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The case for more robust Exploratory, Honors, Interdisciplinary, Undergraduate Research and Success Programs at Purdue University: report of the ‘UHSS’ Task Force

Executive Summary

A University Task Force, composed of faculty, staff and students was charged in September of 2010 to develop new models for the structure of exploratory, honors, interdisciplinary, undergraduate research and success programs at Purdue. The Task Force first developed guiding principles based on the University Strategic Plan, benchmarked peers, conducted a literature review, engaged John Gardner and Associates for consultation and ultimately developed four models for consideration.

The guiding principles of the Task Force include: (1) Student success (profile, retention and graduation rates), (2) Diversity as a core value, (3) Mobility for students, (4) Visibility of programs/recruiting students, (5) Faculty involvement, and (6) Synergies and efficiencies.

The Task Force considered multiple models and sub models, concluding that a new model is needed based on the guiding principles. Further, there was strong consensus supporting the potential for integration and synergies to better serve students. The Task Force has chosen to present four models in order of preference:

a. An Honors College and a separate unit (‘Discovery College’) with exploratory studies (E), interdisciplinary programs (I), undergraduate research coordination (R), and success programs (S).

Fourteen of eighteen voting Task Force members rated this model first or second. Overall, there was strong support for an Honors College (with students enrolled in both an Academic College and the Honors College), and a separate unit that integrates exploration, interdisciplinary programs and coordination of undergraduate research. There was a split opinion on the best administrative location for success programs. Using the name “Discovery College” for the second unit was favored by a strong voting majority of the Task Force. Integration of E, I, R and S is a unique opportunity to elevate all of these programs in a creative model distinct from the structures found at most universities. E, I, R and S programs together can serve as an incubator for innovation and student achievement, building a lattice of programs that work closely with academic college programs. The Task Force sees Discovery College as a leadership opportunity for Purdue. A separate Honors College will provide Purdue a new level of identity and visibility in recruiting, educating and graduating high ability students. There also exists substantial opportunity for fundraising. Model (a) also supports each element of our hypothesis stated below. The principal concerns for this model are: a) creation of two new major units will require a financial investment; and b) inclusion of success programs in Discovery College may limit its potential impact, since other Colleges could view ‘success’ as the sole responsibility of the new unit rather than the responsibility of all colleges.
b. An Honors College, a separate unit (Discovery College) with E, I and R. S retained as a separate unit

This model was a close second in preference by the Task Force. The model is identical to (a), except in proposing to keep success programs managed directly by the Provost’s office. Thus the strengths and weaknesses of this model are similar to (a) with the additional weakness that it conflicts with the hypothetical proposition that success programs would be most effective if administratively tied to academic efforts. Eleven of eighteen voting Task Force members rated this model first or second. Nine rated it first and six rated it last, which demonstrates the split within the Task Force concerning the best administrative location for success programs. The Task Force is fairly evenly split between recommending that success programs are best included as part a ‘Discovery College’ or remain managed in the Office of the Provost. The divergent opinions appear to center on enrollment of students and involvement of faculty in a unit called a ‘College’.

c. A single unit (Discovery College) with E, H, and I. R and S retained as separate units.

Models (c) and (d) do not separate the honors program into a new college and were similar to each other in overall rank (2 point difference). Model (c) was favored by two members and Model (d) was favored by four members. Six of 18 members favored keeping honors in a larger unit as a separate question. Model (c) had eleven members rank it third whereas model (d) had seven members rank it fourth (last). The advantage of this model is that the new college would enroll students and be functionally equivalent to current colleges. This model may have lower administrative costs and greater efficiencies by engaging faculty in exploratory, honors, and interdisciplinary functions. Research and success would be coordinated at the university level (with a faculty advisory group) thus cutting across all colleges. However, the Task force felt that this model would negatively impact the identity, visibility and opportunities available to Honors, where there is a large potential for immediate programmatic success.

d. A single Discovery College with exploratory studies (E), honors (H), interdisciplinary studies (I), undergraduate research (R) and success programs (S)

This was the least favored model. Four Task Force members rated it a first while seven members rated it last. Strengths and weaknesses are similar to (c) but this model includes success and research programs as part of the unit. Thus, the comments on the location of success programs in (a) above also apply to this model.
Concluding remarks

During the benchmarking, literature review and subcommittee discussions, numerous Task Force recommendations were developed that could be implemented regardless of the structural model. These include: additional interdisciplinary certificates, a BS option in Interdisciplinary Studies, an undergraduate research academy, interdisciplinary learning communities focused on the grand challenges, more seamless connections and integration between residential life, student affairs and academics, success and exploratory programs in close proximity to students, the implementation of a cultural shift toward (1) connection, (2) community and togetherness, (3) attachment to the institution, (4) diversity as a strength and, (5) comprehensive student support, four year degree maps for each academic program, foundational classes taught in stepped sequences, a single visible honors point of entry, an integrated campus-wide honors program, a stronger honors residential experience, focused honors recruiting efforts, additional faculty leadership in all units, a university-wide faculty coordinating body to manage undergraduate curricular issues and expanded fundraising efforts for all units.

Regardless of which model is implemented, the Task Force proposes next steps for the process:

1) Engage Purdue Marketing and Media with Admissions to conduct focus groups with prospective and current students.

2) Engage University Development to identify and price funding opportunities.

3) Seek counsel from the Faculty Senate.

4) Hold an Academic Leadership Forum this semester to provide an opportunity for discussion.

5) Inform the Core Curriculum Committee of the UHSS Task Force report and work collaboratively with the committee.

6) Conduct a fiscal evaluation and develop budget models.

7) Integrate the upcoming Foundations of Excellence program with the next steps in this plan.

8) Develop models for physical location of new unit(s).

9) Utilize the expertise of the Task Force as needed. 10) Move quickly to implementation for Fall of 2012.
Background

In September of 2010, Provost Tim Sands commissioned a Task Force to examine current undergraduate studies, success, interdisciplinary, UG research and honors programs at Purdue, benchmark these programs with peers, and make recommendations regarding mechanisms to improve the effectiveness and impact of these programs (see Appendix 1 for the charge to the Task Force). The UHSS (Undergraduate Honors, Studies, Success) Task Force is chaired by Associate Provost Dennis Savaiano. The Task Force includes students, staff, faculty and administrators and has met regularly since September (see Appendix 2 for a full list of members -note that additional members were added to the Task Force throughout the planning stages with the approval of the Provost). Members of the Task Force have visited programs at Indiana, IUPUI, Ohio State, Michigan, Penn State and Arizona State. Benchmarking data on peers has been collected and reviewed (Appendix 7). Further, John Gardner and Associates, national experts on the First Year Experience, were retained to provide consultation. The Task Force divided into four subgroups for its preliminary work: Exploratory, Honors, Interdisciplinary and Success Programs. The Interdisciplinary and Exploratory groups chose to merge in the middle of the process. Each subgroup developed models for improvement of the sub-areas (Appendices 4, 5, and 6). These models were evaluated by the entire Task Force and integrated into this final document.

Hypothesis

Further development of honors and undergraduate studies experiences at Purdue will improve student recruitment, retention and graduation rates consistent with Purdue Strategic Plan (Appendix 3 includes Strategic Plan excerpts related to the Task Force charge).

Exploratory

The rapid growth of knowledge creates new challenges for students to explore majors. Not all students who come to Purdue are ready to choose a major. A more visible, integrated, faculty-driven exploratory program will help students find their educational path early, leading to improved graduation rates. Integrating exploratory efforts with College, interdisciplinary and success programs will increase the synergies, visibility and efficiencies and ultimately the success of these efforts.

Honors

Honors students have unique learning needs that are best met in community with other honors students and with specialized classes that address advanced, complex content. Purdue and its faculty have an obligation to use its substantial expertise to most effectively educate students in Indiana and beyond. A more robust and visible honors opportunity will foster community and identity among high-ability students, target students in building a portfolio of experiences that will ensure competitiveness towards high-profile awards, create broader and more enriched educational experiences, increase the awareness of and respect for research opportunities in affecting post-graduate outcomes, and provide for more personalized mentoring from faculty and graduate students. The Task Force believes that such a program will, for the first time, create a viable alternative to other national opportunities currently available to high ability Indiana students and will result in them staying in Indiana to take advantage of a Purdue Public Research University experience. Given more in-depth and interdisciplinary experiences,
these students will lead Indiana into a more productive future. Expanded honors programs will also attract high ability out-of-state students, enhancing Purdue’s profile and impact across the world. Further, a more robust honors program at Purdue is a cost-effective alternative for families seeking a special experience for their student. Currently, a typical admitted first-time full-cohort at Purdue consists of at little more than 20% honors quality students. Unfortunately, we typically yield less than 15% of them. Therefore, making an honors option more visible is a potential strategy to attract more honors-like students to attend Purdue. The Figure below compares 6 year graduation rates for honors caliber students to the rest of the population. While high ability students have a graduation rate that is approximately 16% higher than the comparison group, it is nearly 15% lower than most of the honors programs we benchmarked. Thus, the potential to increase graduation rates of our highest ability students is also substantial.

Interdisciplinary

The grand challenges of the 21st Century such as global health promotion, energy independence, and economic development require interdisciplinary solutions. Purdue has excelled in bringing interdisciplinary approaches to its discovery activities, primarily through Discovery Park. We are turning attention to the interdisciplinary opportunities for undergraduates, so they can be most successful as leaders in helping to address these grand challenges. We have had some success with our ‘Entrepreneurship Certificate’, minors and related approaches. However, much more can be done to transform a Purdue education to launch tomorrow’s leaders. Much of this effort concerns the challenges of coordination, leadership, visibility and communication along with utilizing existing faculty expertise.
Undergraduate Research

Students benefit greatly from meaningful participation in academic research with faculty mentors. Following participation in inquiry-learning it is expected that students will have (1) an increased understanding of their discipline (2) greater problem-solving skills (3) expanded and collaborative relationships with faculty and (4) increased confidence in their ability to perform research. A public research university has substantial opportunity to provide its undergraduates a hands-on experience while developing new knowledge. This unique opportunity is a hallmark of research universities and affords students with skills for life-long learning as well as opportunities to continue toward advanced degrees.

Success

Students who matriculate to the public research university come with variable preparation for the rigorous challenges they face. It is the University’s responsibility to insure that all students are given the opportunity to develop skills that will lead to academic success, and graduation. Purdue has established numerous success programs which serve critical needs. Student success is one of the pillars of Purdue’s Strategic Plan and central student success programs (e.g. STAR, BGR and Learning Communities) have been recognized by University leadership and peers nationally as major contributors to rising retention rates and the quality of the Purdue experience. At the same time, these central programs are not as connected with the academic community as they could be. Purdue also has some cohorts of students, particularly transfers, who could be better-served. Although social and personal connections are very important aspects of student engagement and associated with student success, the challenge of rigorous coursework is closely associated with attrition and low achievement. It is therefore very important that success programs be better coordinated and evaluated, that best practices are identified and replicated, and that success programs be directly and coherently tied to other academic programs that are faculty led and delivered.
Faculty leadership

A critical step in the development of more robust undergraduate studies and honors activities is academic leadership. To date, many of these programs are administered by excellent, dedicated staff who directly report to the Office of the Provost. However, faculty involvement in program development and intellectual oversight can enhance the success of these programs. Thus, faculty involvement through a ‘College’ mechanism seems a most appropriate mechanism to reach this goal.

**Task Force guiding principles and goals**

- **Enhancing student success**: acknowledging the challenges ALL students face transitioning to College and Purdue’s commitment to facilitating the success of all students. Increase:
  - Profile
  - Retention
  - Graduation rates

- **Diversity as a core value**: support for undergraduate students and changes in structure of programs must support the continued growth of a diverse Purdue population

- **Mobility for students**: reducing barriers to CODOing across Colleges and increasing the opportunities for exploration that move students toward successful and timely completion of degree requirements

- **Visibility of programs/recruiting students**: enhance prospective and current student awareness of exploratory, interdisciplinary, UG research, success and honors opportunities at Purdue

- **Faculty involvement**: develop/appoint/empower faculty who oversee these programs

- **Synergies and efficiencies**: seek to increase effectiveness and limit expenses by building new collaborations
Models

The Task Force considered multiple models at both the macro (integration of honors, success, research, exploratory and interdisciplinary) and micro (within each of these four areas) level. These are described in some detail in the appendices. We also considered how programs could be staged over time. Ultimately, the Task Force has chosen to present four models, in order of preference, with the following strengths and weaknesses:

a. **An Honors College and a separate unit (Discovery College) with exploratory studies (E), interdisciplinary programs (I), undergraduate research coordination (R), and success programs (S).**

Fourteen of 18 Task Force members rated this model first or second. Overall, there was strong support for 1) an Honors College (with students enrolled in both an Academic College and the Honors College) and, in a separate unit, 2) integration of exploration, interdisciplinary and research, and 3) a split opinion on the best location for success programs. Using the name “**Discovery College**” for this second unit was favored by a strong majority of the Task Force.

**Strengths:**

A separate Honors College will provide a high level of visibility to recruit, educate and graduate high ability students, and for fundraising, where the opportunity is substantial.

A separate Honors College will best facilitate a strong honors community by creating a clear honors identity amongst its participants. The benefit of creating such an identity will have long-term implications as it is well known that donors tend to give back to programs they believe contributed to their success.

Faculty tend to relate to, and engage in activities, where they have academic appointments. A separate Honors College, with academic appointment, will create a shared identity amongst participating faculty.

Honors has the highest probability of success as an independent organization in the near future. Integration of E, I, R and S provides a unique opportunity to elevate all programs in a creative model unlike what most other Universities have done. E, I, R and S programs together could be a great incubator for innovation, building a lattice of programs that integrate and coordinate with academic college programs. This is a leadership opportunity for Purdue. Finally, this model addresses each of the hypothetical propositions stated above and supports the hypothesis that success programs are best located with academic programs.

E and I will enroll students, thus putting this unit on plane with academic colleges.
Weaknesses:
- Potentially higher administrative costs
- Assessment issues for honors separate from ‘Discovery College’
- Harder to adopt cutting edge honors ideas for interdisciplinary programs
- Two units may stretch faculty resources and make it more difficult for faculty involvement

b. An Honors College, a separate unit (Discovery College) with E, I and R. S retained as a separate unit

This model was a close second in preference by the Task Force. The model is identical to (a) except proposes to keep success programs managed directly by the Provost’s office. Thus the Strengths and Weaknesses of this model are similar but not identical to (a). Eleven of 18 Task Force members rated this model first or second. Eight rated it first and six rated it last, demonstrating the split among the Task Force on the best location for success programs.

Strengths:
- Success is everyone’s job. Keeping success programs in the Provost’s Office demonstrates that success is a university-wide emphasis, rather than the possible perception that it is a set of programs for students in Discovery College.
- An Assistant/Associate Provost for Success may be able to better coordinate current success programs, reduce duplication across the university, and lead the development of new initiatives.
- Success programs are less likely to be “swallowed up” into the structure of Discovery College, where it would compete with E, I and R. Putting in a Discovery College could marginalize it

Weaknesses:
- Separating success programs from ‘Discovery College’ could make it harder to improve the success culture at Purdue

c. A single unit (Discovery College) with E, H, and I. R and S retained as separate units.

Models (c) and (d) do not separate the honors program into a new college and were similar in overall rank (2 point difference). Model (c) had two members rank it first and eleven members rank it third whereas model (d) had four members rank it first and seven members rank it fourth (last). Note in question 2 below, six of 18 members favored keeping honors in a larger unit.
Strengths:

- Potentially lower administrative costs, greater efficiencies and simpler logistics

- A single faculty might make it easier to engage faculty across functions

- S and R would be coordinated at the university level, thus cutting across all colleges

- Honors would be easily included in incubator activities with E and I

- This unit would enroll students in E, H and I and thus be parallel to other academic colleges

- Faculty advisory committee would help guide R and S, but it would be led by Provost

Weaknesses:

- It may be more difficult to get faculty involvement in success programs

- Consistent assessment could be more difficult across units

- Honors, where the potential for success and support appears to be the greatest, could lose visibility and opportunity

- d. A single Discovery College with exploratory studies (E), honors (H), interdisciplinary studies (I), undergraduate research (R) and success programs (S)

This was the least favored model with four Task Force members rating it a first and seven members rating it last.

Strengths:

- Easiest logistics and lower perceived administrative costs with one unit

- A common assessment effort for all components could be more easily developed

- Faculty and staff synergies could be easiest to develop

- One unit may help destigmatize success programs

- It could be the best incubator to synergize and develop all programs

- Honors students could more readily become involved in working with exploratory and interdisciplinary students and programs.
Weaknesses:
Very large unit with management issues related to size, diversity and focus

Some units are likely to be less visible and supported than others. This particularly a concern for honors

Harder to fundraise the diverse units

Could create a ‘silo’ effect and not a cross cutting activity with academic colleges

**UHSS Task Force ranking of four models**

Each Task Force member was asked to anonymously rank the four models from 1 (most favored) to 4 (least favored) and to provide strengths and weaknesses of each model. Eighteen Task Force members replied to the request. One turned in a partial vote. There was strong support for a separate Honors College and mixed views on the best location for Success Programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forced Ranking of Models by Task Force</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Points*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. An Honors College and a separate unit with exploration (E), interdisciplinary programs (I), undergraduate research (R), and success programs (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. An Honors College, a separate unit with E, I and R. S retained as a separate unit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A single unit with E, H, and I. R and S retained as separate units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A single unit with (E), (H), (I), (R) and (S)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Points calculated from sum of # votes x rank with 4 points for a ‘1’, 3 points for a ‘2’, etc.
Task Force rating of questions regarding central vs. distributed models and appropriateness of the term “Discovery College”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Exploratory Studies (E)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Prefer centralized but with more faculty involvement and increased communication with colleges</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Disperse more of exploration to existing colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Honors (H)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Should be part of larger unit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Needs to be a separate Honors College</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Interdisciplinary Studies (I)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Just at the beginning, will take time. Don't attach it to a structure yet.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Needs more visibility and to be part of a structure.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. UG Research (R)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Mostly a distributed issue. Doesn't need much additional central oversight</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Opportunities exist to promote that require more central involvement</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Success Programs (S)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Best run by Provost office, Student Services or some entity separate from Discovery College</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Should be synergized and integrated with other unites under review</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. &quot;College&quot; as a term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A good term to use: pluses Academic. Has faculty oversight. Students enrolled in it. Potential for interdisciplinary degrees</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. We should use a different term: minuses May not be degree granting May not be primary home for faculty Does/may not deliver full curricula or credit courses Alternative wording welcomed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. &quot;Discovery xxxxxx&quot; as a term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Fits with much of the functions</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Doesn't fit (suggestions welcomed)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies to move Exploratory Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, Honors, Undergraduate Research and Success programs forward regardless of structure

1. Exploratory Studies

   a. Develop Four-year degree maps (using a common template) for each academic program.
   b. Increase faculty participation.
   c. Establish a University-wide coordinating body to manage undergraduate curricular and change of curricula issues.
   d. Establish a core curriculum with common learning outcomes.
   e. One of the challenges with students changing majors, whether they are moving within a college or between colleges, is the diversity of foundational course offerings. As an example, the mathematics department has made extraordinary efforts to appeal to students from different majors with calculus offerings that are school or college specific. Unfortunately, many of these courses are not accepted by more than one college and students who switch majors must repeat a substantial number of these foundational courses. We propose a transformation in foundational course offerings that mimics what is currently done in foreign languages. Effectively, students enter into a given sequence at an appropriate level (through self selection, AP exam, or entrance exam). Such a model would make it possible for students to select courses based on their initial level and move upwards until they have completed the sequence to the level required for their major. Instead of different versions of a particular course, the foundational classes would be taught in stepped sequences.

2. Interdisciplinary Studies

   a. Build groups of faculty who work together toward additional interdisciplinary certificates, minors and an interdisciplinary major.
   b. Develop a BS degree option in Interdisciplinary Studies.
   c. Consider the relationship between interdisciplinary programs, graduation requirements and core curriculum. Consider a common faculty coordinating body.

3. Honors

   a. Enhance the visibility and impact of honors programs and honors students at Purdue by creating an integrated, centralized organization for all honors programs to provide an administrative structure for honors programs and to establish and sustain a sense of community among students and faculty.
   b. Prepare honors students for long-term success once they have completed honors programs at Purdue
      - Offer a curriculum of honors courses that includes both discipline-specific and broad, interdisciplinary opportunities. Courses will be taught in ways that address the unique learning characteristics of honors students.
      - Offer research and professional development experiences that allow students to learn about and experience career opportunities and expectations in their chosen fields.
• Offer programs with threads that culminate in capstone experiences to insure that students have meaningful experiences throughout their honors education.
• Offer regular advising and regular faculty interaction to honors students, and track the achievements and accomplishments of honors students once they have graduated from Purdue.
• Develop and sustain special placement relationships with employers and graduate education programs.
• Contact honors program graduates to track educational and career paths and to ask for input about how the honors program could enhance preparing current students for post-graduate experiences.

c. Create a community of scholars among honors students and faculty that extends outside the classroom
   • Create a single honors organization and brand to establish and sustain a sense of community and shared experience among honors students and faculty
   • Offer several opportunities for shared experiences among honors students which spans throughout all years, including common first-year themed courses and study abroad opportunities
   • Offer residential experiences to foster and support the community of scholars among students and faculty
   • Provide physical space for honors students and faculty, including classrooms, meeting rooms, and offices
d. Better prepare students to compete for national awards and scholarships and attract greater numbers of students who would be competitive for these awards.
e. Increase faculty engagement in honors programs, which includes teaching honors courses, mentoring honors students, and opportunities for increased roles in faculty governance.

4. Undergraduate Research
   a. Develop a Faculty-Driven undergraduate research academy that coordinates, supports, publicizes and celebrates UG research activities
   b. Build a pipeline to graduate studies with emphasis on STEM disciplines
   c. Create increased opportunities for undergraduate research in STEM fields with an emphasis on broadening the participation of historically underrepresented students
   d. Coordinate the new Undergraduate Research Journal through this Academy in collaboration with the University Press
   e. Establish goals, learning outcomes, strategies, assessment plans and funding streams for UG research
   f. Provide guaranteed research opportunities for new students which should facilitate recruiting

5. Success Programs
   a. Facilitate a cultural shift toward acknowledging the challenges ALL students face transitioning to College and Purdue’s commitment to facilitating the success of all students and the building of a community of scholars.
   b. Market and produce communication materials for academic success services using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.
c. Increase proximity between academic support programs/units and students and enhance accessibility of services.
d. Increase proximity between faculty and students and facilitate positive formal interactions between faculty/administrators and students.
e. Increase diversity as well as opportunities for enhancing awareness of diversity and intercultural competencies.
f. Market and produce communication materials about social programming (e.g., student organizations, interest groups, centers) using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.
g. Increase proximity between students and campus opportunities for social connection.
Selected Impressions from site visits

Arizona State University

Residential environment for honors very visible and attractive to high ability students
Common Freshman seminar (N=20 per section)
Many honors courses, both sections of regular courses and separate courses (core and major courses)
Thesis required of all students to graduate with honors
ASU Honors College is very successful at placing students in post-graduate fellowships
Creative budget model: 1) For profit organization partnered to build 130M campus 2) Honors college fee of $1000 extra which is returned to students in study abroad and thesis scholarships. This fee has strong student support 3) Incentives for regular dept faculty to develop honors courses, but not ongoing support for their continued offering.
Stable non-tenured Honors Faculty (n=18) with 3 year rolling appts.
Strong commitment by upper administration for honors
Holistic honors review has kept honors numbers strong in most colleges
Exploratory studies and interdisciplinary majors managed in the Provost’s office. The common core facilitates exploration and mobility
Exploratory staff work well across four campuses

Penn State

Exploratory studies is much like current Purdue model, but easier to implement due to common core. It is also the largest freshman enrolling unit on campus.
Exploratory studies has the authority to manage needed spaced in core courses for all students.
Students apparently do not lose time to graduation due to the ease of transferring and common requirements. Strong lower division core with upper division major requirements.
Academic colleges and majors at Penn State are very transparent about entry requirements and applicable timelines. Entry requirements are also connected with year of entry.
Honors College is residential, offers scholarships to all its freshman admits and has a strong visibility, recruiting and fundraising effort.

The Dean credits the Honors College with much of the profile enhancement seen in recent years at Penn State.
Honors at Penn State uses a single freshman admission application process with faculty review and is very selective. One perceived limitation of the single admission criteria (i.e., not considering academic college) is it limits diversity.

Upper division entry to Honors College is through Department review. Upper division admission does not provide automatic scholarship support.

Named for Schreyer family (55M) gift which adds prestige and resources.

**Ohio State**

Honors program has grown very large at Ohio State, causing financial concerns. OSU is scaling back Honors from approximately 10% to 5-8% and moving more students into their ‘scholars’ programs (enriched learning communities). Regular learning communities are less well developed. OSU administrators give Honors and Scholars much of the credit for the significant increase in profile and success. OSU is moving toward a two year residence hall requirement for all students.

The lack of assessment of success and exploratory programs was troubling.

**Michigan**

Long standing honors and learning communities exist at Michigan, tied to Arts and Sciences (the primary Undergraduate College at Michigan). Residential and academic integration is a strength at Michigan and serves as a primary retention tool. Residential Colleges include active participation by senior faculty with courses, advising, and strong communities. Active and prestigious honors residence hall. Dual level honors (lower division course-oriented and upper division thesis oriented)

**Development Opportunities**

The Task Force sees great opportunity for fundraising to support these University wide activities. There are multiple examples of existing named honors colleges (Arizona St, IU, Miss St, U Miss, U Oregon, Penn State). Further, there are opportunities to name ‘Discovery College’, facilities, certificate programs, interdisciplinary programs, orientation and success programs, scholarships and endow faculty and staff. The Task Force recommends, regardless of the model, that the programs under review become active participants in fundraising activities.
Next steps this academic year

The Task Force recommends the following next steps regardless of the model chosen for further evaluation and implementation:

1. Engage Purdue Marketing and Media with counsel from the Office of Admissions (and possibly the Task Force) to conduct focus groups with prospective and current students related to the models and to develop a plan for communicating the implementation of the model
2. Engage University Development to begin to develop targets for fundraising opportunities
3. Seek counsel from the Faculty Senate through the Academic Organization Committee, Educational Policy Committee, Senate leadership and the entire Senate
4. Hold an Academic Leadership Forum this semester to provide an open opportunity for discussion of the Task Force proposals
5. Inform the Core Curriculum Committee of the UHSS Task Force report and work collaboratively with the Committee
6. Conduct a fiscal evaluation of the current programs and develop budget plans related to future models
7. Integrate the upcoming Foundations of Excellence program with the next steps in this plan
8. Develop models for physical location of new unit to promote synergies, efficiencies and visibility
9. Utilize the expertise of the Task Force as needed
10. Move rapidly with strong faculty input to allow for a Fall 2012 (or sooner) implementation of the new model
11. Immediately identify and appoint leadership

Selected goals for the 2011-12 academic year

- Determine a model for faculty appointment and appoint faculty
- Develop appropriate committees (e.g., curriculum committee)
- Develop transition plans with timelines which includes staffing issues, communications plans, the role of existing units, and assessment and outcomes
- Budgets developed and implemented
- Staging plan(s) and timeline(s) developed
- Develop a space plan: Physical Space (i.e., temporary, actual, or construction plans) identified
- Communications Plan developed and implemented
- By Fall 2012, the unit(s) should be ‘open’ and serving students and constituents. Staff and faculty in place with defined responsibilities, reporting lines, and any possible staff re-organizations underway or completed.
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Task Force charge from Provost Sands

September 22, 2010

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to ask each of you to serve on a task force chaired by Associate Provost Dennis Savaiano to consider a future structure for Purdue’s current Honors, Undergraduate Studies, Student Access, Transition and Success and academic support/supplemental instruction programs. In keeping with the New Synergies strategic plan priorities for student access and success, we have grown support for exploratory, success and honors studies, particularly aimed at first and second year students. It is expected that these programs will continue to increase their impact on Purdue’s student profile, retention and graduation rates.

The Strategic Plan specifically recommends that we consider the development of a University College and a recent external review recommended the development of an Honors College. I ask that you consider these recommendations and develop at least three models for how Purdue can better promote, support, synergize and increase efficiency in the conduct of these programs. At least one of the recommendations should keep Honors and Undergraduate Studies as separate units.

In addition, I would ask that the task force consider the impact of a core curriculum on the organization of UHP, USP and SATS along with overall first and second year success programs and the potential for individual majors.

I also ask that the Task Force provide monthly updates to the Campus Community and involve as many stakeholders as is feasible in the discussion, given the timeline below.

Please begin by developing guiding principles such as visibility, student mobility, synergies, efficiency, etc. and use these principles as the benchmark for your work.

Finally, we have a very short timeline so as to be able to make a decision on future structures of these programs. I ask that your task force report to the Provost on your findings and recommendations by March 1, 2011. I also ask that you consult with the University Senate as part of the process.

Thank you for your service and commitment to our students. If my office can provide any clarification or support please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Tim Sands
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The excerpts from the ‘New Synergies Strategic Plan’ related directly to the further development of Undergraduate Studies and Honors activities.

New Synergies Strategic Plan:

Launching tomorrow’s leaders by enhancing student success with careers in a dynamic global society, as well as fostering intellectual, professional and personal development for lifelong learning.

Mission Characteristics:

Knowledge of great depth and breadth to be explored, expanded, applied, and preserved for access by all learners, scholars, and practitioners to foster their intellectual and professional growth.

Programs centered on preparing learners from all walks of life to succeed as responsible scholars, leaders, professionals, consumers, citizens, and lifelong learners.

Learner-centered, inspiring, and nurturing educational communities marked by human and intellectual diversity, and the promotion of a dynamic culture of equity and inclusion for all people, in a pervasively supportive climate that fosters excellence of students, faculty, and staff.

Vision

Purdue University will set the pace for new interdisciplinary synergies that serve citizens worldwide with profound scientific, technological, social, and humanitarian impact on advancing societal prosperity and quality of life.

Characteristics:

Visionary interrelationships across disciplines that position the University as a leader in defining the academic structures and culture needed to become a synergistic, globally engaged university in the 21st century.

Outstanding success of students that rivals the very best in a dynamic world in developing successful global citizens and leaders, stimulated by synergistic programs of learning, discovery, and engagement that draw worldwide attention for their quality, relevance, depth, and scope.

Goals:
1. Launching Tomorrow’s Leaders

Programs of superior quality, relevance, and value in every academic discipline, strengthened by multidisciplinary synergies that prepare learners to be innovative, successful, and leaders in a diverse global society.

Excellence in teaching and support services with innovative pedagogies and curricular synergies for improved learning and student success.

Transformational learning opportunities that actively engage students to discover, expand, and apply knowledge within their disciplines, across disciplines, and with respect to global issues.
Strong support services to increase success, retention, and graduation for students from all backgrounds, with particular attention to students performing below their potential success levels.

A learning environment immersed in a rich and dynamic culture of diversity, equality, and inclusion for all people, with widespread support and a diverse educational climate for an evolving global society.

**Strategies Specific to Launching Tomorrow’s Leaders**

Consider developing a university college to provide common first-year program options for students to make well-informed choices of curricula before admission to a college/school degree program.

Undertake the initiatives toward a university-wide core curricular experience for integration into all degree programs in response to the need for core competencies the graduates must demonstrate, reflecting the value of curricular synergies that render them as informed graduates in a global society.

Engage all undergraduate students in experiential learning, early in their careers at Purdue, through involvement in research, service learning, study-abroad programs, and other hands-on experiences appropriate to their curricula.

Provide exceptional students with enhanced educational opportunities through an expanded university honors program and accelerated learning options.

Proactively attend to student success through early monitoring and positive intervention for students with declining academic success.

Significantly transform introductory (gateway) courses and develop effective pedagogies that are appropriate for various learning objectives so as to improve student success.

Create a centralized framework for student excellence and leadership to provide comprehensive one-stop support functions that enhance the effectiveness and responsiveness of core student support services, and coordinate activities and experiences that enhance student academic performance, extra/co-curricular activities, and professional development.

Develop personalized academic connections with prospective students before, during, and after their enrollment to keep them engaged in their academic pursuits with encouragement, motivation, and support.

Create opportunities and spaces for active/interactive/collaborative learning and interaction of students, faculty, and staff to engage in spontaneous and creative informal learning activities.
Measures

- SAT scores & high school rank of admitted students
- Yield for enrollment
- Number of students with significant honors
- Undergraduate retention and graduation rates
- Percent of grads remaining in Indiana
- Honors programs enrollment
- Student program examples
  - (academic, co-curricular, health)
- Core curriculum examples
- Assessment examples
- National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Percent of classes taught by faculty
- Undergraduate class/section size
- Alumni participation rate
- Career placement/additional study
- Rankings/awards (National & International)
- Demography (faculty, staff, student)
- Faculty & staff recruitment
- Synergy examples
- Private giving

Input Measures

- Entering students’ standardized test scores, high school GPA and rank percentiles
- Student admission/yield for enrollment
- Number of students with significant honors
- Student-to-faculty ratio
- Integrated Post-secondary Educational Data Systems (IPEDS) revenues/expenditures per student
- Undergraduate class/section size
- Faculty compensation by discipline/rank; staff compensation by job/comparison group
- Graduate student stipend level by discipline
- Student financial aid disbursement
- Share of classes taught by faculty as primary instructors
- Endowment value
- Participation rate of alumni as donors
Output Measures

- National and international rankings (institutional and programs) and related criteria
- Undergraduate retention and graduation rates
- Undergraduate indebtedness upon graduation
- National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) [includes study-abroad participation]
- Graduate student time to degree
- Ph.D. degrees granted per year
- Graduates’ career placement and advanced study enrollment
- Sponsored program awards and expenditures
- Faculty recognition (national academy memberships; national/international awards)
- Demography of underrepresented populations (faculty, staff, students)
- Licenses and patents for technology commercialization, and start-up companies per year
- National grading for sustainability characteristics

Student Success

- Increase recruitment of excellent students
- Develop a plan to ensure increased diversity of student body
- Provide honors and other accelerated learning programs for top students
- Market Purdue’s advantage for recruiting STEM students
- Improve retention/graduation rate of students
- Enhance first-year and second-year experience, including developing a university-college for students entering without identifying a major
- Redefine “access” to Purdue, increasing enrollment at regional campuses
- Develop university-wide core curriculum
- Foster success in “gateway” courses through new pedagogy
- Enhance experiential learning opportunities (research, global, service)
- Develop centralized “hub” of services to foster student excellence and leadership
- Pursue funds for increased financial aid and scholarships (need and merit)
- Renovate and revitalize student center for wellness, fitness, and community
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Exploratory Programs White Paper

Sue Aufderheide, Tomalee Doan, Brent Drake, Bria Jones, Dennis Minchella, Eric Nauman, Teri Reed-Rhoads, Mary Sadowski, Chair

Background

All entering students have the capacity for success. Purdue must offer a supportive first-year environment not only for students who have declared a major, but also for students who wish to explore their academic options. The provision of academic support for students is critical as the campus includes an increasingly diverse population of students with varied ethnic, cultural, and economic backgrounds. A strong exploratory program would allow students to delay the declaration of a major until they were better able to assess their skills and interest in a field of study. If the first-year curriculum included a number of courses that fulfilled university core requirements, this exploration would allow all students to explore without losing time toward graduation.

The adoption of a university-wide core curriculum would represent an essential academic transformation. In order for the exploratory approach to become a viable academic strategy, students must be allowed to explore particular disciplines while meeting campus-wide learning objectives. To this end, it seems more effective to focus on learning outcomes, rather than a particular set of required courses for first-year students. Various courses across diverse disciplines could incorporate these campus-wide learning objectives, so that students could take these courses during their first year without regard to a particular plan of study, and they would “count” in whatever discipline the student eventually chooses.

The exploratory program would allow students the flexibility to investigate diverse disciplines in their first year. This would allow students to ignite their academic passion and better evaluate their talents. After deciding on their scholastic trajectory, these students would then have access to and seamlessly transfer into the various colleges on campus. If the majority of incoming students were encouraged to explore their academic options they could be successful in finding a major and be matched to an academic environment consistent with their goals. Our current lock-step model leads to high numbers of students who leave their academic colleges with courses that “don’t count” toward their new major. Reducing the number of these CODOs would be a high priority in this model.

In addition to first-year students, the Exploratory Studies could serve a wide range of students at various points in their academic careers, functioning generally as a home for students who are without or ‘between’ colleges. This academic unit would not only serve as a home for entering students who are unsure of their major, but also for students who do not initially succeed or who change directions at Purdue. This unit would be a place for the freshman engineer who will not become a sophomore engineer, for the pre-pharmacy student who will not be accepted into pharmacy school, and for the confused nineteen year old who was ‘supposed’ to become a doctor. These students often need the same type of counseling and support available to undeclared entering students. The exploratory studies structure would provide institutional ownership for these transitional students.
If students are going to explore academic possibilities and still have a timely graduation rate the following are critical:

1. Four-year degree maps (using a common template) for each academic program
2. Faculty participation
3. University-wide coordinating body to manage undergraduate curricular and change of curricula issues
4. BS degree option in Interdisciplinary Studies
5. A core curriculum with common learning outcomes

Data Discussion

Student movement amongst the colleges is a common phenomenon at Purdue. In any given one-year academic period approximately 11% of the undergraduate students continuously enrolled at the West Lafayette campus CODO from one academic college to another. This pattern begins within the freshman year as 12.2% of the new first time students to the campus are retained their second year in a different college than their initial entry school, while 76.7% are retained in their entry college. Ultimately, this behavior leads to only 42.9% of the new entry students graduating from their initial college within six-years, while an additional 26.7% graduate from a different college at Purdue. The highest university non-CODO completion rate in Purdue’s history stands at only 47.0%. Six-year graduation rates from initial college of entry top 60% in only two of the academic colleges. It should be noted that this data summary is taken from the 2004 cohort which has one of the lowest retained cohorts in many years (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Undergraduate Studies Program 2004</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Undergraduate Studies Program 2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Purdue University 2004</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Purdue University 2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT (CR +M)</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td></td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT composite</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. GPA</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>+0.27</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>+0.17</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Rank</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University New Beginning Enrollment and School Profiles Reports

**Figure 1**: Profile of New Beginning Students 2004 and 2010
Additionally, a large contingent of new beginning students are entering the university with a goal of exploration as 323 (5.1% of the overall new beginner class) new students selected the Undergraduate Studies Program (USP) as their first choice college for admissions in the fall 2010 class, accounting for 79% of the new entry students who accepted an offer of admission to USP. This strong interest has led to an increase profile in the program.

One important note to the overall discussion of student success is the current trend in first-year retention of the University (Figure 2). Though first-year retention is not the full story, it is an indication of early success initiatives and programs. Currently, Purdue is on an upward trend, which cannot be overlooked. The downward trend of the early 2000’s has been reversed beginning in 2006 and has grown steadily with each passing cohort year. Though cause and effect can not be established, there are correlations to increased merit scholarship programs, student success efforts, and curricular innovations.

![1-Year Retention of First-Time Full-Time New Beginners West Lafayette](image)

**Figure 2:** First-Year Retention rates for the past 13 years at Purdue University

**Undergraduate Studies Program (USP) History**

Many students entering college have a variety of academic interests that do not immediately point to a specific major. USP was created in 1995 to give these qualified traditional-age, post-secondary students the opportunity to discover academic and career interests before declaring their major. During the first year, USP advisors help students, through one-on-one advising and through a mandatory three-credit hour course all beginning USP students must take their first semester. USP advisors help students identify interests and abilities that link them to an appropriate major; explore various majors and minors to determine which ones challenge them and direct them toward career goals; and select courses, work experience, extracurricular activities, and leadership opportunities that help prepare them for the future. The first class of USP students entered in August 1996. Exploratory Studies (ES) will grow out of USP.
Option 1. Exploratory Studies (ES)

The mission and vision of the Exploratory Studies program (ES) will parallel that of the existing Undergraduate Studies Program. Exploratory Studies will be an exemplary program for students seeking to explore a variety of degree options at Purdue University. The program will continue to help those students who want to explore their options before selecting a major. Students will be empowered to develop and implement individualized plans for academic success and personal and career development. They will make a smooth and academically sound transition from Exploratory Studies to their chosen degree-granting programs. As with USP, Exploratory Studies will not be degree granting and will be open to all admitted Purdue students who will remain in the program until they have selected a major. As with USP, there will be a maximum time that any student can remain in Exploratory Studies.

All students in Exploratory Studies will be required to take an academic and career planning course. If a new interdisciplinary college is constituted at Purdue, ES would reside within this unit. Students would need to have access to all first year courses needed to make adequate progress in majors of their choice. It is hoped that the university will make a commitment to all incoming students that these courses will be available and thereby removing many of the CODO barriers.

Tracking sequences: There are numerous models for encouraging students to find and successfully complete a major plan of study. The first is to require them to enter a specific college as freshmen. This is effectively the current model at Purdue and students face significant challenges when they attempt to transfer or change their majors. The second is to define broad areas of interest such as, but not limited to (1) Life Sciences, (2) Humanities, (3) STEM, (4) Education, and (5) Business. This is a viable option provided that there is a core curriculum in place to allow students to make progress while they explore their career options. If little movement between the pre-defined areas, it allows the potential for four separate core curricula. The third is to implement a more structured core curriculum so that there are few barriers between colleges. The primary advantage of this model is that it allows students to explore with little or no penalty in terms of time to graduation. It also makes it possible to track students and map their “exploration pathways,” in order to define common sequences. Few curricula build in an evolutionary model in this manner and it has the potential to provide data-driven motivation for potential curricular changes across the university.

Promoting Exploration Between and Within College: One of the challenges with students changing majors, whether they are moving within a college or between colleges, is the diversity of foundational course offerings. As an example, the mathematics department has made extraordinary efforts to appeal to students from different majors with calculus offerings that are school or college specific. Unfortunately, many of these courses are not accepted by more than one college and students who switch majors must repeat a substantial number of these foundational courses. We propose a transformation in foundational course offerings that mimics what is currently done in foreign languages. Effectively, students enter into a given sequence at an appropriate level (through self-selection, AP exam, or entrance exam). Such a model would make it possible for students to select courses based on their initial level and move upwards until they have completed the sequence to the level required for their major. Instead of different versions of a particular course, the foundational classes would be taught in stepped sequences. (Appendix A)
**Option 2. Expansion of First-Year programs across all colleges**

Purdue University is known for progressive and unique advances in undergraduate education (more recent examples include Signals and the Ideas to Innovation Learning Laboratory). Continuing this tradition and given that there are successful and in one case the nation’s first program in first-year discipline specific programs, one model that can be considered is intentionally expanding first-year programs across all colleges. When USP was created, these types of programs existed in at most two colleges. Now that we have established that a small group of students do wish to explore each year, expanding first-year programs in combination with expanding success programs for first-year students is a viable option. In addition, this model would allow the staff and structure of the current Undergraduate Studies Program to morph to a Center of Student Success for upper level transitioning students typically composed of those who are at risk of being dropped from the university and students who are unable to stay in their original college due to academic or choice issues. A Center of Student Success targeted at the sophomore and higher levels would be a differentiator in the retention model since we know that as we become more and more successful at the First-Year level, the issue of the Sophomore Slump will become bigger. This has already been noted in colleges with existing first-year programs. Being proactive on the sophomore slump would again place Purdue at the forefront of undergraduate education initiatives especially for large public institutions as currently most formal sophomore initiatives exist in small liberal arts colleges. Key to this model is that every college would have a first-year program where all students begin their studies with a dedicated staff and faculty that partner with the entering students in advising, learning, and exploring majors within the college, but also between if a change of college is found to be the student’s potential desire. This model relies on a common core at the university level. The model also calls for collaborative and more formal structured environment between the colleges or academics in general and with the university-based success programs.

Using the model proposed by John Gardner of the current practices for first-year students in the United States (2010), there are three key aspects to successful programs;

- pre-university programs for First-Year students,
- first-year initiatives focused on the curriculum and/or the faculty, and
- structures, services and activities that benefit first-year students. *(Appendix B)*

Within Purdue University, we already have all of these components in our typical distributed structure. By adding intentional structure and coordination, these components can be expanded across all colleges to create a more integrated and ultimately seamless transition within and between programs targeting the success of all admitted students, exploring and non-exploring.
Option 3. Interdisciplinary Studies College

USP has demonstrated that it helps students explore their academic options and navigate the university to fulfill their academic potential. The introduction of a new college structure to house the newly named Exploratory Studies program (ES) has numerous advantages over options that currently leave USP without an academic home. The primary advantage is that it provides a focus for faculty involvement. It should be noted, however, that there is a natural extension of this new college concept with ES as its foundation and that is the ability to create a major program for interdisciplinary studies, forming a College of Interdisciplinary Studies. This college could focus on state, national, and global challenges such as energy independence, economic development, or improving health and healthcare.

(a) Create a new college of Interdisciplinary Studies with a focus on state, national, and global challenges.

Faculty: split FTE with home college and develop courses around specific challenge areas.

ES: provides framework for students to explore. Students will be encouraged to choose a major, however, will have the option to remain in the College of Interdisciplinary Studies.

(b) House the interdisciplinary studies major within an already existing college

Faculty: may split FTE with home college and develop courses in specific areas with the selected college faculty.

ES: provides a framework for students to explore. Students will be encouraged to choose a major, however, will have the option to obtain a degree in interdisciplinary studies from this college.
Appendix 4a

The sequence for calculus currently separates differential, integral, and vector calculus offerings into three separate four credit courses. The proposed change would amount to a slight restructuring in which differential and integral calculus are combined and offered at an elementary level and an intermediate level (they could potentially be broken up further if desired).

Table 1: Mathematics example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Model for Mathematics</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differential Calculus (4 credits)</td>
<td>Elementary Integral and Differential Calculus (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral Calculus (4 credits)</td>
<td>Intermediate Integral and Differential Calculus (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Calculus (4 credits)</td>
<td>Introduction to vectors and vector calculus (combination of physics, linear algebra, and vector calculus, 3 or 4 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential Equations</td>
<td>Advanced Calculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differential Equations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional advantages include the ability to integrate first year mathematics and physics into a single class (introduction to vectors and vector calculus). It is also likely that students who score a 3 on the AP exam could viably test out of the elementary class and move on to the Intermediate class. Students who score a 4 or 5 on the AP exam may be able to move directly into Introduction to vectors and vector calculus.
Appendix 4b

**Pre-university programs for First-Year students:** Current Purdue practices aligned with the pre-university programs for first-year students are new student orientation events such as BGR, STAR, and subsequent admission programs on Saturdays, for example. There are also examples of parent/family orientation programs through Parent Newsletters, information brochures, and specific orientation sessions targeting parents while their students are attending parallel orientation programs. In fact, translation of brochures to Spanish has occurred in some colleges targeting the Spanish-speaking parents of our rising Latina/o population. A successful summer bridge program exists at Purdue called the STEM Boot Camp where students are prepared curricular as well as socially in the summer preceding their fall admission date. Finally, Purdue's two-year-old Common Reading program is another example of a noted pre-university first-year program. These programs span various models of administration from committee to college to multiple college collaborations to university.

**First-year initiatives focused on the curriculum and/or the faculty:** Current Purdue practices focused on first-year initiatives on the curriculum and/or faculty are numerous. Academic Advising exists in all colleges with a few already having staff and faculty advising dedicated to the first-year students. First-year courses focused on major exploration provides for a developmental environment within a college that allows for informed decisions on major. Within a college, the content expertise rests with the faculty to share and inform students of discipline specific information that is broad at the college level, yet not too broad as to exclude exploration beyond the college. These types of courses exist at Purdue from one credit hour seminars to three credit hour survey courses. Purdue’s faculty development programs exist at the university and college level and cross-collaboration would benefit all faculty and ultimately students. Learning communities are expanding at Purdue and have been shown to lead to higher first-year retention with a diminishing differential towards graduation. Many faculty led service learning opportunities exist within our curriculum in all colleges and many are cross college and truly interdisciplinary. Finally, Supplemental Instruction is often provided as a model for curricular success and Purdue goes beyond this model by enhancing it with numerous help and study opportunities specific to disciplines and targeted toward first-year students.

**Structures, services and activities that benefit first-year students:** The final area noted by Gardner and his colleagues are structures, services, and activities to be of benefit to first-year students. Purdue is leading the nation in many opportunities along this path including the Signals system which is focused on first- and second-year courses which are often referred to as gateway courses due to the numbers of students required to take and pass the course before proceeding through their majors. These early warning systems are noted in the literature to have an impact on student grades and ultimately retention. The student life opportunities and organization at Purdue are outstanding in number and quality. The leadership training and opportunities are very good through the Dean of Students structure. The creation of good habits at this level is a goal of most of our first-year programs. These can often be seen in course, college, and/or university policies. Examples include attendance policies, mid-term required grade checks, self responsibility, and requirements of students performing and learning to perform on interdisciplinary teams. Finally, the very first learning community created at Purdue was one of a living-learning community and it still exists today as the largest learning
community. These environments are being expanded with new and innovative residence halls that incorporate residential living with academics and support services.
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UHSS Task Force
Student Success Subcommittee
Draft Report

Subcommittee Members: Cheryl Altinkemer, Dan Carpenter, Kauline Davis, Cesni Ennis, Don Petrin, Heather Servaty-Seib (chair), Kendra Watkins, and Toyinda Wilson-Long

Subcommittee Meetings: November 11th, December 6th & 15th, and January 5th, 11th, & 19th

Process: Subcommittee spent meeting times:
• discussing vision, goals, and potential action items,
• generating list of current Purdue student success services (see Appendix A),
• reporting on information collected from other institutions,
• developing potential organizational models for student success services/programs, and
• generating advantages and disadvantage of each structural approach.

Subcommittee members researched student success/support services at institutions with similar student bodies.

• Appendix B: Template
• Appendix C: Information highlights by institution

Vision: Students who attend Purdue University will become academically integrated into and socially connected with the institution during their first and second years of study.

Guiding Assumptions:
• Purdue, particularly because of its size and organizational structure, is a challenging institution for students to navigate.
• As an institution, Purdue draws a high achieving population of students who have done well historically and may not be personally prepared for the academic challenges that college brings (i.e., they are not accustomed to struggling academically).
• Two of the three top reasons Purdue first-year students indicate for why they are not planning to return for their second year of study are academic factors and campus culture (other one is financial factors). These findings are from research done by the Purdue Office of Enrollment Management in 2008 and 2010. Critical elements of campus culture were as follows (% of endorsement for each year in parentheses):
  o more social opportunities (50% each year)
  o a school with fewer students (50 to 55.3%)
  o more economic diversity (21.1 to 33.3%)
  o more racial and ethnic diversity (21.1 to 33.3%)
  o don’t like living in the city (10.5 to 16.7%)
    o a school with more students (13.2 to 16.7%)
• It is preferable for students to seek out academic assistance as soon as struggles arise vs. waiting for campus officials to approach them.
• Purdue students have diverse academic and personal interests and Purdue has a variety of ways (e.g., student organizations, cultural centers) through which students can become socially connected.
• The use of trained peer leaders is a potentially powerful way to increase academic and social connectedness.

Overarching Goal

Implement a culture shift around awareness of the normative academic and social challenges faced by students during college, regardless of the particular institution. The transition to college is stressful and demanding, both intellectually and interpersonally. Students coming to college leave behind an environment they were knowledgeable of and are now working to understand and become part of the Purdue culture.

Purdue current campus culture:
• Purdue’s current culture is based on independence, autonomy, and strength (e.g., Purdue Pride, Boiler Up). Such a culture does not lend itself to encouraging students to seek support or work to develop connections when they are struggling.
• Purdue is student-centered in a decentralized way. This approach can and does provide individualized attention to specific sub-populations, but does not likely lead to a general sense of community and connection across campus or attachment to the institution as a whole.

Possible actions to facilitate cultural shift:
• President (and/or other leaders) directly address issues related to the academic and social challenges of the college experience with new students during STAR, Boiler Gold Rush, etc. Topics covered could include:
  o College is more academically demanding than high school—offered in a normalizing way. It is a big transition and it is ok and expected that they will struggle at times.
  o Purdue is committed to assisting students during those times when they will academically struggle—information offered regarding various support services (campus-wide and specific to college) and the manner in which they can be accessed.
  o Purdue is a big place with a large student population. They will not connect with everyone, but they will find their “pocket” or “place” of connection.
  o Purdue is proud of its continuing growth toward diversity. Diversity is broadly defined here at Purdue (e.g., race/ethnicity, sex, SES, first-generation college students, religion, size, rural/urban, sexual orientation, etc.).
  o Purdue is committed to assisting students in connecting with their community on campus—however they define community. Reference to the variety of student organizations, groups, and centers on campus.
• Messages related to normative academic and social challenges and opportunities are echoed by many offices/units:
  o SATS
  o Academic Advising
  o CAPS/PUSH
  o Exponent
  o MMPD – Multicultural and Minority Program Directors
  o Athletics
• Internal marketing and communication material that emphasizes concepts of:
  o connection, community, & togetherness,
  o attachment to institution,
  o diversity as a strength,
  o and availability of support and social opportunities.

Additional Goals

In addition to the overarching goal, the committee generated a number of more specific goals related to academic integration and social connectedness. The goals are noted here and more details about each goal and the associated action items generated by the subcommittee can be found in Appendix D.

Goal 1: Market and produce communication materials for academic success services using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.

Goal 2: Increase proximity between academic support programs/units and students and enhance accessibility of services.

Goal 3: Increase proximity between faculty and students and facilitate positive formal interactions between faculty/administrators and students.

Goal 4: Increase diversity as well as opportunities for enhancing awareness of diversity and intercultural competencies.

Goal 5: Market and produce communication materials about social programming (e.g., student organizations, interest groups, centers) using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.

Goal 6: Increase proximity between students and campus opportunities for social connection.

Potential Structural Models

Guiding Questions: What are the pros and cons of each model with regard to meeting the above noted goals and facilitating associated action items? Are there structures and approaches that would improve academic integration and social connectedness?

Model I: Decentralized

All academic support services and social programming efforts are decentralized in organization and implementation.

Pros:
  • Independence of units to be creative in meeting the needs of particular populations, including but not limited to college/school of study.
  • Status quo: As most (but not all) efforts are currently decentralized, resources not expended on the process of change.
  • Some metrics related to current decentralized efforts appear to be improving.
  • Allows for a sense of “pocketing/subculture effect” on Purdue’s large campus.
Cons:

- Cultural shifts are difficult to implement when units are decentralized.
- Units do not benefit from others’ successes.
- No opportunities for economies of effort.
- Potential differences and inequities in services (e.g., quantity, quality, etc) each student receives. Ethics of service/programming provision must be considered when only offered to subpopulations.
- Internal communication, coordination, and synchronization are difficult.
- Marketing programming is complicated.
- Challenging for students, staff, and faculty to navigate.
- Assessment and evaluation is challenging and is uneven across units.

Model II: Hybrid A

Academic support services and social programming efforts are connected through a number of centralized coordinating bodies. These coordinating bodies would likely have overlap in membership as several units on campus provide a variety of services to students. The coordinating bodies would not maintain any changes of authority or resources.

Potential emphases of the coordinating bodies include:

- Academic assistance centers (e.g., Academic Success Center, Writing Lab)
- Diversity-related efforts
- Student life (e.g., Residential Life, SAO, PMO, Athletics, ISS)
- First-year/transition to institution efforts

Pros:

- Sharing of ideas.
- Encourages collaboration across units.
- Potential for increased coordination and decreased redundancy of efforts.
- Culture shifts may be possible.
- Enhanced opportunity for operationalizing and implementing strategic plan through increased coordination.
- Ease in dissemination of information.
- Potential positive impact on development efforts. Donors are more likely to give to coordinated efforts involving higher numbers of students where there donations will “work harder.”
- Creates sense of smaller structure.
- Increased likelihood of multiple points of student participation which is positively associated with student success.

Cons

- With no authority or resources, the coordinating bodies will have little power to formally implement change or facilitate growth and development. Could create a situation of cross-unit communication with no follow through.
- Could be challenging to disseminate funding acquired through development efforts to appropriate units connected with the coordinating bodies. For example, if a donor gives to “diversity efforts,” which specific unit should receive the funds?
Model III: Hybrid B

Academic support services and social programming efforts are structured differently based on whether or not they serve the entire Purdue student body and whether or not they have ties to an academic unit. In this hybrid approach, there are three different approaches to organization and implementation.

- All academic support services and social programming efforts that serve the entire student body or a subsection of the student body and are not associated with an academic unit are centralized in organization and implementation. Examples of services to entire student body include Orientation/Welcome Programs, Learning Communities, Supplemental Instruction, Academic Success Center, CAPS, and SAO. Examples of a subsection of students include Disability Resource Center, Horizons, and Purdue Promise.
- All academic support services and social programming efforts that serve the entire student body and are associated with an academic unit are centrally organized (i.e., dual reporting lines) and decentralized in implementation (e.g., Writing Lab, Math Help Lab, Purdue Counseling and Guidance Center).
- All academic support services and social programming efforts that serve a subsection of the student body and are associated with an academic unit are centrally coordinated and decentralized in implementation (e.g., Women in Science, Women in Engineering, Business Opportunities Programs).

Pros:
- Offers a tiered approach which could fit Purdue better than would a purely centralized approach.
- Cultural shifts could be possible with some level of centralization—from structural organization to basic coordination.
- If one unit were to oversee all of the effort noted above, there would be a clearly identified unit students could contact regarding academic support services and/or social programming efforts.
  - Assist with increasing proximity between students and units
- Units could benefit from successes of other units—cross pollination of ideas and successes (e.g., use and training of peer staff members)
- Central organization and/or coordination could allow for unified needs assessment process.
  - What are the academic needs of first-year students, sophomores, etc.?
  - What are the challenges in getting students to attend an initial call-out for a student organization?
- Central organization and/or coordination could allow for unified and efficient assessment and evaluation of services.
- Central organization of units that do serve all students would provide new oversight unit with the authority and power to implement changes that benefit all students.
- Coordination of efforts could enhance development opportunities.
- Increased likelihood of multiple points of student participation which is positively associated with student success.

Cons:
- Categorizing efforts based on tiered approach could be confusing and potentially controversial.
- Dual reporting situations are complicated. For example, the director of the Writing Lab would report to both the English Department and the new structural unit. Where are the resources for the Writing Lab housed, who has authority for personnel decisions, etc.?
Model IV: Centralized
All academic and social support units are centralized in organization and implementation.

Pros:
- Cultural shifts are more possible with centralized approach
- Students need a clearly identified and single unit they can contact regarding academic support and/or social connection.
  - Assist with increasing proximity between students and units
- Units could benefit from successes of other units—cross pollination of ideas and successes (e.g., use and training of peer staff members)
- Central organization could allow for unified needs assessment process.
  - What are the academic needs of first-year students, sophomores, etc.?
  - What are the challenges in getting students to attend an initial call-out for a student organization?
- Coordination could allow for unified and efficient assessment and evaluation of services.
- Potentially increase the institutional and financial support to implement programs—could increase “buying” power of units to implement large scale efforts.
- Increased likelihood of multiple points of student participation which is positively associated with student success.

Cons:
- Sheer number of units could make this unwieldy and impractical
- Potentially stifle those services that ought to remain unique as they serve specific groups.
- Could limit activity level. When multiple people and units involved, each specific unit could perceive less responsibility (i.e., diffusion of responsibility) for growth and development.
- Could limit creativity. When layers of bureaucracy are added there could be less time and/or energy available for creativity (i.e., opposite of Skunk Works)
- Getting decisions is harder and slower.
- Could be diplomatically and politically challenging in terms of Purdue’s current culture of decentralization, specialization, and independence.
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Purdue Current Support Services: Broadly Defined

- SATS programs
  - Orientation programs
    - Winter welcome
    - Fall welcome
    - Boiler Gold Rush
    - Athletic orientation
  - STAR (Summer Transition, Advising, and Registration)
  - Learning communities
  - Twenty-First Century Scholars (TFCS)
  - Purdue Promise (financial, academic, and social support for TFCS).
  - Common Reading Program
  - Supplemental Instruction—newly reinstated—peer-led academic assistance for gateway courses
- Academic help centers
  - Academic Success Center—housed in CLA, but serves whole student body
  - Decentralized help centers in a number of academic units
- Purdue Writing Lab—housed in the Department of English
- Testing Center—housed in ODOS
- Disability Resource Center—housed in ODOS
- Horizons—housed in ODOS
- Academic advising—decentralized in colleges also USP
- Counseling services
  - PUSH/CAPS
  - ODOS
  - Purdue Counseling and Guidance Center—College of Education
- Center for Career Opportunities
  - Provides assistance to students regarding choice of academic major—one of many services provided
- First year seminar courses
  - USP—EDPS 105 taught by USP advisors for their advisees
  - Decentralized in number of colleges
- Experiential learning
  - Service-learning and Center for Instructional Excellence
  - Decentralized in a number of colleges
- Signals—operated through ITAP and Blackboard
  - Academic warning system— instructors establish “cut-off” and below this level receive an email (written by instructor) indicating recommended action
  - At this point, no other formal follow-up or intervention with students
• Diversity initiatives
  o Campus centers include: Black Cultural Center, Latino Cultural Center, Confucious Cultural Center, Native American Educational and Cultural Center, Purdue University China Center
  o College/School academic and retention efforts
    ▪ Louis Stokes Alliance
  o Diversity Resource Office
• International Students and Scholars
• Purdue Student Activities & Organizations
• Purdue Athletics
• Purdue Music Organizations
• Purdue Residential Life
  o Under business side of the house at Purdue—harder for connections with other student success efforts and services
Appendix 5B  Survey document used by subcommittee

Institution:
Source(s) of Information:
Guiding questions:
  How are support services organized/structured—where are programs/units housed?
  What are the names of support service programs/units?
  How do they differ from approach at Purdue?
  How are support services “marketed” to the student body?
  What unique support services does the institution employ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Program/Unit</th>
<th>Present (Y/N)</th>
<th>Name of Program/Unit</th>
<th>Housed: Physically</th>
<th>Housed: Structurally</th>
<th>Centralized?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New student orientation(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New student summer advising and registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year seminar course(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized support program for first-generation and/or low-income students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental instruction: peer-led academic assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other peer-led forms of assistance/support (e.g., peer counseling program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Program/Unit</th>
<th>Present (Y/N)</th>
<th>Name of Program/Unit</th>
<th>Housed: Physically</th>
<th>Housed: Structurally</th>
<th>Centralized?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic help/learning center(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing lab/center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized support for students with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity initiative(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential and/or service-learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activities and organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential life: student support programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Highlights of Data Collected From Other Institutions (all with strong engineering focus)

Rose–Hulman

- Use of freshman residence hall with sophomore tutors/RA’s.
- First year College & Life Skills seminars taught by 55 volunteer faculty:
  - Campus Involvement, Leadership-The top 10 Freshmen goof-ups, Extracurricular Activities, Leadership Styles, Things That I Wish Someone Would Have told Me Before Coming to Rose, Survival Tips for Your First Week of college, 25 Tips to Help You Survive and Thrive Your Freshman year and Beyond, Building Your Career, Resumes, Stress Management, Health & Wellness, Study Skills, Phone & E-mail Etiquette, Professional Etiquette – Interview Attire, Business Casual, Windsor Knot, Handshaking, Interview Dos and Don’ts, Engineers Creed, Money Management, Rose-Hulman Graduate Panel, Evaluation.
- Common Reading Program.
- Ease of website to locate the program and find the appropriate contact and/or information.
- Residential life social programs taught by RA’s.
- Evening/night tutoring program in central location.

Harvey Mudd

- Creation of new student success programs driven by needs assessment.
- Writing lab hours in sync with the study needs and habits of today’s UG population.
- Academic student support services provided in the residence halls.
- Greeks are banned (not terribly important regarding our charge but I find this fascinating none-the-less!)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI)

- Class Initiative: Each student cohort (2nd year, 3rd year, etc) has a Dean responsible for students retention. The Dean “moves” with the class in time. Dean of 2nd Year becomes Dean of 3rd Year as that class progresses.
- Early Intervention: RPI has an early warning process similar to Purdue’s Signals. However, they’ve taken it to the next stage. Each Student Services/Affairs professional staff member has a caseload of students. Students who are identified, by this method, as being in academic difficulty are assigned to a staff member for follow up.
- RPI has no Learning Communities per se. They feel that these are unnecessary as their students are all following prescribed paths anyway.
- The Advising/Learning Center: This unit is at the university level. It coordinates the efforts of academic advising across the academic units. It assigns students to their advisor and coordinates academic help/assistance.
- Their residence halls assign “Learning Assistants” to live-in with Residence Hall Assistants. While the RA’s role is that of a traditional RA, the LA serves as an academic mentor and student representative of academic assistance activities on campus.
Worcester Polytech

- Insight is an “extended orientation program” that last the first year of study. It involves a faculty mentor (serves as student’s first advisor), a peer mentor, and connection with residence halls
- Academic Resource Center—centralized location for all academic support services such as writing lab, testing center, disability resources, workshops related to academics, etc.
- Significant number of peer assistance programs including student health advisory council (health center), student support network (counseling center), and sexual assault peer mentors (counseling center).
- Dean of students indicated that the president speaks with students during orientation and is intentional about stressing that they will struggle and that there are resources to assist them in the process. He also indicated that they have found the peer facilitated programs to be effective in enhancing student success.
- About two years ago leaders from academic affairs and student affairs began meeting every other week to discuss student needs and to initiate strategies to meet those needs. It began in connection with a larger than usual incoming class, but has continued because it is perceived as effective and beneficial.

California Polytech

- Inclusive Excellence council advises the university President. Their initiative is called “Make Excellence Inclusive,” a goal developed and promoted by the Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- The health and counseling services has a program called P.U.L.S.E where students can be trained to be a peer health counselor. Peer health counselors assist students with alcohol and nutrition and more.
- Learning communities programs are facilitated by University Housing they have four LC programs: Living Learning Programs; Connections; Transitions; & Sophomore Success Programs.

Northwestern

- During welcome week, students meet with their academic advising team, which includes a peer advisor, to make their schedule. The peer advisor can give advice about classes from a student perspective—everything from best professors, to building locations, etc.
MIT

- During freshman orientation, students are introduced to MIT, as well as Boston, the surrounding city that will be their new home.
- Seminar XL is offered by the Office of Minority Education. It is an optional first year seminar course, which is taken by students taking similar math and science courses. The seminar is led by graduate students and upperclassmen, who help students identify questions/problems then use collaborative thinking to find answers.
- The Office of Minority Education has a Tutorial Services Room, which is student organized and managed. The Tutorial Services Room offers one-on-one tutoring sessions, question and answer sessions, test reviews, and final exam reviews.
- The Freshman Advising program includes upperclassmen students as part of the Freshman Advising team.
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1. Academic Integration—extent of academic connection with the institution as reflected variables such as grades, perceived value of what is being learned, enjoyment of content and process of studying, identification with academic norms and values, and identification with role as a student (Tinto, 1987).

**Goal 1:** Market and produce communication materials for academic success services using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.

Possible action items:
- Conduct research with Purdue first-year students to determine which potential names of academic assistance offices would lead to greater utilization. Titles from other institutions suggest that words such as “help,” “resource,” and “support” may not be as effective as more innocuous word such as “learning” and “advising.”
- Conduct research (e.g., focus groups, interviews, etc.) to inform production of marketing materials for academic success services. Use a theory that connects attitudes with behaviors (e.g., Theory of Planned Behavior) upon which to base research design. Research findings would then suggest specific variables associated with students’ intentions to use academic success services. Data from administrators who extensively work with first-year students could also prove useful in determining students’ needs and attitudes related to academic services.
- Develop and implement an internal marketing plan of academic assistance programs that incorporates findings from research done with Purdue students and administrators (see above).

**Goal 2:** Increase proximity between academic support programs/units and students and enhance accessibility of services.

Purdue current efforts:
- Writing Lab provides service hours in the Hicks undergraduate library.

Possible action items:
- Academic success units hold office hours at times when students are most likely to access services (typically outside of normal business hours).
- Academic success units hold office hours in the residence halls.
- Academic success units increase number of and training for peer staff members (e.g., Supplemental Instruction, Tutoring).
- Each unit in residence hall to employ peers to serve as Learning Assistant (LA)—similar structure to resident assistant, but with sole emphasis on assisting student in the area of academic success and making referrals to appropriate academic success units.
- Create and use academic space in the residence halls (i.e., first and second-year courses actually held in the halls).
- Create Purdue academic services phone applications
  - Students live in the digital world
  - Students may be more open to “asking for help” if they can find what they need electronically
Applications could include a decision tree approach that allows students to answer questions that lead them to the most appropriate unit to provide assistance they need.

- Create online videos and/or webinars (perhaps designed and narrated by students) to walk new students through the academic service/programs available.
- Enhance use of Signals: streamline process for faculty, create structure for follow-up by professional staff (e.g., academic advisor, student affairs staff, RA, Residential Life Manager).
- Implement first-year seminar course that includes core objective related to knowledge of academic support services.

**Goal 3**: Increase proximity between faculty/administrators and students and facilitate positive formal interactions between faculty and students.

**Purdue Current Efforts:**
- Undergraduate Research Programs (LSAMP, DURI, FEELS, ETC.)
- Learning Communities
- Faculty Fellows program in Residence Halls

**Possible Action Items:**
- Institutionalize the undergraduate research programs
- Establish connection between JPUR and undergraduate research program Create a campus-wide program that connects students with faculty and/or staff outside of the classroom. Establish resources to incentivize the faculty and/or staff to be involved.
- Create position of undergraduate ombudsman

**Goal 4**: Increase diversity campus-wide as well as opportunities for enhancing awareness of diversity and intercultural competencies.

**Possible Action Items:**
- Continue to grow scholarship support for underrepresented students
- Increase human resource efforts in urban centers outside Greater Lafayette
- Enhance diversity and intercultural training for all faculty and staff
- Collect and use data related to why prospective diverse students chose to not attend Purdue.
- Consider, in discussions of core requirements and the structure of a university college, the importance of requiring an intercultural competency course for all first-year students (e.g., AGR 201: Communicating Across Cultures).
  - Such a course could be connected with a certificate program added to students’ transcript (similar to the DiversiKey program).
  - Intercultural and diversity defined broadly.
  - Format could be large lecture for content and small recitation lab for experiential activities.
  - Scholarly connection through use of Milton Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.
Strong need for research using a pre-post design with measures such as the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI).

II. Social Integration — extent of social connection with members of the institutional community as reflected by variables such as number of friends, perception of connection with a sub-group, number of staff known by name, number of staff with whom personally interacted, and number of interactions with staff per week/month/year.

Goals:

Goal 5: Market and produce communication materials about social programming (e.g., student organizations, interest groups, centers) using language that is aligned with the Purdue student body.

Possible action items:

- Conduct research (e.g., focus groups, interviews, questionnaires) to inform production of marketing materials for student organizations. This research can be focused on both the content (e.g., what kinds of messages are attractive) and the medium (e.g., where and how are student most like to go seek information) of the marketing material. Use a theory that connects attitudes with behaviors (e.g., Theory of Planned Behavior) upon which to base research designs. Research findings would then suggest specific variables associated with students’ intentions to seek connection with a social unit on campus. Data from administrators who extensively work with first-year students could also prove useful in determining students’ needs and attitudes related to social programming.
- Develop and implement a marketing plan that incorporates findings from research done with Purdue students (see above).

Goal 6: Increase proximity between students and campus opportunities for social connection.

Purdue current efforts:

- Students find out about social programming through:
  - “Call outs” (likely primary way).
  - BGR and STAR
  - Directory and online search through student activities and organizations
  - Exponent

Possible action items:

- Provide an extended orientation program that lasts throughout the first semester (e.g., extension of Boiler Gold Rush)
- Academic advisors serve as facilitators of students’ organizational involvement
- Each academic advisor works with a peer mentor who assists students in connecting with student organizations on campus.
- Create Purdue student social unit phone applications
  - Students live in the digital world
  - Students may be more open to join an organization if they can find information about it online
Applications could include a decision tree approach that allows students to answer questions that lead them to the student organizations that most closely fit their interests.

- Create online videos and/or webinars (perhaps designed and narrated by students) to walk new students through the academic service/programs available.
- Implement first-year seminar course that includes core objective related to knowledge of social programming on campus.
- Require that all new students (including transfer undergraduate students) participate in Boiler Gold Rush.
- Develop a robust orientation program for graduate students and require participation.
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UHSS Task Force

Honors Subcommittee Report

Draft, February 7, 2011

Subcommittee Members: P. K. Imbrie, Jeffrey Karpicke (chair), James Ma, Sidney Moon, Chris Oseto, Catharine Patrone, Mark Daniel Ward, Michael Watts

Vision Statement: To cultivate the long-term success of a diverse community of scholars through experiential opportunities that are grounded in evidence-based practices, and to develop and sustain a named, nationally recognized university honors college.

1. Aspirational Goals and Objectives for Honors Programs at Purdue:

   a. Enhance the visibility and impact of honors programs and honors students at Purdue
      - Create an integrated, centralized organization for all honors programs to provide an administrative structure for honors programs and to establish and sustain a sense of community among students and faculty
      - Attract and retain greater numbers of high-ability students, both residents and non-residents
      - Yield resident students who would be attracted by a nationally recognized honors college through a combination of resident tuition and scholarships
      - Create new opportunities for university development by attracting donors who are interested in supporting Purdue honors programs and by offering naming opportunities to donors
      - Foster an active, long-term community of alumni who have graduated from honors programs at Purdue

   b. Prepare honors students for long-term success once they have completed honors programs at Purdue
      - Offer a curriculum of honors courses that includes both discipline-specific and broad, interdisciplinary opportunities. Encourage innovation in pedagogical methods to foster creative teaching methods tailored to the unique learning characteristics of high ability students.
      - Offer research and professional development experiences that allow students to learn about and experience career opportunities and expectations in their respective fields
o Offer programs with threads that culminate in capstone experiences to insure that students have meaningful experiences throughout their undergraduate honors education
o Offer regular advising and consistent faculty interaction to honors students, and track the achievements and accomplishments of honors students even after graduation from Purdue
o Develop and sustain special placement relationships with employers and graduate education programs
o Develop and maintain mechanisms for feedback from alumni, tracking educational and career accomplishments and encouraging alumni engagement in student development

c. Create a community of scholars among honors students and faculty that transcends classroom boundaries
   o Create a single honors organization and brand to establish and sustain a sense of community and shared experience among honors students and faculty
   o Offer several opportunities for shared experiences among honors students spanning all undergraduate years, including, but not limited to, common first-year themed courses and study abroad opportunities
   o Offer residential experiences to foster and support the community of scholars among students and faculty
   o Establish and maintain physical space for honors students and faculty, including classrooms, meeting rooms, residential facilities, and offices.

d. Prepare students to compete for national awards and scholarships and attract greater numbers of students who would be competitive for these awards
   o Create an honors organization with greater visibility to help recruit and retain higher profile students. Leverage a unified honors organization to ensure greater levels of student engagement and success
   o Provide continued advising and support services for ensuring student competitiveness in post-graduate awards

e. Increase faculty engagement in honors programs, which includes teaching honors courses, mentoring honors students, and opportunities for increased roles in faculty governance

2. Evaluation of the Current System: University Honors Program and College Honors Programs

Currently, honors education at Purdue consists of the University Honors Program (UHP), the college-based programs in Agriculture, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Science, and a few departmental based programs in psychology, history, and the former CFS. There are approximately 1500 honors students in total, and approximately 450 of those students are in the UHP.
There are several disadvantages and challenges faced by the current system of honors programs at Purdue:

- The profile and visibility of Purdue honors programs, both within the Purdue community and beyond it, could be enhanced.
- Current honors programs lack the institutional structure, administrative authority, and resources that are required to increase the prominence and expand the visibility of honors programs.
- There is a lack of integration across UHP and the college-based honors programs. This results in confusion among students and faculty regarding what actually is honors education at Purdue.
- The number of honors courses offered is not sufficient to accommodate the demands of honors students.
- Purdue honors programs are unable to adequately market themselves, both to prospective students and in fundraising efforts.

3. Proposal for a University Honors College

Description of the overall structure of an Honors College:

- The Honors College will be a single, central, unified organization within the university, administered by a dean. It will work with the colleges and Purdue admissions.
- Admissions and recruiting will be centralized. Entrance into the Honors College will involve an application process. Review of applications will be informed by representatives from the specific colleges participating in the Honors College.
- The Honors College will eventually require additional staff, including student advising staff and development personnel.
- The Honors College will exist in a residential space with resources for students and faculty.
- The curriculum in the Honors College will strive for both breadth and depth. Students will have common, shared-experience courses. In addition, students will be able to identify themselves with threads within the Honors College (e.g., an Engineering Honors thread, a Liberal Arts Honors thread, and so on).

Stage 1:

- Restructure the current system of honors programs (UHP plus college-based programs) into a single honors organization called the University Honors College.
- Appoint a dean of the Honors College.
- Implement a centralized admissions procedure that is informed by college-specific input. All students in the Honors College are considered honors students, but admission of students to different college-specific thread programs may depend on different criteria.
- Move all current honors learning communities into the same residence hall.
Stage 2:
- Establish a curriculum committee for the Honors College
- Insure strong faculty involvement in the Honors College with an incentive plan.
- Implement a residential experience

Stage 3:
- Expand size of the program (number of honors students)
- Require the residential experience (2 years)

4. Recommendations about Implementation
- Designate a minimum number or percent of Trustees and Presidential scholarships for University Honors College students
- Include goal in the University Fundraising campaign to support supplemental scholarships for the University Honors College.
- Allow supplemental scholarships to be added (i.e., stacked) to the Trustee awards for the “Trustees Plus” scholarship awarded to a select number of University Honors College students
- Require via a Provost mandate a minimum number of honors classes/sections taught by faculty based upon the percentage of honors students in the school/college

5. Summary of Goals Achieved by Creating an Honors College:
- Increases the visibility and impact of honors programs at Purdue
- Provides a more rigorous learning experience for Purdue honors students
- Maintains the integrity and uniqueness of college and university programs, balancing breadth and depth/specificity in the curriculum
- Enables Purdue to attract higher profile honors students
- Increases incentives to attract faculty interested in working with honors students, and creates potential to attract new, creative faculty to the university
- Engages donors with targeted fundraising efforts for honors programs
- Establishes a framework to recruit and advise students to become more competitive for national awards and scholarships
- Creates an active community of alumni who have graduated from the Purdue Honors College
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Undergraduate Honors, Studies and Success Programs benchmarks/background

Arizona State University

Barrett: The Honors College
- $130M seven-building campus (housing, fitness, classrooms, dining hall, computer lounge, faculty offices.
- 3200 students, fall 2009.
- 1700 living on the Honors Campus
- Craig Barrett, Intel CEO: $10M endowment exclusively for honors students and their projects
- Residential College, students also enroll in disciplinary major.
- International opportunities, scholarship opportunities, social and cultural events, research projects, leadership opportunities, service learning
- Classes n=19 or less, 1300 faculty appointed, 23 full time at Barrett
- Lectures, convocations, success fest, thesis workshops

Dr. Mark Jacobs, Dean
Sage North Hall, room 124
Barrett, The Honors College
PO Box 871612
Arizona State University
Tempe AZ 85287-0760
480 965-4033
480 965-0760 fax

University College
- Four tracks: Engineering, math, technology and physical sciences
  - Fine arts, humanities, design
  - Health and life sciences
  - Social and behavioral sciences
- Explorers Residential Colleges as part of University College
- Emphasis on Interdisciplinary studies.
- First Year Residential Experience. Workshops on success and transition.
- Fireside chats.
**Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Honors Program**
- Entering class n=120 F2009
- Four years old
- Special topics courses
- Case study for fundraising available as part of their campaign
- Office of Undergraduate studies separate

Gregory H. Nobles, Director
Georgia Tech Honors Program
103 A. French Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30332
honorsprogram@gatech.edu

**Undergraduate Studies office:** Student support for academic programs beyond the classroom.
- Advising
- Office of Success Programs
  - Orientation
  - Freshman Seminar
  - Freshman Reading
  - Individualized academic support
  - Sophomore support programs
- A Division of Student Affairs

**Indiana University**

**Hutton Honors College:**
- Edward L. Hutton $9M gift to international programs 2003
- Admission by invitation (eligible to apply for scholarship) and petition (not eligible for scholarship)-10% of new freshman
- Can also be admitted after one semester on campus-petition
- Coursework focus (one course per semester), mentoring program with continuing honors students, international experiences, community service, grants for research, teaching internships, extracurricular programs
- Residential community option
- Focus on Freshmen and Sophomores
- Compliments but separate from Dept and College honors programs-thesis oriented (dept honors vs. general honors-21 credits, two honors courses, foreign study counts, 3.4 GPA)
- New building 2009
- Nice View book

Matthew Auer (mauer@indiana.edu)
Dean of the Hutton Honors College
811 E. Seventh Street
Bloomington, IN 47405.
(812) 855-3555
(812) 855-5416 Fax
University Division is separate—most Freshmen start in UD
  Academic advising
  Academic and student support
  Exploratory student resources
  Health professions and prelaw center
Individualized Major Program
Integrated Freshman Learning Experience
IU Science, Technology and Research Scholars Program
IU is moving toward admitting more students directly into majors

Kurt Zorn  zorn@indiana.edu
Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
812-855-4964

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

Honors College
  • Research thesis and coursework, service learning, experiential learning, study abroad, honors classes, graduate coursework
  • Honors academic plan to graduate with honors
  • Honors house in the campus apartments-open to honors students only: programming, building community
  • Scholarships

Dean Jane Luzar
ejluzar@iupui.edu
420 University Blvd.
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317 274-5555

University College
University College is the home for entering students at IUPUI.
  Academic and career planning
  Student support services
  Orientation
  Bepko Learning Center
  Student Success

Scott Evenbeck, Dean  evenbeck@iupui.edu
317 274-5032
**The Ohio State University**

**Honors** program (upper 10%) and **Scholars** program (upper 20%) “Honors and Scholars”
- Both have residential components available
- Admission by invitation to honors. Application for Scholars (living and learning communities).
- Kuhn Honors and Scholars House (former President’s home named for former Provost Kuhn), remodeled 1990
- 500 sections of honors courses per year (capped at 25 each)
- Honors students have priority scheduling
- 3.4 or 3.5 GPA to stay in program (by unit)
- Requirements vary by unit
- College/Dept Honors advisors, College staff are listed as honors and scholars staff as well
- University Exploration Program is separate for undecided students-20% of entering students in program

Linn D. Van Woerkom [van-woerkom.1@osu.edu](mailto:van-woerkom.1@osu.edu)
Associate Provost & Director
Honors & Scholars Center
The Ohio State University
202 Kuhn Honors & Scholars House
220 W 12th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210
[honors-scholars@osu.edu](mailto:honors-scholars@osu.edu)

**First Year Experience** Programs
- Success series
- Orientation
Undergraduate Admissions and First Year Experience
120 Enarson Hall
154 West 12th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210-1390
Phone: (614) 292-3324
Fax: (614) 247-6289
E-mail: [askfye@osu.edu](mailto:askfye@osu.edu)

**Personalized Study Program**-Arts and Sciences

**University Exploration** at The Ohio State University-20% of Freshman
**University Exploration**
352 Denney Hall
164 West 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
614.292.0646
[exploration@osu.edu](mailto:exploration@osu.edu)
Michigan State University

Honors College, top 5% and Academic Scholars Program for students who want to enter Honors after 1st year
- 3000 students, 190 courses, 250 faculty honors advisors, honors floors in residence halls,
- Enrollment priority after 1st year, 3.2 GPA to maintain enrollment, 8 honors courses to graduate
- Undergraduate University Division for all undergraduates with less than 56 credits except those in residential colleges

Dr. Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore
Dean and Professor
The Honors College
Michigan State University
Eustace-Cole Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1041
Phone: (517) 355-2326
Fax: (517) 353-4721
E-mail: honors@msu.edu

Academic Living-Learning Communities
  Degree granting residential programs:
    Honors College
    James Madison College
    Lynn Briggs College
    Residential College for Arts and Humanities
  Plus numerous Residential Communities

Academic Support Services
  Learning Resource Center
  Math Learning Center
  Writing Center
  Office of Supportive Services
Students can choose ‘no preference’ as a major when admitted with less than 42 credits.

Mississippi State

Judy and Bobby Shackhoulos Honors College, $10M gift 2006
- Residence Hall/building
- Courses
- Priority Registration equal to seniors for active students (enrolled in one course)

Nancy McCarley, Director nmccarley@honors.msstate.edu
Shackhoulos Honors College
PO Box EH
Mississippi State, MS 39762
662 325-2522
662 325-0086 fax
Penn State

Schreyer Honors College founded 1997 with $30M gift from Joan and William Schreyer (former head of Merrill Lynch)-most $ goes to scholarships. $25M more pledged in 2006

- Current $47M endowment
- 223 courses, 231 shared faculty, 21 staff, senior thesis, study abroad, mentoring program, 1631 students
- Two residence halls, priority registration (not exclusively honors students)
- Graduating Schreyer students receive a medal prior to commencement at a special ceremony
- 3.4 GPA required to maintain enrollment
- Courses and a thesis required
- Separate Division of Undergraduate Studies w/ 2667 students at Univ Park and 7239 students in the system. 6% of Schreyer Scholars in DUS

Christian M. M. Brady, D.Phil.
Dean, Schreyer Honors College
10 Schreyer Honors College
The Pennsylvania State University
SHC home page: http://shc.psu.edu/
My blog: http://shc.psu.edu/blogs/dean
cbrady@psu.edu
AIM: drcbrady
University Park, PA 16802
Phone: 814-863-2635
Fax: 814-863-8688

Division of Undergraduate Studies
For exploratory studies
Advising
Testing
Discover house living-learning opportunity

Eric White A.B., M.S., Ed.D. erw2@psu.edu
Executive Director and Associate Dean for Advising; Affiliate Assistant Professor of Education
118 Grange Building
University Park
814 865-7576

Penn State Learning
Peer Tutoring
Study Groups
Team project work spaces
Math Center, Tutoring Center (General Ed), Language Center, Writing Tutors, Writing Center
First Year Experience and Living-Learning Communities (Special Living Options n=19) in Residential Life Academically and Theme based

Texas A&M University - College Station

- Honor Societies, College and Department Honors Programs
- Separate School of Undergraduate Studies-responsible for core, advising, undecided students

Undergraduate Studies
Pamela Matthews, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies

Student Learning Center
University Writing Center
Honors Program

Ed Funkhouser, Executive Director
Texas A&M University Honors Program
114 Henderson Hall
College Station, Texas 77843-4233
honors@tamu.edu
(979) 845-1957

- General Academic Programs
- Undergraduate Research
- Center for Student-Athlete Services
- First year seminars
- Freshman convocation

University of California – Berkeley

- Honors by College or unit, same with undecided, Letters and Science College

University of Illinois

Campus Honors Program and College Honors Programs
- Students in Campus program called Chancellor’s Scholars “small campus-wide program”
- College-based honors students (variety of programs) called James Scholars
- Automatic $250 in-state tuition scholarship, out-of-state varies (only 10 awards), summer research grants also available for Chancellor’s Scholars
- 125 admitted each year, 3.3 GPA required to stay in program, application based,
- Five honors courses (sections of regular courses) required
- Study abroad opportunities
• Honors house (offices and library), no residential option
• Managed from Provost’s office by committee with two co-chairs
• First year discovery program
• Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Degree Program
• Undergraduate Research Initiative
• Division of General Studies-10% Illinois undergrads or 3100 students-advising hub

**University of Iowa**

**University College** includes Honors Program, Study Abroad, Career Center Programs and study at Iowa Lakeside Laboratory.
• UC includes Bachelor of Applied Studies (distance for community college grads), Leadership studies, Nonprofit Management, and Sustainability
• UC includes first year programs, College Success Initiatives, programs for underrepresented students in sciences, Lifetime Leisure Skills, ROTC, Aerospace Studies and Military Science
• UC includes numerous pre-college programs.
• Honors: 3.3 GPA to maintain enrollment, course-based with thesis option
• Extracurricular activities, Blank Honors Center (new facility)
• Three living-learning communities for honors
• Honors Commendation/graduation with Honors for completing 12 honors credits

John S. Nelson, Director
Honors Program
University of Iowa
420 Blank Honors Center
Iowa City, IA 52242
319 335-1681

**University of Michigan**

**Honors Program**: College of Literature, Science and the Arts
• 500 students per class approx
• Course-based
• Honors Housing/Community
• First year seminars
• Residential College in LSA
• Learning Communities
• Undecided major
University of Minnesota

- Honors program
- Advising, courses, community, events
- Central honors seminars and Dept courses (sections)
- 3.5 GPA to maintain enrollment
- Four honors experiences each year: Freshman and Sophomores years
- Three experiences each year: Junior and Senior years including a thesis
- Study abroad, service learning, foreign language study, internships, community involvement, research presentations, etc. can all count
- Sole way to graduate with Latin honors at MN: cum laude 3.50, magna 3.666, summa 3.750
- No apparent Undergraduate Studies or Exploratory Studies program. Admission to College, some Colleges only admit upper division students

Serge Rudaz, Founding Director and Professor of Physics
University Honors Program
20 Nicholson Hall
216 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Tel: 612-624-5522
Fax: 612-626-7314
honors@umn.edu

Individualized majors, College of Liberal Arts

University of Mississippi

Sally McDonnell Barksdale Honors College
- 1997 gift (largest gift to Ole Miss at the time)
- Enrollment 840, 310 Freshmen in F2010, 35% out of state, ACT average 30.2
- Building
- Priority registration
- Experiential Learning
- Fellowships

Douglass Sullivan-González, Dean
SMBHC, Room 105
University of Mississippi
P.O. Box 1848
University, MS 38677
Phone: (662) 915-7294
Fax: (662) 915-7739
dsg@olemiss.edu

Residential College: integrated living learning environment
**University of Oregon**

**Robert D Clark Honors College**
- 1652 applicants, 196 entered, total student body 674, 3.0 GPA to maintain enrollment
- Summer reading program, prison exchange program, study abroad, courses (core curriculum) and a thesis
- Three honors residence halls, College building
- Undergraduate Studies: First year programs, Academic Learning Services, Freshman interest groups (group advising and two common courses)
- Faculty of 13 resident/tenured in Honors College plus affiliated faculty

David Frank, Dean
Robert D. Clark Honors College
1293 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1293
Phone: 541-346-5414
honors@uoregon.edu

**Division of Undergraduate Studies**-part of Academic Affairs
- Student Orientation
- First-Year Programs (and second-year seminars)
- Academic Advising
- Disability Services
- Teaching and Learning Center
- General Education

Plus affiliated programs: Honors College, Society of College Scholars, Faculty Perspective Seminars, Faculty Firesides, Community Conversations, Phi Beta Kappa, Distinguished Scholarships
Undergraduate Council (faculty governance)

**University of Texas - Austin**

**University Honors Center** in School of Undergraduate Studies
- Honors Residential Living
- Honors Societies
- Scholarships and Awards
- Student Leadership Council
- Performing Arts Series
- Honors Colloquium

Plan II **Honors** program-has its own core curriculum-in the College of Liberal Arts
- Year long Freshman course
- Interdisciplinary tutorials
- Year long philosophy course for Sophomores
- Semester honors social science
- Two semesters non US history
- Four semester sequence of reasoning, math, calc, life sciences, physical sciences
- Senior thesis
Michael B. Stoff
Associate Professor; Distinguished Teaching Associate Professor; Director, Plan II
planidirector@austin.utexas.edu
Phone: 512-475-7217

Freshman honors programs in other Colleges

School of Undergraduate Studies
- Oversees core curriculum
- Home for exploratory studies/"strategic advising"
- Bridging Disciplines
- First year interest groups
- Signature courses
- Texas Success Initiative
- Undergraduate Research
- University Honors Center
- Archer Program (live learn intern in DC)

Paul Woodruff, Dean of Undergraduate Studies

University of Wisconsin

- Honors and Scholars programs in Colleges and Schools
- Letters and Science has 1700 students and a building (Washburn Observatory)
- Center for the First-Year Experience
- Cross-College Advising Service