

Minutes of the Undergraduate Council
Monday, Dec. 4, 2000
#3

Patricia Mutch, acting chair; Meredith Jones-Gray, vice chair; Delmer Davis, secretary; Samuel Chuah, Tom Lowing, William Richardson, Malcolm Russell, Brad Sheppard, April Summitt, Charles Tidwell, Patrick Williams, Lynelle Weldon, Jan Wrenn

**VOTING MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Charlotte Coy, Emilio Garcia-Marenko, Erling Snorrason, Gary Williams

**NON-VOTING
MEMBERS PRESENT**

Lloyd Erickson, Don May

GUESTS

The committee voted the approval of the minutes from Nov. 6, 2000.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES**

Delmer Davis introduced the recommendation from the General Education Committee that the Undergraduate Council approve the proposed new Honors curriculum. Malcolm Russell briefly reviewed the proposal (see attached), noting the rationale for the changes, the kinds of courses in the new curriculum, how the changes will affect transfers in and out of the Honors Program, and other reasons why the Undergraduate Council should approve the new curriculum. He noted that the part of the attachment related to an Honors College is not really a serious proposal at this point, but merely a discussion item.

**THE NEW HONORS
CURRICULUM**

Questions centered on how the program would affect university finances, how departments would be able to provide staffing for team-taught courses on top of present faculty loads, how students might be affected if they attempted to transfer out of the Honors Program just before graduation, and how this program meshes with professional and technical programs at the university. Malcolm Russell and Pat Mutch recognized that there could be financial implications in the staffing of the program, but also noted that certain present "Honors" sections of regular General Education courses would no longer be taught, thus freeing-up some personnel to help cover the new courses. Malcolm Russell noted how the proposal does include information

on the handling of transfer students and that last-minute senior student transfers out of the Honors Program would still have met the General Education requirements, even though they would not be graduating with Honors. He also indicated that students in professional and technical programs, because of the extensive requirements in their majors, might benefit from the establishment of "Departmental Honors" programs. He suggested that the Honors Council is going to be working on a series of guidelines for the setting up of such Departmental Honors programs.

Delmer Davis reminded the committee that the General Education Committee had discussed the revisions at two separate meetings and suggested that perhaps, given bulletin time-lines, the Undergraduate Council might be willing to approve the proposal immediately, rather than waiting until the next meeting in February. After some discussion of this issue, the Undergraduate Council voted to approve the proposed new Honors Curriculum.

**VOTED: APPROVAL OF
THE NEW HONORS
CURRICULUM**

Pat Mutch indicated that Lloyd Erickson has noted that the policy for handling CLEP scores must be updated to reveal the new standards recommended by the testing company. No longer can percentiles be used. Also, the CLEP General Exams are being phased out; only Subject Exams will be available. The committee voted the following revision in the CLEP policy: "Credit is allowed if the student scores at ~~or above the 70th percentile in a CLEP General Examination~~ and at or above the ~~50th percentile~~ 50 in a CLEP Subject Examination."

**VOTED: REVISION IN
CLEP POLICY**

Don May presented a report from the Student Success Review Team (see attached). He noted that Karen Tilstra is presently in contact with between 120-150 students who are having serious academic difficulties. The Student Success Review Team has addressed general concerns about the kinds of students admitted to Andrews University and is expressing serious concern about the many students who have not submitted ACT or SAT scores as well as the many students who fall below the suggested minimum for admission on such tests (50th percentile). According to the Student Success Team, many of the students who have been admitted do not have the skills to handle college; nor does the university have the resources to provide the kinds


**REPORT FROM THE
STUDENT SUCCESS
REVIEW TEAM**

of help necessary to salvage such students. It is clear from the submitted data that the university has not been applying the letter of the law in regards to the requirement of test scores for admission. Dr. Mutch indicated the need to increase advisor awareness of how to use ACT or SAT scores. She also indicated her concern that such scores are more reliable for admission than are the GPA levels of students from secondary schools. She wondered if all the admission standards and procedures needed review with the idea of simplifying the process. She indicated that the requirement of test scores would mean that the university would have to be willing to administer the "Residual" ACT on demand. Discussion was wide-ranging regarding the admission issues.

The material in the attached letter and the accompanying data were submitted to the Subcommittee on Academic Standards for further review of the admission standards and process.

**ADMISSION CONCERNS
REFERRED TO THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

Patricia Mutch, acting chair



Delmer Davis, secretary

Student Success Service Committee
Undergraduate Council
Admissions Subcommittee
Admissions and Academic Standards Subcommittee
Enrollment Management
Niels-Erik Andreasen

The Student Success Review Team is a new group that was formed at the beginning of the 2000 - 2001 school year with a two fold purpose: to provide support for the efforts of the newly appointed Student Success Consultant, and to function as a case management team for at-risk students. The team consists of representatives from campus supports which include: Assistant Deans from CAS and COT, Math Tutoring Center, Writing Tutoring Center, University Center of Learning, Reading and Assessment, Counseling and Testing Center, Career Planning & Placement, Student Finance, Student Services, Residence Hall Deans, Academic Support & Student Advising, and Student Success Consultant.

After nine weeks of weekly meetings to discuss individual students who are having academic difficulties, we on the Student Success Review Team have observed a disturbing pattern among those students we manage. We have found with regularity students who are not prepared academically, socially, or conceptually to meet the demands of college. These students' skills are at such low levels that the resources and interventions available at Andrews are, in many cases, inadequate. As a result, many of these students are destined to almost certain academic failure.

Due to the frequency of this type of student profile (See attached document), the Student Success Review Team wishes to raise the following questions:

1. Are the Andrews University acceptance standards currently being applied?
2. Are SAT/ACT scores used in the manner in which the College Board designed them to be employed by a university?
3. Are the unspoken expectations placed upon students with low baseline skills, so unrealistic that there is little hope of their persistence to graduation?
4. Is there an ethical dilemma in accepting students who are socially, academically, emotionally, and financially unprepared for the demands of the university experience?
5. How does the Student Success Review Team interface with the advisor and the advising process?

Recognizing the fact that the position of Student Success Consultant was an outgrowth of the Andrews QIT retention team, managing at-risk students is one of many facets to improve student success and retention. Because of this, we must, as an institution recognize that the volume of severely at-risk students is larger than the resources available to build success within this student population. Unless the resources are available this student population will persist (if allowed) but in many cases not graduate; but instead amass huge financial liabilities and reduced self-confidence.

While the Student Success Review Team recognizes that these are difficult questions, we feel that we have a moral responsibility to begin addressing these issues if we are to obtain success with our students, teachers, and university as a whole. By addressing these issues we will be holding ourselves responsible to both the university and the student.

We are willing to collaborate as a group of professionals to seek answers that will enable us to provide the quality education and level of satisfaction which we all desire.

Sincerely,

Student Success Review Team

Karen Tilstra
Student Success Consultant - Team Leader
Sharon Adams,
Residence Hall Dean
Elynda Bedney,
Assoc. Director - Student Finance
Spencer Carter,
Residence Hall Dean
Bruce Closser,
Director - Writing Center
Gerry Coy,
Assistant Dean - COT
Delmer Davis,
Director - General Education
Ken Franz,
Director - Math Center
Glenda-mae Greene,
Assistant V.P. - Student Service,
Sheryl Gregory,
Director - University Center for Reading, Learning & Assessment
Don May,
Assistant Dean - CAS
Herdley Paolini,
Psychologist
Erling Snorrason,
Assistant Director - Academic Support & Advising
Patricia Stewart,
Career Counseling & Placement Director
Carletta Witzel,
Instructor - UCRLA

Preliminary Observation of ACT Data and Usage for Andrews Enrollment 11-00

This preliminary information was based on computer-based scripts provided by Sue Schwab on 10-19 & 10-30. The population selected was enrolled, full-time undergraduates (Freshman through Senior) studying on the campus of Andrews University. Undergrad campus enrollment was at 1614 students on 10-19-00. (ACT data based on 978 student scores available at 10-19-00) The ACT COMPOSITE result was run on 11-9.

Summary

- Although the bulletin states that before registration, all new students must take the ACT or SAT for use in academic advising, (pg 21) 22% of Andrews students are missing these scores. Approximately 3:1 ACT/SAT.
- Although the bulletin admission policy states: "ACT/SAT of 50th percentile" (pg 20), 40% of Andrews students scored below this cut-off point on the ACT Composite.

Math

- 29% of students scored between 0-17 on ACT MATH scores.
- 52% of students scored below the mean on the ACT MATH test.
- 14% of students scored below one standard deviation on the ACT MATH test
- Only 58.4% of students scoring above the mean on the ACT MATH test scored a 4.0 on the math placement test. Based on 834 students with both ACT MATH scores and AU placement scores
- 87.2% of the probationary students scored below the mean on the ACT MATH test.

Reading

- 19% of students scored below ACT READING 18 (28th %ile nationally)
- Of the students scoring below ACT READING of 15 (14th %ile nationally), 71% had not taken any remedial reading courses
- Of the students scoring below ACT READING of 10 (3rd %ile nationally), 50% had not taken any remedial reading courses

Class standing of undergraduate students without ACT/SAT scores:

- 21% are Freshmen
- 15% are Sophomores
- 19% are Junior
- 42% are Seniors
- 3% are Post Graduates

Enrolled undergraduate students without ACT/SAT scores:

- 61% are from the College of Arts & Sciences
- 19% are from the College of Technology
- 13% are from the School of Business
- 4% are from the School of Architecture
- 4% are from the School of Education

Statistics requested:

General

1. Total undergraduate on campus full-time
2. Total number of students with ACT or SAT scores
3. Total number of students with ACT or SAT scores by class standing
4. Total number of students in each class
5. Total number of students with ACT scores
6. Total number of students with SAT scores

At-risk Student Population

7. Total number of students with ACT COMPOSITE at 20 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 970.
8. Total number of students with ACT COMPOSITE at 20 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 970 per each school.
9. Total number of freshmen with ACT COMPOSITE at 20 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 970.
10. Total number of students with ACT COMPOSITE at 16 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 780.
11. Total number of freshmen with ACT COMPOSITE at 16 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 780.
12. Total number of students with ACT COMPOSITE at 16 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 780 and have AU GPA of 2.49 or less.
13. Total number of students with ACT COMPOSITE at 20 and lower and SAT Composite (add Verbal & Quantitative score) less than 970 and have AU GPA of 2.49 or less.

Math

14. Total number of students with ACT MATH and SAT QUANTITATIVE
15. List of students have a AU Math placement test score.
16. List of students scored a 1.5 or less on the AU Math Placement Test
17. List of students scored below 400 on SAT QUANTITATIVE or ACT MATH 15
18. List of students scored below 400 on SAT QUANTITATIVE or ACT MATH 15 and scored 1.5 or less on the AU MATH Placement Test
19. List of students scored below 485 on SAT QUANTITATIVE or ACT MATH 20 and score 1.5 or less on the AU MATH Placement Test.

Read

20. Total number of students with ACT READ and SAT VERBAL
21. List of students scored below 400 on SAT VERBAL or ACT READ 15
22. List of students scored below 485 on SAT QUANTITATIVE or ACT READ 20 or lower

Brief Comparison of SDA Honors Programs

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Andrews U.</u>	<u>LaSierra U.</u>	<u>Pacific Union C.</u>	<u>SoouthernAdventist</u>	<u>Union College</u>	<u>Walla Walla C.</u>
<u>Admission requirements</u>	3.50 Secondary GPA + 80 th percentile, SAT or ACT.	3.25 Secondary GPA + 60 th percentile, SAT both verbal and quantitative	12 H.S. solids 3.5 GPA; 80 th percentile, SAT	3.70 Secondary GPA. Test scores not indicated.	3.33 Secondary Test scores not indicated.	3.30 Secondary Satisfactory test scores and essay
<u>Curriculum Courses</u>	Honors Sections of regular courses, plus occasional topics courses. Few listed in the Bulletin, only ~ 8 offered annually	4 interdisciplinary seminars + elective seminars	12 credits Greek 12 seminars. Replaces GE entirely	Stipulates 4 specific non-honors GE alternatives +inter. foreign language.	Honors composition +5 Honors Seminars (=21 sem. hours) + 37 hours regular GE. [Total is 1 hour less than BA].	Western Thought I,II plus other seminars; specified other courses.
<u>Research</u>	Independent study, senior project/thesis required.	Senior research	senior thesis	Senior project	Senior project	Senior project
<u>Min. GPA</u>	3.33; 3.5 for J.N. Andrews Scholars	probably 3.25	3.5 for senior thesis	3.5	3.33	3.25
<u>Required Sem. Hours</u>	16 (met by <50% of Honors students)	16+	33	6? (Senior project) [+ specific courses]	21	22
<u>Scholarships</u>	\$11,000 annually (for 240 students = ~ \$50 /yr per student)	\$ 1,000 one-time per student, junior year [unpublished info.]	6 hours free tuition in Britain	tuition waiver for 4 3-hour classes; honors seminar waives tuition	Not mentioned in Honors webpage; exists.	4 semester-hour tuition grant

August 2000

THE 2001 HONORS GE PROGRAM

The proposed curriculum for an Honors GE Track

<u>Level</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Broad Categories</u>
100	Western Heritage	5 + 5 Required	Humanities; Religion (O.T., Gospels; church); Arts, essays
100	Transacting and Transcribing the Self	3 Required	Behavioral Science; literature; composition
200	Scripture	3 Required	Religion, communication
200	Elective	3	(From General Elective List below)
2/300	Elective	3	(From General Elective List below)
200	Literature & Arts topic	3 Required	fine arts; humanities. Paper.
300	What is "Other"? The Non-Western World	3 Required	humanities, culture, religion of non-Western peoples. Paper
300	Cosmos	3 Required	science; some creation/origins. Paper
398	Research Pro-seminar	1 Required	Proposal; stress on writing, speech. Attendance.; present.
400	Thinking Theologically: Christian Life & Faith	3 Required	Christian Life & Faith; oral presentation
497	Project/Thesis	2 hrs. min.	GPA of 3.5; computer skills (writing; appropriate software)
	Math & Science	9 Required	Existing math & science courses; possible Honors contracts.
	PE Activity Courses	1 Required	

Co-curricular Requirements

Participation in Honors Activities
Service Fieldwork

documented service required of all Scholars.

TOTAL, BS

47 hours

[BA: add intermediate language]

Recommended: For competitive applications to rigorous graduate programs:
one year of calculus; intermediate modern language; one-year science sequence.

Options: General (choose two) (If demand exists, any other electives will be based on significant works.)

200	What is America?	3 Elective	political science, literature; research paper
200	Materialism & Idealism	3 Elective	economics; philosophy; computer spreadsheet
300	Justice	3 Elective	ethics; social sciences

Expected High School Coursework:

English	4 years
Math	Algebra I, II, Geometry. Pre-calculus recommended.
Science	Biology, Chemistry or Physics; preferably both
History	U.S.; World history highly recommended. American Government (for U.S. diplomas).
Religion	yearly as available. Students unfamiliar with Christianity may wish to take "God & Human Life".
Physical Ed.	both personal exercise and group sports
Health/Wellness	<i>Required on either high school or college level.</i>
Computer Science	Applications course
Foreign Language	2 years minimum
As available:	Music, Art & Drama; Journalism Social Sciences (psychology, sociology, economics, geography).

TRANSFER INFORMATION:

Transfers out of Honors:

Logically done best at end of full academic years.

Mid-freshman year: W. Heritage I replaces HIST115

[Taken: 5 hours; GE replaced, 2 hours. 3 hours simply count as electives]

End, freshman year: waive HIST115,116 (5); RELB100(3); ENGL115(3).

[Taken: 13 hours; GE replaced, 11 hours. 2 hrs as electives]

End, sophomore year: waive the following requirements: Religion (6); Humanities (5 + 3); Social Science (6)

[Taken: total: 5 hrs of electives]

Junior-Senior Years: Religion may apply to regular GE; the electives might suit (unneeded?) humanities.

Note: Other universities have the liberty of accepting or rejecting these equivalents.

Transfers In:

Honors transfer credits are welcome, and the program will seek to facilitate the smooth calculation of GE equivalents.

Best done at beginning of year.

Freshman Year: full Requirements (except where explicit duplication exists: HIST115/God in Human Life and W. Heritage first semester).

Sophomore Year: Waive first-year courses if similar GE courses were taken.

Junior Year and thereafter: Waive first-year courses if similar GE courses were taken; take at least two (2) sophomore seminars.

This achieves the minimum national standard of 15% of credits in Honors.

The Pacific Union College Honors Program (1999-2000)

HNRS 101

5 A

Heroes

Homer, *The Odyssey*; David narratives (I Sam. 16 to Kings 2:12; I Chron. 11 to 29); Donatello, Michelangelo, and Bernini, *David*; Plato, *Apology of Socrates and Crito*; Kelly, *Eleanor of Aquitaine*; Shakespeare, *Henry V*; Cervantes, *Don Quixote*; Shaw, *Saint Joan*; Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther*; Beethoven, *Eroica* (symphony); Brookhiser, *Founding Father: Rediscovering George Washington*; and *Gandhi* (film).

HNRS 102

5 W

Order and Liberty

Sophocles, *Antigoni*; Plato, *The Republic*; St. Augustine, *City of God* (selections); Machiavelli, *The Prince*; Locke, *Second Treatise on Government*; Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities*; Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*; Mill, *On Liberty*; Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*; Koestler, *Darkness at Noon*; Danton (film); David, selected paintings.

HNRS 103

5 S

Scripture I

Genesis, Job, Ruth, Isaiah; Mendelssohn, *Elijah* (oratorio); Blake, engravings of Job and Genesis.

HNRS 251

5 A

Cosmos

Ptolemy, selections; Lewis, *The Discarded Image*; Bacon, *Novum Organum*; Galileo, *Dialogues*; Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*; Hawking, *A Short History of Time*; Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*; Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*; 2001: *A Space Odyssey* (film); Holst, *The Planets* (symphony). This seminar includes laboratory.

HNRS 252

5 W

America

Declaration of Independence; *Constitution*; *The Federalist Papers* (selections); Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (selections); Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter*; *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*; Lincoln, selected speeches; Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*; Dickinson, selected poems; Twain, *Huckleberry Finn*; Cather, *Death Comes for the Archbishop*; Stegner, *Angle of Repose*; *Heartland* (film); Winslow Homer, selected paintings.

HNRS 253

5 S

Virtue

Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (selections); *The Koran*; Shakespeare, *Richard III*; Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*; Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*; *Crimes and Misdemeanors* (film).

HNRS 330

5 Su

Christianity

(Summer term in Europe)

Lewis, *Mere Christianity*; The Virgin Mary in the National Gallery, selected artists; Dante, *The Divine Comedy*; Julian of Norwich, *Showings*; selected stained glass; Luther, *Christian Liberty*; Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*; St. Paul's Cathedral; Law, *A Serious Call*; Mozart, *Requiem*; Dostoevsky, *The*

Brothers Karamazov; Flannery O'Connor, selected stories; *The Mission* (film).

HNRS 331

5 Su

Scripture II

(Summer term in Europe)

Mark, Acts, Romans, I John; *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (film).

HNRS 360

4 A

Beauty

Michelangelo, *Letters*; Burke, *A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*; Shelley, *Defense of Poetry*; Coleridge and Wordsworth, *Lyrical Ballads*; Hawthorne, "The Artist of the Beautiful"; Wilde, *the Decay of Lying*; Barzun, *The Use and Abuse of Art*; Bayles, *Hole in Our Soul*; Wolfe, *The Painted Word*; Venturi, *Learning from Las Vegas*; *Bird* (film); The Parthenon; the Bauhaus.

HNRS 361

4 W

Self and Society

St. Augustine, *Confessions*; Rousseau, *Confessions*; Wesley, *Journals* (selections); Hume, *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*; White, *Life Sketches*; James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*; Freud, *The Future of an Illusion*; Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*.

HNRS 363

4 S

East

Confucius, *Analects*; Bhagavad Gita; Lady Murasaki, *Tale of Genji*; Marco Polo, *Travels*; Naipaul, *A Bend in the River*; Hesse, *Siddhartha*; Hokusai, selected prints; Van Gogh, selected paintings; *Mister Johnson* (film); traditional Ethiopian music.

HNRS 485

4 A

Progress

Voltaire, *Candide*; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (selections); Malthus, *Essay on the Principle of Population*; Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein*; Darwin, *The Descent of Man*; Achebe, *Things Fall Apart*; *The Bounty* (film).

HNRS 498

3 W, S

Honors Project

Preparation and evaluation of the Honors Project. Prerequisite: GPA of 3.5.

Plus intermediate Greek

14

TOTAL

73 Quarter Credits
(= 48 2/3 semester hours)

*Tuition for the two summer classes is free (through scholarship); student pays own airfare.

A Rationale for the Proposed Honors Curriculum

Recommended by the Honors Council to the AU GE Committee, October 16, 2000

I. Why is a new Honors Curriculum Necessary?

- A. The Competition: The Changed World of Honors Programs:** With a retention rate > 80% for 1999-2000 freshmen, the Honors Program *retains* the kinds of students Andrews University needs. However, recent changes in both secular and Adventist honors programs threaten the ability of AU to *attract and enroll* prospective students.
 - 1. Even small and mid-sized universities have created Honors Colleges that provide an attractive residential and liberal-arts environment. These are well-funded and high-powered; *US News* labeled them "Ivy League education at State U. prices".
 - 2. After major improvements, the programs at Union, Walla Walla, La Sierra and PUC comfortably surpass the AU model of "the honors curriculum as largely sections of regular GE courses." Moreover, these institutions and Southern offer substantial honors scholarships or tuition cuts far exceeding AU's honors grants.
- B. Intellectually,** the present program almost completely lacks the interdisciplinary, great issues/great works focus of most honors programs. Moreover, a pattern of elective Honors sections inherently provides no coherence, no common experience, and no community.
- C. Practically,** scheduling is very complicated when done by departments. It is also difficult to offer sections above the 100-level. Honors students often take non-honors sections recommended by their departmental advisors, and by their junior or senior years find it nearly impossible to meet the national minimum of 15% of credits in honors, let alone the recommended 20-25%. Students lacking the credits drop out of the program, so undergraduates do too little research and too few graduate with honors.
- D. Image and Marketing Issues:** A comprehensive package, not individual sections, is absolutely required to compete with recently strengthened programs, secular or SDA.
Conclusion: The ability of Andrews to recruit students of Honors caliber and interest is gravely threatened. We can only work to retain students if they choose to attend AU.

II. What philosophy guided the design of the proposed curriculum?

- A. Traditional Honors Concerns: Great Ideas/Great Works/Great Questions:** An interdisciplinary emphasis on thinking. Our students must become better read.
- B. A desire to deepen the spiritual growth and religious understanding of our students.** Beyond attempting to foster our students' closer connection with God and their commitment to live Christ's teaching, we wish to encourage understanding of ethical issues in daily life, knowledge of great Christian literature, preparation of a Christian world-view, deepen their knowledge of Adventism, and foster involvement in the church.
- C. Respect for both Western Tradition and non-Western accomplishments, and concern for female and minority perspectives as well.** A non-Western course is required.
- D. Respect for the intellectual abilities of Honors students.** Honors students differ from average students in their intellectual interests and levels of thought; they prefer abstract and theoretical issues. Their high minimum grades (high school 3.5) and test scores (80th percentile) mean they arrive on campus better prepared--in maths, writing, factual knowledge in every measured field, and literature--than most AU freshman. Often they earn Advanced Placement credits. We believe it necessary to create an Honors program that reflects such backgrounds and builds on them through courses at a higher level.
- E. The Historical Position of Honors at Andrews:** During its days of the greatest numbers of students graduating with honors (1980s), the program 1). Exercised its autonomy to create its own alternative GE courses, and 2). Allowing individualized GE requirements.
- F. Recognition that the Honors Program must involve fewer credits than regular GE.**

An Honors GE track must be simple enough to fit students in many programs, some of them with briefer requirements than the standard BS and BA. *Practically, then, an Honors General Education Program must require fewer hours than the standard GE package.* This seems to us intellectually defensible because honors students arrive better prepared, typically take more courses than the minimum in high school, know more about the world, and will often take non-honors GE courses as cognates or for certification. Some will arrive with Advanced Placement credits applying to regular GE, but not for Honors. *We also believe that the nature of the proposed honors courses means these students will receive a general education superior to the existing program.*

III. Why does the proposal modify or remove some categories of GE traditional at Andrews?

- A. Above all local considerations, the Honors Council recognizes that a competitive program must contain the content appropriate to Honors. The necessary standard of comparison is not the traditional GE package for Andrews students, but requirements elsewhere for Honors, influenced by the mission of Andrews University.**
- B. We expect religious perspectives to form a significant portion of most seminars. We wish to recognize this integration by considering it the equivalent to one course. In addition, we will incorporate 3 hours of religion in the Western Traditions course (teaching team to include a professor of religion) and require two religion seminars, thus achieving the 12 hours of religion common to most other programs.**
- C. Conceptually, the Honors Program will incorporate a number of skills in the Seminars. We have identified courses where specific communication, composition, and computer skills will be developed. More generally, the seminar format requires students to participate more actively, and gain experience in oral and written discourse. For example, the research component will often require skills in statistical software packages, presentations software, and related technologies.**

IV. How will the Honors Program be administered?

- A. The Honors Council will supervise the curriculum and standards for Honors Faculty.**
- B. Courses will carry an HONS-prefix, be scheduled by Honors, using identified Honors faculty who have devoted time to special preparation. Departments will receive reimbursement for faculty teaching in Honors.**
- C. Financial expectations of the program will be agreed between the Honors Council and the Vice President for Academic Administration. In addition, the Honors Program will vigorously seek additional financial incentives for its students.**
- D. Assessment: A program substantially different from the standard GE package would need to assess both the results of its efforts and student satisfaction with the program.**

V. Why is the proposed Honors Program superior to the present?

- A. Graduates will be far better read, and much more thoughtful.**
- B. More undergraduates will complete a senior research project.**
- C. Students in the Honors Program will form a more cohesive group. Having such an identity, they will more likely remain at Andrews.**
- D. The program's students will read about 50 outstanding works, study artistic and musical masterpieces, and initiate a broad, liberal education with a Christian heart.**
- E. Recruiting prospective students of ability to Andrews should be enhanced by a coherent program. Without significant revision, Andrews will not offer a competitive program.**

Desirable Traits of an Honors GE Package:

- I. **Conceptual simplicity:** for easier understanding by students, parents, and faculty.
 - A. Attractive for its intellectual content rather than disciplinary surveys or skills.
 - B. Provides a common experience for honors students (only limited electives).
 - C. Requires fewer credits than the standard GE package, because:
 - 1. Honors freshmen arrive better prepared, often with AP credits anyway
 - 2. Scholars will often take GE options as cognates, for certification, etc.
 - 3. The quality of the package will ensure that reduced hours still surpass the learning achieved in regular GE courses.
- II. **Simplicity in detail:** for Students, the Honors Program and Faculty; Registrar's office.
 - A. One set of acronyms, and thus one location in the *Bulletin*—the Honors Program..
- III. **Simplicity in image:** its marketing requires a concise, easily understood, label.
 - A. We can best market courses that Honors itself supervises and schedules.
- IV. **Simplicity in structure:**
 - A. One line of authority: therefore, housed in the Honors Program.
 - B. Guided by an Academic Affairs Committee of the Honors Council
 - 1. composed of : 3 Council faculty; 3 teaching faculty; 2 students; director
 - 2. The Academic Affairs Committee to carry responsibility for
 - a. selecting honors faculty, and planning their orientation
 - b. ensuring coherence among the courses and faculty in the program,
 - c. approving and evaluating all proposed courses,
 - d. approving the annual course schedule proposed by the director.
 - C. Autonomous in resources though not necessarily independent in resources:
 - 1. Implies Honors Program will schedule courses and receive some income.
 - 2. Implies the creation of an active and selective Honors Faculty trained in the particular types of courses and professorial roles expected in the program.
 - 3. Implies the Honors Program will reimburse departments for faculty time.
 - 4. Implies the Honors Program can request a department for a particular faculty member to teach an honors course, with no guarantee of approval.
 - 5. Implies student-faculty efficiency guidelines to be established between the Academic Affairs Committee and the university Academic Vice President.
- V. **What won't work:**
 - A. Honors as stipulated regular courses taken as GE options (e.g., SAU). [≠Honors]
 - B. Honors significantly comprised of mixed honors/non-honors courses or honors contracts for individual students in individual courses. [≠Honors; uncompetitive]
 - C. Honors as separate sections of existing GE Courses. It's too difficult to sell.

Sample Course Descriptions

(The first description has been approved by the Council; the second has been proposed)

HONS105-106 WESTERN HERITAGE (5,5)

An interdisciplinary study of significant issues that emerged in the development of Western civilization, through reading major works and reflection them. The first semester's topics reflect the ancient world to the Reformation era; the second, the Enlightenment to the modern world. In both semesters, spiritual and religious themes occupy a significant portion. Small group projects, field trips, and cultural events will enrich the lectures and class discussion. Required.

[Each semester divides into five sections, each of approximately three weeks, providing the opportunity to study one major work as well as a few shorter works or excerpts. Besides four lectures per week, students will meet one more time weekly, for small group discussions (moderated by trained senior Honors students) about the course, honors, and college life. Integrated cultural events, films and field trips.]

HONS100 Transacting and Transcribing the Self (3) (proposed description)

What is this entity we call self? How is formed, reformed, transformed? What role does the "other" play in our determination of self? To what extent is self an independent construct, and to what extent is it socially and ideologically determined? These and related questions will be addressed through an examination of our own lives and the lives of others as presented in significant texts through the ages.

HONS200 Scripture (3) (Awaiting discussion with the Religion Faculty)

HONS200 America (3) (From Butler University Description)

From its discovery by Europeans, America has been a constant object of speculation, a site of shifting hopes and dreams, anger and fear, admiration and contempt. What is this place? A wilderness? A paradise? A land of gold? Is the United States a model of religious and political freedom? Or a slave society still rent by racism? Are we the Defender of Democracy or the Great Satan?

HONS200 Materialism & Idealism (3) (From Butler University: *Consumption, the Good Life, and Justice*)

Does our high-consumption lifestyle bring us happiness or continuous dissatisfaction? Is the global marketing of this lifestyle destructive of cultural diversity and a scenario for future environmental disaster? Should we consume less in order that the global poor may consume more? Is it wrong to consume goods made in deplorable working conditions? This course will examine how philosophers, social scientists, environmentalists, and activists have addressed these questions of the "ethics of consumption."

HONS200 or 300 Justice (Yale University—*The Book of Job and Injustice*)

The Book of Job is a template for thinking, about the unjustifiable sufferings inflicted during this destructive century. The Nazi Holocaust, to choose one terrible example, provokes the same questions that Job posed: "Where was God, that this was permitted to occur?" "What justice is there in the universe, that this could occur?" "In the face of this occurrence, how, if at all, can belief in the ideal of justice — faith in the goodness of the universe — be rekindled?" The course will consider such questions in three principal ways: by a close study of the perspectives offered in the Book of Job; by a comparison of the conceptions of justice and the possibility of its vindication treated elsewhere in the Bible; and by exploration of the ways in this century that secular institutions have addressed these questions in trying to assert norms of justice in response to such shattering events.

Proposal for an Honors College
From Don Rhoads, Chair, Mathematics Department
October 25, 2000

It seems to me that the Honors Council has done a fine job of putting together an outstanding curriculum for the Honors program, and I trust them and the rest of my colleagues to give it genuine integrity. But I fear that if it is presented to our public as "an honors program" merely attached to the Andrews University college degree, it will not achieve its full potential. Everybody has honors programs, right? So this is an Andrews honors program, so what? Do not over-estimate the cachet of the Andrews University name.

If we are to have any hope of making a dent in the situation lately described by Jack Stout and his committee-specifically, if we are to succeed in attracting substantial numbers of high achieving students who are now going outside the Adventist system (and attracting others who are not Adventist), we must decisively position the new Honors program. It must be given an easily recognizable identity that will clearly set it apart from the open admissions CAS, and will give its students a consciousness of being involved in something very special.

I propose that the Andrews honors program should be thought of, and marketed as a "College" within the university. This does not mean that we must set up the formal machinery of a separate "school" in the University. "College" has meant many things over the years, from an autonomous institution gathered with others in a University (as in Oxford and Cambridge), a residential unit (as at Rice), a professional organization (as in the American College of Physicians). "College" is a very flexible word, and we should take advantage of that flexibility.

The Honors program sets its own academic standards, admissions policies, and graduation policies, and hopefully (eventually) living arrangements. Thus it already has many of the attributes of a "college". I am proposing that it be designated a "college" on the basis of its function, not on the basis of organizational formalities. If, in the future, wild success, burgeoning numbers and expanding resources should make it advisable to constitute it an organizationally separate school, so be it. For now, it can be accommodated within the existing structure...

The honors program already has a director and staff. The students who participate in it are now called "John Nevins Andrews Scholars". The entity to which they belong is the "John Nevins Andrews Honors Program". The names are too long, cumbersome, a bit stuffy, and do not sufficiently distinguish the program from all the other things around here which are variously called "Andrews".

What the proposed "honors program" needs to become a functioning "college" is an identity, a name (I'm using "Nevins" here, as an illustration), letterheads and promotional literature, and a diploma which states that the degree is from "Nevins College, a unit of Andrews University..."

The Adventist system of higher education has long needed a genuinely first-rate option for first-rate students. What is being proposed here is such an option. Once an easily recognizable and memorable identity is given to the program, that identity can begin to accumulate associations, reputation, and loyalty. There is a niche here to be filled that possibly no other institution in the system has the resources to fill, and we can fill it, unless our imaginations fail us.

Proposed blurb (which can be improved, expanded, in many ways):

The Nevins College experience is that of a community sharing a common core of experience: substantial religious study and worship experience, study of original texts, authentic artistic and literary experience, and scientific insight. The curriculum is modern and multi-ethnic, but grounded deeply in the great western intellectual tradition. Frequent seminars and conversations, both formal and informal, combine with traditional classroom instruction to provide a first-class learning experience for the high-achieving student.

Organizationally, Nevins College sets its own admissions, academic, and graduation standards, and functions as a close-knit community within the larger University. Students who enjoy the common life within the College may major in any of the fields offered by the university and may draw on the wider resources of other University schools such as the SDA Theological Seminary and the College of Technology.

The Nevins degree, either Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science, is distinguished by its rigor, its breadth and depth of inquiry, and its marketability. If you are in the upper 10% of your high school class, have made exceptional scores on the SAT or ACT, or have compiled an outstanding record in a freshman year at another college, and if you are motivated by a desire to drink deeply at the fount of wisdom, Nevins may be for you.