should be original typescripts, double-spaced, on white opaque paper, 8½

x 11. Unsolicited contributions that are unacceptable will be returned only if accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope."

c. There are now 303 individual and 194 institutional members of the NCHC. The folowing is a list of institutional members:

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERSHIP

Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado

Albion College
Albion, Michigan

Albright College
Reading, Pa.

Alcorn A. & M. College
Alcorn, Mississippi

Allegheny College
Meadville, Pa. #16335

The American University
Washington, D. C. #20016

Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio #45387

Arkansas Polytechnic College
Russellville, Arkansas

Asheville-Biltmore College
Asheville, North Carolina

Augsburg College
707 21st Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota #55404

Augusta College
Augusta, Georgia

Baldwin-Wallace College
Berea, Ohio

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin #53512

Bethany College
Bethany, West Virginia

Bishop College
3837 Simpson Stuart
Dallas, Texas

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Boston, Mass.

Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio #43402

Brooklyn College of the City
University of New York
Brooklyn, New York

Brown University
Providence, R. I.

Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pa.

California Lutheran College
Thousand Oaks, California

California State College at Long Beach
6101 East Seventh Street
Long Beach, California #90804

Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri #64093

Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington

The City College
Convent Avenue at 138th St.
New York, N. Y. #10031

Claremont Men's College
Claremont, California

Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia #30314

Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina #29631

The Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Colorado State College
Greeley, Colorado

Concordia Teachers College
River Forest, Illinois

Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

The Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska #68131

Drew University
Madison, New Jersey #07940

Drexel Institute of Technology
Philadelphia, Pa. #19104

East Carolina College
Greenville, North Carolina

East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico

Eastern Oregon College
LaGrande, Oregon #97850

Elmhurst College
Elmhurst, Illinois

Erskine College
Due West, South Carolina #29639

Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida #32306

Fordham University
Thomas Moore College
New York, New York

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas

Fort Lewis College
Durango, Colorado

Franklin & Marshall College
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Furman University
Greenville, South Carolina

Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pa. #17325

Gonzaga University
Spokane, Washington

Good Counsel College
White Plains, New York #10603

Goshen College
Goshen, Indiana

Graceland College
Lamoni, Iowa

Gustavus Aldolphus College
St. Peter, Minnesota

Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas #72032

Hiram College
Hiram, Ohio

Holy Cross College
Worcester, Mass.

Howard Payne College
Brownwood, Texas

Howard University
Washington, D. C.

Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

State College of Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Kansas State College of
Pittsburg
Pittsburg, Kansas #66764

Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas #66801

Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas #66502

Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

King's College
Briarcliff Manor, New York

Lake Erie College
Painesville, Ohio

Lewis College
Lockport, Illinois

Loyola College
4501 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland #21210

Loyola University
Los Angeles, California

Lincoln Memorial University
Harrogate, Tennessee #37752

Lincoln University
Lincoln University, Pa.

Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota #55101

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin #53233

Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia

Mayville State College
Mayville, North Dakota #58257

Meredith College
Raleigh, North Carolina

Miami University
Oxford, Ohio

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

Moorhead State College
Moorhead, Minnesota

College of Mount Saint Vincent
Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson
Bronx, New York #10471

Muhlenburg College
Allentown, Pa.

New Haven College
New Haven, Connecticut

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

New York University
Washington Square, New York

State University of New York
at Albany
135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York #12203

State University of New York
at Oswego
Oswego, New York

Francis T. Nicholls State
College
Thibodaux, Louisiana

North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan #49855

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Norwich University
Northfield, Vermont

Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio #43210

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon #97331

Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas

Otterbein College
Westerville, Ohio

Ouachita Baptist University
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

Quincy College
Quincy, Illinois

Rice University
Houston, Texas

Roanoke College
Salem, Virginia #24153

Roosevelt University
430 South Michigan Ave.
Chicago, Illinois #60605

Rust College
Holly Springs, Miss. #38635

Sacramento State College
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California #95819

St. Anselm's College
Manchester, New Hampshire

St. Augustine's College
Raleigh, North Carolina

St. Bonaventure University
St. Bonaventure, New York
#14778

College of St. Catherine
St. Paul, Minnesota

Saint Louis University
221 North Grand Blvd.
Saint Louis, Missouri #63103

College of St. Mary of the
Springs
Columbus, Ohio #43219

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

Siena College
Loudonville, New York #12211

St. Norbert College
West DePere, Wisconsin

St. Olaf College
Northfield, Minnesota #55057

College of Saint Rose
Albany, New York #12203

San Diego State College
San Diego, California

San Jose State College
San Jose, California #95114

Scripps College
747 North Dartmouth Ave.
Claremont, California #91711

Seattle University
Seattle, Washington

Seton Hill College
Greensburg, Pennsylvania

Southern Connecticut State
College
New Haven, Connecticut

Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois #62901

Southern Illinois University
Box 310
Edwardsville, Illinois

Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

State University of New York
College
Plattsburgh, New York

State University of New York
College
Potsdam, New York

Stephen F. Austin State College
Nacogdoches, Texas #75961

Stout State University
Menominee, Wisconsin

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Taylor University
Upland, Indiana

Texas A. & M. University
College Station, Texas

Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

Transylvania College
Lexington, Kentucky

Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana
#70118

Tusculum College
Greenville, Tennessee

Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama

United States Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland #21402

University of Akron
Akron, Ohio #44304

University of Alabama
Box M
University, Alabama #35486

University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas #72701

University of California
Santa Barbara, California
#93106

University of California
Los Angeles, California #90024

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado #80302

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

University of Houston
Houston, Texas

University of Illinois
Urbana Campus
Urbana, Illinois

University of Illinois
Box 4348
Chicago, Illinois #60680

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas #66044

University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
#55455

University of Mississippi
University, Mississippi

University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

University of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri #65201

University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire

University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
#87106

University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

University of North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina
#27412

University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota
#58201

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pa.

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington #98416

University of Rochester
Rochester, New York

University of Scranton
Scranton, Pennsylvania

University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota
#57069

University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin #53706

University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Blacksburg, Virginia

Washington State University
Pullman, Washington #99163

Wayne State College
Wayne, Nebraska

Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan #48202

Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan #49001

Western Washington State
College
Bellingham, Washington
#98225

Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Wilmington College
Wilmington, Ohio #45177

Winthrop College
Rock Hill, South Carolina
#29733

Wisconsin State University
Whitewater, Wisconsin

Wisconsin State University
Platteville, Wisconsin #53818

Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin

Wittenberg University
Springfield, Ohio

Yeshiva University
Amsterdam Ave. & 18th St.
New York, New York #10033

Innovation in Higher Education

PAUL A. MILLER
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

It gives me great pleasure to be with you today and it seems to me a most opportune time to meet with you. I have recently left my position as President of the University of West Virginia to enter the service of the Federal Government. After seven weeks of reviewing our educational process from a new dimension, I am even more convinced that we who are involved in higher education must redouble our efforts to meet the challenge of modern society. What are our dreams, our aspirations for the American college and university? What are we doing that is innovative and creative? We, in this room, are the educators of future astronauts, medical scientists, and executives who will deal with the latest innovations in technology and business. Universities, with their ever-growing research facilities, should be leading in the field of innovation and should be serving as examples of the application of innovation. Instead, we tend to be lethargic; we fail to continuously examine our curricula; and, to this point, we attend to our extramural activities in piecemeal fashion.

Permit me today to share with you some of my thoughts on this vital task of innovation in higher education.

To you as professional educators there is little need to dwell on the developments in recent years that have made it so crucial for us to update our educational techniques and machinery. You are certainly aware of the tremendous increase in enrollment which has taken place at every level of our educational system over the past 20 years—an increase which has not been matched by a commensurate number of teachers, classrooms, or other educational facilities. This problem is acute at

the college level. It is indeed sobering to compare the Office of Education figures for total enrollment and total instructional staff over a 20-year period. In 1955, the total full enrollment was 2,660,429 and the total instructional staff equaled 227,929. The projections for 1975 are 8,995,-000 students and 639,000 teachers. Thus, over the 20-year period, an increase of approximately 6,300,000 students is expected with approximately 411,000 additional teachers. It is clear that one problem of our educational system is simply quantitative. Of course, our aim is to train more teachers and to construct more facilities, but we cannot simply count on a larger educational plant to meet the quantitative problem. We must also develop new ways to get additional mileage out of the educational facilities we now have.

At the same time that our educational system faces this demand for greater quantity, it is also facing an almost equally insistent demand for better quality in education. In the face of these two wholly justified demands, we cannot remain satisfied with the educational techniques of the recent past.

There are, of course, many different kinds of universities performing a variety of functions. Most obviously and traditionally, they provide a person with the necessary preliminary training to enter a profession. They provide him with some knowledge of the history of his country, the structure of its government, and the works of its writers. But in this emphasis on the vocational and the instant-culture aspects of education, the universities have seriously neglected one of the most important tasks of education: emancipating the student. The university must assume major responsibility for assisting students to develop learning skills which will facilitate the increasing independence of the student. To encourage the student's independent study and growth, the faculty must become concerned with understanding and applying the principles of learning to the mastery of liberal and specialized areas of knowledge.

The process of emancipation cannot be commenced, however, without a shift in the basic organization of the university. The usual triumvirate of lecture, seminar, and library study will no longer suffice. Small group work and frequent contact between professors and students must become essential elements in the educational process. There must be less emphasis on the professional monologue and more emphasis on the teacher-student dialogue. To provide such an atmosphere, a breakdown of large universities into constituent colleges with resident faculties may be desirable. As professors become more and more involved in govern-

ment-sponsored research projects, their students should be given an opportunity to participate and to contribute in areas which have meaning and relevance, for, once the student becomes receptive to the adventure of thought, he can learn from observing his teacher at work on meaningful topics which do not necessarily fit the instructional pattern. At present, students have little opportunity to express their views or even to develop viewpoints through discussion. This is unfortunate, for the zeal, enthusiasm, and idealism of youth are rarely found in such abundance in later periods of life. I am anxious to see our universities and colleges provide opportunities for the expression and the utilization of student ideas, for, as Emerson said, the secret of education lies in respecting the pupil.

The sharp separation between the student body on the one hand and faculty and administration on the other was at least temporarily corrected, I understand, at the recent Magnolia Manor Conference, a meeting on innovation of higher education sponsored by the Office of Education. The participants at that meeting were made up of university teams of students, faculty, and administration representatives. It is also my understanding that the students who participated made excellent contributions and that there was no dearth of participation and ideas from their department.

A most significant student project—one of the most outstanding in the nation today—is an experimental college established at San Francisco State College. The students, who conceived this idea, arrange for faculty members, both inside and outside of the parent institution, to test new ideas in teaching. The project is funded through student government appropriations and support from the Office of Economic Opportunity. Credit is given for a significant number of courses and, in turn, the experimental college seems to be providing its professors with new ideas for reexamination of their own curricula.

As one college dean put it, the challenge today "is to provide the environment in which student creativity, imagination, aggressiveness, independence, social awareness, and nonconformity might be directed to constructive and productive ends and in which a relationship between the student and the institution, based on the essentials of learning, can be formed. This will require greater clarity of purpose on the part of the institutions and more effective promulgation and articulation of objectives and standards."

Of course, intimately related to the emancipation and stimulation of the student is the necessity to free the professor for the more creative

aspects of teaching. One innovation offering tremendous possibilities for communicating basic information is educational television. Just as commercial television can bring into the homes of millions of Americans the finest in drama, so education television, by spreading the costs among a number of schools, with perhaps some assistance from the government, can enable students at the relatively small, financially weak schools to hear videotaped lectures by the most dynamic, brilliant, and interesting professors in the field. William James defined learning as that which one attends to, and, certainly, attracting attention is an integral part of the teaching process. To tap the tremendous potential of educational television, educators must recognize their dependence on skilled television producers and take counsel from professionals who know the medium and what it can do.

Television provides the opportunity to test new teaching techniques and to eliminate the less successful methods. And, thanks to videotape, programs can be recorded, repeated, saved, snipped, and pasted. Best of all, material which the professor must reiterate year after year is permanently recorded so that his talents can be utilized for the more creative aspects of teaching.

Technologists have also succeeded in producing a four-way division of radio bands, which has the potential of providing continuous educational programs for college and university students. For some time, radio stations have been able to provide stereophonic music by the use of a sub-channel but the series of four sub-channels has not as yet been utilized although it is a very simple, inexpensive, and immediately available technique.

Let me discuss with you now a second problem of magnitude which confronts higher education today. Many of our smaller colleges are struggling to survive. Approximately ten percent lack proper accreditation and many are isolated from the main currents of college and university life and intellectual development in this country. There are many institutions, particularly among the predominantly Negro colleges, that cannot, without substantial assistance, provide a quality level of higher education, and the enrollment crisis makes it imperative that all parts of higher education be strengthened and expanded.

Formal and informal cooperation between institutions of higher education will, I predict, loom as one of the important items of discussion in the next decade. For example, it will be necessary to find ways to strengthen and stabilize the faculties of junior colleges, which are a most significant institutional development of recent years. Approximately one-

fourth of the teachers in junior colleges today have been drawn away from high school teaching. The junior college is fertile ground for utilizing the talents of university graduate students and, in turn, should provide them with valuable teaching experience and a forum for development of ideas.

The developing Institutions Program, Title III, of the Higher Education Act, offers a real opportunity for American higher education to join hands in strengthening its own house. It links small and large institutions through programs of faculty exchange and through technical assistance to the smaller universities. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funds for the establishment of regional laboratories, and it would seem to me that developing institutions under Title III of the Higher Education Act could also benefit immensely from their use. I suggest that these laboratories should serve as institutions of higher education and as neutral meeting grounds for faculty members from the weaker and stronger colleges to assemble and work together.

Let me add here a word about the general role of the Federal Government in these educational endeavors. I feel that its function should be to serve as an educational catalyst. It is an adviser, a financial supporter, an instigator of projects, and a clearing house for ideas on new educational techniques. Historically, American higher education has been able to deal quite confidently with the Federal Government both in terms of serving the special federal interest (for example, space technology) and the national interest, such as the training of college teachers. The basic reason for this, in my judgment, is that the academic community knows that the competence for higher education resides on the campuses and not in Washington. Federal resources must be used to strengthen and improve higher education without impairing either its freedom or its diversity.

Now let us turn our attention to a third concern, which involves a substantial issue in the modern history of higher education. The issue is a collision between ten centuries of traditional sentiment about the university idea and the startling new demands placed upon it by the Western industrial world. The traditional view is that the university can best serve only if it remains substantially disengaged from society. On the other hand, the modern claims of society on the university are manifest in the waves of new students, massive research programs in the present national interest, the pull of knowledge to vexing public problems, and the legions of adult learners pursuing the new necessity of lifelong education. How can an accommodation be reached between the two?

There are obstacles which must be surmounted. There is growing inadequacy of the adolescent-oriented instructional model of the university. Complex "moonlighting" techniques secure the overtime resources of the faculty for a host of functions other than classroom teaching. And when such techniques fail, specific arrangements are made in their place. Hence, the instructional model is plastered with centers, institutes, and interdisciplinary committees. One is reminded of the barnacles on the side of a ship!

A second obstacle refers to the newer techniques by which university resources are marketed to the larger society. The Federal Government has become the chief arbiter and inventor of these techniques because, in many respects, it is the Federal Government which has provided the major support to the universities for the newer and more innovative functions. Most support has been based on the agent-client technique. It is a method which exchanges public resources for the performance of specified services. This technique has vastly improved the research experience of the American university and enlarged enormously the intellectual versatility of the country. The national welfare is much the better for it; and, on balance, so is the university. But its current extensiveness forewarns us now of its chief defect: asking for the return of services almost equal to what it gave in resources initially. Too little remains which adds to the persistent strengthening of the universities.

The major point is that the gulf may increase between the university's intramural traditions and its extramural opportunities, surrounded as they are by administrative organization over which the university has scant control. I can do no less than conclude that without a vigorous reconsideration of what the universities themselves propose for the contemporary issues of life, an accelerating encrustation of flimsy apparatus may become commonplace. I am urging a more vital consideration of the university as a whole in terms of its role as a developing organization in society.

The final subject which I would like to touch on involves experiments in innovation with general education courses. As indicated by the groundswell of ideas emanating from sources external to the campus, there is considerable opportunity for rendering the liberal arts experience more relevant to contemporary political, economic, and social problems. Innovation has the potential for fostering such reorganizations as the four-year A.B.-M.A. program and the six-year A.B.-Ph.D. program.

As Secretary Gardner has aptly stated, "The failure of many human organizations to attain their objectives is attributed primarily to internal

slowdown and rigidification. The antidote to this organizational malaise is developmental growth, and the most expedient method by which its vitality can be perpetrated is change."

There must be a thoroughgoing reform of the undergraduate curriculum. This will necessarily require a reappraisal of the aim of education in each field, the exploration of possible implementation of the new techniques and aids of teaching, a more widespread and ingenious use of independent study, and a continuing effort to do justice to interdisciplinary approaches.

Secretary Gardner has underscored the schism between the source of innovative ideas and the machinery for their implementation. This emphasizes the need, mentioned earlier, to free the faculty from certain repetitive, uninspiring tasks so that it may consider and formulate plans by which innovative ideas may be integrated into the curriculum. In essence, a veritable stagnation has permeated much of the teaching function. Even if an idea is accepted in principle, our college departments often seem unwilling, or are unable, to release their members from conventional teaching duties to apply the new technique. I would like to see our campus faculties and administrations establish patterns and procedures for continuing change as part of comprehensive campus planning.

And, in speaking of change, I am mindful that this Conference aims to send you charging out of every exit motivated to chart the road ahead. We should recognize, however, that consideration of innovation and change in higher education is never finished. Every such conference as this will hopefully establish a new threshold of development; and, in the next instant, the threshold will be different. Any reflection about the future must be joined with an inexhaustible wellspring of perspective, judgment, and humility. The truths we seek to apply will not be completely certain. I hope genuinely and faithfully that you will continue to study and reflect and still not completely know the answer. For you will be grappling with an exciting grist, some of which will be most unsure, some approximately sure, and no part of it absolutely certain.

On the Selection of Honors Teachers or Some Factors in the Achievement of Good Instruction

HAROLD D. HANTZ
Coordinator of Honors
University of Arkansas

"The vital ingredient" of an honors program is superior teaching. The words are not mine but Professor Walter Weir's from an article in an early issue of *The Superior Student*. Professor Weir even suggests that ". . .in programs for the superior student, the greatest problem is that of staffing them."[1]

I am not sure that staffing is the greatest problem, but after working in one program for eleven years and discussing the matter with participants in others, I am convinced it is one of the great problems. In spite of its importance, the literature on honors programs is strangely silent about it. In the 48 issues of *The Superior Student* I think we shall find only one other article devoted solely to the subject, "Honors Teaching," by Dean John Hicks.[2]

By contrast, the articles on the selection and performance of students are legion. We seem much more enchanted with this subject, or is it that we have been much braver in dealing with it? Possibly it could be helpful to inquire why we have been more enthusiastic about assessing the competence or frailty of our students than ourselves, the instructors. However, I leave to psychologists the exploration of that tender question.

[1]The Vital Ingredient: The Superior Teacher," *The Superior Student*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (May, 1958), p. 3.
[2]*The Superior Student*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (April, 1960), pp. 20-23.

I am much more interested in bringing the neglected problem of instructor selection to the fore.

Let me say, then, that the purpose of this paper is simply that—to bring the problem to the fore. The problem is complex; thus I shall attempt to discriminate some of its aspects. Once we see them, perhaps we can begin to attack them. I wish I knew the answers. I can only hope to offer tentative suggestions which might be worth exploring.

How should we begin? Initially, I should like to avoid three alternatives which seem to me fruitless. The first is the search for the Platonic Ideal Honors Instructor, who would serve all possible disciplines equally well. If there is such an ideal, I have never seen the characteristics described or been able to find them myself. Secondly, I do not think the radical pluralist is correct who asserts that the only things the good instructor of art and the good instructor of zoology have in common are the appellations "good" and "instructor." Thirdly, I cannot agree with the view that good teachers are born and not made and that, if we have some good ones, all we can do is thank the gods and pray for more.

I should like to offer an approach more modest than the Platonic Ideal, less despairing than the radical pluralist's, and perhaps more promising than the uncertain gifts of the gods. I should rather suggest five factors or guides which may both steady our selection procedures and assist in clarifying what we mean by good instruction. These guides are tendered as no panacea; they provide no certainty of results. They are offered as hypotheses, if you wish a fancy term, as to certain requirements of good instruction and how these requirements might be met. The first is particularly important and will be examined in some detail. In view of the time consideration, the remaining four will be simply noted.

The first factor is that the ends of an honors program, the purpose of an honors course, the aim of a departmental program should be formulated with sufficient clarity that a director or an honors council or departmental committee or whoever does the selecting can know what an instructor is selected for, and in turn the instructor has a fairly definite notion of what is expected of him. The statement of this factor is such a commonplace that it seems hardly worth mentioning; yet its observance is often more an earnest hope than a living reality. If you examine the aims of a number of programs, I think you might come to the conclusion that they are exceeded in piety and vagueness only by a mystic's vision. Let me use my own institution as an example. Years ago my colleagues and I wrote the following pellucid sentence as the objective of the honors pro-

gram: the program is designed to provide superior students with "opportunities for additional and independent study to broaden and deepen both their knowledge of their own fields and their general education backgrounds."[3] Almost any sort of instruction would seem to serve this aim. I doubt that there is an instructor at our institution or any other, for that matter, who does not consider himself preeminently qualified to satisfy it. Thus, our institution or any other with similar objectives should have no problem of selecting instructors. Well, either we have reached an honors paradise, or something must be wrong if anything an instructor happens to be doing counts for honors teaching. I suspect the latter.

Of course, we could not rest with that mass of vagueness; and over the years it has been molded by the Honors Council, dozens of other instructors, and several hundreds of students into many kinds of ends. You may say that what has happened at Arkansas is characteristic of any complex institution—general objectives have to be vague, like the "liberal education" that every college of arts and sciences professes to offer, and then departments provide the needed clarity and precision. The difficulty with this retort is that the hundreds of courses in some catalogues seem to indicate that anything an instructor wants to do contributes to a liberal education. But is this so?

Thus, have our many ends at Arkansas been honors ends and have we obtained the right instructors for the stated ends? There have been some sterling achievements, some modest successes, and some emphatic failures. Allow me to pursue the matter further with results of a study the Honors Council made, which illustrates the importance of the rule and the difficulty of following it.

We have developed honors sections in twenty-two courses, varying from one section in most to as many as ten in Freshman English. Many of these have continued in robust health, a few have had an uncertain survival. Even the healthy ones have had at times dissatisfied instructors. The council therefore decided to study the sections and over a period of two winters met with instructors from ten courses. The council was interested in obtaining comments from the instructors about such questions as: What are you trying to do? How do you see your honors section differing from the regular? What have been your successes? Your failures? What do you think of the selection of your students? (The dissident instructors, I assure you, did not think much of the techniques.) What suggestions do you have for improvement? and so on.

[3]*Regulations of the Honors Program,* University of Arkansas, I.

One of the obvious results of the inquiry was that a dissatisfied instructor often was not clear on the ends to be pursued. As one instructor put it, "I was not sure of what I was supposed to do." Why wasn't he? We who were responsible for being clear or making the ends clear didn't carry out the obligation. Sometimes instructors formulated their own ends which were unrealistically high. Given superior students, they wanted a really superior course. The difficulty was that the selection procedures were insufficiently related to the ends the instructors conceived. On occasion the instructors assumed a knowledge of the subject matter which the students did not have; for the students had been selected primarily on general scholastic aptitude. The instructor's ends were not the selector's ends. The dissatisfied instructor was, furthermore, often critical of student motivation. Instructor aspirations for the students were often uncommonly high, expecting the motivation of the committed major or graduate student. This aspiration is hardly appropriate for some freshmen who, though scholastically able, still had not found their fields. In contrast with the dissatisfaction, the instructors who were happy with their honors classes were on all these accounts more realistic, surer of what they were trying to do, more sensitive to the qualifications of their students, and conscious of the motivational factor.

Another factor discovered in the determination of ends and the success or failure of instruction was the type of course developed. We found what might be called the "extended honors course" and the "novel honors course." By "extended course" I mean one in which the means and ends of the honors section are fundamentally the same as those of the regular sections. The difference is more quantitative than qualitative. For example, in Western Civilization, the same text and source material will be used except that there will be additional source material, more discussion, more writing, and, hopefully, greater understanding. By "novel course" I mean one in which there is a radical departure both as to means and ends. In Physical Science for nonscience majors, for example, the regular course has the familiar objective of introducing students to some of the basic concepts of the physical sciences by means of a large lecture section, a standard textbook, and laboratory demonstration. For the honors section there is an imaginative conceptual framework based upon theories of the development of the universe. Principles of physics, chemistry, and geology are placed in this framework. The instructor employs a lively Socratic technique for examining the meaning of principles and some of their implications. There are simple but instructive laboratory

experiments. The students do major term papers on topics of their interests.

Without exception, instructors of novel courses found their honors teaching rewarding. Their tenure in the courses was also generally longer. There is no time to examine the reasons for the differences in attitude and tenure; but it is important to note that, for the selection of instructors, this sort of difference in the course desired does affect both attitude and tenure.

The concern for ends disclosed another difficulty. There are two contrasting views of education which profoundly affect the ends pursued and the selection of instructors. One might be called "the encyclopedic view." Under this view the function of a college education is to provide a student with as much information as possible. This aim can be most effectively accomplished by instructors interpreting the literature of the field in extensive coverage. In the sciences, this purpose includes training in laboratory techniques through well-established standard experiments. The emphasis in this view is more upon learning than the search for novelty or creative activity. Thus, the function of an honors section is to provide wider coverage than the regular sections. This view has dominated our extended sections. The objective of a departmental program is to fill in the student's gaps in his field. The colloquia are usually eyed with suspicion.

A contrasting view emphasizes that self-education is more effective than instructor-dominated education, which it judges the prior view to advocate. To be sure, the undergraduate years must open new fields to students and deepen areas with which they are familiar, but emphasis should be less upon coverage (a fiction at best since any coverage is selective) than upon understanding basic principles and their implications. The analysis of ideas by students themselves should be stressed, with the instructor serving more as a Socrates than one who affects the attitude of the expert who knows and tells those who do not. In the sciences there will be less emphasis upon discrete factual materials and more upon the derivation of theoretical constructs. The laboratory will be used as a device to initiate students into the art of discovery rather than the repeated performance of what is already known. The curriculum must not simply tolerate creative talent but provide means for sympathetic encouragement of it. Too much of college education, this theory avers, including honors programs, cultivates pedantry rather than creativity. This view produces the novel honors section, conceives of the departmental program as placing the student ever more on his own, and supports the colloquia as

justifiable ways of promoting a dialogue about ideas and a significant cultivation of the art of conversation. The aim is more the analytic, reflective mind in search of novelty and less upon informational learning.

I do not, of course, contend that these are the only two views of education or that the dichotomy is so stringent that the two cannot be blended, but I do suggest that they are two very prominent views which often operate in antithetical ways. Furthermore, the recognition of these views affects profoundly the selection of instructors. If your program for the entire college or a department or a course emphasizes the encyclopedic approach, then leave your Socratic instructors out; for they will not only not accomplish your purpose but will fret over the demand to do what they consider a waste of time. Alternatively, if your program is creatively bent, don't expect your encyclopedists to carry out your aim. They will consider your desired products at best well-meaning ignoramuses. Wittingly or unwittingly they will subvert your purpose. These two views even affect the old saw that the good instructor must know his subject. It is axiomatic that he should. But what constitutes knowing, and how one should know a subject are diversely conceived as illustrated here; hence, the importance of being clear on what one means by "knowing the subject."

If we recognize the importance and complexity of the problem of clarifying ends, there still remains the question of how we can meet it. Here is where I begin to falter; for a director or honors council may have a heavenly vision of what an honors program should be, but the earthly or earthy instructor may do what he pleases. No matter how wondrous the vision, some instructors do not like to be told, "This is what we want, and this is the way we want it done," when they think that what is wanted is stupid, and the means futile. How, therefore, in the complexity of a college or university program can reasonable agreement on ends and appropriate means be reached?

There is an easy out by saying that a continuing dialogue should be maintained between the controlling power of the program and the instructors in the courses, departmental programs, and colloquia. Obviously the proposal is a bit shabby, for it is easily urged; but how is it done? By a director? No director knows enough. By the honors council? This alternative might be possible if the council members sat in continuous session, deserting their classrooms and laboratories. But what council will do that?

Thus I pose the question and struggle for an answer. I have two

suggestions for an approach, offered very timorously. The first is to institutionalize—a horrible word—the dialogue or communication. I am thinking of a structure into which new teachers will be introduced and in which the old participate, providing a continuing framework for discussions as a customary rather than an occasional function of the program. The advantage of a structure of participation over the occasional *ad hoc* advice by a director or council is that the new teacher need not feel he is being singled out for assistance or the old for criticism. Furthermore, the plaint of the new instructor, "I did not know what I was supposed to do," would be avoided, and the confrontation of the established instructor with novel ideas would help to keep the program from ossifying. In this sort of arrangement, admittedly the director, the honors council, and the instructors cannot escape being burdened; but the burden is that of achieving clarity and maintaining freshness.

Secondly, a continuing system of evaluation should be built into the program. The very discussions referred to are an integral part of evaluation, for evaluation cannot go on unless we have some idea of what we are evaluating. But more is needed—some provision for determining whether the instructors are meeting the ends, a provision which also includes the judgments of students on instruction. The entire problem of evaluation is difficult and obviously beyond the scope of this paper. I am simply recognizing its importance with respect to instructor selection and the quality of instruction.

I have dwelt on the problem of the ends of an honors program at this length, for I believe it is perhaps the more critical of all factors in the selection of instructors and determining what we mean by good instruction. I turn now to a brief listing of four other factors or guides, which deserve careful consideration but must wait upon other occasions for detailed examinations.

The second factor is that the motivation of instructors is of equal importance with the motivation of students. By instructor motivation I mean the recognition of the need for a higher level of performance on the part of instructor and student than obtained in the ordinary curriculum, the desire to meet the need, and a spirit of adventure and imagination to seek new ways of accomplishing this end.

The third factor is the importance of self-criticism in instructors, a characteristic we require of the good honors student. By "self-criticism" I mean a certain attitude toward the advancement of knowledge on our own part, and the cultivation of the quest in the young, an attitude which

conceives of not only the student but also the instructor as engaged in a search for knowledge, halting and perplexed, in the realization that today's truth is tomorrow's error, an attitude which avoids the posture of the expert, self- or otherwise annointed.

The fourth factor is a general academic and administrative climate in which the rewards of promotion and remuneration are as visibly showed on the good honors teacher as his colleague in research. Teaching and research need not be polar enterprises, but sometimes they may be. When they are, there is not much doubt in this age which enterprise receives the greater rewards.

The fifth factor is that we should apprentice the best graduate students to the best honors instructors at every level—honors sections, departmental programs, and colloquia. If we assume that honors instructors are not born but can at least be cultivated, what better time to begin the cultivation and to foster a commitment to honors teaching than in the years of graduate training?

In conclusion, let me say that I would not have less study of the selection of students; I would simply have more of the selection of instructors. I am suggesting that we are too easily satisfied with uttering pieties like, "Good students require good instructors" as if the utterance is a talisman which produces the good instructors. It is this myth I would challenge along with the complacent assumption that it is patent to all what good instruction is. The superior teacher may not be the vital ingredient, as Professor Weir contended, but unquestionably the superior teacher is a vital ingredient. So vital is the ingredient that I have serious doubts that any honors program can rise above the quality and vision of its instructors.

Selectivity or Shamanism?

M. JEAN PHILLIPS
Assistant Director of Honors Program
University of Illinois

It seems to me the honors program at the University of Illinois can be likened to Freud's classical paradigm of personality development. Without spuriously stretching for anthropomorphism, the James Scholar Program, as the honors program is known on our campus, has survived the uncertainties of infancy, where the chief struggle is first to be recognized, then to be accepted, and finally to be acknowledged as a full-fledged autonomous entity with a voice of its own worthy of a seat at the family conference table. It was a small persistent voice during this early period, often negative in tone, fighting the sacred cows of established tradition.

Then followed the latency period characterized by egocentrism, self-assessment, reality testing, and vague rumblings of growing pains. Now, we seem to be entering the adolescent phase, aware of our role in the academic and administrative community of the institution; ready for growth and expansion; welcoming—even searching for—intercourse with others whom we have come to realize (and this is the true mark of maturity) are nearly as capable of conducting the honors program as are we. Note, I say "nearly." We're not quite ready to abandon our *raison d'être.*

Since my topic deals with the selection of honors students, I shall try to apply this developmental analogy to some of the things we have learned in regard to selection processes during the eight years the James Scholar Program has been in operation.

The early stages of the program were necessarily highly oral in nature, dependent as we were (and are) upon high school personnel for nominations of potential James Scholars. Much effort was spent publicizing the program, and to Dick Marsh, who was given the responsi-

bility of high school visitations, goes the credit for the status of the program today throughout the state. From the beginning, efforts have been made to maintain liaison with high school personnel.

Illinois is not the least populous of states, therefore the problem of feedback to the high schools assumes monstrous proportions at times; but we firmly believe the expenditure of time, money, and effort is well spent in terms of the prestige gained and the increasing selectivity of judgment we sense behind the nominations submitted to us by counselors, guidance directors, and principals in the secondary schools. In addition to personal visitations by Dr. Marsh, we notify every high school, early in the fall, of the progress their former students have made at the University of Illinois. In the spring, we send word back to the schools indicating the status of their seniors who have been nominated as James Scholars—whether appointed, deferred, or rejected. As a result of these communications, we find that counselors and administrators have begun to develop models of the type of student most likely to succeed at the University of Illinois.

Gaining acceptance among the secondary schools of the state was but the smaller half of this oral phase, however. High school faculties know their students and are eager for recognition of their best. We simply came along and offered something which was desired in the first place.

Recognition within the university community became the major challenge for this petulant offspring. Every child needs a protective bachelor uncle, a gentle, nurturant maiden aunt, and doting supportive grandparents to assist him through the infancy period. Fortunately, the honors program found such relatives, often in unexpected quarters. Here and there, a few faculty members, deans, and administrators supported the first, tentative wobblings of this vocal infant. Steps were taken gradually—steps called Advanced Placement, Early Admissions, Honors Sections, Honors Courses, Honors Seminars, Honors Advisement, Deans Lists, etc. Gradually, some of the neighbors noticed the sturdy growth and decided if the new feeding schedule was good for the James Scholars, it was good for their children too, and the honors concept expanded.

Now, with less need to stand yelling, "Look at me," it was time to enter the anal stage. Time to retain that which we had and to engulf even more into the province of the program. As the program grew, a strange phenomenon began to develop. Every year selection standards, in terms of high school rank and College Board Scores, were tightened; and each year the number of students dropped because of failure to maintain the

required grade point average increased. For example, in 1959, 137 new freshmen were admitted; of this group, one out of three were dropped at the end of the year. Their mean high school percentile rank was 93.8. In 1963, the new group of freshman James Scholars numbered 300 students; their mean high school percentile rank was an all-time high of 96.2; their mean ACT total scores at the 93 percentile. By the end of their first year on campus, nearly 50 percent had failed to maintain a *B* average. One of every four was the valedictorian or salutatorian of his high school. One of every two had received a letter of commendation or a finalist rating on the National Merit Scholarship Qualification Tests. All had received glowing recommendations from high school counselors, and their records had been reviewed by the Faculty Selection Committee on the campus. From the standpoint of statistical probability, these students couldn't fail—but they did.

Traditional rationalizations were offered by puzzled officials in an attempt to explain the paradox. One by one, Dr. Dora Damrin, then assistant director of the Honors program, by systematic research, cast the rationales aside.

To the explanation that many of the students at Illinois come from small, rural communities and are thus penalized academically, she said, "Not true. The correlation of high school size and grades of James Scholars is zero." (One of our recent Rhodes Scholars was a James Scholar who graduated in a class of 64 students. Several of our university valedictorians and salutatorians were graduates of small, semirural consolidated schools.)

To the rational that instructors of honors courses grade on the curve and thereby fail some of the most able students, she repeated, "Not true," and backed up the statement by proving James Scholars in good standing, as well as those dropped from the honors program for low grades, obtained significantly higher grades in their honors courses than they did in the regular courses taken by the average university student.

In response to the explanation that students who had no accelerated programs in their high schools were unprepared for accelerated work at the college level, she again said, "Not true," and compared records of Scholars who had participated in high school XL courses with the records of Scholars who had no such background. There were no significant differences in the drop-out rates of the two groups.

One of the more militant doctoral candidates I've known insisted the university structure stifled, chewed up, and then spat out the creative,

divergent thinking individual; and set about to prove his position by using the Getzels and Jackson Creativity Measures and the Torrence Motivation Inventory to identify stereopathic and nonstereopathic groups of James Scholars. At no point was he able to show a relationship between scores on these instruments and retention in the honors program. He received his degree and left the university convinced he was right, but the instruments were faulty. (I feel he had a point, but I suspect the type of student he hoped to champion is rarely seen at the college level. They have been chewed up and spat out in the elementary and secondary schools.)

The ultimate rationalization when all else fails is to conclude the student who "washes out" despite phenomenal potential must be maladjusted. To the extent the MMPI, Sears Self-Concept Inventory, the Christensen-Guilford Battery, and the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator measure "maladjustment," we again must reply "Not true." This battery of instruments was administered to every James Scholar who entered the university in 1962. Three years later the results were compared between those who were still in the program and those who had dropped out, voluntarily or because of low academic performance. The personality inventories presented, generally, a picture of emotional stability in the members of both groups.

A few clues were gained from this study, however. For example, the male students in good standing tended to have a more positive self-concept of their mental ability, and scored higher on measures of extroversion than their less successful peers. The female students in good standing felt they had better social relations with their teachers and better work habits than did the students no longer in the program. Their scores on the divergent thinking tests indicated a greater degree of intellectual flexibility and adventuresomeness. On the other hand, the women dropped from the honors program tended to score higher on their self-concept of physical abilities, and they indicate fewer physical complaints than their more academically oriented sisters.

I don't mean to imply by all of this that we don't have our share of individual honors students who make a truth of the rationalization. We do. We do encounter scholars suffering severe emotional disturbance. We do have the nonstereopath who is serving time for burning his draft card or who has left the institution revulsed by the administrative red tape which prevents his getting the education he anticipated. We do have the student ill-prepared for college by an inadequate high school background. We do encounter many brilliant students who are overwhelmed

by the sense of anomie created by the impersonality of the multi-versity; but the fact remains, for us at least, that none of these provide *The Answer* why superior students run into academic difficulty.

By 1964, we had a complex selection process which involved consideration of high school nomination, class rank, test scores, a student's self-rating of study habits and attitudes, autobiographical statements, qualitative analysis of high school courses, extracurricular activities, and the college and curriculum the applicant planned to enter. All of these factors purportedly were studied by the Selection Committee of the University Honors Programs. Whether it was due to the process or whether the quality of the entering freshman class was improving, I don't know; but the attrition rate of James Scholars at the end of the freshman year began to slide from an all-time high of 50 percent in the 1963-64 year to 30 percent last June.

By this time, however, we were entering the adolescent phase of development. Some of us began to question the established order. Dora Damrin, shortly before her death, described the successful James Scholar as a veritable paragon of academic virtue. "He is conscientious, interested, docile, well-adjusted, well-mannered. He studies hard—*regardless* of the assignment and *regardless* of his interest in it. His papers are neat and handed in on time. . . . He has accepted and internalized *our* values and *our* standards—he performs as we wish him to perform—and from us he receives our accolade of merit, the golden *A*."

In short, we realized we were making an extraordinary effort to select the "Little Dons" of David Riesman: freshmen who enter the university ready for graduate school. The university serves primarily to add to his erudition; it rarely changes him and never excites him. At Sarah Lawrence, such students are known as "morning glories." The term is used not so much for its connotation of early fading as for its implication of an early maturation that seems to fade because it never increases. The morning glory is the delight of the freshman teacher, but the despair of later ones who cannot break through the student's rigid scholarly shell.

Last year we took a long hard look at our selection procedures. We were concerned by the statistical favoritism toward the early blooming Little Dons; we were even more concerned over the 30 percent who failed to live up to expectation. One-tenth of these students left the university during their freshman year, the rest tended to maintain respectable averages, but most grade profiles yielded patterns of *A*'s and *E*'s. We didn't know these students. We had no idea what was going on with them. We

began to face up to the fact that while we decried the use of computers for selecting talent on a philosophical level, in practice we were relying on essentially the same means, carried out through human rather than mechanical agents.

We began to realize that an expensive, inefficient shamanism was taking place in a highly rational and bureaucratic fashion. Granted, the complex procedure was considerably better than chance alone, but an analysis of the decisions reached by each member of the selection committee indicated that, in the majority of cases, test scores and class rank were the chief factors. Given higher cutoff points, the 7,094 in the Admissions Office could do in seconds the work which had taken three to five highly paid Ph.D.s an average of one afternoon a week, for 18 weeks, to perform. Who did we think we were kidding? The snow job had been so complete, we had blinded ourselves.

We knew the quality of the entire freshman class had increased steadily during the preceding several years. We knew the high school personnel were becoming increasingly selective in their nominations of students for the program. Two of the "neighbors," the largest colleges on the campus—LAS and Engineering—were wanting to name as James Scholars some of their outstanding students who had slipped by us because we had no way to identify them. Why not open the floodgates a bit? Why not move toward more liberal admission to the program and free ourselves for activities which would reinforce the successful honors student and give us time to identify and (hopefully) support the able student in difficulty?

Briefly, this is the selection policy we developed during the summer and have inaugurated this year:

1. Trust the judgment and personal knowledge of high school guidance personnel to select those students most likely to benefit from the honors program. In the two weeks since the request went out, we have received 450 nominations, approximately half of which have been recommended without reservation, by counselors, as potential honors students. These will be named James Scholars automatically without further review by us. The Selection Committee will still function by reviewing applications from students who were not so identified by their counselors, but the time spent should be cut by half.
2. We will no longer reject any student who applies to the program; but, when in doubt, judgment will be deferred until the student has completed one semester on the campus. Research in the past has shown that

about one-third of the rejected applicants do as well as, or better than, the appointed James Scholars. Previously we found ourselves in the embarrassing position of writing to these students after one semester to apologize for our mistaken judgment and to invite them to enter the program after all since they did better than we shamans expected. It isn't loss of face which brought about this change in policy, but rather concern over the immeasurable damage the initial letter of rejection may have created at a time in life when most students can least tolerate rejection.

3. Trust the judgment of our honors-minded colleagues in the various colleges of the university to identify and appoint as James Scholars their students beyond the freshman year who are worthy of the title. Instead of guarding jealously our "right" to pick these students, we are beginning to perceive our function as being one of coordination, facilitation, and service to James Scholars within the institution as a whole.

4. Finally, we plan to develop means of reinforcing sustained superior performance by the Scholars. We're fuzzy about this at the moment, but one idea under consideration is to select 25 outstanding James Scholars each year for special recognition, in the form of honors books for the students and engraved placques to be presented to their high schools of origin. These Outstanding Scholars would not be selected on the basis of cumulative averages alone, but also by faculty and peer group nomination.

It has taken quite a while to bring this child through the maturation process. The program has grown from 125 Scholars in 1959 to a healthy 2,000 in 1966. We've learned a great deal, primarily in the negative sense, in terms of what doesn't work: but I'd like to think that we are now on the threshold of maturity.

Administration of Honors Programs

VISHNU N. BHATIA
Coordinator of the Honors Program
Washington State University

In considering the administration of honors programs, the first thing that needs to be pointed out is the close relationship between successful administration and the soundness of the program that one has to administer. It is obvious that the most astute administrator would fail if the program that he is running is not soundly conceived. And, conversely, the best program is apt to be unsuccessful in the hands of a poor administrator. Hence, in talking about the administration of an honors program, we need to consider two major aspects of the question. First, we need to define the qualities that a program must have to render it capable of being administered properly. Second, we should examine what it is that the administrator of an honors program should do in order to carry out his tasks and responsibilities with a minimum of trauma.

Let us consider the first question—what qualities should a program have to render it capable of sound administration? The former ICSS had listed 14 or 16 items that it felt should characterize an honors program. I am not talking about these. I intend to list seven criteria purely from the viewpoint of an honors administrator. The order of their listing does not imply any priorities.

The first criterion is that the program must have the support of the university administration. It is important here to define what is meant by support.

1. The support for an honors program on the part of the administration must go beyond platitudes and statements that place the administration on the side of the angels. The administration has to be prepared to back the program with adequate financial support. Various studies and my

own experience have shown that the education of an honors student in a properly conceived honors program costs roughly one-third more than the education of a student in a traditional program. This fact must be taken into account, and adequate budgetary provisions must be made to cover these additional costs. Also, in providing this support it is important that honors be accepted as an important and integral part of the university's academic program, and not something to be catered to after the traditional jobs of education are taken care of. For, if an honors program is to succeed, it must be considered a necessary and needed part of the university's total academic efforts and not treated as a "frill."

2. The administration should be prepared to support the program, not only in terms of money for the teaching of honors courses, but also with money for space and facilities (and here I include such things as the establishment of an Honors Center, an Honors Reading Room, and all the various physical facilities that go with an honors program).

3. The administrator of the honors program, of a successful program, has to be provided by the administration with a clearly defined and adequate budget, pretty much the same way that a dean or a department chairman has a clearly defined budget with which to operate his academic area.

In short, the administration must be prepared to recognize and bear the cost of having an honors program and also be prepared to do this with clearly defined fiscal procedures which would free the administrator from devoting a great deal of his time in trying to get support here and there as the program goes along.

The second thing that the honors program needs is to have the support of the faculty. I assume here that if a university establishes an honors program it is already determined that the faculty supports the idea of honors and accepts the value of having an honors program. What I am talking about here is in relation to the continuing support that is necessary for the successful administration of the program—the kind of support that makes the faculty feel that their expenditure of time in honors teaching will be recognized. The best way to do this is through a properly conceived arrangement for adequately compensating the department of a faculty member for any time he devotes to the work concerned with the honors program. The honors programs that are having the most difficulty in the country today are the ones which rely entirely on the good will of the faculty to staff the honors courses without adequate compensation being provided to the departments from which the faculty members are drawn.

In other words, there should be adequate provision made and adequate policies developed which would clearly recognize that the teaching of honors courses, the conducting of honors seminars, and the conducting of honors examinations take time and effort on the part of the faculty, and reduce the amount of participation of a faculty member in his own departmental program. As an example, on our campus we have a definite policy with respect to this type of compensation to the departments. Whenever a faculty member is asked to teach a section of an honors course, his department receives in lieu of this man's efforts an additional one-fourth of a faculty position. Unless this or a similar provision is made, even the most enthusiastic faculty can be expected to support the honors program only so long. For, once the faculty and departmental administrators have become aware of the fact that the honors program is being run at their expense or, one might say, is coming out of their hide, without any sort of compensation or recognition for their work, the program is bound to fail.

The third criterion is that the honors program should be organized in such a way as to provide fair treatment of honors students. Too often in the conception of an honors program one finds that all kinds of special work is added on to the curricular requirements of honors students with the idea that if they are really dedicated students they will take on the extra work. However, as in the case of the faculty, you can run an honors program for just so long on the good will of the students. Let me suggest two general rules.

1. Honors requirements, when they are imposed, must be in lieu of some other requirements that can and should be waived.

2. Academic credit should be awarded for all honors work. Unfortunately in too many honors programs, additional honors requirements are imposed on the students for which they are not given any academic credit. When this is done, sooner or later even the best student is going to start neglecting noncredit work, regardless of how interesting or rewarding it may be, and he will tend to work where he can see his rewards clearly in terms of the credit hours on his transcript.

The fourth criterion to remember is that the program should be conceived in such a way as to give it a reasonable amount of structure, but within this structure enough flexibility should be permitted so that the administrator of the honors program is free, within certain broad limits, to tailor the program to the needs and objectives of individual students. One thing that cannot be done in an honors program is to reduce the students in

it to automated numbered creatures following in lockstep. I think an honors program that does not have any structure will fail because of the confusion that it creates in the minds of the students. At the same time, an honors program which does not have any flexibility within the framework of a structure is going to be so rigid that some of the best students are not going to be satisfied with it. There are examples of both types available. One of the major universities that I know of has an almost completely unstructured program where the honors students are not even expected or required to attend classes. The net effect is that some of the most promising honors freshmen drop out, not only from the honors program, but out of the school because they are confused by the complete lack of direction. My own honors program in its first few years exemplified the other side of the picture because the rules and the regulations laid down in the catalogue for honors students were so rigidly enforced that we lost a large percentage of our best students from the program.

Fifth, there should be adequate provisions made in the organization of an honors program to provide for a mechanism for evaluation of the program and for its reasonable evolution and change with a minimum of red tape. Failure to do so can only result in stagnation and also results in a rigidity which would rapidly tend to make the program sterile and out of date.

Sixth, the role of the administrator of the honors program should be clearly defined. His authority and the limits of his authority need to be clearly understood, not only by the administrator himself, but by all his colleagues on the campus. One of the facts that has to be faced is that the establishment of an honors program sets up an administrative structure on the campus which often overlaps and runs across the normal departmental boundaries, and therefore the failure to clearly define the role and duties of an honors director is bound to lead to difficulties and misunderstandings for him, and these would eventually hurt the program and the students in the program.

Finally, the seventh criterion that must be kept in mind is that the program should meet the needs of the particular campus on which it operates. It should be geared to the level of the superior student on that campus, and its academic and curricular requirements must be in tune with the existing strengths of the university for which it is designed. The easiest way to make sure than an honors program will not work is for one university to copy the program of another without considering the relative qualities of the two groups of students and faculty.

So far, I have talked about the first of the two major aspects of the administration of an honors program, namely, the characteristics that render a program capable of being properly administered. Let us at least briefly consider the second aspect, the one dealing with the qualities that should be expected in the administrator of an honors program. It goes without saying that anybody who takes on the job of running an honors program must definitely believe in the value of honors programs and must believe in the honors program that he is operating. But there are, in addition to this, certain other things that need to be present if the person is going to be able to do a successful job.

First, at the risk of stating the obvious, let me say that it is essential that anybody selected to administer an honors program be a person who has the respect of his colleagues. This is, of course, necessary for any job but it is particularly important in an honors administrator because when he starts dealing with honors students and advising them, he is in a sense interfering in an area that was previously the exclusive domain of the student's major department. Therefore, unless the administrator is a person who is respected and whose judgment is trusted by his colleagues, serious frictions are apt to arise.

Second, an honors administrator must be a person who has some breadth of knowledge which extends above and beyond his field of specialization. This is important because honors programs by their very nature are interdisciplinary and consequently require that the administrator have a fairly broad understanding of the total academic scene. This is not such a tall order as it seems, because I am not suggesting that we need to find some sort of an omniscient being who will be a specialist in all fields. What is needed is that the man have sufficient breadth of knowledge to be reasonably free of the usual academic prejudices; or, in other words, the man should know his own limitations in areas in which he is not competent and be prepared to accept the opinions of experts in the various subject matter fields without feeling compelled to accept their parochialism.

Third, the honors administrator must be a person who is capable of holding the line, both in his dealings with those who would impose unreasonably stringent requirements on honors students, as well as those who would be so lax so as to make a mockery of the program.

I would like to conclude by quoting a very fine statement made in a talk entitled "Honors and the Administrator" by Dean Cecil G. Taylor of the College of Arts and Sciences at Louisiana State University. Dean Taylor stated, "Perhaps the finest role that the administrator can fill

with respect to honors is that of a principal agent in breaking the academic lockstep and in establishing the freedom and flexibility necessary for optimum instruction of the talented. An alert administrator will acquaint himself with the experiences of other institutions in developing Honors Programs, but he will do this with the full knowledge that there are no pat formulas that suit the particular nature and the purposes of every institution and that a pattern for one institution is not transplantable *in toto* to another. And finally, the alert administrator will see that an Honors Program gets to be identified as a project of the faculty and not of the administration, or even better still, as a project of the faculty supported by the administration."

Motivating Honors Students in Colloquia

WALTER D. WEIR
Director of Honors
University of Colorado

After a summer spent in the creative Apollonian-Dionysian waters of the Mediterranean, I returned to the tensions of Boulder and the affairs of the NCHC. I learned I was scheduled to speak at this meeting on the topic of motivating honors students. As I began to ruminate and reflect upon this assignment, I saw that the question of motivation involved the question of ends and purposes, and that ends and purposes were a part of the larger context, the society in which we live. We sometimes forget in our colleges and universities that our students come to us with motivations, ends, and purposes; and that, as the famous Jacob study revealed, they tend to leave us with these same motivations, ends, and purposes. We forget, too, that our higher institutions of learning are themselves a part of a larger culture. I, therefore, wish in this brief presentation to view the question of motivating honors students in the larger context of our society and its goals. It is here, I believe, we must look to find the source of the increasing dissatisfaction of our students, and especially of our more sensitive honors students, with their college education.

Our honors students come to us highly motivated to succeed, to climb the ladder of affluence and success. They tend to have more intellectual curiosity than most students, to be quicker and more industrious; but their most fundamental trait is their ability to get good grades. Indeed, we tend to select honors students for our programs on the basis of success in playing the academic game in high school. Though some of our honors student are able to attend our colleges only because they have received financial assistance in the form of scholarships, most of our honors students come from middle and upper-economic families. All have tended

to accept, consciously or unconsciously, the values of what Albee has called the "American Dream." In this dream, money talks, success is all, and appearance is fundamental. It is my contention that more and more of our students are beginning to question the values of this American Dream and that this questioning is related to the very high drop-out rate of honors students from honors programs and even from colleges. Many are opting out of college and society and trusting no one over thirty.

It is almost a truism, a tautology, that education is preparation for life; and I submit, however inadequate in detail, that our present education does prepare us for life and values embodied in Albee's "American Dream." Our college graduates make more money, own more cars (ironically called Mustangs, Cougars, and the like), fly more frequently, dress better, and wear more imposing titles than high school graduates. Posters, in buses, trains, stations, etc., all over the country have sought to motivate our young ones to continue their education by pointing to these facts. But more and more frequently our college graduates, having realized these promises, are haunted by the refrain, "That isn't what I meant at all, that isn't what I meant at all." And this refrain is now being heard by our Holden Caulfields in high school and college. They are becoming increasingly conscious of a crisis of values and of their self-identity.

These sensitive, bright, honors students who live in an age of unparalleled affluence, in an age of Albee's American Dream, see J. Alfred Prufrocks strutting across ever-expanding wastelands, and Marthas laughing at the oh-so-silly question, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" and they are scared. They want to peel labels, get to the marrow of the bone, and discover again the distinction between truth and illusion. They recognize that too often modern man is motivated by illusion and, as a result, suffers the despair allotted to those alienated from truth and reality. They scoff at women who come and go speaking of Michelangelo and at men in grey flannel suits who fly to Kansas City to talk and talk so that they too can rationalize their participation in the expense-account deformed society. With Elijah's fiery wrath they cast us into the Sheol of nothingness and await the fruits of another Mary's womb. Until such time as we recognize the emptiness and futility of our current motivations, neither mermaids nor our really promising students will sing or listen to our blasphemous or irrelevant voices.

Our best, and potentially most creative, students are appalled at the irrelevancy of so much college work to the crisis of modern man. They have read E. M. Forster, A. Malroux, E. Hemingway, A. Camus, H.

Hesse, N. Kazantzahis, J. Kerouac, N. Mailer, etc. They have looked at their own lives and the lives of their parents. Growing up absurd, they sense the frenetic drive to self-destruction evident in so much of modern living, and they cry out in the darkness for new hope, for a new J.F.K., a new Messiah. They seek vision, and they are given a list of irrelevant facts to memorize. They seek the health of new values, and they are made sick unto death with reams of unrelated bits of knowledge. Where in the university, they ask, are there attempts being made to solve the crisis of our time? Who is concerned with ultimate concerns, with ends and concerns which are really fulfilling, conducive to an ever-expanding touch, taste, and tang of existence? They cry for dialogue and receive a monologue. Seldom do they find what they are seeking in our colleges, and so they either opt out, or they go through the motions of the system, frustrated and sometimes bitter.

Some give up and join the establishment. Others, recognizing that only those who abandon hope are doomed to live in hell, and only those who are neither hot nor cold are spewed out of the mouth of the Savior, turn to Vista, the Peace Corps, the Civil Rights Movement, LSD, the Free University, in their desperate attempt to find meaning, to ground care in being, to fulfill themselves in a meaningful universe. Since most of our honors students still care, still hope, the gates of heaven are still open. Those of us working in honors may be better Pauls than Peters, but we may still be able to open the gate. Honors colloquia can motivate our students by focusing on the concerns of modern man, by exploring the ramifications and possible answers to the questions of our time, and by reaching out not only to the minds of our students but also to their hearts, guts, and loins as well.

It is long since time that we recognize that our honors students, like all men, are persons with feelings as well as minds, and that they ought to be treated as persons. Albee's American Dream has had its heart, guts, and loins destroyed; and so it can no longer feel anything. Our students quite rightfully reject a society of castrated and, therefore, impotent bodies climbing ladders of power to towers of success. We need to educate the whole man, and for that we need dialogue between persons.

Honors colloquia can provide the context for dialogue, for the giving and taking between professors and students, students and students, and between both and a subject matter. Professors and students can become involved and engaged in the search for significant meaning. Only those who become engaged can taste the fruits of marriage and overcome

the alienation of subject and object. We desperately need such marriages—for to know, as the Bible suggests, is to have intercourse with the others. But intercourse requires a reaching out, a care and interest in the other. Without this care and interest we cannot have intercourse, cannot know, and cannot be. This is a recognition that persons become unique and interesting by virtue of a history of being interested.

The world does not give us the gift of grace, of life, of identity, until we actively reach out to it. Thus, the professor and the student must be searchers and researchers; they must pose the productive questions rather than listen to the overwhelming sermons. Professors and students must approach each other and the subject of their search with honesty, heart, humaneness, humor, and humility, as well as with their minds. Information and facts must be seen in context, in relation to a problem or theory, and in relation to our cares and concerns. In so doing, we may develop the capacity to see and feel and discriminate between the important and the trivial, truth and illusion.

An increasing number of our honors students are demanding more from our society and our universities. They are motivated by a search for vision, for a wisdom relevant to the human condition, for a meaning that they can live and die for. They are seeking a new union of Apollo and Dionysius, a union of reason and passion. They can and will be motivated by honors colloquia which recognize these concerns.

Motivating Students in Honors Courses

JAMES KARGE OLSEN
Dean, Honors College
Kent State University

These remarks will concern themselves with the experience of the Kent State University Honors Program/College, 1960-1966, as that has been the only "honors laboratory" available for study by the author. Despite the parochial character of the comments it is hoped that general inferences of value to many will be possible.

THE HONORS FRESHMAN

In planning for an honors program, Kent State University assumed certain characteristics as descriptive of the "honors freshman" and definitive of an honors program.

It was presumed that the intrinsic, and not the extrinsic, satisfactions to the individual student are the hallmarks of an effective honors program. An honors program is not primarily for a university's administration and faculty.

Indeed, it seemed reasonable to conclude that our experience with superior students would be exaggerated and intensified by an honors program; that experience had shown that many superior students, not having enjoyed precollege challenge, suffer from a "prima donna" arrogance. Others are over reticent, sensitive, and wary of their peers. Either group is easily "bruised." The capacities and interests of the superior high school graduate, or college lowerclassman, have not been thoroughly discovered, crystallized, or stimulated by the relatively limited experience of his schooling, family, and community. He needs exposure to and the discipline of enriched, intensive, and integrated study characteristic of honors work in several areas of general education in order to recognize

and ascertain where his special abilities and goals are. Moreover, it is no less essential than trite to observe that scholarliness and proficiency are not marked by excellence and appreciation in only one area of study.

Despite these apparent limitations, there was little question but what the honors freshman was literate, that he could read, that he could write, that he had the capacity for independent thought, that he could understand and perceive. Whatever the lack of sophistication, reading one thousand dull pages, rather than five hundred dull pages, would not constitute honors. Writing two pedestrian themes instead of one would equally fall short of honors objectives. Listening to lectures by ever so erudite professionals—the method of instruction formulated in the medieval ages when libraries and books were not available and so lectures were necessary to communicate learned materials—would not suffice.

The superior students need to find themselves and develop the ability to express themselves orally and in writing with circumspection and discernment. For honors instruction, a most talented and understanding instructor is prescribed, and one who will require reading, writing, discussion, research, problem-solving, and experimentation.

BASES FOR THE FOUNDATION OF THE KENT STATE UNIVERSITY HONORS PROGRAM

With the preceding analyses and conclusions in mind, certain underlying principles served as the bases for the foundation of the Kent State University Honors Program[1]:

1. It is best to start with the freshman year and extend the program as a continuing experience throughout four years[2];

2. Only a university-wide program can serve students of varying educational and vocational objectives[3];

[1]Olsen, James Karge, "The Honors Program at Kent State University," *Educational Research Bulletin,* Vol. XL, No. 9 (December 13, 1961), pp. 224-231.

[2]Hatch, Winslow R., and Bennet, "Independent Study," *New Dimensions in Higher Education,* No. 1 (1960), p. 5.

Editors, "Beginning of the Freshman Year," *The Superior Student,* Vol. 2, No. 8 (December, 1959) p. 2.

Editors, "An All Ohio Conference on Honors," *The Superior Student, op. cit.,* pp. 27-28.

[3]Editors, "General Honors—Depth in Breadth," *The Superior Student,* Vol. 3, No. 2 (March, 1960), p. 1.

Kent State University is composed of four degree-granting undergraduate colleges, namely, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Education and Fine and Professional Arts which collectively offer a total of nearly sixty baccalaureate degree programs.

3. With the exception of courses concerned primarily with the mechanics of a discipline, e.g., languages and mathematics, the greater emphasis should be on enrichment rather than acceleration, quality rather than quantity[4];

4. Independent study is only a single feature of an honors program and must be supplemented by devices that serve and stress the learning requirements of interdependent study and dialogue.[5]

These assumptions and principles, coupled with the realities of a faculty and student body at a large, comprehensive state university devoted to many and varied educational and vocational objectives with structured curricula, while not eschewing colloquia and independent study, seemed to indicate a primary focus upon honors sections or courses with particular emphasis upon the selection of faculty concerned.

SCOPE OF OPERATION

Departmental Participation in Honors

	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66
Number of H. Sections	49	63	77	67	84	129
Number of Depts. Offering H. Sections	13	18	20	18	20	22

During 1965-66, twenty-two academic departments, schools, or disciplines, namely: Art, Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Economics, Secondary Education, English, French, German, History, Honors, Health and Physical Education, Journalism, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Russian, Sociology, Spanish, and Speech, offered 129 ability sections of 78 different courses in order to produce an effective and appropriate honors program and motivate the students concerned. Seventy-one members of the faculty were instructors of these sections.

These data represent an increase of four departments, 62 sections, 32 courses, and 32 faculty members over comparable figures for 1963-64, the

[4]Editors, "Acceleration Is Not Enough," *The Superior Student*, Vol. 3, No. 7 (November, 1960), p. 2.

[5]Editors, "On Independent Study," *The Superior Student*, Vol. 3, No. 8 (December, 1960), p. 1.

first year during which the Kent State University Honors Program was in effect as a four-year program.[6]

There was a grand total of 1,734 enrollments in honors sections, an increase of 638 over 1963-64. The average class size of Honors College sections was 18.4 students compared with a comparable figure of 15.9 for 1963-64. Honors College students, on the average, enrolled in 5.4 sections during this past academic year, whereas the comparable figure for two years ago was 4.6.

These data are cited only to show that this significant increase in the level of the operation of the Honors College with its primary emphasis on honors sections reflects satisfaction of the students and faculty concerned. Indeed, the most frequent complaint expressed by Honors College students, in the annual evaluation questionnaires which we employ, has been that there are an inadequate number and variety of honors sections offered. The increase in the Kent State University Honors College operations, as measured quantitatively by these statistics, would suggest that the Honors College students' petitions for more courses was warranted.

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION

Periodically, throughout the six years of the Kent State University Honors Program, the students have been asked to assess the worth and the effectiveness of honors courses as well as other features of the College. It has been felt that to determine student motivation and satisfaction one ought to inquire of one's clients.

These questionnaires have listed brief statements theoretically descriptive of honors courses and asked the honors students to indicate which statements describe the ideal honors course and which describe the honors courses within their experiences.

The last three listed statements are intended as negative descriptions whereas the first twelve are intended as positive descriptions. It is most interesting to note that, whereas 73 percent of the students use the thirteenth statement, "Honors sections require more work," to describe the Kent honors courses, only 11 percent characterized this additional work as being "excessive" by designating the fifteenth statement, "Honors sections require excessive work," as descriptive of the Kent honors courses.

[6]The Kent State University Honors Program was launched in September, 1960, at the freshman level with succeeding class levels added annually.

Statements	Students' evaluation of ideal honors courses (percent)	Students' reactions to Kent honors courses (percent)	Ratings	
			Rankings by differences between actual and ideal percentages	Rankings by differences between actual and ideal ranking orders
1. Honors instructors have been stimulating, enthusiastic, and effective.	93.5	71.0	11 (-22.5)	11 (-4)
2. Honors sections have stimulated me to creative and original thinking.	92.0	59.0	13 (-33.0)	14 (-2)
3. Honors sections have been less formal than regular sections.	91.5	89.5	2 (- 2.0)	4 (+1.5)
4. Honors permit more class discussion than regular sections.	91.5	95.0	1 (+3.5)	2 (+2.5)
5. Grading in honors classes has been fair.	89.0	82.5	5 (- 6.5)	10 (-2)
6. Honors sections broadened my knowledge and increased my appreciation of the inter-relationship of several areas of study.	88.5	67.0	10 (-21.5)	7/8/9 (-1)
7. Honors sections stimulated me to read or do research on my own.	86.0	51.0	14 (-35.0)	12/13 (-5)
8. Honors sections increased and broadened my understanding of my particular field of concentration.	84.5	29.5	15 (-55.0)	12/13 (-5)
9. Contact with other honors students has been challenging and satisfying.	82.5	54.0	12 (-28.5)	7/8/9 (-1)
10. Honors sections require more independent study.	73.0	63.5	6 (- 9.5)	3 (+2)
11. Honors sections require a different type of study than regular sections.	71.5	67.5	3 (- 4.0)	1 (+5)
12. Honors sections were scheduled in appropriate classrooms.	68.0	53.5	8 (-14.5)	5/6 (+1)
13. Honors sections require more work.	56.5	73.0	9 (-16.5)	15 (-9)
14. Honors sections require less work.	3.0	7.5	4 (- 4.5)	5/6 (+1)
15. Honors sections require excessive work.	0.0	11.0	7 (-11.0)	7/8/9 (-1)

Apparently Kent's record, on the basis of these statements and evaluations, is the most deficient with respect to the eighth statement, "Honors sections increased and broadened my understanding of my particular field of concentration." This is easily explained. The vast majority of honors courses are taken during the freshman and sophomore years when the students are devoting most of their attention to general education and before they have begun concentrated study in their major fields.

These statements were not listed in the order indicated on the questionnaires. The listing reflects the ranking by the students employing the statements to describe an ideal honors program. Listing the statements that were indicated by 85 percent or more of the students to describe an ideal honors course, we may conclude that the following seven statements would describe that honors course which would most satisfy and motivate honors students.

1. Honors instructors have been stimulating, enthusiastic, and effective.
2. Honors sections have stimulated me to creative and original thinking.
3. Honors sections have been less formal than regular sessions.
4. Honors permit more class discussion than regular sections.
5. Grading in honors classes has been fair.
6. Honors sections broadened my knowledge and increased my appreciation of the interrelationship of several areas of study.
7. Honors sections stimulated me to read or do research on my own.

On the other hand, the seven statements most frequently marked by Kent honors students as describing the Kent honors courses in the order of the frequency of students' designation are:

1. Honors permit more class discussion than regular sections.
2. Honors sections have been less formal than regular sections.
3. Grading in honors classes has been fair.
4. Honors sections require more work.
5. Honors instructors have been stimulating, enthusiastic, and effective.
6. Honors sections require a different type of study than regular sections.
7. Honors sections broadened my knowledge and increased my appreciation of the interrelationship of several areas of study.

Only two of the statements descriptive of the ideal honors course failed to make the list descriptive of the Kent honors courses. They are:

1. Honors sections stimulated me to creative and original thinking.
2. Honors sections stimulated me to read or do research on my own.

In the description of the Kent honors courses the two statements immediately above are replaced by the following two:

1. Honors sections require more work.
2. Honors sections require a different type of study than regular sections.

By the first rating scale, Kent's most serious deficiencies, other than statement number eight, already explained, are the two statements from the ideal list which are not found, unfortunately, on the list descriptive of Kent courses. By the second rating scale, Kent's two most serious deficiencies are failure of the Kent courses to be described by the following two statements:

1. Honors sections (do not) require more work.
2. Honors sections stimulated me to creative and original thinking.

By the first rating scale, the two strongest features of the Kent honors courses are:

1. Honors permit more class discussion than regular sections.
2. Honors sections have been less formal than regular sections.

Both of these statements were tied for third and fourth in the students' indications of an ideal honors course.

By the second rating scale, Kent's honors courses are marked most strongly by the following two statements:

1. Honors sections require a different type of study than regular sections.
2. Honors permit more class discussion than regular sections.

It is apparent from the list of ideal features as indicated by the honors student that the instructor of the course and the methods and techniques by which he instructs the course are the critical factors in assessing an honors course that satisfies and motivates an honors student. The typical pattern of formal lectures, unexciting texts, and routine objective tests will not motivate an honors student.

The conclusions obvious from these evaluation studies would certainly seem to confirm the assumptions and principles upon which the Kent State University program of honors courses was launched.

QUALITIES OF AN HONORS INSTRUCTOR

If honors students are to be motivated and be satisfied in honors courses, very careful attention must be given to the instructors and the methods of instruction employed. The results of our studies have been reported to the Kent State University faculty. Last year, in response to the request of several members of the faculty and department chairmen, the University Honors Council drafted and adopted unanimously a statement which is quoted in full below. It was later promulgated by the Vice President and Dean of Faculties. It is designed only to be informative and helpful.

The full statement is as follows:

QUALITIES OF AN HONORS INSTRUCTOR

1. An awareness of the specific aims of the Honors College and a sympathy with the honors concept of education which include:

   a. Providing a special and different learning experience designed to meet the needs of the superior student with individualized, challenging and enriched study developing the individual student's initiative and capacity for scholarly effort as a continuing experience throughout the student's four undergraduate years.
   b. Employment of reading, writing, discussion, research, problem-solving and experimentation as instructional methods rather than principal reliance upon the lecture method of instruction and utilization of objective-type examinations.
   c. A greater emphasis on enrichment rather than on acceleration, quality rather than quantity.
   d. Independent study supplemented by interdependent study and dialogue.
   e. Service to students of varying educational and vocational objectives.
   f. Determination of grades on an absolute and not a competitive basis so that the honors student may expect the same grade in an honors section as he would receive in a regular section.

2. Professional experience, manifested not necessarily by the possession of a doctoral degree, but understood to be something beyond what a graduate assistant would be expected to possess.

3. A serious interest in the undergraduate program and in teaching for the sake of teaching — such serious interest not to preclude an interest in graduate education and in research and publication but to preclude an exclusive concern with this second group of pursuits. (The difficulty of assessing such "serious" interest is granted; the intention of this criterion, however, is plain: to emphasize the particular character of and competence for undergraduate honors instruction as distinguished from equally meritorious but distinctive competences for other types and levels of instruction and academic efforts.)

(While a colleague on the faculty who was—I mean, is—a close friend described part of the statement as "limp," he also asserted that nothing better could be formulated.)

It is our conviction that this statement has some considerable value as a set of general guidelines to inform and assist department chairmen and faculty in the furtherance of satisfying the needs and objectives of honors courses.

CONCLUSION

In these remarks, there have been no neat and pat formulae to motivate honors students in honors courses. One could cite specific instances such as the History of Civilization professor's drafting an art historian, a dramatist, and a musicologist to discuss those aspects of communities pertinent to their specialties. Each such specific instance, however, is the product of the individual faculty member and the particular course involved.

What is necessary is to recognize that the students are not completely self-generative and that the primary consideration is the instructor and his methods. He, the instructor, must be one oriented to honors and equipped to depart from the traditional methods of instruction. Above all, he must be devoted to undergraduate education and willing to experiment with techniques and devices out of the normal pattern of instruction so as to demand and develop individual student initiative and scholarly effort.

Student Panel Discussion

National Collegiate Honors Council Founding Meeting
University of Kansas, October 23, 1966

Dean Aldon D. Bell: We have four students tonight from our four different institutions: Edward Bolton of the University of Missouri, who is a double major in mathematics and philosophy; Gary Gregg from the University of Kansas, who is a double major in history and political science; Carl Cowen from Indiana University, who is a major in mathematics; and Charles Cardwell from Kansas State University, who is a major in philosophy and physics.

QUESTION: What is the place in a university of an honors program?

Bolton: At the University of Missouri we have a program called the Honors College, which attempts very much to maintain a separate identity from the parent College of Arts and Sciences. When I came to the University, I found I had been classified as a member of the Honors College and was placed primarily in honors courses. I was put in an atmosphere that tended to direct itself toward other members of the Honors College. I think this has been very useful to me, because it has allowed me to get an education remarkably better than the general education at the University of Missouri. I have been given the opportunity to associate primarily with higher caliber people, to have better instruction, and to get special teaching by being withdrawn in part from the general College of Arts and Sciences.

Gregg: I think it is very difficult to speak about the honors program at the University of Kansas simply because one is rarely conscious that one is in an honors program here. The only formalized structure we have is on a freshman-sophomore level. Freshmen are chosen for the program on the basis of various tests and measurements. After the first semester, anyone who is on the Dean's Honor Roll can enter honors program courses, except for mathematics. I think this has been the experience of a great number of people here at KU.

On the junior-senior level, I feel the honors program, although not designated as such, has been influential in shaping my attitudes and desires. We have what is called the Senior Independent Study Program. Any person who enters this program takes up to 16 hours of directed reading in fields of his choice under the supervision of a professor of his choice. There also are other honors arrangements, such as the summer language institutes, although they are not designated as honors.

At KU, I think the basic philosophy of the honors program has been not only to provide the superior student with an opportunity to advance himself, but also to influence the entire University rather than to set the honors students apart.

Cowen: The program at Indiana is entirely a departmental program. Students enter each departmental program on merit in that department. There are four interdepartmental honors courses which are attended by perhaps 20 students a semester. Anybody who is good in English or chemistry as a freshman can take Honors English or Chemistry for freshmen. If a student doesn't get into a departmental honors program early, he can get into it late. Students qualified in departments other than their own are perfectly welcome there.

Cardwell: I think we are talking about a philosophical question—whether honors programs should be separate or not. At Kansas State I think we have achieved a good compromise. Departmental honors programs—faster sections—are open to anyone in the university. Members of the honors program may take interdisciplinary courses—sophomores are encouraged to take more than one. There are one-hour seminars, different each semester, and students are encouraged to take seminars in fields other than their own to encourage diversification of intellectual interest.

In the sophomore-junior year there is an interdisciplinary colloquium with four professors—one from the humanities, one from the social sciences, etc.

Seminars do individual work in their fields, which results in a paper. I like the philosophy behind allowing people not actually in the honors program to take honors courses. I think there is danger in restricting honors courses to a certain group and in isolating a little group.

Bell: Is an academic community, the specific community as a community, benefited by an honors program?

Bolton: I think the university's program has had a significant effect on the university as an organization, although I don't think it was the in-

tention of the people who created the honors program to do this. First, we are set apart and identified as members of the Honors College by other students. This causes a certain amount of prejudice to develop. Common complaints are that the Honors College takes away the good students and the good teachers from the rest of the students, and that we get to go to special programs. All of these things are true. It has the effect that students close to being qualified to get into the Honors College have a great deal of pressure to improve their grades. It makes competition rougher, and it allows an important part of the student body to have a kind of group identification.

Gregg: I disagree with the basic premise that honors programs should stimulate people to improve their GPA.

I think this puts too much emphasis on grade point, which may or may not be relevant to ability. I think one of the primary purposes of an honors program should be to make the pursuit of scholarship as pleasurable for the student as possible, and I think an honors program which really has some significance will do this, simply by presenting material which challenges the student's thoughts, beliefs, prejudices. This is the essence of an honors program, not the idea that a student should have to compete either to remain in such a program or to be allowed to enter it. In the University of Kansas honors program a student is never cashiered on the basis of his grade point average.

The way an honors program affects the university I think is vital. I look at the university as a service institution, not only to superior students but to every student. I think it is important for departments to look at their honors programs to see if the techniques and materials used in honors courses can be applied to regular courses with beneficial effects. But to make the honors program simply a goal for which the students should strive is reinforcing tendencies all too prevalent today.

Bolton: At the University of Missouri, we cashier a lot of people from the honors program, and I think this is a good idea. (Gregg) says we reinforce all too prevalent tendencies. We are reinforcing competition, but I am not so inclined to think this is necessarily bad, and I don't think the only reason people learn is that they are motivated by a kind of love of learning. I think this is naive, and it seems to me that introducing competition into scholarship is a good thing basically.

Cardwell: You said earlier you felt the honors program ought to help you; help you at the expense of other students. How do you think you would like it if you were on the outside, and you felt a selected group

of students was getting all the good professors and all the good everything?

Bolton: I wouldn't like it, but I still think it is a good idea. There are simply not enough crack teachers to teach everyone; they have to be given to somebody. And I think it makes better sense to serve economic ends. I think I can profit better from good teachers.

Cowen: That is true, but there is no reason to divide up your society so much. I think you can do it inconspicuously. After all, we are out for knowledge, not to divide up and show ourselves better than anybody else. You can present the honors program so students get the knowledge without seeming to brag about it.

Bolton: Yes, you could do that, but I think you would defeat some of the other real values of the program at the University of Missouri. You wouldn't get the administrative body to help you around corners. And I think if you start worrying about hiding the Honors College, you inevitably create the general feeling that you do not have a really knit group.

Gregg: I question whether there would be, under such a highly rigid structure, a real community of scholars; or whether it would be a real community of competitors for a higher grade.

I think a program without this rigid structure—where any qualified student can go to a foreign language institute, for example—is obviously an honors program without the honors designation.

I don't think cohesiveness or group interaction actually takes place in any kind of an honors arrangement which doesn't have some connection beyond the classroom, and I think this cohesiveness can be as effective in a program not designated "honors" as in a rigid structure.

Bolton: We have some people in the Honors College, perhaps, who are barely hanging on and are interested in the status, but we also get a good group of people who have long records of being above the requirements. We have an opportunity to talk with one another. We know the people in this group frequently will be personal friends by the end of the college experience, and I think you can get this only by creating some kind of fairly rigid structure and being pretty sure everyone belongs there.

Bell: If it is advisable to identify in some more precise way the Honors Program, is it wise to go to the extent of an Honors College which lives apart as well?

Cowen: No. All our lives we are not going to be separated from the "intellectual rabble." After all, these people do have something to present also.

Bolton: I don't like the idea either, but for a completely different reason. I like the idea of putting all the honors people in one place, but I don't like the idea of having to live in a dormitory. A lot of fraternity people enjoy fraternity life, and there are plenty of Independents who don't want to live on the campus at all. If you go to the idea of a residential college, you will have a mechanical problem in making it work.

Cowen: You are talking as if the people of the higher intellect would never get together if it were not for this rigid honors program. I think that is false. People of superior intellect will seek out people to whom they can talk intelligently.

Bolton: I think that depends on the size of the school. With over 17,000 people, if I knew what he looked like, I would have trouble finding him.

Cowen: With 25,000 at IU I think we have done a pretty good job.

QUESTION: How many students are in the Honors College at Missouri, and does this make a difference in the social life?

Bolton: I can give you a rough figure of about 200 students in the college. I could tell you more about the departmental program, but this is a little more restrictive than the regular program.

Yes, this certainly affects my social life. I am going with a girl I met through Honors College, my friends are members of the Honors College, the men I am living with I met in the Honors College.

Bell: Let me toss the social life part of the question to one of the other three.

Cardwell: I met a lot of people in the honors program and in honors classes. My friends haven't been restricted to these people, because I have taken classes with other people. I met a lot of people all over the university in various activities. It would have made a social difference to me only if I had been able to meet more people.

QUESTION: I would like to ask each one what addition, improvement, or extension he would like to see in his program.

Bolton: We are experimenting with an integrated program as an introduction to the development of the sciences. This is very important in the 20th century; you don't have a very realistic view of man or his place in the universe without some kind of compatible scientific view. I hope this project gets worked through.

In addition we will need more money; there are not enough courses being offered.

Gregg: I would suggest the extension of honors opportunities on

the junior-senior level—perhaps seminars on contemporary intellectual issues or classic or major works.

Cowen: We need more courses, especially in the humanities, and a few more interdepartmental courses. The courses we already have might be popularized or advertised.

Cardwell: I think we should have more of the same, too. Students should be able to investigate fields a little more. Another thing I would like to propose is that these be offered to more students, maybe for some on the other end of the spectrum. These small, intimate seminars interest persons in fields where they actually have very little interest, and maybe very little ability, when they go in. But it seems to me this is really the goal of education—to interest people in knowledge for knowledge's sake.

Bolton: The university's departmental structure hurts the university's honor program: If, instead of being a departmental honors candidate, you could be a third or fourth year honors candidate under one man's direction, I think you would be freer to study some general problem or area. When I turn in a paper in the philosophy department it has to be sufficiently philosophical for everyone to accept it, even though another treatment of the subject could be more reasonable.

QUESTION: I was wondering about the size of the honors seminars.

Bolton: I have done work in which I was the only one working with the instructor, and I have taken an honors course in mathematics where there were 45 people in this class. Generally, they range a bit smaller; the important thing is that they generally have better teachers. My experience has been most classes will range from 15 to 20.

Cowen: Freshman-sophomore mathematics classes have about 30; and when they get up at the senior level there sometimes are as few as five.

Cardwell: Our seminars are restricted to 10 or 12; that is true of the junior colloquium. The accelerated classes—mostly in the history, English, and speech departments—are about the ordinary size at the university, or between 20 or 30 .

Gregg: I found the size of a course or the size of a seminar really isn't that important. I am in a seminar of 20 people which is essentially a discussion group; numbers do not affect, to any large degree, the ability of a person to express himself or limit his opportunities to speak.

QUESTION: What is the attitude of student members here toward some of their friends who either were dismissed from an honors program or were not included in an honors program?

Bolton: The second part of the question is one of the things that does bother me about a rigid kind of structure. There are students at the university who should be in honors but don't have the grade point—because of the way they think, because of the way they work, because of the amount of independent work they do. I don't know how to cure this without examining each case on an individual basis. Now, what is my attitude toward people who have been dropped by the honors program or by the university? I am sympathetic, of course. I would like to see them get back in and raise their grade points. But in general, I am inclined to say it helped them while they were there, it is a good thing, and it's unfortunate they didn't make it.

Gregg: First, the effect on people not in the honors program. Many students, especially at the freshman and sophomore levels, find regular introductory courses where the material isn't particularly interesting and the methods of teaching aren't particularly challenging. I think this tends to be more true in a university where the honors program is so definitely set apart from the university that little energy is expended on improving instruction for the regular student. We do not flunk people out of the program at KU, but there are those who, in terms of GPA, have fallen below where they possibly should have been. First, those people don't care, or, second, have the ability but do not seem to know how to apply it. I am sympathetic to a certain degree with those cases.

Cowen: This point, I think, is the strength of the departmental honors program; if the student doesn't have the over-all grade point average or knowledge to get into a rigid honors program, he can still have the knowledge and grade point in one particular field. As for the people who have dropped out of the program, not separating them from the rest of the college makes it easier to remain friends with them; you still have the same things in common.

Cardwell: I think not segregating the honors program is advantageous. I suppose I would have to compare last year's list with this year's list to find out if anyone has dropped out.

Yes, I think the program is beneficial, and I think it would be great if all classes in the university had eight or ten people. If more classes were this way, you wouldn't have the problem of the student who has the ability but isn't interested. Being lost in the crowd can cover up what interest you might have.