1993

An evaluation of the honors program at the College of Lake County

Carole Bulakowski
Loyola University Chicago

Carole Bulakowski

Loyola University of Chicago

AN EVALUATION OF THE HONORS PROGRAM AT THE COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY

This study investigated the effects of the Honors Program at the College of Lake County. More specifically, it assessed the program's effects on the honors students and faculty who participated in it as well as the effects on other students, faculty, and administrators within the college community. In a larger context, this study also explored two issues intimately connected to the mission of the community college--access and quality of instruction. Since the Honors Program provided an academic program for a specific group of academically elite students, it was inaccessible to the typical community college student.

In this qualitative study, the researcher interviewed 66 subjects who participated in a standardized open-ended interview to determine their perspectives about the program's effects. Information obtained from the transcripts of those interviews was coded and organized into matrices related to both the expected and unexpected effects of the program. The researcher also analyzed documents related to the establishment and on-going administration of the program.

The investigation indicated that the Honors Program affected honors students and faculty in several positive ways. Students enjoyed the challenges within the curriculum, strengthened their sense of intellectual self-esteem, and experienced a sense of belonging to the college. Students who completed the program believed the program better prepared them for upper-level coursework at their transfer institution. The majority of faculty enjoyed working with prepared and motivated students, and some stated that they utilized new ideas they had introduced in the honors classes within their regular courses.

However, the Honors Program was criticized by some faculty and administrators who believed the program represented elitist values antithetical to the egalitarian mission of the community college. Isolating academically elite students from regular students produced feelings of resentment by non-honors students and their faculty and implicitly communicated to some students and faculty in regular classes that they were "second class" in quality and importance. This study identified critical issues community college leaders must consider when considering the establishment of an honors program.

AN EVALUATION OF THE HONORS PROGRAM AT THE COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY

by

CAROLE BULAKOWSKI

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May, 1993

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Barbara Townsend, for her continuous encouragement and guidance in my research, my doctoral program, and my career; and to Dr. Steve Miller for his conviction in the importance of qualitative research and his enthusiasm for my study; and to Dr. Terry Williams for his support during this research and throughout my doctoral program.

I would also like to thank Doug Sherman, Dr. James Doppke, and the members of the honors committee whose commitment to developing an honors program at the College of Lake County made this research project a reality. I am also indebted to Robin Palmquist for her careful transcription of the interviews; and to my secretary, Robin Vos, for her meticulous attention to detail, technical expertise, and continuous support during this research.

I am forever indebted to my husband, Mike, for his sense of humor and unwavering love; and to my children, Beth Ann, Michael John, and Tanya Marie, for their constant encouragement throughout my doctoral program.

Finally, I would like to thank the students in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Program who shared their feelings, thoughts and experiences with me throughout the doctoral program.

VITA

The author, Carole Bulakowski, is the daughter of the late Louis and Dorothy (Palm) Kaiser. She was born on December 8, 1943 in Dearborn, Michigan.

She attended Marygrove College in Detroit, Michigan and earned the Bachelor of Arts degree in Child Psychology in 1966. She received her Masters of Arts degree in Reading from Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1974.

She worked as Reading Specialist at Park College in Parkville, Missouri from 1978 to 1980; as Director of the Learning Center at Mid-America Nazarene College in Olathe, Kansas from 1980 to 1982; as Director of the Learning Center at Triton College in River Grove, Illinois from 1982 to 1984. From 1984 to the present, she has served as Director of the Learning Assistance Center at College of Lake County in Grayslake, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

VITA iv

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Conceptual Framework
Developmental Model
College Impact Model
History of the Honors Program at the College of Lake County
Purpose of the Study
Research Questions
Methodology
Significance of the Study
Limitations of the Study
Organization of the Study

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 18

Origins and Status of Honors Programs
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector
Rationale for Concept
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector
Curriculum
Four-Year Sector
Four-Year and Two-Year Sectors
Two-Year Sector
Student Services
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector
Administration
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector

Admission and Retention Criteria
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector
Student Profile
Four-Year Sector
Two-Year Sector
Demographics
Learning Style Preferences
Evaluation of Honors Programs
Four-Year Sector
Four-Year and Two-Year Sectors
Two-Year Sector
Summary

III. METHODOLOGY 51

Research Design
Procedures of the Research
Subject Selection Process
Students
Faculty
Administrators
Documentary Analysis
Instrumentation
Ethical Safeguards and Considerations
Pilot Study
Validity and Reliability
Data Analysis
Summary

IV. OVERVIEW OF HONORS PROGRAM 74

Program Components 74
Curriculum
Writing
Reading
Critical Thinking
Exams
Projects
Discussion
Interdisciplinary Focus
Computers in Class
Summary

Student Services
Advising
Cultural Activities
Costs
Profile of Honors Fellows 99
Demographics
Admission Data
Academic Ability
Study Skills
Personality Types
Motivation for Program Participation
Background Experience
Students' Work and Academic Success
Perceptions of Program's Effects on Students 119
Cognitive Skills
Writing Ability
Reading Ability
Critical Thinking Ability
Discussion Ability
Understanding of Interdisciplinary Connections
Computer Literacy
Preparation for Transfer
Affective Variables
Self Esteem
Interpersonal Relations
Cultural Awareness
Involvement in Extracurricular Activities
Profile of Honors Faculty 139
Motivation
Selection Process
Divisional Procedures
Colleague Response
Evaluation Process
Interaction
Honors Program Coordinator
Honors Program Committee
Honors Faculty Meetings
Informal Faculty Interaction
Faculty Perception of Program's Effects on Non-Honors Curriculum and Teaching Techniques 150
Summary 153

V. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES 157

Program Strengths 157
Student Perceptions
Honors Fellows
Non-Honors Fellows
Administrative Perceptions
Faculty Perceptions
Honors Faculty
Non-Honors Faculty
Summary of Perceived Programmatic Strengths
Program Weaknesses 164
Student Perceptions
Honors Fellows
Non-Honors Fellows
Administrative Perceptions
Faculty Perceptions
Honors Faculty
Non-Honors Faculty
Summary of Perceived Programmatic Weaknesses

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 183

Honors Program's Effects
Honors Fellows
Honors Faculty
Administrators, Faculty-At-Large, and Students-At-Large
Implications for Community Colleges
Implications for Future Research

APPENDIX A 201

APPENDIX B 203

APPENDIX C 205

APPENDIX D 206

APPENDIX E 207

APPENDIX F 208

REFERENCES 209

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Demographic Comparison of Student Sample and Honors Fellows	55
2.	Student Sample (Academic Records)	56
3.	Student Sample (Years of Participation)	57
4.	Student Sample (Student Employment While Enrolled in Honors Program)	57
5.	Honors Program Faculty	58
6.	Faculty Sample (Profile)	59
7.	Administrative Sample (Profile)	60
8.	Definitions of Codes for Evaluation Project	69
9.	Characteristics of Students in the Honors Program	71
10.	Related Outcomes of Honors Program	72
11.	Did the Honors Program Change CLC's Image?	72
12.	Honors Program Costs Considerations	96
13.	Honors Program Expenses 1987-1992	97
14.	Financial Aid Summary	97
15.	Profile of Honors Fellows	100
16.	Profile of Honors Fellows and CLC Students by Year	101
17.	Enrollment of Honors Fellows and CLC Students by Geographic Area	102
18.	Admission Data on Honors Fellows	104
19.	Academic Records of Honors Fellows as of 1/92	109

20. Comparison of Work Hours to Success Maintaining 3.5 GPA 118

21. Grade Point Averages at CLC and Transfer Institutions 128

22. Motivation of Faculty 140

23. Student Perceptions of Honors Program's Strengths 158

24. Administrative Perceptions of Program Strengths 160

25. Faculty Perceptions of Program Strengths 162

26. Student Perceptions of the Honors Program Weaknesses 169

27. Administrative Perceptions of Honors Program Weaknesses 173

28. Faculty Perceptions of the Honors Program Weaknesses 181

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A continuing theme of American higher education has been the broadening of collegiate constituencies (Jencks & Riesman, 1968; Ravitch, 1983). Believing that education is the vehicle for upward socioeconomic mobility and a contributor to the country's economic growth, the American public has supported expansion of higher education to the point where it is now considered a right rather than a privilege (Ravitch, 1983). Access to higher education expanded with the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 which established public land-grant universities in every state. Continued expansion of educational opportunities occurred with the development of public community colleges in the twentieth century.

Commonly known as junior colleges in the early 1900s, these institutions were established to offer the first two years of college level instruction. Offering this instruction was:

> Meant to fulfill several institutional purposes: a polarizing function, a democratizing pursuit, and a function of conducting the lower division for the universities. (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 15)

Gradually, the mission of community colleges responded to a rapidly changing society and economy. Their new title, comprehensive community colleges, reflected their changing constituencies. While their mission expanded to include vocational training, remediation, and community service, the community colleges of the 1980s continued

to acknowledge their transfer function as a high priority (Deegan & Tillery, 1985).

Community colleges' importance grew because they provided access to higher education for many students who were not academically qualified for admission into four-year colleges and universities and who could not afford to attend them. Community colleges provided:

> The point of first access for people entering higher education; by the late 1970s, 40% of all first-time-in-college, full-time freshmen and around two-thirds of all ethnic minority students were in two-year institutions. (Cohen & Brawer, p. 16)

In 1988, 36% of all white college students, 42% of all African American college students, 54% of all American Indian college students, and 56% of all Hispanic college students were enrolled in two-year schools (Rendon, 1990). In 1991, the 1,211 American community colleges enrolled about 45% of all students in higher education and nearly 55% of all first-time freshmen each fall term (Doucette & Roueche, 1991). The U.S. Department of Education projected that total enrollments in public and private two-year institutions totalled 5,312,000 in 1992 (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1992, p. 12).

Cross (1971) claimed that:

> The majority of students entering open door community colleges come from the lower half of their high school class academically and socially. (p. 7)

These students lived in families with lower incomes and parents with less education than students attending four-year colleges (Deegan & Tillery, p. 61). London's (1978) ethnography at City Community College produced a portrait of community college students with poor academic histories and few cultural experiences. London

concluded that these students from working class families experienced great self-doubts, closely linked to their social class (p. 27). Generally, community college students were more likely to be members of minority groups, part-time, working, older, less wealthy and less well-prepared than students attending four-year colleges and universities (Breneman & Nelson, 1981). Richardson and Bender (1986) demonstrated that urban community colleges concentrated on remediation and vocational-technical courses. In 1988, Bernstein noted that "more than two-thirds of matriculated [community college] students are enrolled in vocational programs and 71% of all associate degrees and certificates were awarded in vocational areas" (p. 48). In The Academic Crisis of the Community College, two community college professors described typical community college students as those who did not take themselves seriously as learners and who came from backgrounds that did not value controversy and debate and had little sense of controlling their lives (McGrath & Spear, 1991).

While these generalizations reflect the characteristics of many community college students, they do not acknowledge a distinct group--academically talented students. Bay (1978) cited a 1974 survey which shows that 20% of all entering freshmen at a community college were in the top quartile of their high school class. In 1977, Astin found that fewer students who had graduated in the top 20 percent of their high school classes were attending four-year colleges than fifteen years earlier.

> For men, the proportion in the top-ability quartile that goes to four-year institutions has declined by 16 per cent, and the corresponding proportion attending two year colleges has increased by 10 per cent since the early 1960's. For women, the decline in the proportion

> attending four-year institutions has been 9 percent and the corresponding increase in two-year institutions, 12 percent. (Astin, 1977, p. 248)

The National Center for Education Statistics (1984) confirmed that similar statistics existed seven years later--21% of those community college students who tested for academic ability were in the top quartile of their high school class. Furthermore, 12% of community college students had mostly A's in high school (Deegan & Tillery, p. 60). This report confirmed earlier research produced by Astin, Henrand, and Richardson (1982) showing 10% of all community college students had an A average in high school.

The reasons that these highly qualified students chose to attend community colleges were similar to those of other community college students: "Low cost, easy access, and part-time attendance possibilities" (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 369). According to Piland (1986), the most frequently cited reason that honors students selected a community college was cost. Tuition at community colleges is lower than that of state universities and significantly lower than that of private colleges and universities. In addition, community colleges are within commuting distance of over 90% of the United States population (Doucette & Roueche, 1991). Highly qualified students may choose to attend a community college close to home for a variety of reasons. Many cannot afford the cost of room and board in a campus residence hall or in private apartments. Others have family commitments they cannot ignore. In some households, families depend on the income this student generates through a nearby job. Others may not be prepared for the psychological shock of leaving home.

Due to their financial and personal obligations, many of these students attend school on a part-time basis during the days, evenings, or weekends and find that college classes held at a convenient location at a community college meet both their time constraints as well as academic goals.

In the early 1970s, attention began to focus on how well open access colleges met the educational needs of students attending community colleges. Karabel's (1972) research led him to assert that:

> The community college generally viewed as the leading edge of an open and egalitarian system of higher education is in reality a prime contemporary expression of the dual historical pattern of class-based tracking and educational inflation. (p. 526)

Tinto (1975) also argued that community college students were more likely to drop out and that this phenomenon increased the inequality of educational opportunity in higher education. In Four Critical Years (1977), Astin claimed that community colleges

> May not be serving the interest of students coming directly from high school to pursue careers requiring baccalaureate degrees. (p. 247)

Using national data, Astin concluded the following:

> When students were equated for entering ability, social background, motivation, parental income, and aspirations, the chances of persisting to the baccalaureate degree are substantially reduced. Perhaps the most significant consequence of the negative impact of these institutions on persistence is the student's chances of implementing career plans are reduced in almost all fields: business, engineering, school teaching, nursing, and social work. (Astin, p. 234)

Breneman and Nelson (1981) explained correlations between college choice and income:

> Since occupational status is generally considered to be highly correlated with adult earnings, the positive relationship between attending a university and occupational status bodes ill for future earnings for students choosing a community college. (p. 72)

Statewide comparisons of community college transfer students and native university students have been conducted by the Florida State Department of Education (1983), the Illinois Community College Board (1986), and in Kansas (Doucette & Teeter, 1985). These studies indicate that overall persistence and graduation rates for community college transfers were lower than the persistence and graduation rates of native university students (London, 1986). Pascarella and Terenzini's (1991) meta-analysis of research produced similar conclusions.

> The weight of evidence is clear that when assessed over the same period of time, baccalaureate aspirants who enter two-year colleges tend to have lower levels of education and degree attainment than do comparable individuals who enter four-year institutions. (p. 373)

During the last three decades, community college researchers have also expressed their concern about the perceived lack of quality of baccalaureate preparation for community college students. London (1978) discovered that faculty adjusted the difficulty of courses for the ability and behavior of students. Farnsworth (1982) examined enrollment patterns of highly qualified students at Muscatine Community College and concluded that "this group of academically accelerated students was dropping out at a rate equal to that of students with marginal skills . . ." (p. 32) and that an alarming number were discontinuing their education. Farnsworth

was convinced that these bright students were leaving because they needed an academic challenge. The authors of Literacy in the Open Access College concluded that the prevalence of less prepared and less ambitious students led community college faculty to have diminished expectations for student success (Richardson, Fisk, & Okun, 1983). Bers (1991) stated that students attending community colleges were sometimes skeptical of the institution's academic quality and expected to find minimal intellectual demands. McGrath and Spear (1991) warned that general education courses can end up becoming remedial versions of university programs because community college students do not take themselves seriously as students.

Faced with the disturbing implications of these studies, educators at community colleges began to consider how they could maintain their collegiate identity and how their most academically talented students could experience educational opportunities that would challenge them and allow them to achieve their potential. Some community colleges began to establish honors programs within their institutions as a means of providing quality education for their academically elite students.

Conceptual Framework

According to Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), the impact of college on students has been a growing area of inquiry since Feldman and Necombe's (1969) The Impact of College on Students. Over the last twenty years, two types of theories related to how college affects student development have emerged.

Developmental Model

The developmental model explains the changes college students experience as discrete stages of development.

> This movement is typically seen as orderly, sequential and hierarchial, passing through ever-higher levels or stages of development, and to some extent as age related. . . . Developmental change may be due to biological and psychological maturation, to individual experiences and the environment, or the interaction of individual and environment. (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 18)

Some developmental theories focus on the content of the changes in cognitive and affective domains (e.g., Chickering, 1969; Perry, 1970) while others describe moral development (Kohlberg, 1969). Despite the various explanations for the number of developmental stages and the origins of the changes, certain commonalities exist. During their college years, students learn to develop internal controls, enhance their understanding of themselves and their relationship to others, and progress to self-definition and integration (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

College Impact Model

In the college impact model, the college is seen as an active force that provides opportunities for interaction between students and multiple factors within the college's environment. For example, Astin (1985) proposed a theory of involvement which claims that "students learn by becoming involved" (p. 133). Tinto's model of institutional impact focuses more closely on how well students' abilities, personalities, and attitudes become integrated within the formal and informal structures of the college community.

Pascarella and Terenzini suggest that student growth is:

> A function of direct and indirect effects of five major sets of variables. Two of those sets, students' background and pre-college characteristics and the structural and organizational features of the institution (e.g., size, selectivity, residential character) together shape the third variable set: A college's or university's environment. (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, p. 53, 55)

The two remaining variables include the types of students' interactions on campus and the quality of their efforts in learning.

These researchers concur that the college environment provides both formal and informal opportunities which impact the cognitive, affective, and behavioral growth of students. This study is influenced by the college impact model.

Community college educators believe that their courses and programs provide multiple opportunities that impact students. Not only do these programs serve a broad spectrum of students' needs, but they also are continuously being refined and improved. Honors programs serve a specific population of community college students and provide opportunities for them to grow intellectually and emotionally. College of Lake County (CLC) in Grayslake, Illinois explored the establishment of such a program in 1985.

History of the Honors Program at the College of Lake County

Early in 1985, a CLC faculty member met with the Vice-President for Educational Affairs to share the instructor's vision of an honors program. The Vice-President supported the idea and asked the instructor to select a steering committee to develop such a program. Identified as the Honors Program Task Force, the steering

committee met that spring and summer to study honors programs at other institutions and to explore how the model of an honors program could be developed and implemented at CLC.

In September, 1985, the first draft of the Honors Program Proposal circulated to members of the Educational Affairs Council and the academic divisions. The proposal established a structure for the program by detailing specific criteria for admission, scholarships, retention, and graduation requirements. It also established a list of courses for the honors curriculum and defined the responsibilities of the Honors Program Director and the Honors Program Committee. The proposal explained the recruitment process, proposed the concept of an enrichment program, and established the process by which faculty would be chosen to teach in the honors program. The final page of the proposal included a list of benefits that would result from CLC's Honors Program: An improved academic image; new opportunities for faculty innovation and renovation; and, a higher percentage of academically strong students in non-honors sections (Sherman, 1985).

After the proposal was circulated to academic divisions and meetings were scheduled with the faculty, a revised Honors Program Proposal was shared with the College Senate for information and discussion. In February, 1986, the Board of Trustees approved the Honors Program Proposal.

The instructor who proposed the concept of an honors program was assigned as the Honors Program Coordinator and began his recruitment process in the fall, 1986. The first group of Honors Fellows enrolled in honors classes in the Fall 1987

semester. In December, 1988, the Board of Trustees increased the amount of financial support in the form of scholarships because many Honors Fellows couldn't complete their degree requirements within the sixty credit hours scholarship limit.

The program continued under the direction of the Honor's Program Coordinator until he resigned in August, 1991. Even though a job description for Honors Program Coordinator was circulated to all full-time faculty, no volunteers stepped forward. The Dean of Instruction invited eight instructors to apply but all refused. The program remained without a faculty coordinator during the 1991-1992 academic year with recruitment functions being handled by the Office of Student Recruitment.

In May, 1992, the Dean of Instruction announced that the Honors Program would no longer function in its current structure. Students admitted into the program for the 1992-1993 academic year received their scholarships for one year and the future of the Honors Program was scheduled to be discussed by the Faculty Senate in the Fall 1992 semester.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to examine the effects of the Honors Program on the College of Lake County. More specifically, it attempted to assess the program's impact on those who directly participated in it and for whom most of the program's components were designed--the students. Formally labelled the Honors Fellows, these students were recruited and awarded full tuition scholarships. They also received

special advising and advance registration and enrolled in specific honors sections every semester.

This study also considered the Honors Program's effect on those faculty who participated in the program. These faculty taught honors sections of transfer level courses which led to the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees. Faculty were expected to design courses which would challenge students to become better writers, critical thinkers and to become more comfortable discussing issues with their peers. This study assessed what effects that involvement had on these faculty and their colleagues.

In addition, this study attempted to examine how the Honors Program affected the Associate Deans who assigned the faculty as well as those administrators who managed offices which interacted with the program.

In a larger context, this study also explored two issues intimately connected to the mission of community colleges--access and quality. The researcher attempted to understand how these two goals were actualized within the culture of the College of Lake County.

Research Questions

This study addresses the following questions.

1. What effects did the Honors Program have on the students, faculty, and administrators who participated in it?
2. What effects did the Honors Program have on other students, faculty and the college in general?

3. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Honors Program?

Methodology

The methodology for this study is qualitative and based on Scriven's (1983) Goal Free Evaluation Model. The purpose of this approach is to consider all effects of a program, regardless of its goals.

The researcher interviewed 66 subjects who were involved with the Honors Program. The subjects included 25 students, 31 faculty, and 10 administrators. The subjects participated in a standardized open-ended interview to determine their perspectives about the effects of the program at the College of Lake County. Information obtained from transcripts of those interviews was coded and organized into matrices related to both the expected and unexpected effects of the program.

The researcher also analyzed documents related to the establishment and on-going administration of the program from 1985 to 1991. These documents provided additional information about the history of the program and the ideas of individuals unavailable for interviews.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. To begin with, community colleges have a unique mission in higher education. That mission, however, continues to be challenged by critics. When community colleges became open access institutions in the 1960s, some critics perceived that these institutions' attempts to reach out to the disadvantaged were a means of reinforcing the existing class structure

of American society. For example, Zwerling (1976) criticized community colleges' focus on vocational and technical education and claimed that fewer community college students aspire to earn an Associate Degree. Pincus (1980) argued that fewer students who enroll in community colleges obtain a bachelor's degree than those who start in a four-year college. Other critics have maintained that as community colleges became comprehensive institutions, they weakened their academic standards and ultimately proved to be a disservice to students.

The quest to renew the academic function of community colleges is reflected in the resurgence of honors programs. To many, these programs present a means to both project and actualize an image of academic quality. They also provide an opportunity to recruit better qualified, more motivated students into college classes. Additionally, honors programs provide opportunities for community college faculty to become renewed because they can teach academically motivated students. For some educators, honors programs help challenge college students to grow and develop more of their academic potential.

While there is some evidence that university honors programs challenge students and result in positive cognitive growth and self-esteem (Astin, 1977; Ory & Braskamp, 1988; Pflaum, Pascarella & Duby, 1985), there have been few studies which explore these issues in community colleges. Even though some community colleges (Armstrong & DeMeo, 1989; Montgomery, 1991) have surveyed their students in honors programs to assess their satisfaction with these programs, there has been no qualitative research which probes more deeply into the effects of such

programs on community college students and faculty.

The results of this study will help educators understand how these programs affect both students and faculty. More importantly, it will help researchers understand the complexities of determining such effects. In addition, it will shed some light on the challenges community colleges face in committing to quality in open access institutions.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the reports of students, faculty and administrative staff who were involved with the Honors Program from 1985 to Fall, 1991. The students primarily reflected the general profile of those who participated in all program components. The study included all but one of the faculty who taught in the program during that time period. While the two students who were not Honors Fellows were interviewed, the study did not include a wide representation of the other 15,000 students who attended the college each year. Even though three faculty who were not in the program as well as 10 administrators were included, it did not reflect all of the opinions of the other full time faculty and administrators at the college.

Moreover, it did not include the opinions of other professionals in the community, such as high school teachers, counselors and principals; parents of Honors Fellows; local journalists; business representatives; and citizens at large.

This study was limited to examining the effects of College of Lake County Honors Program from 1985 to 1991. Any attempt to apply these findings to other community colleges would be an error of overgeneralization. The conclusions of this

study are limited to the specific population who participated in a clearly defined honors program within the College of Lake County.

Organization of the Study

This chapter discussed the need to study the effects of honors programs on community college students and faculty. It included the conceptual framework for the present study as well as the purpose, significance and limitations of the investigation.

Chapter II reviews the origins and status of honors programs in colleges and universities. After highlighting the common elements of college honors programs, the researcher presents general information on gender, ethnic status, and age ranges of participants. In addition, the most frequently cited rationales for honors programs are included. The chapter concludes with studies which note effects of honors programs in the four-year as well as the two-year sector.

Chapter III describes the methodology used in this study. After an explanation of the research design, the chapter provides details on the three groups of subjects and the subject selection process. It also contains information on how a variety of documents related to the establishment and operation of the program were used to verify statements of interviewees. This chapter also focuses on how interview questions were designed for the three groups of subjects and concludes with a description of the data analysis utilized to organize information related to the program's effects.

Chapter IV is an overview of student and faculty perceptions of the honors program's effects. It includes a description of the curriculum, student services, and

program costs. A detailed profile of the 238 Honors Fellows includes information on demographics, academic ability, motivation, and personality types. After an analysis of the students' perceptions of the program's effect on their cognitive and affective skills, the chapter concludes with the faculty's perceptions of the program's effects.

Chapter V focuses on the program's strengths and weaknesses. It begins with specific analyses of what each subject group identified as the program's strengths and then highlights commonalities in those perceptions. Similarly, this chapter identifies the program's weaknesses as perceived through the ideas and feelings of students, faculty, and administrators. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the weaknesses identified by all three groups.

Chapter VI summarizes the effects of CLC's Honors Program on the three subject groups as well as other members of the college community. It also analyzes their values related to their belief in the egalitarian spirit as it is actualized within the community college. Finally, the researcher considers whether the effects of the honors program are consistent to the college's dual mission of access and quality.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Honors programs are currently being used in community colleges as one means of attracting and retaining academically elite students. However, the appropriateness of these programs for community colleges and the effects upon the institution are topics of concern. This chapter reviews the literature on honors programs in both four-year and two-year institutions but focuses more specifically on honors programs in two-year colleges.

Origins and Status of Honors Programs

Four-Year Sector

Honors programs began in the early 1900s as educational institutions searched for ways to challenge students. According to Rudolph (1977),

> Before World War I a number of eastern institutions--Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia among them--explored the use of honors programs of special opportunities and heightened expectations for especially able students, as a way of remedying a climate of undergraduate indifference to scholarship. (p. 230)

Similar beliefs were promoted by Reed College's President who "argued as early as 1911 for more specialization rather than less and for greater incentives and opportunities for the brighter and more hardworking students at the expense of the less talented" (Veysey, 1973, p. 168).

Austin, former executive secretary-treasurer and president of the National Collegiate Honors Council, believed that the movement began in 1917 when professors provided opportunities for acceleration for bright students through mentorships and senior honors experiences (Personal communication, C.G. Austin, November 1, 1992). Aydelotte, a former Rhodes scholar, popularized the concept of honors programs when he established the Oxford pass/honors program system as his model at Swarthmore in 1922. This program provided honors students with the opportunities to focus on specific fields of concentration, to participate in tutorials and seminars, and required them to complete a thesis as well as oral and written exams evaluated by external examiners. His involvement with that honors program resulted in his 1924 report, "Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities." His rationale for honors programs was as follows:

> . . . to separate those students who are really interested in the intellectual life from those who are not and to demand . . . a standard attainment for the A.B. degree distinctly higher than we require of them at present and comparable perhaps with that which is reached for the A.M. (Aydelotte, 1944, p. 31)

Even at this period, his approach was controversial. Veysey explained that these "honors programs and independent study arrangements all bore the stamp of . . . intellectual elitism" (p. 178).

According to Cummings (1986) "this effort to adapt a foreign elitist model to the strongly egalitarian American educational system epitomizes the tension and controversy that have characterized the honors system since its origin" (p. 17). Aydelotte (1944) responded to his critics by insisting that honors elitism was a direct

expression of democracy: "We must recognize that there are diversities of gifts . . . a society that is not to be condemned to mediocrity must demand the best of each" (p. 19).

Honor courses and programs increased as other educators developed their own approaches to honors education. Joseph Cohen, who started an honors program at the University of Colorado in 1928, established the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student (ICSS) which became a resource to spread interest and information on honors programs to other universities and colleges. Rudolph (1977) claimed that at least 93 honors programs were functioning in a variety of four-year colleges and universities by 1930. According to Veysey (1973) 116 such programs existed by the end of World War II.

Levine's (1978) History of Undergraduate Curriculum noted that "In the aftermath of sputnik, two colleges offering rigorous programs--Oakland University [Michigan] and New College [Florida] are established" (p. 511). In 1966, the ICSS was replaced by the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC) to provide information on developments in honors education through annual conventions and two quarterly publications, Forum for Honors and the National Honors Report. The NCHC does not endorse a model of an accredited honors program and has no way to enforce national standards for honors programs. V.H. Bhatia (1977) explained that there was no common model, "There does not exist any standard pattern or format for such programs. In fact, they vary from campus to campus in their structure, operation, and scope" (p. 24). According to W.P. Mech, NCHC President, the

quality and scope of honors programs continue to vary widely in the higher education community. In 1992, more than 400 four-year colleges and universities were members of the NCHC (Personal communication, W.P. Mech, September 4, 1992). A review of the literature provided no national or regional reports on the status of honors programs in four-year colleges and universities.

Two-Year Sector

There is no definitive information on the origins of honors programs in community colleges. According to O'Banion (1989), almost every community college in the late 1950s and early 1960s had an honors program, but their numbers diminished significantly in the 1960s as the "spirit of democratizing higher education" (p. 15) became prominent. O'Banion did not provide any sources for his statement.

During the 1970s, there were few honors programs at community colleges. A 1975 national survey administered by Olivas for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges showed that only 47 (7%) of 644 community colleges had formalized honors programs. Olivas described this phenomenon as "a fledgling attempt to educate one constituency in an extremely heterogeneous student population" (p. 12). He also noted that such programs elicited a "vague uneasiness about possible overtones of elitism which are inimical to community colleges" (p. 6). Contacts with the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, and the National Collegiate Honors Council (NCHC) confirmed that no national study on the status of community college honors programs has been completed since the Olivas report (Personal communication, Bonnie Gardner, AACC;

Karen Hsiao, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges; W.P. Mech, NCHC, September 4, 1992).

Information on the prevalence of honors programs in the two-year sector is limited to single institution reports and regional or statewide surveys. These reports indicated that in the early 1980s, the numbers of honors programs were small but beginning to increase. Piland and Gould's (1982) survey to 48 Illinois community colleges determined that seven (19%) reported honors programs, each one enrolling from 10 to 100 students. "A greater percentage of larger community colleges (27%) had programs than medium (11%) and smaller (19%) colleges" (p. 25). In 1984, McKeague surveyed 46 campuses in a 19-state North Central region and discovered that 40% had honors programs. Piland, McKeague, and Montgomery (1987) reported that 27% of 137 community colleges in a 19-state North Central region had established honors programs and that 67% of those programs had existed for three years or less. Colleges with large student populations were more likely to report that honors programs were increasing. O'Banion cited a similar development on the west coast. "In 1983 there were only two Honors Programs in California Community Colleges but in the fall of 1987 there were approximately 60 such programs" (p. 15).

In describing the growth of honors programs in small four-year colleges and community colleges, Whitehead-Jackson (1986) also claimed that honors programs grew quickly after 1978 and that fifty-three two-year college honors programs were well established in 1986. These studies suggest that while the number of community

college honors programs may have increased in the 1980s, there was no clear information to verify their prevalence on a national basis.

Rationale for Concept

Four-Year Sector

The rationale for establishing honors programs in the four-year sector includes some common themes:

1. Challenge academically elite students (Alvarez-Harvey, 1986; Austin, 1986; Aydelotte, 1944; Cummings, 1986; Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Halverson, 1973; Triplet, 1989).

2. Attract and retain students of outstanding ability (Alvarez-Harvey, 1987; Austin, 1986; Irby, 1986; McKuen, 1992; Whitehead-Jackson, 1986; Worta, 1992).

3. Renew and retain faculty (Austin, 1975; Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Halverson, 1973).

4. Increase opportunities for admission into professional schools and for preference when applying for jobs (Alvarez-Harvey, 1987; Gillen, 1986; McKuen, 1992).

5. Attract campus scholars and speakers to campus (Austin, 1985; Halverson, 1973).

6. Enhance public image of institution (Austin, 1975).

7. Promote student interaction and involvement with peers (Irby, 1986).

Two-Year Sector

References to honors programs in two-year colleges frequently included

reasons for their establishment. The reasons included below are in the order of those most frequently cited.

1. Attract, challenge, and retain students of outstanding academic ability (Austin, 1975; Bentley-Baker, 1983; Bridges, 1988; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Edman, 1992; Friedlander, 1983; Heck, 1986; Lindblad, 1986; McCabe, 1986; Piland & Azbell, 1984; Piland & Gould, 1982; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Rankin, 1989; Skau, 1989; Terrill, 1991; Todd, 1988).

2. Enhance the public image of the institution (Austin, 1975; Bentley-Baker, 1983; Cohen, 1985; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Collison, 1991; Friedlander, 1983; Heck, 1986; Lindblad, 1986; Link, 1986; McCabe, 1986; Parsons, 1984; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Rankin, 1989; Skau, 1989; Todd, 1988).

3. Attract and retain faculty committed to quality education (Austin, 1975; Backus, 1989; Bentley-Baker, 1983; Cohen, 1985; Friedlander, 1983; Heck, 1986; Lindblad, 1986; Parsons, 1984; Piland, McKeague, and Montgomery, 1987).

4. Strengthen the quality of academic programs (Cohen, 1985; Edman, 1992; Friedlander, 1983; Heck, 1986; Parsons, 1984; Piland & Gould, 1982; Skau, 1989).

5. Enhance relationships with transfer institutions (Parsons, 1984; Todd, 1988).

6. Provide opportunities for honors students to transfer to prestigious colleges and universities (Parsons, 1984; Wilson, 1992).

McCabe, President of Miami-Dade Community College (1986), reflected the

ideas of other community college educators who believe that honors programs benefit their institution and their students.

> With increased focus on achievement in community colleges, it is important that these institutions not become places for those only with poor academic skills. Yet overwhelmed by the problems of underprepared students and the task of providing support for them, the community college has, over a period of time, neglected superior students. These students represent one more aspect of our total diversity that can be well-served by the community college. The superior student is an important asset, not only to other students, but also in building and maintaining a positive, public attitude toward community colleges. (p. 25)

Skau (1989) cautioned that the primary purpose for establishing an honors program at a community college should not be to increase enrollments or enhance the image, but to strengthen the educational mission and to enhance its quest for excellence.

The rationale for both types of institutions to establish honors programs center on students. There is consensus among many educators that academically elite students can benefit and grow from the challenges that honors programs provide and that these students will be retained at the colleges because of their increased satisfaction with their courses and the program. Both types of institutions see other advantages for the students when they leave school. For community college students, there are enhanced opportunities to be admitted to a transfer institution, possibly a prestigious one. For undergraduates at a four-year school, it might increase the possibility for admission to professional schools or give the student preference when applying for a job.

Another commonly held belief is that these programs benefit faculty. Some

writers believe honors programs renew and even retain faculty at four-year colleges, while others believe that honors programs at community colleges can also attract some faculty.

Some rationales are significantly different. While 17 authors believe honors programs enhance the image of the community college, only one citation noted that as a reason for establishing them at four-year schools. Likewise, several researchers believe that these programs strengthen the quality of academic programs at community colleges. No citation noted that benefit for four-year colleges or universities.

Curriculum

Four-Year Sector

In Innovation in Liberal Arts Colleges (1969), Brick and McGrath identified the use of special honors courses and seminars to address the needs of the superior student. The authors reviewed various curricular elements at twelve colleges and concluded that:

> A major purpose that runs throughout the honors programs is to provide educational opportunities for the exceptionally well-endowed student whose goal may be more intensive intellectual development than the average student. (p. 25, 26)

They added that honors classes are different from regular classes because they are smaller, more informal, and challenge students to understand the meaning, order, and relationships among concepts covered in class. Students are also given more opportunities to work collaboratively with their peers and to establish informal relationships with faculty.

In Fostering Academic Excellence Through Honors Programs (1986), two NCHC members discussed the various curricular models. Austin (1986) explained that even though the programs vary, they all include "rigorous, coherent, and integrated academic experiences and a high degree of student-faculty interchange" (p. 8). Austin described university honors programs:

> The honors courses are likely to be rigorous, low enrollment, faculty-taught versions of regular courses, with integration achieved through individualized curricula that are required to be coherent as well as rigorous and that may include interdisciplinary seminars. An honors education is usually capped by an individual research experience that culminates in a senior thesis and an oral examination. (p. 8)

Austin distinguished between two categories of honors curricula--general and departmental honors.

> General honors refers to alternatives to the regular general education course. Subject matter is explored with greater intensity and depth, concepts are examined, and research patterns are introduced. (p. 8)

While general honors is more common to lower division courses, departmental honors is typically the independent study in which the faculty member tutors the student. These programs usually culminate with a senior honors thesis or project.

Austin (1975) argued that honors courses and curricula impacted the larger academic community because they foster innovation and often result in new courses, new majors, and living-learning centers.

According to Gabelnick (1986), team teaching is another common approach to honors courses which exposes students to different perspectives on the same topics, but the most popular model for honors courses is the interdisciplinary seminar.

> These thematic seminars may address social, political, psychological, scientific, or literary issues. They generally are small discussion classes using writing or oral presentations, but they also try to incorporate experiences from the outside world into the course. (p. 76)

Four-year colleges also offer upper-level honors seminars with a specific focus. These seminars bring depth into the curriculum and focus on specific themes which are more complex and penetrating than those offered for entry-level students.

Honors courses within disciplines are common. These enriched classes are usually accelerated and "push the students to consider some of the fundamental philosophical and methodological issues in the discipline and . . . may require more papers and certainly more student participation" (p. 81).

Gabelnick claimed that when honors programs established the honors semester in the 1970s, it became the precursor to learning communities recently acclaimed because of their ability to foster active classroom participation and integrated learning.

> Diversifying the academic presentation thus allows students at different stages of development who approach problems in different ways to experience a sense of competence and accomplishment. The small classes that are the norm among honors programs allow students to work more closely with a faculty member, forming mentoring relationships that will benefit them educationally and professionally. (p. 85)

Four-Year and Two-Year Sectors

Irby's investigation of the curricular elements within honors programs at seven two-year and 39 four-year colleges in Texas revealed that multi-disciplinary courses were offered at 27 institutions. Thesis honors projects were also identified by 26 colleges. Other common elements were guest lecturers (21) and independent studies (20). In addition, colleges frequently identified field trips, visits to faculty homes,

colloquia, and team taught classes as typical elements within the honors curriculum.

Two-Year Sector

Descriptive information on the curricular components of community college honors programs is limited. In 1983, Bentley-Baker and a committee of nine community college educators produced Honors in the Two-Year College. Sponsored by the National Collegiate Honors Council, the National Council of Instructional Administrators, and the Community College Humanities Association, this handbook described common curricular components and honors program models. The information was based on a survey of thirty two-year colleges. A copy of the survey instrument was not provided. Eight of the participating community colleges were represented on the writing committee. While the book was based on limited sources of information, it is the only work focused on the development, implementation, and management of honors programs. Based on this book, it appears that many elements within the community college curriculum are similar to those offered in the first two years at a four-year college or university.

According to Honors in the Two-Year College, the curricular elements of honors programs vary. The most typical component includes separate honors sections of general education courses in which a small class of high ability students meet with a pre-selected faculty member. Students in these honors courses have more discussion, read more primary sources, write more papers, and cover subjects more deeply than do students in a regular class.

Honors credit can also be awarded in a regular class through a contract basis.

Honors credit is awarded to students who have contracted to do extra papers or projects. This approach is more common in small-sized schools or at the sophomore level where there are not enough students to justify separate honors sections.

Seminars are also used in a variety of ways for honors academic credit. They can be established by a department as a semester-long series of seminars on a specific topic taught by faculty volunteers. Honors seminars can also be offered as a shorter series of meetings with a nationally known speaker. Honors seminars frequently provide an interdisciplinary overview or the unifying element in a project-based program.

Some honors programs offer an honors core, a set of courses which focuses on a specific topic or perspective and continues for two terms. The focus may be interdisciplinary such as an American Studies program or the Humanities Honors Colloquium.

Independent studies are popular components of honors programs. They provide opportunities for students to work with faculty mentors to explore new ideas, build specific skills, go into a topic more deeply, work creatively, and even do internships.

Bentley-Baker et al. (1983) organized honors programs into five different models.

1. The Course-Centered Program. "Honors sections of selected courses are the major, and frequently only, ingredient of the program" (p. 15). These courses are

usually part of the general education core. Students are pre-screened for ability and they receive honors designation on their transcript.

2. Single Track or Prescribed Curriculum. This approach is more structured and integrated. Honors students are expected to enroll in specific courses for four consecutive semesters. Electives are either minimal or nonexistent.

3. Core-Oriented Program. This model stresses a common theme and an interdisciplinary approach in a required group of courses.

4. Individualized Courses. Used at many community colleges, independent studies are the basis of this model and are adaptable to the needs of community college students who are older, part-time, or enrolled in vocational/technical programs.

5. Comprehensive Model. This approach accommodates both transfer and career students and includes multiple options of honors sections, honors contracts and seminars, and is integrated within academic divisions.

According to Honors in the Two-Year College, the models differ because of the specific characteristics of the student body and the institution. No information is available to explain which model is preferable or more effective for specific types of students or institutions.

Student Services

Four-Year Sector

Tacha (1986) recommended that advising become an essential component of all college honors programs because faculty members who advise honors students become

their mentors and tutors and that informal social occasions and guest speakers broaden the students' experience and expose them to "divergent disciplinary views, value systems, and cultural backgrounds" (p. 59). Finally, he added that if a college can provide financial assistance to a student, it can improve the attractiveness and effectiveness of the program. While Tacha described these elements as beneficial, he provided no additional sources of data to support his statements.

Two-Year Sector

McKeague's (1984) research on 19 community college honors programs indicated that the most common special features include:

1. Academic advisement (84%)
2. Scholarships (84%)
3. Recognition banquet (79%)
4. Specially designed courses, seminars and workshops (68%)
5. Special education or intellectual activities in addition to coursework (68%)
6. Career counseling (68%)
7. Faculty mentors (68%)
8. Social activities (68%)
9. Opportunities for research (53%)
10. Personal counseling (47%)
11. Special privileges (i.e., early registration) (47%)
12. Honors meeting room (42%) (p. 7).

McKeague's research also indicated that scholarships are the major feature which attracts students to honors programs.

Administration

Four-Year Sector

Austin (1986) explained that:

> There is no single model for placing an honors program in the organizational or budgetary structure of a college or university . . .

> Some programs are comprehensive and university-wide; many are limited to liberal arts. In complex universities, a director may coordinate several relatively autonomous programs in several undergraduate colleges. (p. 12, 13).

The position of honors coordinator may be filled by an assistant liberal arts dean or a faculty member with release time. Honors programs usually provide a governance function for faculty and students and an evaluation component within their charter.

Whitehead-Jackson (1986) noted that "the leadership of small-college honors programs has been undertaken usually from the humanities departments, but occasionally from the social sciences and natural sciences" (p. 66). Typically, honors coordinators in these types of institutions teach one-third time and administrate two-thirds. In small colleges with a favorable ratio of honors program students and faculty, coordinators tend to work more actively to secure and maintain the best teachers in key departments and divisions. Additional responsibilities of coordinators include recruiting and identifying the best students, monitoring the budget, securing scholarships, chairing the honors council, and monitoring honors residence halls. Jackson believed that the challenge of administering an honors program on a small college is to maintain a balance of academic integrity and a positive curricular and financial relationship with the larger college.

Two-Year Sector

While most community colleges identify a person to coordinate honors program activities, the information on the frequency of that assignment varies. In their surveys of 19 honors programs, McKeague, White, and Wilders (1984) found that 95% of the programs had an Honors Director or Coordinator. Information

gleaned from other surveys indicated that "almost three quarters (74%) of honors programs are headed by a program director or coordinator" (Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987, p. 35). This person is usually a faculty member with released time to handle the management of the program.

Advisory committees are also common to honors programs (Bentley-Baker et al., 1983; McKeague, 1984; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987). Their role is:

> One of quality control: Approving student applications, course proposals, and contracts; evaluating the program; and reviewing student performance for graduation from the program. (Bentley-Baker et al., 1983, p. 25)

Honors in the Two-Year College recommended that the committee include faculty and staff from student services, admissions, and the library. Piland and Gould (1982) also suggested that the committee also include a community representative.

In a report for the Mid-Career Fellowship Program at Princeton University, Skau (1989) noted that successful honors programs have dedicated faculty, a program coordinator with sufficient released time, an advisory committee, and mechanisms to recognize students' accomplishments.

Admission and Retention Criteria

Four-Year Sector

Robert Kiltgaard (1985), former admissions chairperson for Harvard's Public Policy Program, provided the following guidelines for establishing admission criteria for an honors program:

1. Selection criteria should match the goals of the program.

2. Both objective and subjective indicators can best determine students' abilities.

3. Other aspects of talent besides intellectual ability should be considered.

4. Identification data such as standardized test scores, extra-curricular activities, and teacher recommendations and weight selection should be grouped according to their importance.

According to Jenkins-Friedman (1986):

> A high grade point average is the most common standard, closely followed by scores in the 95-98 percentile range on standardized tests of academic ability such as the SAT and ACT. (p. 31)

She recommended that honors programs also consider students' tangible accomplishments and work done to improve society as well as their motivation and capacity for hard work. While tests of intellectual and academic ability are appropriate for purposes of admission, Jenkins-Friedman urged honors program coordinators to consider the interaction of intelligence and creativity in selecting honors students.

She referred to the admission requirements of the Honors College at the University of Oregon as an example of broadly based criteria.

> (1) intellectual ability; (2) independence of thought; (3) judgement and maturity; (4) industry and motivation; (5) effective oral communication; and (6) effective written communication. (p. 38)

Triplet (1989) noted that the admission requirements to the Honors Program at Northern State University [South Dakota] include an ACT composite of 24 or above,

high school rank of top 25 percent for high school seniors, and a 3.25 GPA for currently enrolled students.

The retention requirements from the Honors Program Handbook at the University of Maine at Orono require a student to maintain a "B" (3.0) average to stay in the program.

Austin (1988) reports that students who graduate with honors at the University of Arizona must have earned a 3.5 GPA, completed 30 hours of honors courses, attended three honors seminars, and finalized three units of honors research.

Two-Year Sector

Admission criteria commonly used for honors programs are similar to those at four-year colleges and universities and include:

1. SAT composite scores from 1,000 to 1,200; ACT composite scores from 22 to 28 (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Bridges, 1988; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Friedlander, 1983; Piland, 1981; Piland & Gould, 1982; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Terrill, 1991; Todd, 1988).

2. High school grade point average (GPA) - 3.0 to 3.5 (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Friedlander, 1983; Piland, 1981; Piland & Gould, 1982; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Todd, 1988).

3. Demonstration of special ability through writing samples, auditions, portfolios, and so forth (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Friedlander, 1983; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Todd, 1988).

4. Graduation rank in high school ranging from the top 10% to the top 25%. (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Piland, 1981; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Todd, 1988).

5. Recommendations from high school teachers and college professors (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Piland, 1981; Piland & Gould, 1982; Todd, 1988).

6. Interviews with the college's honors committee (Friedlander, 1983; Jenkins-Friedman, 1986).

Most community college honors programs have established retention criteria. Honors students usually need to maintain a GPA from 3.0 to 3.5 on a 4.0 scale and must enroll in a minimal number of hours in honors courses each term to graduate from the program (Bentley-Baker, 1983; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Friedlander, 1983; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Wilson, 1992).

Student Profile

Four-Year Sector

A review of the literature provided little information on the students enrolled in four-year honors programs. The only citation noting specific characteristics of honors students at a university focused on a small sample. Mathiasen (1985) investigated the characteristics of 17 members of the honors program at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. The subjects in this study included four men and thirteen women. Their mean age was 21 years. Their academic profile included a mean high school rank of 85.34 and mean ACT composite score of 27.88. The students completed four educational-psychological tests: The Survey of Study Habits and

Attitudes (Holtzman, Brown & Farguhar, 1954), the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1963), the Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) (Rotter, 1966), and the Academic Motivations Inventory (Moen-Doyle, 1977). Mathiasen reported that compared with college students in general, the honors students scored significantly higher on the Work Methods scale ($t = 5.77$, $p < .001$), the Study Habits scale ($t = 3.64$, $p < .01$), and the Study Orientation scale ($t = 2.18$, $p < .05$) of the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes. Results of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule showed the honors students to be significantly higher in need for achievement ($t = 3.24$, $p < .01$) and significantly lower in need for deference ($t = 3.23$, $p < .01$).

Two-Year Sector

Demographics. In contrast to the four-year sector, information on student demographics is common to studies on community college honors programs. Piland and McKeague's (1982) survey indicated that 63% of the honors program participants were female and 37% male. McKeague's (1984) survey produced a similar profile with 61% of the honors students as females. Piland and Azbell (1984) analyzed the data from questionnaires received from 104 honors students in eight community colleges in Illinois and Florida. Participation by females (63.1%) exceeded that of males (36.9%). The ages of respondents ranged from 17 to 45 with 59% being 17 to 18 years of age. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were Caucasian. More than 75% of the participants surveyed by Piland and Gould were Caucasian. Armstrong and DeMeo's (1989) study at San Diego Community College (SDCC) confirmed the

earlier studies by showing that females as well as Caucasians were over-represented in community college honors programs. Females in the Honors Program at SDCC comprised 70% of the group, but only 52% of the college's body. Similarly, Caucasians comprised 78% of the SDCC Honors Program participants as compared to 65% of the student body. Piland and Azbell (1984) explained why the females are apt to be the majority, "Female students are more likely to be identified as gifted than male students even if their abilities are equal" (p. 47), but gave no data to support this explanation.

Montgomery (1991) surveyed 490 honors students in 17 Illinois community colleges and reported that even though the students ranged in age from 17 to 73 years, the most common age was 18 years and the mean age was 24 years. A total of 190 (39%) respondents were male and 299 (61%) respondents were female. Also, 92% were Caucasian with Hispanic students (2.7%) comprising the largest minority group followed by Asian-American, African-American, and American Indian students.

Eighty percent of the honors students in Montgomery's (1991) study were employed with the most common level of employment ranging from 11 to 20 hours per week. Piland and Azbell (1984) reported that 31% of their honors students worked more than 20 hours per week. At Miami-Dade Community College, 70% of the honors students worked and 50% were part-time students (Link, 1988). Armstrong and DeMeo's study at San Diego Community College indicated that 66% of their honors students worked part-time.

Learning Style Preferences. A few researchers have attempted to learn more

about how honors students in two-year colleges learn. These studies were small and focused on specific questions. Wentzlaff (1988) studied 24 honors students in a Basic Communications course at her community college and discovered that these students preferred collaborative and participant styles of learning. She believed these students' preference for active involvement with their peers should cause honors faculty to adjust their teaching methods.

Piland, Rothschild, and Sanchez (1990) administered Canfield's Learning Style Inventory to 88 honors program students in three southern California community colleges. These authors reported that the students preferred lecture as a mode of instruction in addition to in-depth discussion and interaction with students. These researchers concluded that honors students' "preferences reflect the traditional image of a college student desiring traditional learning experiences" (p. 227) and differ from those preferences of the adult postsecondary student.

Evaluations of Honors Programs

Despite the fact that honors programs have been in existence in higher education for more than seventy years, the bulk of the relevant literature is descriptive and anecdotal rather than evaluative. Coursol and Wagner (1986) contend that

> . . . despite growing interest, current studies are deficient in a number of ways; samples tend to be small; students high and low in achievement are often compared rather than genuine honors students; investigations are restricted to one honors course or a single departmental honors program; the criterion of success is usually college grade point average and not necessarily graduation from an honors program; predictor variables usually focus on either cognitive or biographical measures but not both. (p. 139)

Studies designed specifically for evaluation were primarily single institution studies. Those conducted at universities tended to be quasi-experimental studies intended to compare the success of honors students with other groups of students. Community college studies focused on assessing student satisfaction with the honors program. Other reports were anecdotal in nature. One study utilized multiple methods to investigate the participants' assumptions about their honors program. No study specifically attempted to assess honors program's effects through interviews of faculty, students, and administrators.

Four-Year Sector

The literature on honors programs in four-year colleges and universities indicates that these programs produced both positive and negative effects on students.

Astin (1977, 1982, 1984) reported on the results of a nationwide study which utilized longitudinal data from over 200,000 students at 300 institutions. Astin's research demonstrated that participation in honors programs at four-year colleges and universities positively affected grades, persistence, and students' aspirations for graduate or professional degrees. Astin also claimed that honors students significantly increased their interpersonal self-esteem, intellectual self-esteem, and artistic interests. His research also indicated that there was a positive relationship with student satisfaction with their science classes and quality of instruction as well as enhanced relationships with faculty. These students were somewhat more likely to remain in college and to plan to earn graduate or professional degrees than regular students. Isolation from peers, however, could be interpreted as a negative effect (p. 221).

Pflaum, Pascarella, and Duby (1985) used a quasi-experimental design to compare the academic achievement of three groups of freshmen enrolled at the University of Illinois at Chicago. The sample for the study consisted of 158 freshmen who entered the university in the fall quarter of 1982. The sample included 58 students in the Honors College, 35 students who were invited to apply but chose not to, and 65 students randomly selected from the freshmen class. Their research indicated participation in an honors program had a positive influence on academic achievement of talented and motivated students. Even though there was no difference in the persistence rates among the three groups, the honors students had a significantly higher cumulative GPA at the end of the academic year than did freshmen with equivalent ability and freshmen at large. The authors believed that the academic structure of the honors program provided increased opportunities for both classroom and non-classroom interaction and opportunities for socialization with faculty and peers.

Coursol and Wagner (1986) reviewed the files of 160 students in the honors program at the University of Akron. The results of their research revealed that women were more likely to graduate from the program than men and that

> . . . high school grade point average was the only cognitive variable which predicted both college grade point average and honors graduation ($r = .30$ p, .01 and $r = .19$ p, .05 respectively). Surprisingly, the ACT composite was not significantly related to either criterion. (p. 140)

Harvey (1987) reported that the graduates of the Honors Program at Jackson State University made the college's good academic record stronger and more visible,

aided in raising the ACT and SAT average scores of the college's student body, and improved retention of honors students at this historically black public institution. She also claimed that it provided faculty with opportunities to become more creative and innovative in the classroom. These claims were not accompanied by any detailed information as to how the author reached such conclusions.

Ory and Braskamp (1988) compared three groups of students at the University of Illinois at Urbana by administering Pace's College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) to 225 students. Their study indicated that honors students were more active in art, music, theater, and clubs and that they demonstrated more academic, personal, and social gains in their first year as compared to regular students and another group of students with special talents in music or athletics. They concluded that greater academic and interpersonal effort led to these greater gains in intellectual and interpersonal areas.

In 1988, Austin examined the Honors Programs at the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, and Northern Arizona University. After reviews of the printed materials and informal interviews with honors students, faculty, and administrators at the three campuses within a five day period, Austin reported on the quality of the curriculum, the level of the admission and retention criteria, the organizational structure, and the level of administrative support at all three campuses for the Arizona Board of Regents. Austin concluded that the students were very satisfied with the quality of instruction but noted that they complained about the lack

of integration within their honors seminar and the subjectivity faculty used when assigning grades.

While some educators (i.e., Austin, 1975; Friedlander, 1983; Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Halverson, 1973) claim that honors programs benefit faculty as well as students, a review of the literature yielded no evidence that faculty at four-year colleges and universities believe that honors programs have benefitted them professionally or personally.

After interviews with 34 faculty who did not teach honors courses at Indiana University, Wolosin (1973) concluded that they lacked knowledge and information about the objectives of the honors courses in their divisions. Wolosin also reported that the commitment and willingness of these faculty to support honors programs varied greatly. These faculty agreed that honors students need a greater challenge and higher standards than regular college students. They expected that honors courses should be innovative and stimulating and also expose students to interdisciplinary material.

Four-Year Sector and Two-Year Sector

In 1985, Steenstra examined the perceptions of students, faculty, and administrators at honors programs operating at three state universities, one private university, five four-year colleges, and two community colleges in Michigan. After surveying seventeen university students in Honors Humanities II class, he reported that they perceived that their honors classes were challenging. Steenstra surveyed 30 honors program coordinators at 11 institutions and reported that they believed that

their programs focused on demanding, but different types of coursework as well as the personal growth of the students. These coordinators presumed that the superior teachers would be stimulated by teaching talented students and thus deliver courses which were more lively, exuberant, and intense.

While the honors programs promised accelerated intellectual development and increased opportunities for self-directed study, Steenstra's two months of observation of honors classes indicated that there were "many interactionless episodes" (p. 52), when the students did not actively participate in class, and the presentation of course material was not rigorous. Steenstra concluded that "there is a significant difference between the perceptions of honors programs and realities" (p. 58). Steenstra recommended that honors programs need to demonstrate quality and that researchers find a way to measure the effects of such programs on participants.

After investigating the character and extant of honors programs at four-year colleges and universities and community colleges in Texas, Irby (1986) stated as follows:

> Differences in philosophical positions which includes the scope and content of the curricula and conflicting attitudes held by teachers and by the students--in particular the implication that the programs have an elitist connotation--was reported as the major reason for not offering honors program. (p. 61)

Of 132 institutions surveyed, 18 four-year colleges and 11 community colleges stated that such philosophical differences were a critical issue related to the establishment of an honors program at their institution.

Two-Year Sector

Follow-up data on community college students is limited to information collected at single institutions or on a statewide basis. Four institutional self-studies from 1973 to 1989 (Armstrong & DeMeo, 1989; Etchinson, 1985; Lindblad, 1988; Miami-Dade Community College, 1984) summarized student responses to specific program characteristics. In general, students enjoyed the challenge provided by honors courses.

An experiment in inter-institutional cooperation prompted the establishment of an honors program at Grand View College in 1970. This innovative program was designed to move students smoothly from the first two years at this private college to a selection of upper level classes offered by selected four-year institutions at Grand View's campus. Etchinson's (1973) 34 questionnaires and interviews with some of the participants revealed that while the students were satisfied with the quality of instruction and availability of the faculty, they criticized the program's lack of academic orientation. Students complained that they had not been challenged or intellectually rewarded.

In 1984, the President's Office at Miami-Dade Community College incorporated a report of its honors program within its self-study. Thirty-five students who had taken one or more honors courses responded to a survey regarding the program's benefits. The report noted that the majority of the students were pleased with the program and believed that the courses met their expectations. One comment included within the report indicated that the Honors Program was primarily geared for

younger students. "The mature students feel out of place in this program" (p. 61).

The report also acknowledged that non-honors faculty at Miami-Dade were divided about the worth of mainstreaming gifted students. One faculty member stated:

> Gifted students should be pursuing demanding programs in which all the electives are both interesting and demanding. They don't need segregated courses. (p. 63)

In 1988, Lindblad reported that honors students at Frederick Community College (FCC) believed the FCC Honors Program had had a "significant positive effect on their educational development" and that honors courses were stimulating and enhanced student-faculty interaction. She provided no further details on the number of students or year of the survey.

In 1989, Armstrong and DeMeo reported on an evaluation study of the Honors Program at San Diego Community College District (SDCC). The evaluation was conducted in two stages. During the first week, honors students completed a Student Profile Questionnaire. This instrument provided demographic and educational characteristics of honors students from the program's pilot in 1986 through full implementation in 1989. At the end of each semester, students and faculty completed a questionnaire to provide more qualitative information on their perceptions of the program. The questionnaires focused on the program's goals of quality of instruction, enrichment of faculty and enhancement of the public image. Students affirmed that they valued the program's quality of instruction, originality of subject matter, smaller class size, and opportunities for projects and class discussions. A telephone survey to

students who dropped out revealed the most common reasons were conflicts with work schedules, excessive numbers of courses, and personal conflicts. Faculty acknowledged increased satisfaction with teaching honors students, but also indicated there was no way to measure any change in public attitude towards the college.

Montgomery's (1991) research on 490 honors students enrolled at 17 Illinois community colleges explored factors which contributed to their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their honors program. Surveys asked students to identify the one factor which contributed most to their satisfaction and the one factor which contributed most to their overall dissatisfaction with their honors program. Two independent raters analyzed their responses for content and grouped them into seven categories. The seven primary categories were defined as instruction, challenges, offerings, prestige, peers, privileges, and management.

> The most common factor cited by honors students as contributing to their overall satisfaction with their honors program was the quality of instruction in the honors program. Students also liked the nurturing environment, discussion, and small classes. The number and type of honors program offerings contributed most to their overall dissatisfaction with their honors program. There were too few honors courses and not enough offered in all subject areas. Courses were not offered at convenient times, especially for part-time and evening students. (p. 139)

Montgomery also sought to determine if any relationship existed between the identified satisfying factors and each of the following variables; age, gender, ethnic origin, current year in school, father's level of education, mother's level of education, type of high school attended, high school GPA, ACT, and SAT scores, participation in high school honors program, college GPA, level of employment while attending

college, current course hours, number of completed course hours, and educational objectives. Chi-square tests and one-way analyses of variance indicated that the students' age, high school GPA, ACT scores, and current course hours were significantly related to the category of satisfying factor at the .05 level of significance.

Montgomery also sought to determine what relationship existed between the dissatisfying factors and the various variables previously identified. Cross-tabulations revealed that non-traditional aged students were approximately twice as likely to have no dissatisfaction with their honors program than either the freshmen or sophomore students.

Summary

More information is available on the effects of honors programs on students in four-year colleges and universities than on community college honors students. The value of that information is limited however, because there have been no recent national studies to determine if Astin's (1977, 1982, 1984) findings on the positive effects of honors program participation can be replicated. Also, the other evaluative studies which have been conducted in single institutions focus on the specific programs of those institutions (e.g., Coursol & Wagner, 1986; Harvey, 1987; Ory & Braskamp, 1988; Pflaum, Pascarella, & Duby, 1985).

Studies of community college honors programs centered on the demographics and educational characteristics of honors students in specific institutions or on a regional basis (e.g., Bentley-Baker, 1983; McKeague, 1984; Piland & Azbell, 1984; Piland & Gould, 1982). Other reports frequently described program elements. Only

five studies reviewed causes of students' satisfaction with their honors programs.

Much of the community college literature on honors programs identified similar benefits but did not verify that those benefits occur (e.g., Bentley-Baker, 1983; Cohen & Brawer, 1987; Friedlander, 1983; Heck, 1986; McCabe, 1986; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987; Todd, 1988). L.L. Cohen (1985) concluded that there is a paucity of empirical data which document the positive effects of community college honors programs on recruitment, retention and public image and argued that "some sort of detailed, dispassionate evaluation of representative honors programs is needed" (p. 6).

This study responds to the need for more information on the effects and the impact of honors programs. The results of this study attempt to fill the void of information available on the effects of honors programs in community colleges. Chapter III describes the methodology used in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the method of inquiry, the instruments used, and details of the data analysis employed to examine the effects of the Honors Program on the College of Lake County.

Research Design

This qualitative study was influenced by Scriven's (1973) Goal Free Evaluation Model. The central theme of this approach is "critical examination of the institution, project, program, or thing irrespective of its goals" (Gardner, 1977, p. 380). The researcher selected this type of inquiry to identify both expected and unexpected outcomes and to determine all the effects of the Honors Program without being constrained by a narrow focus on the program's goals.

> It is often the case that an evaluator turns up information about unintended side effects of a project or program which may be more important in some regard than the information relative to project goals or pre-identified decisions. (Gardner, 1977, p. 380)

As in other types of qualitative methodology, direct quotations are crucial in goal-free evaluation.

> Direct quotations are the basic source of raw data in qualitative measurement revealing respondents' level of emotion, the way they have organized their world, their thoughts about what is happening, their experiences, and their perceptions. (Patton, 1980, p. 28)

Scriven (1983) clearly recommends that evaluators utilize the wealth of information available both from the clients for whom the program is designed as well as from the program staff.

When planning such evaluations, the researcher must include other factors. Scriven recommends that the researcher also consider the worth of a program, based on its costs in the effective use of funds, opportunity costs, and non-monetary costs. Historical documents are another valuable resource for evaluation because they help the researcher identify how "the working goals change with the experience of program delivery" (Scriven, 1983, p. 237). Inclusion and review of historical documents also strengthen the research because when a variety of data sources converge, one can assume that biases will be cancelled and the research will converge upon perceived truth (Patton, 1980, p. 271). The strategy is based on the concept that "multiple methods and triangulation of observation contribute to methodological rigor" (Patton, 1980, p. 18).

Procedures of the Research

Subject Selection Process

The subjects for this study were members of three distinct groups at the College of Lake County. They represented three major groups directly affected by the Honors Program: students, faculty, and administrators.

As the researcher identified potential interviewees from each group, it became apparent that it would be important to choose those who would represent certain subgroups. This was particularly important with the students since the researcher

interviewed students from every year of the program's operation. More students were interviewed from the first year than from the last year because the first year students had two years of participation as well as a perspective of how the program affected their performance in four-year colleges and universities. Also, interviews with two students in the last year of the program without the coordinator provided very similar views on the program's effects.

The selection of faculty interviewees focused more on those instructors who taught in the program rather than the faculty at large. This approach was consistent with Scriven's Goal Free Evaluation Model which recommends interviews with program participants rather than program observers (Scriven, 1983). The three interviews with faculty outside of the program provided similar opinions about the program's effects. Based on these interviews and the information provided in other documents, the researcher assumed that those interviews reflected some of the opinions of other faculty.

The same approach was used in identifying appropriate administrators for interviewing. Those most directly involved with the program's operation provided the most pertinent information on the program's effects.

Sixty-six subjects participated in interviews beginning on July 3, 1991, and ending on January 6, 1992. All of the interviews occurred in person at the college campus except for two interviews with administrators off campus and eight telephone interviews with students. In these cases, students' conflicts in their time commitment and their inability to commute to College of Lake County necessitated the telephone

interviews. Interviews ranged in time from 30 minutes to one and one-half hours; the average length was about one hour. All interviews were taped and transcribed verbatim.

Students. When the Honors Program was first conceived, it was designed to:

> . . . accommodate two types of honors students: (a) those who are admitted into the Honors Fellows program because they satisfy criteria which are indicative of high academic achievement and are hereafter known as Honors Fellows; and (b) those who are admitted into individual honors courses because they can satisfy criteria which indicate that they can be successful in specific courses. (Sherman, 1985, p. 2).

According to the records of the Honors Program Coordinator and the files of the Financial Aid Office, a total of 238 Honors Fellows participated in the program from the Fall 1987 semester through the Fall 1991 semester. Since CLC enrollment data for those students admitted into individual honors courses were unavailable, they were not included in this study.

Twenty-five Honors Fellows were interviewed. They were chosen from lists of student rosters provided by the former Honors Program Coordinator. The researcher attempted to select students who represented the ethnicity, age, gender, and various years of participation of the entire Honors Fellows population. While attempts were made to reflect the ethnicity of Honors Fellows, the researcher was unable to contact any Hispanic students for an interview. One contact with a student with a Hispanic surname revealed that the student was Asian-American. Two attempts to contact older students revealed that one had moved away and another left the program after the first few weeks. The latter student explained that her

experience would not truly reflect the effects of the program. Two students who did not participate in the program were also selected for interviews because they were seen frequently studying and socializing with the Honors Fellows. Table 1 includes the demographic comparison of the student sample and the Honors Fellows.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISON OF STUDENT SAMPLE AND HONORS FELLOWS

	Original Population Honors Fellows		Sample	
Ethnicity	N	%	N	%
African American	1	0.4	1	4
Asian American	5	2.1	3	12
Caucasian	229	96.2	21	84
Hispanic	3	1.3	--	--
	238	100.0	25	100
Age				
17-25	231	97.0	25	100
26-35	4	1.7	--	--
36-45	3	1.3	--	--
	238	100.0	25	100
Gender				
Female	152	63.9	12	48
Male	86	36.1	13	52
	238	100.0	25	100

Table 2 summarizes the academic records of the student sample.

TABLE 2

STUDENT SAMPLE--(Academic Records)

ACT: (N=21)	Mean	
English	23.85	
Mathematics	26.10	
Social Science	25.14	
Natural Science	25.76	
Composite	25.19	
High School Rank (N=23)*	.067	
High School GPA (N=18)**	4.23	
CLC GPA***	3.21	
Hours Attempted	66.28	
Hours Earned	60.96	
Four-Year College GPA (N=11)***	3.39	
CLC Degree Objectives:		
A.A.	5	(20%)
A.S.	19	(76%)
A.A.S.	1	(4%)
Degrees Earned:		
A.A.	4	(16%)
A.S.	10	(40%)
B.A.****	1	(4%)
B.S.****	4	(16%)
Plans for Grad School	15	(60%)

* High school rank was obtained by dividing the rank of the individual student by the total number of students in that graduating class.

** GPA reflects a general range of 0-4 scales with weighted scales for Honors Courses.

*** GPA reflects range of 0-4 scale.

**** Self-reported.

Table 3 contains information on years of students' program participation and Table 4 provides information on their employment while enrolled in the program.

TABLE 3

STUDENT SAMPLE--(Years of Participation)

No. of Semesters	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	Did not Participate
Four	7	3	2	--	--	--
Three	--	--	--	1	--	--
Two	--	4	--	3	--	--
One	--	--	1	--	2	--
Zero	--	--	--	--	--	2
Total	7	7	3	4	2	2

TABLE 4

STUDENT SAMPLE--(Student Employment While Enrolled in Honors Program)

Response	No. of Students	Hours Worked Per Week			
		0-10	11-20	21-30	31+
Yes	20	5	7	6	2
No	5	--	--	--	--

Faculty. Twenty-six full-time faculty and one part-time instructor were assigned to teach various semesters from Fall 1987 through Fall 1991. CLC counselors are members of the professional staff. One counselor was identified to work with the Honors Fellows who were undecided about career goals. Table 5 includes details of divisional information regarding faculty gender, ethnicity, and number of semesters faculty spent in the program.

TABLE 5

HONORS PROGRAM FACULTY

Division	Gender		Ethnicity			Semesters in HP		
	F	M	Af Am	Cauc	Hisp	1	2	3+
Biology	1	1	--	2	--	1	--	1
Comm/Human/Fine Arts	7	3	1	8	1	5	--	5
Counseling	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	1
Engin/Math/Phys Science	--	6	--	6	--	--	3	3
Social Science	4	5	--	9	--	3	5	1
Total	12	16	1	26	1	9	8	11

The researcher used a "snowball" sampling to select the faculty sample. In addition to selecting a representative group of faculty who taught in the program, she identified additional respondents from information provided by initial interviewees (Sudman, 1976). She attempted to interview all faculty who had been involved in the Honors Program as well as those who had expressed concerns about the program. This cohort totalled 31 faculty and included:

1. The Honors Program Coordinator who also taught honors courses.

2. Twenty-four of the twenty-five full-time faculty who taught honors courses from 1987 through the Fall of 1991. Attempts to establish contacts with one instructor were unsuccessful.

3. One faculty member who functioned as Interim Honors Program Coordinator for one semester.

4. One part-time faculty member who taught an honors course.

5. One counselor with faculty rank who was designated to provide career counseling to Honors Fellows.

6. Three full-time faculty who did not teach in the program, but represented three different academic divisions assigned to teach honors courses. These three instructors were referred to the researcher during faculty interviews because they had expressed their opinions about the Honors Program to their colleagues. Table 6 details the divisional membership of the faculty interviewees and specific information on gender, ethnicity, and numbers of semesters teaching in the program.

TABLE 6

FACULTY SAMPLE--(Profile)

Division	Gender		Ethnicity			Semesters in HP			
	F	M	Af Am	Cauc	Hisp	0	1	2	3+
Biology	1	3	--	3	--	2	1	--	1
Comm/Human/Fine Arts	8	3	1	9	1	1	4	3	3
Counseling	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
Engin/Math/Phys Science	--	6	--	6	--	--	--	2	4
Social Science	4	5	--	10	--	1	2	4	2
Total	13	18	1	29	1	4	7	9	11

Administrators. Administrators represented the third group affected by the Honors Program. Their specific involvement with the program varied. They included one Executive Officer, one Dean, five Associate Deans, and three mid-level administrators. Table 7 provides specific information on the administrators' ethnicity and gender.

TABLE 7

ADMINISTRATIVE SAMPLE--(Profile)

	Ethnicity	Gender	
		Female	Male
African American	1	1	0
Caucasian	9	1	8

Documentary Analysis

Documents and records related to the establishment and on-going administration of the program were also collected and identified. Documents included the Honors Program Proposal (1985), Honors Program Status Report (1988), and Honors Program Evaluation (1991); minutes from CLC Board of Trustees meetings and Honors Program Steering committee; newspaper articles related to the program; memos from faculty and administrators during the establishment and administration of the program; official publications of the college and news releases.

These documents proved to be valuable resources for information about the program. They clarified the chronology of the program reflecting what events occurred during the program's inception and on-going operations. They enhanced the researcher's understanding about the program's goals. They also were valuable resources to explain the motives and attitudes of certain individuals who were no longer employed by the college and were unavailable for interviews, such as the college's former President and the Vice-President for Educational Affairs. In addition, certain documents provided specific details related to the funds used to

operate the program. But more importantly, these documents frequently corroborated statements of certain subjects and increased the validity and reliability of the data analysis. These sources were extremely helpful when determining the climate of the college when the program was first established. Copies of informal notes helped clarify what issues were discussed behind the scenes.

Instrumentation

The subjects participated in a standardized open-ended interview to determine their perspectives about the effects of the Honors Program at the College of Lake County. The researcher designed separate instruments for each of the three groups (Appendix A, B, & C).

All subjects were asked to identify the program's strengths and weaknesses and explain whether they believed the program improved the college's image.

Honors students responded to questions aimed at soliciting information about their motivation as well as their opinion on the quality of the curriculum, faculty advising, and other program components. In addition, all the sampled honors students were asked to explain how they would describe both CLC and the Honors Program to high school seniors. Students also completed a brief questionnaire at the end of the interview. Items focused on age, ethnicity, GPA, degrees, plans for graduate school, and number of hours worked while in the program (Appendix D).

Faculty answered questions related to curriculum design and the students' response to challenging course requirements. Additional questions to faculty focused on how the honors program impacted their other courses and interaction with their

colleagues. All the sampled faculty were also asked to explain their reasons for involvement in the program and their reasons for leaving it whenever appropriate.

Interview questions to administrators were more related to operational issues. The researcher sought to determine how they and their offices interacted with the Honors Program and what effect the program had on the function of their offices.

Because the interview questions were open-ended, the researcher frequently responded to the flow of the conversation by asking additional questions related to interviewees' specific comments. While a special effort was made to focus the discussion to the effects of the Honors Program, the researcher believed that responding to unexpected comments could lead to new discoveries about the program's positive and negative effects.

For example, when students discussed certain classroom activities, it was important to discover why they responded so strongly and to clarify how their specific concerns were resolved. In other cases, it was important to clarify terms such as "advising" and "image." Clarification probes helped the researcher gain a better understanding of the meaning of the responses. These additional questions enhanced the student's validity because they clarified how the program affected the subjects. Asking additional questions enhanced the validity and reliability of this study instead of weakening it. Since all subjects were exposed on a common set of questions, there was consistency in the search for a better understanding of the program's effects.

Ethical Safeguards and Considerations

All three groups gave their voluntary permission to participate in the study by

signing a release form approved by Loyola University of Chicago's Institutional Review Board. All interviewees were assured that their remarks would be kept confidential (Appendix E). Faculty and staff who wrote specific responses when the program was initially proposed and while it was in operation signed a release form giving their permission to include their comments in the study (Appendix F).

While students expressed willingness and eagerness to share their experiences about the program, faculty and administrators were somewhat more reluctant. In some cases, they needed to be reassured that the information that they provided would be kept confidential. In other cases, they asked that the tape recorder be turned off while they discussed sensitive issues. The researcher complied with their requests.

Pilot Study

The researcher developed interview questions that were approved by three faculty members in Loyola's Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department.

These faculty members used their expertise in curriculum development, community college history, and theories of college student development and qualitative analysis to review the research design and to assess the appropriateness of interview questions. They sought to ascertain whether the items addressed both the positive and negative effects on the program participants. Their theoretical expertise strengthened the consistency and accuracy of the data collection. For example, one faculty member recommended that the researcher keep a journal so she could refer to notes taken after interviews which could identify emerging issues which may not have been readily apparent at the study's beginning. Another faculty member urged the

inclusion of several faculty members and students outside of the honors program to assess how their perceptions may have differed from program participants. Thus, the faculty's review of interview questions ensured that the data collected were related to certain theoretical constructs and that the data were as dependable and accurate as possible.

A pilot study was then conducted at Harper College in Palatine, Illinois in June, 1992. Harper College was selected because it is a suburban community college serving a similar student population and has had an Honors Program in operation for several years. The researcher interviewed two students and two faculty who participated in Harper's Honors Program. These individuals responded to the interview questions identified in Appendixes A and B. A review of their responses indicated the interview questions identified relevant issues and concerns related to the effects of Harper's Honors Program. Their responses confirmed that the interview questions could remain unchanged.

Validity and Reliability

Since qualitative researchers typically have no external measures with which to compare research results, they must explore "internal indices to provide convergent evidence" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 235). Triangulation is a strategy by which a researcher attempts to both generate and verify findings through the use of multiple approaches. Denzin (1978) identified four basic types of triangulation: (1) Data triangulation--a researcher uses a variety of data sources in a study; (2) Investigator triangulation--several different researchers participate in an evaluation; (3) Theory

triangulation--several perspectives are used to interpret a set of data; (4) Methodological triangulation--multiple methods are used to study a single problem. Triangulation is based on the belief that multiple sources of information enhances the researcher's understanding of a program and increases the reliability and validity of evaluation data.

Triangulation becomes the "credibility check" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 240) researchers utilize to discover if independent measures converge and agree. Patton warns that the "perspective gained through careful qualitative analysis is not arbitrary nor is it predetermined, but it does fall short of being truth" (Patton, 1980, p. 327). However, by identifying multiple constructions from different respondents, the researcher believes that the results of this study do conform to the general issues of validity and reliability needed in studies in the human sciences.

The researcher attempted to find corroborative information by comparing perspectives of people with multiple points of views. Her major source of information on the program's impact were primary informants with first-hand experience with the program. Along with twenty-six faculty who taught in the program, she interviewed three faculty critics of the program to determine how their views could provide different perspectives of the program's impact on faculty morale and college politics. She interviewed more students who had earlier experiences in the program to determine if they could provide a broader perspective on the overall impact of the program. All respondents were interviewed alone so that there would

be more assurance that their views would be personal perceptions and also be kept confidential.

The researcher compared and cross checked the respondents' perspectives with specific data included in documents and student records. Further analysis of documents and other written records was conducted to validate the respondents' beliefs about the program costs, committee decisions, and Board of Trustees action.

By identifying common patterns of responses within groups, the researcher clarified related patterns of thinking thus insuring some degree of reliability. For example, since the student interviewees represented the ages, ethnicity, and genders of all five honors groups, it can be reasonably assumed that their responses broadly reflect those of the entire Honors Fellows cohort. Twenty-six of the twenty-seven faculty who taught in the program were interviewed. The faculty's response provided essential information related to the curriculum and its immediate impact on both the faculty and students. Ten administrators most closely involved with the curriculum and administration of the program also shared their ideas on how the program impacted faculty and the institution. The insights of all three groups provided the researcher with a more complete understanding of the program's effects as well as providing a system of reliability and validity checks.

Data Analysis

A tape recorder was used during the interviews to ensure accuracy of responses for later analysis. Transcripts of each interview included complete verbatim responses from each subject. Transcribing interviews required nine months

(July, 1991 to March, 1992) of work. The transcripts from these interviews were designated by a code letter which identified the group, S (Student), F (Faculty), or A (Administrator) and a number which identified each respondent (01, 02, etc.).

Program records and documents provided other sources of information about the effects of the Honors Program. Copies were made of all relevant documents. Document summary forms put the documents in context, explained the significance, and gave a brief content summary (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

Since the researcher collected data from a variety of sources, it was imperative to use a method of data analysis that produced clear, replicable meanings from a set of qualitative data.

Miles and Huberman have introduced orderliness to the analysis needed for social research. With a familiarity of relevant research and theoretical constructs, the researcher selects, focuses, simplifies, abstracts, and transforms "raw" data into clearly written field notes which are then displayed into an "organized assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action taking" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 21). Using their techniques of designing matrices, graphs, networks, and charts, researchers can see what is happening and come to valid and reliable conclusions.

Miles and Huberman's (1984) interactive model of data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verifying provided the researcher with a model that allows for a fluid model appropriate for the information to be collected in this study. Since the data to be analyzed were primarily words rather

than numbers, they had to be processed differently. As the researcher collected and organized the respondents' experiences, opinions, and feelings about the Honors Program as evidenced in interviews and in documents, she used code words to identify categories which developed throughout the data collection process.

Codes are categories derived from research questions and are used to organize data. Miles and Huberman recommend that the researchers create codes prior to their fieldwork, but also be flexible to add new ones. They recommend that they fit into a structure and that the terms are semantically similar. All terms should be defined in advance and refer to a specific meaning. They advise researchers to keep the codes on a single sheet for easy reference. While the researcher listed codes that related to the research questions of this study, she soon discovered they were too broad and needed to make them more specific, especially as they related to the program's multiple effects on students. Other codes emerged as she attempted to identify issues related to the program's establishment such as college mission, organizational culture, and faculty culture. A list of codes is included in Table 8.

Specific codes emerged for each interview group. The categories reflected the research questions around program effects. Eventually, after all 66 transcripts were coded, the data was summarized and developed into a matrix in which certain patterns became evident. These patterns reflected general themes of student, faculty, and staff perceptions of the quality and effects of the Honors Program.

Miles and Huberman (1984) explain that qualitative researchers need to be confident that the conclusions are not unreasonable, that another researcher facing the

TABLE 8

DEFINITIONS OF CODES FOR EVALUATION PROJECT

CODE	MEANING
MOT	Motivation
/ST	- Student
/FAC	- Faculty
STR	Strengths of Honors Program
WKN	Weaknesses of Honors Program
CHAR/ST	Student Characteristics
/HP	- Honor Student
/NHP	- Non-honors Student
CHAR/FAC	Faculty Characteristics
/HP	- Honors Faculty
/NHP	- Non-honors Faculty
/COUN	- Counselors
OUT	Outcome
/ST	- Student
/KN	- Knowledge
/ATT	- Attitude
/BEH	- Behavior
/SK	- Skills
/TR	- Transfer
/WK	- Work
/CHL	- Challenge
/SOC	- Socializing
/ACT	- Activities
/CT	- Critical Thinking

CODE	MEANING
OUT	Outcome
/FAC	- Faculty
/ATT	- Attitude
/CHL	- Challenge
/FEL	- Feeling
CURR	Curriculum
/HP	- Honors Program
/NHP	- Non-honors Program
/ADV	- Advising
/CULTACT	- Cultural Activities
HP	Honors Program
/DIR	- Director
/COM	- Committee
/FAC/MTG	- Faculty/Meeting
/REQ	- Requirements
FAC	Faculty
/CULT	- Culture
/EVAL	- Evaluation
/INT	- Interaction
/SEL	- Selection
CC	Community College
/MIS	- Mission
CLC	College of Lake County
/ORG	- Organizational Culture

data would reach a similar conclusion. By selecting, simplifying, and transforming the raw data into field notes and then organizing that information into rows, columns, and matrices, researchers can analyze and draw conclusions from the results. These techniques developed by Miles and Huberman enhance the coherence and validity of this type of analysis.

The information gleaned from this study was then organized into charts and graphs related to specific group memberships, length, and years of involvement in the program. Determining the categories of these charts was closely related to both the manifest and latent effects of the honors program based on the views of three constituent groups. According to Merton (1968), both anticipated and unintended consequences must be considered to truly understand the complexities of social phenomena. In this study, members of each group discussed the characteristics of the Honors Fellows. Those comments fell into specific categories. In order to understand the commonalities of those comments, the researcher designed a chart to organize the various categories. Table 9 replicates the format used by the researcher to analyze information on student characteristics obtained from the interviews. The researcher reviewed each transcript and entered the comments of each interviewee with that person's code into a specific category. To separate comments of specific groups, the researcher assigned each group a different color. After all were listed, the researcher then underlined those comments which showed commonalities.

A similar chart was designed to organize and summarize the outcomes of the honors courses. Those outcomes were separated into both general benefits and

TABLE 9

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS IN THE HONORS PROGRAM

Aca Ab	St Sk	Pers Typ	Bkg Ex	Comments

specific effects related to writing and reading ability, critical thinking, discussion skills, and affective needs. Again, identification codes to identify students' comments were included to each note within that specific column.

To summarize the other various outcomes related to the program, the researcher designed a grid. Table 10 includes a model of that grid. Students' comments were summarized on each line. The researcher could easily identify common themes on specific outcomes and also see how each student responded on several effects.

The researcher developed a chart to organize the comments of all three groups on the issue of the Honors Program's effect on the college's image. Table 11 reflects the structure of that chart. There are columns for each group and on the left side of each column, there is a space to show the individual's immediate response as well as space for additional comments. Tables 9, 10, and 11 reflect the types of charts the researcher used to organize the information obtained from the interviews and documents.

TABLE 10

RELATED OUTCOMES OF HONORS PROGRAM

Student Codes	Transfer	Socializing With Students	Socializing With Faculty	Activities	Work	Cultural Activities
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

TABLE 11

DID THE HONORS PROGRAM CHANGE CLC'S IMAGE?

		Students		Faculty		Administrators
1.	Y		Y		N	
2.	Y		Y		Y	
3.	N		N		N	
4.	N		Y		N	

After noting patterns and regularities in data collection, the researcher began to verify conclusions. The process was on-going. "The meanings emerging from the data have to be tested for their plausibility, their sturdiness, their confirmability . . . their validity" (Mile & Huberman, 1984, p. 22). This process is similar to the Constant Comparative Method (1965) by Glaser who believed that his approach aided

researchers in generating theories which were "integrated, consistent, plausible, close to the data" (p. 437). His method included four stages: (1) Comparing incidents as the basic units of evidence; (2) Integrating categories and noting regularities, patterns, explanations, and possible configurations; (3) Drawing conclusions and verifying theories; (4) Writing analytical statements about the relationships. This system was well suited to the diversity of human experience as evidenced by staff and students impacted by College of Lake County's Honors Program.

Summary

Scriven's Goal Free Evaluation Model provided the basis for this qualitative research design. The goal of this model is to discover all the effects of a specific program.

Sixty-six individuals representing students, faculty, and administrators at College of Lake County were interviewed. Information provided by these interviews was analyzed to determine what effect the college's Honors Program had on the staff and students at the College of Lake County. Documentary data related to the Honors Program were also collected and analyzed to further explore the impact of the program.

The information provided through the interviews and documents was then coded, categorized, summarized, and formed into patterns. These patterns reflected participants' ideas and experiences about the effects of the Honors Program's. The results of these analyses will be described in Chapter IV, Chapters V and VI.

CHAPTER IV

OVERVIEW OF HONORS PROGRAM

This chapter provides an overview of CLC's Honors Program from 1985 to 1991. It summarizes both the plan and delivery of the program's components: curriculum, student services and cost. After reviewing the characteristics of Honors Fellows, the chapter provides an analysis of the program's effect on their cognitive skills and other affective variables. The chapter concludes with a profile of honors faculty and their perceptions of the program's impact on the non-honors curriculum and teaching techniques.

Program Components

Curriculum

The Honors Program Proposal specified the curriculum would provide a unique emphasis.

> Honors sections will differ from typical sections of the same course in that there will be heavy emphasis on the integration of critical thinking, writing, and where applicable, computers within the curriculum. Common assignments will be incorporated into the curriculum, where feasible, in order to demonstrate the relationship between disciplines and between writing and critical thinking. The basis of a sound Honors Program is not just the inclusion of more information. The proposed program is designed to provide the gifted student with an in-depth perspective of the nature of specific disciplines, the interrelationship and interdependency of disciplines, and a higher level of cultural literacy. Writing, reading, and thinking skills developed as a result of the proposed process will provide the student with the foundation necessary to pursue his/her desired goals at the highest level of competence. (Sherman, 1985, p. 4)

The proposed curriculum reflected the values of the Honors Program Task Force as well as CLC faculty development activities in the mid-1980s, such as writing across the curriculum and critical thinking across the curriculum. Moreover, the Honors Program Proposal stated that all honors faculty were expected to "have completed coursework necessary to provide suitable instruction in writing and critical thinking" (p. 10). While the delivery of this emphasis varied, some common elements emerged.

Writing. The Honors Program Task Force and faculty teaching in the Honors Program agreed that the inclusion of writing within all honors classes was valuable. The emphasis was not on the technical aspect of how to write, but on the assumption that the writing process in itself enhances learning.

Even though most of the Honors Fellows entered the program with a grasp of the mechanics of grammar rules, they impressed some of the faculty because they attended to basic lessons on commas and punctuation and incorporated them into their papers.

Not only did honors students write more papers than students in regular classes, students in honors English courses wrote papers requiring more in-depth research and analysis.

> Different types of papers, more research, more documentation of research. Almost from the start, we have them doing some kind of research and documenting it and the various ways you can document and incorporating more of that kind of research material, even by way of interview . . . or by way of reading. (F3)

> They were responsible for preparing an author that they chose from a list on which they had to do annotated bibliography, biographical

> research, read the criticisms, and then make recommendations to the class and present an oral report to the class. (F18)

> I really structured all my papers to be longer, to be more analytical or argumentative. I focused a lot more on ideas and thoughts in the papers and in the discussions. I really left off narrative and descriptive and I really concentrated on kinds of critical thinking and critical writing. I did a lot more issue-oriented text and I used the readings in the text for topics and assignments. So it was much more geared to ideas, writing about ideas, presenting ideas, persuasion, which I felt was the kind of writing that they would do in college and in their career. (F30)

This English instructor also used writing to help her students improve their understanding of themselves and to become comfortable in exploring their own ideas.

> They had mastered all the rudiments of keyhole essays, the three main points and they were very good. They didn't have a lot of major problems but they could be very boring in trying to fit everything into a format they had learned. They were very diligent, not very creative, and so I've started doing a little more personal essays. Trying to get them in touch, in the beginning, with who they are and what events shaped them. And I found that this is sometimes very hard for the honors students. Some of them do it well, but many of them are much, much better at writing about an issue than expressing themselves. (F30)

Social science faculty incorporated more papers (F6) and book reviews (F6, F9) and essay exams (F6, F16, F27) in their honors classes. Essay assignments and essay exams required extensive analysis. Not only were book reviews more frequent, the requirements were more demanding. Faculty reported that they challenged students to think critically and write about their discoveries.

> The great emphasis is on critiquing the book, not summarize the content, [but consider] the author's biases, frame of references and source material, the value of this book, compare/contrast. (F9)

Social science faculty expressed satisfaction with the students' efforts to meet the challenge.

> I got some good results, some nice, well worked out, you could tell it was not the first draft . . . you could tell they had proofread it, they had organized their thoughts and answers to the question which is not typical [in a regular class]. (F16)

Science faculty also incorporated writing in the course requirements. Since the assignments were discipline specific, honors students were challenged to adapt their writing skills to a new context. Faculty expected their students to write as scientists communicating to their colleagues.

> In my case, it was scientific writing and report writing . . . and it turned out very, very well . . . [they had to] be able to do clear, concise lab reports and at the end of the semester do it so easily that when they do get out in the business world they will be so good at what they do. They will be able to assess a situation, get into their introduction, their methods and so on and cut out all those waste words that we work so hard on and I couldn't be more pleased at the results. (F29)

> Scientific abstracts were also common assignments in geology which included the details of who, when, where, why, how, those kinds of things. (F17)

Math faculty also incorporated writing assignments within their courses. Some of these assignments demanded that the students use extensive data collection and deliberation in their writing assignments.

> If you are going to be drawing conclusions from data and stuff, you had to be able to write about it and so we're able to do a lot of writing with the honors students in statistics . . . one of the things that I had them do in the honors section was to do a project at the end of the term and they actually started on it half way through where they had to go ahead and gather some data from a question, all the kinds of things you would have to do if you were doing a study and then do the data analysis and explain it. And I got some pretty good stuff. They were

> pretty clear in their writing and it indicated they had, in most cases, a relatively good understanding of statistics . . . writing assignments for those were more extensive in the honors section than would be in our normal . . . you would write in both, but the questions were a bit more probing in the honors section. And I think that helped them get something out of the class. (F11)

> I wanted to see how they were writing and [if there was] more formalism in terms of proving things than the regular class would be and getting things done that way. So there was a good deal of writing in that kind of form, but not papers as such, but I mean individual homework assignments and also in exams and explaining what was going on. So looking for the concepts more than the process. (F7)

Journals were common in honors calculus classes.

> I required the honors people to keep a daily journal and I would give them questions of the day, each day, based upon our lecture in class . . . There would be questions that asked you to explain how something is done or why something is done and under what conditions, but more into the theory or concept of explaining what is really behind the process rather than just doing them. [Students had to demonstrate] a deeper level of understanding and they would have to turn these journals in six different times during the year and I would grade the journals. (F10)

The honors faculty were united in their belief that the inclusion of writing assignments was critical for honors students. Not only were writing assignments common in most of the honors courses, the nature of those assignments was different. They required higher levels of synthesis and analysis. They challenged students to evaluate a writer's bias. In addition, the faculty pushed the students to step back and probe deeply into their own beliefs. The writing assignments were designed to help the students become more familiar with concepts, to understand the "why's" of formulas and proofs, rather than only focusing on the mechanical process of writing.

Faculty were generally impressed with the students' ability to meet the

challenge. Several faculty noted how this group took the lessons and assignments more seriously and produced writing of a better quality than many of the students in their regular sections (F12, F9, F16, F29).

Reading. Faculty looked for different types of texts for the honors students. Finding that ideal text was challenging. One instructor (F30) changed texts every semester. Others intentionally selected difficult texts, even with a readability of the fourteenth grade level (F19). A philosophy instructor (F20) challenged his honors students with a book on creativity, Whack on the Side of the Head (von Oech, 1983).

Using a different text for honors was important to faculty for a variety of reasons.

> I used a different textbook so that I could particularly . . . immediately separate what was going on in that class from my other courses so unconsciously I couldn't make them the same courses . . . and I also gave an added book . . . To Be Human that was kind of a contemporary way of closing out the course where they could deal with creating the utopian society . . . they had more elaborate readings, and then I even added handout readings as well. (F28)

In an honors section of environmental biology, the teacher chose a text that set a special theme for the course and introduced a unique element to class. This text provided students with the opportunities to weigh the merits of different opinions on controversial issues.

> I even had them purchase a supplemental book called Taking Sides. So it was really a time when I felt that I could get students into a little perhaps depth and thinking about the topic and exposing them to ideas on both sides of issues and writings. (F8)

One instructor (F26) used a text which incorporated the idea of writing across the curriculum. While some were looking for challenging texts, a few English faculty

introduced different pieces of fiction. These selections were integral pieces of reconceptualized English courses.

> I chose stories that were by authors that regular students would find too difficult to read. They would not read them, too difficult in the sense not just in vocabulary, but in interpretation, philosophical aspects. I chose stories and plays that I could get some psychological and philosophical discussions going that I know that I can't in a regular class . . . We did a Brecht play and . . . we did Pirandello and they had a tough time with it. I mean any freshman would have a tough time with it but they read it and they could think and when I posed the questions they did it. I chose a lot of foreign authors. (F12)

> I totally redesigned the class. I did a whole semester on [English] Comp II on fantasy literature that began with Edgar Allen Poe and led up to the movie Carrie. (F13)

Social science faculty noted how both the heavier volume as well as the more difficult quality of reading assignments challenged students. In addition to using different texts and articles, handouts for honors students were also more difficult. Additional handouts were common, but faculty chose them with special care.

A political science instructor broadened and strengthened her students' background knowledge with a larger volume of reading assignments for more complicated, comprehensive research papers.

> I found that their background wasn't that much more substantial than a typical class, but their ability to do additional research was. So I gave them more complicated research papers to do . . . it was the first year after George Bush was inaugurated and I had them do an evaluation of the first year of the Presidency. So not only did they do research on their own, but I probably gave them 70 to 80 articles to read. (F25)

History faculty believed primary source materials were essential, and they included Hammurabi's code, the Magna Carta, and Emperor Justin's Laws (F6). An

economics instructor (F27) supplemented the classroom text by assigned readings from Adam Smith, Keynes, Modigliani and Friedman.

Critical Thinking. The distinguishing element that separated honors courses from non-honors courses was a heavy emphasis on critical thinking. Honors faculty were convinced that this emphasis was both valuable and necessary. Faculty incorporated a variety of different elements in their class to help their students become critical thinkers.

Certain faculty utilized primary source reading assignments to enhance critical thinking. Faculty believed that students' reading and analysis of primary sources would help them become both critical and independent thinkers.

> These primary sources were to get them to critically think about the societies and what these laws reflected as to what the attitude of these people were. (F6)

> One of the things definitely is the prime sources . . . you read what Socrates says or Homer's Illiad, from the evidence, [you must know] what is the Greek notion of the hero . . . a couple codes of law . . . Now who is writing this law, who is it aimed at, and how fair is it? (F9)

Texts and critical thinking were intertwined in discussions in a humanities honors course using the Great Books Method.

> In theory, it runs as an open discussion or conversation based on one initial question. Plus, a great deal of very close textural analysis of going over various points in the class or in the text. Not explaining it, getting the students to explain what the text means and then leading the discussion from there. (F1)

In addition to class discussion, English faculty expected students to improve

their thinking skills by analyzing how effectively they communicated in an argumentative mode.

> An advanced form or . . . a more sophisticated form of argumentation, is doing a Rogerian argumentation that requires a student to also employ the ideas of synthesis and of bridging . . . Not only do they have to be critical thinkers, but they have to be very careful thinkers and they learn that [it] forces you to look at how you are communicating and how you are forming your language in an argument. So you really have to think about what you are saying, what language means and how powerful of a tool it is. (F26)

Another English instructor saw discussion as a vehicle to enhance critical thinking and communication skills.

> I try to work very hard on logic and why this will work and this won't or can we really carry this, what are the basic issues . . . and we talked about definitions and the importance of making it clear to your reader. (F30)

A philosophy instructor believed that in-depth thinking and critical thinking were strengthened through logic and arguments and taught those skills in the honors philosophy section.

> We did a little bit more logic in class. And they had to do more arguments, kinds of "body" papers, and in the debate which they did at the end, they had to take on philosopher roles, we buzzed them. They learned how to buzz each other for informal fallacies . . . some of the students were assigned to be Abraham Maslow, some were assigned to be Jean Paul Sartre, some were assigned to be John Locke, some were assigned to be B.F. Skinner, and they had to give arguments using materials for their ideal society. And if they started their question in such a way that would be considered as a complex question, the other group, if they could identify the mistakes that they were making, could say, "Well, isn't that a complex question, isn't that abating the question?" . . . In terms of critical thinking throughout, it was primarily learning for a lot of them, learning to identify some of the emotional and some of the judgmental aspects of the course. You know critical thinking to me is a process. I did a little bit of logic. I did a unit on that but then throughout the whole semester they were

> very upset on some of those first papers when I would give them B's because they were highly emotional and they didn't have any evidence to support their opinions. (F28)

Some faculty viewed their disciplines as inherently reflecting to the thinking process. An English instructor saw writing as the reflection of thinking.

> You can't write if you can't think and they are just connected. There is no way you can separate them. (F13)

A math instructor explained:

> Hopefully in a mathematics course you are teaching critical thinking, but again in dealing with the problem solving techniques and going through that. I mean they did need to be able to analyze problems. (F7)

Thus, the faculty explained that critical thinking was a fundamental element of honors courses. It could be incorporated within the class through challenging reading material, class discussion, specific writing assignments and application of logic and analysis. While the approaches to teaching critical thinking varied, the goals were similar across honors courses.

Exams. Exams in honors courses reflected the faculty's higher expectations of their students' ability. Honors faculty gave a larger quantity of tests with more items on those exams and believed that those test questions should be more rigorous and probing. Even though many tests included multiple choice items, faculty believed their questions require more thoughtful reflection, critical application and more elaborate responses. Essay tests were common. Many questions required students to draw from several sources as they responded to questions (F1, F10, F17). The philosophy faculty gave oral exams (F1, F20, F28). One philosophy instructor gave a

final which measured the students' creativity and critical thinking.

> You may have seen some of my creative finals floating around campus, but I took that group of people and broke them into groups at the beginning of the semester . . . For the final exams I gave them seven questions at mid-term and they were told to answer them creatively and each group was on their own to answer them. Now what I did was I gave them a rather detailed argument from Milton Friedman who was defender of free market capitalism and I said, "I want you to take your critical thinking skills and apply it to this article and in the process I want you to answer seven questions and . . . but I want you to be creative in how you answer them," and so people really rose to the occasion. One group got together and wrote a song book and there were seven songs in the song book all answering seven questions. The day of the final they came in and sang me their final. . . . One group sent me on a treasure hunt . . . when I came in the day of the final they handed me a piece of paper and it said, "You asked us to work all semester. Now it's your turn. You solve some problems." And they buried all seven problem answers all over campus. It was very clever. One group spent a lot of time and built a model airplane and they took the model airplane and each wing and part fuselage and so on was the different part of the thing . . . so they came into class and shot it down . . . my two favorites though I saved till the end . . . I came in [to class] and I was seated at a restaurant and it was called "Milton's Place" and all the entrees on the menu were different answers to the questions. So one of the things I asked them to do was to find fallacies in the argument--you know--logic fallacies in Milton Friedman's argument and so they handed me a wine list, whine, a whine list, Milton's while list, and inside were the seven . . . were about eight or nine whines I could choose all of which were fallacies from the argument. On the menu I could pick entrees and each entree would give me a different answer to a question and the various people came in and served me my answers. . . . My other favorite one was . . . one group scheduled a sit-down for me and one guy had a pillow inside of him and I didn't quite catch what was going on, just two people in front of the room the day I came in and I sat down and one guy had a pillow inside of him and they both had sport coats on and it was *Siskel and Ebert at the Movies* and they were reviewing a new movie that had just been released by the director, Milton Friedman, and each of the people in their group came in and acted the seven . . . as if they were seeing a scene. Now here is a scene where Milton Friedman does this and then the same person played by Milton Friedman. He went around the room and different characters came in and played the answer to the question. So those were my two favorites. I mean they

> rose to the occasion. I wanted them to be creative and they rose to the occasion. Now the actual content was excellent, I mean they did answer all seven questions, but they did it creatively. (F20)

While the majority of faculty expressed satisfaction with students' performance on these exams, an honors psychology instructor explained her initial dismay and eventual satisfaction.

> After the first test in my first class that I taught, there were 18 or so students . . . close to half flunked the first exam. And so I just thought, "My goodness, what is going on here?" The kind of questions that I asked for them on this exam involved inductive reasoning and taking that little inductive step from here as memorized material, now answer this question and they couldn't do it . . . they were tremendous on memorization. However, they haven't learned to apply material . . . in the next test, after being used to this kind of thing . . . there were only two people who did not do well . . . In other words, there was great improvement. (F19)

Projects. A few instructors incorporated more advanced exercises in which students were expected to apply their knowledge. Students in a psychology class had to do an experiment. Physics students had to build a mouse trap car and analyze all the forces and torques on it. In the honors geology class, the project involved more group work on controversial issues.

> I've got groups of students working on projects where they are taking a particular environmental issue and researching it completely and then they are putting together papers, three papers. Then they are going to present these papers and this thing is going to be bound together in a single issue. . . . we might have a real interesting base to present information to the public at large. (F14)

Discussion. While classroom discussion had not been identified as a specific unit of the honors curriculum, many faculty assumed that it should be an essential element and incorporated discussion as a regular part of their classes. Small class

size also provided more opportunity for students to participate. In general, the faculty saw multiple benefits in classroom discussion. They believed it promoted critical thinking and a better understanding of concepts and theories presented in class.

One biology instructor incorporated weekly discussion as a teaching tool. He believed discussion strengthened students' understanding of controversial topics.

> Every Friday we would hold a discussion on the issue of that week, centered around the two papers and their evaluation in this book called Taking Sides. (F8)

While he was satisfied with how their thinking skills evolved through the discussions, he noted that:

> Honors students can be just as biased about any particular topic as anyone else and that was also interesting to me. So that when we talk about certain issues, the idea of critical evaluation still needs to be promoted. (F8)

Many faculty, however, met some initial resistance from students.

> They were more reticent than I think I expected. They did, I would say, open up a little bit . . . but it was still very restrained in their talking. (F19)

> If you are a super student who may very much be self-conscious of this and [you must] be careful to say what you want to say . . . one of the things I had hoped is they would be a little more talkative and a little more responsive, let their hair down, come on, relax. (F9)

Convinced about the importance of discussion, one instructor tied it directly to the course grade.

> I designated several topics for in-depth discussion. I furnished them with handouts and said, "Now look, you are going to be assessed as part of your grade on how well you read these handouts, digest information, and participate in the discussion. It's a command performance, at least 20% of your grade will be determined on this factor." (F15)

While students were initially hesitant to participate in discussion, they became more comfortable by the end of the class. "Asked more questions and commented more on material" (F25). "It takes almost half a semester, sometimes longer, to win their confidence and to make them feel relaxed enough to speak openly" (F1).

One English instructor introduced a form of technology to enhance classroom discussion and to clarify what may have been confusing or difficult for them to understand.

> We did the electronic conference as a way to continue the dialogue in class outside of class using pseudonyms . . . so that students had the opportunity to be more flexible in their discussion and that really added an extra element to the class, at least for me, and gave me a lot of feedback in terms of what was working and what wasn't . . . They were very conscientious about doing the work, but very unwilling to talk in class . . . They were very hesitant to look stupid in front of their peers. . . . I would give an assignment in class. I would ask if there were any questions. There were never any questions, but in the electronic conference, I would get comments such as "Does anybody understand what this assignment is about? I have no clue. I wish she'd give us more information on it" and things like that. So in the conference, they were more willing to be open and to ask questions. (F18)

By clarifying their expectations, two other instructors helped the students feel more comfortable with discussion. One instructor identified topics from magazines or newspapers which would be discussed in class. Others (F17, F27, F30) alleviated students' anxiety by making it clear no grades would be given on discussions.

Interdisciplinary Focus. The Honors Program Proposal clearly referenced the program's need to demonstrate interrelationships between disciplines. While some instructors may have introduced this component in their classes through readings and assignments, no faculty identified it as a specific unit or part of the course. Neither

did any faculty discuss any special initiatives whereby several honors courses would address topics from different disciplinary perspectives.

Computers in Class. Computers were used in the writing component of an honors section of environmental biology and one English instructor used them for electronic conferencing. They were also required for statistics and physics, but were not introduced as a new component for the honors sections. Calculators were first introduced into the honors calculus courses, but the mathematics faculty did not discuss them as a special component.

Summary. The faculty interviews demonstrated that they carefully designed and delivered honors courses which emphasized writing, reading, and thinking skills. CLC honors faculty designed and delivered the honors curriculum to provide students with a challenging focus. These courses differed from regular courses on a number of dimensions. Regarding writing, their courses consistently required both frequent and difficult writing assignments. Honors exams also incorporated essays as a standard mode of assessment.

Next, reading assignments were more rigorous than those in regular classes. Not only were honors students required to read difficult material, they also were expected to synthesize information from a variety of primary and secondary sources. Furthermore, they had to read carefully to distinguish facts from opinions on controversial issues.

Also, critical thinking was the common goal of a variety of classroom activities. Students were expected to move beyond concrete thinking to inductive

reasoning, logic, and abstract thinking. Faculty incorporated discussion and projects as means of promoting critical thinking. Exams required an understanding of process and the ability to analyze and explain results.

On the other hand, faculty did not collaborate to design courses with an interdisciplinary focus. Similarly, additional coursework involving computers was minimal.

Student Services

Advising. Although advising Honors Fellows was not explicitly identified as a separate program component, the Honors Program Proposal acknowledged its importance to students.

> Honors Fellows will receive significant academic benefits in addition to the scholarship, personalized advisement by instructors in their field of endeavor. (Sherman, 1985, p. 11)

Personalized advisement meant that students would have access to faculty so that they could discuss majors, career options, and colleges or universities with related programs. These instructors were expected to clarify complex degree requirements and identify specific courses needed for transfer to four-year colleges or universities. It was assumed that selected faculty from each division would also assist students with course selection prior to each semester. A counselor was available to help the undecided students explore majors and career options based on their interests and abilities.

Few faculty commented on their advising role. One administrator voiced his support for the importance of advising as students leave the college.

> After they have been here about a year or a year and a half, then get ready to go on to someplace else, I think we have a responsibility to help them go on to whatever the next step is. (A2)

Students in the first four years of the program appreciated the quality of advising they received from faculty. They believed faculty helped them with transfer and career decisions.

> It was great. We were spoiled to death because they used to register us and they used to help us figure out any schedule and anytime you had a question about what classes to take or transferring or anything you know, we knew that somebody was always going to be there. (S12)

When discussing advising, students identified several honors faculty who helped them with both academic issues and personal problems, but also mentioned some faculty outside of the Honors Program. They praised a physics instructor for his assistance with engineering majors.

> He asked if we had any particular four-year college in mind, that we should be thinking about that so he could correspond the honors courses that we were taking here with directly fitting into the program out there so we would have no problems, and we wouldn't be taking classes that we wouldn't need. So it was really helpful. (S10)

Five students expressed their dissatisfaction with advising they received from the counseling staff. The counselor assigned to work with undecided honors students explained that while he helped a few students deal with stress, his overall interaction with them was limited.

> My interaction with them was sporadic . . . at the initial advising session and them again in the spring at the advising session. (F31)

Some honors students believed that the counseling office gave them incorrect information and appeared to be unconcerned about their needs.

> I did go to the Counseling Center and did not receive current information [on transferring] so I just went directly to UIC. (S5)

> The counselors in the Counseling Office, at least the one I talked to, I was not happy with. That's the one I went in to ask for a scholarship book. They gave me a book three inches thick and told me they don't believe that it was set up in any way so I would have to go through every page to find a scholarship that referred to me. So I had to go and find the content and find out how it was set up and do all the work myself. I never went back. (S6)

> I had a really bad experience here with the counselors at CLC. They really messed me up . . . I had to take a class that CLC wouldn't offer to get down to Illinois State. CLC didn't tell me this until like my spring semester before I was going to graduate here . . . I was like here, you make up your own mind. I was looking for more of the guidance. (S8)

> I went down to the counselors and I tried talking to them in my first year and I don't remember who it was, but he really didn't make me want to come back. I haven't gone back since. (S15)

Not all experiences with the counselors were negative. One Honors Fellow met one in a different context that challenged her to grow in an unexpected way.

> I wanted to take a Physical Education class and I just walked in [Counseling Office] and it so happened that he was teaching [in the P.E. Department] . . . and he was very helpful to me. He suggested Tae Kwon Do. He said that I shouldn't be intimidated by the fact that it's martial arts, that girls are involved in it also . . . when I got there I was totally blown away, everyone in class was really helpful and really supportive. Not just the teachers, but my fellow students and it was really embarrassing at first because you're not a coordinated as everyone else but nobody laughed at you. It was really encouraging and they just keep trying, really encouraging. And then when, okay, I would try and I'd get whatever it was I had problems with accomplished, "like, wow." From there it was just a big push because it was them being supportive but all in all, it was me doing the actual work--it helped me a lot. (S10)

This student discovered that even though she was initially intimidated by such a class,

she overcame her fears through the encouragement of her counselor/teacher and her classmates.

The first Honors Program Status Report (1988) noted that eight percent of the honors students believed that they were not getting good advisement. To correct this problem, the coordinator changed the advisement system so that all students could be advised prior to each semester in one location simultaneously. He made himself available during that session to answer students' and faculty's questions on course requirements for the Honors Program, graduation, and transfer.

While some students identified other faculty as their academic advisors, the majority connected to the program's coordinator as their advisor. Since he recruited and admitted them to the program, he knew each of them personally. The coordinator's office became a convenient place to meet with him and other honors students. When they came to his office, he made himself available to help them in many ways. His personal attention to their needs, goals, and concerns was outstanding.

> It was a huge commitment . . . I would advise them in terms of what they would do with school, where they would look for scholarships. I would look when they filled out forms for scholarships. I wanted to see them so that I could make sure that they were done properly, number one, and that when their essays were written, they were written well, so I did a lot of that. I mean I would really help rewrite their essays if they weren't well done. And I spent a lot of time with them, I would have several meetings a semester to talk about some of these things. Before registration, for example, I would get them all together and I would say, "Look, these are the things that you've got to do. You've got to do this with regard to the college graduation requirements. You've got to do this with respect to the Honors Program graduation requirements, and you've got to make sure that you fit these things in when you go to your academic advisor, whoever

> that might be." . . . then they would bring all their schedules back to me and I would make sure that they were registered. (F14)

The coordinator's attention to advising Honors Fellows was exemplary, but as the program continued, the quality of other faculty advising continued to disappoint some students. The final report acknowledged this concern and proposed some solutions that would shrink the advising pool.

> Although only sixteen percent believed that they had received bad advisement, there is no reason any student should receive poor advice. Currently, students are referred to an advisor in their major area of concentration. Many of the complaints stem from the time that the full-time coordinator was on sabbatical leave. Most problems seem to be a result of confusion about the differences between program and college requirements for graduation. Steps that have been taken to alleviate the problem include reducing the number of advisors to those who do the best job and meeting in a general session with all of the students so that they are aware of all of the nuances of the program and college requirements before they meet with an advisor. (Sherman, 1991)

The two students admitted when no coordinator was assigned to work with them expressed disappointment in receiving little personal help. One has been

> . . . basically using the guidelines for transfer sequences . . . to U of I from one of the books I have gotten. [I] tried to follow that as closely as I can. (S25)

> . . . we haven't . . . had any meetings or anything . . . that's why I'm sort of like up in the air about what I should take. But I had a basic guideline from when I discussed it in the spring . . . it was sort of like a seminar and [he] was there speaking about what classes we should take, what we should follow, and then we broke off into our specific areas like business, medical, science . . . mine was a business counselor. I don't remember her name. (S24)

Even though the majority of students expressed satisfaction with advising, the type and quality of that advising varied. General advising sessions were offered prior

to each semester so that Honors Fellows could meet with their assigned faculty advisors to plan their schedule for the subsequent semester with the coordinator being available to assist with clarification of requirements, complex schedules, and so forth. After this meeting, the coordinator verified all of the students' schedules and processed them in the Admissions Office for priority registration. For those students needing additional advice on programs, career choices, and transfer requirements, assistance was available through some faculty and counselors, but this advising support ultimately became the responsibility of the honors program coordinator.

Cultural Activities. The Honors Program was also designed to expose students to cultural activities. All Honors Fellows were required to attend annual lectures by nationally known speakers. Planned specifically for the honors students, these lectures were open to the rest of the college and the community. Honors students could also choose to attend a selected number of cultural activities which included concerts, plays, and art gallery openings on campus. Students also had the choice of attending similar activities off-campus. While a certain number was required each semester, the types of activities depended on each student's interests.

Faculty and administrators believed this component would benefit the students and enrich the honors program. An instructor explained how students' attendance at cultural events strengthened their connection to campus.

> If you're going to give somebody a free ride [scholarship], there is nothing wrong with asking them to take a couple of evenings to support the school events, to come to the gallery . . . I just think it associates them with the school and I think that's probably the biggest problem our students have is [not] being associated with the school. (F30)

Unfortunately, this program requirement became difficult to enforce. Keeping track of attendance was problematic since the record keeping responsibilities fell upon the coordinator. Some students did not attend the required number of events because their work schedules limited their available time and conflicted with many of the weekend events. A few other students mentioned that they resented being required to attend.

Because this part of the program was so closely connected to the responsibilities of the program coordinator, it ceased to function after the coordinator resigned.

Costs

The college's support for CLC's Honors Program entailed significant expenses. The program provided scholarships in the form of complete tuition waivers for all Honors Fellows. The program also offered three hours of release time to all honors faculty during the first semester they taught in the program. This benefit provided faculty with time to design a new honors course. In addition, the program coordinator was given 15 hours of release time annually for his recruitment, scheduling, advising, and other program responsibilities. Additional costs included expenses for invited speakers, printing, mailing, conferences, and travel.

When the Vice-President for Educational Affairs prepared to bring the Honors Program Proposal to the Board of Trustees in 1985, he projected potential revenue and costs of the proposed Honors Program. Table 12 summarizes those projections. Although no explanation was provided for the difference in lower costs for the spring

semester, one could assume that he expected that student attrition might account for the lower cost in tuition waivers.

TABLE 12

HONORS PROGRAM COSTS CONSIDERATIONS

INITIAL YEAR	Costs		Revenue	
	Tuition Waivers	Instruction	Apportionment	
FALL SEMESTER:				
Courses for 50 Students	$20,750	$38,245.50	($28,144.00)	$30,851.50
SPRING SEMESTER:				
Courses for 50 Students	$15,000	$24,391.00	($21,108.00)	$18,283.00
				$49,134.50
		Release Time (15 hrs.)		$19,591.50
				$68,726.00

Information on the Honors Program budgets is included in Table 13 and verifies that annual budgets significantly exceeded the Vice-President's initial cost projections and that tuition reimbursements for 1987 and 1988 were not initially included within the Honors Program Budget.

CLC's Financial Aid Office provided detailed lists of the names of Honors Fellows who received tuition waivers for the years of 1989, 1990, and 1991, but were unable to provide them for 1987 and 1988. Table 14 summarizes the Financial Aid

Office's records of the costs of those tuition reimbursements.

TABLE 13

HONORS PROGRAM EXPENSES 1987-1992*

YEAR	RELEASE TIME AND RELATED EXPENSES	TUITION ASSISTANCE
1987	$22,921.00	**
1988	$28,191.00	**
1989	$34,485.00	**
1990	$36,677.00	$71,000.00
1991	$13,070.00	$36,000.00
1992	$13,070.00	$95,000.00

* Taken from College of Lake County Annual Budget 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992.
**Not included as a separate item within the Honor Program Budget during those years.

TABLE 14

FINANCIAL AID SUMMARY*

YEAR	FALL	SPRING	TOTAL
1989	$43,213.60	$41,194.00	$84,407.61
1990	$44,370.15	$40,150.50	$84,520.65
1991	$44,304.00	$34,411.50	$78,711.50

*Financial Aid Summary: SIMS 7820, 2/14/91

The Honors Program Evaluation sent to the Illinois Community College Board in 1991 addressed the issue of cost.

> The costs of running the Honors Fellows Scholar Program are high. Total expenditures for FY 1990-1991 were $121,371.81. Seventy-five percent of that total was related to scholarship monies and twenty-two percent went for release time for instructors and the coordinator of the program. The remaining three percent of the expenditures were made for operational costs . . . In FY 1990-1991 the amount expended on scholarships totaled $91,892.56 . . . Each instructor in the program is given three hours of release time to prepare for each honors course taught for the first time. The coordinator is given eight hours of release time per semester and three hours during the summer to run the program. In FY 1990-1991 the amount of state apportionment will be $79,781.76. Thus the program will have a shortfall of $41,590.05. (Sherman, 1991)

Three different sources of information on program costs present inconsistent results on program expenses for tuition and release time. They suggest that the college's means of determining actual costs for the Honors Program were neither readily accessible nor clearly comprehensible.

These records verify that the initial cost projections were low. According to Financial Aid records, tuition waivers were projected to be $735.00 per student in 1986 but increased to an average of $1,097.00 per student in 1990 (See Table 14). Part of increased tuition cost can be explained by students' inability to complete the program requirements in four semesters. Thus, several Honors Fellows received additional tuition waivers for summer school enrollments. Also, released time awarded to the coordinator had increased from 15 hours a year to a total of 19 hours a year.

Due to financial constraints in 1988, the college stopped funding the Trustee Merit Scholarship, another form of tuition assistance awarded to one student from

each of the district's high schools. Thus, the Honors Program scholarships became the college's only source for financial support to students based on academic merit.

Profile of Honors Fellows

The curriculum, advising, cultural activities and scholarships were designed to attract and benefit intellectually gifted students. After being formally admitted to the program, these students were identified as Honors Fellows.

Demographics

A total of 238 students became Honors Fellows from the Fall 1987 semester through the Fall 1991 semester. As Table 15 indicates, this group was extremely homogeneous in its ethnicity and age. They were primarily Caucasian and recent high school graduates. In addition, the numbers of female participants almost doubled those of male participants.

Table 16 contains demographic information on the Honors Fellows based on each year of participation and compares each group to the profile of the student body. Table 16 shows that Caucasians in the program were overrepresented when compared to the general CLC student population. The percentage of students-at-large who were minorities grew from 14% in 1987 to 20% in 1991. The proportion of minority students admitted to the Honors Program during those years ranged from 2% to 8%.

Table 16 also indicates that Honors Fellows were a very young group when compared to the general student body. Only seven honor students were over 25 years of age while the majority of the CLC students were over 25 years of age.

The contrast related to gender was not as great. Females outnumbered males

both in the Honors Program and the student body, but the percentage of female participation (63.8%) was higher in the Honors Program when compared to a mean of 58% in the general student population. Table 17 provides information on the student's geographic location in the county. The great majority of students in the Honors Program and general student body resided in the northern half of the county.

TABLE 15

PROFILE OF HONORS FELLOWS (N=238)

Ethnicity	N	%
African American	1	4.0
American Indian	--	--
Asian American	5	2.1
Caucasian	229	96.2
Hispanic	3	1.3
Age		
17-25	231	97.0
26-35	3	1.2
36-45	4	1.6
46-55	--	--
56+	--	--
Gender		
Female	152	63.8
Male	86	36.1

TABLE 16

PROFILE OF HONORS FELLOWS AND CLC STUDENTS* BY YEAR

Student Profile	Fall 1987		Fall 1988		Fall 1989		Fall 1990		Fall 1991	
	HP N= 47	CLC N= 12,712	HP N= 47	CLC N= 12,581	HP N= 51	CLC N= 13,930	HP N= 51	CLC N= 14,885	HP N= 42	CLC N= 15,154
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ETHNICITY										
African American	0	6 (793)	0	5 (695)	0	6 (810)	2 (1)	7 (977)	0	6 (924)
American Indian/Alaskan	0	0.2 (25)	0	0.2 (26)	0	0.2 (33)	0	0	0	0
Asian American	0	2 (291)	2 (1)	3 (360)	4 (2)	3 (414)	4 (2)	3 (452)	0	4 (529)
Caucasian	98 (46)	86 (10,880)	98 (46)	85 (10,728)	95 (49)	84 (11,644)	92 (47)	80 (11,975)	98 (41)	80 (12,156)
Hispanic	2 (1)	6 (723)	0	6 (772)	0	7 (1,029)	2 (1)	10 (1,427)	2 (1)	9 (1,379)
AGE										
17-25 Years	98 (46)	43 (5,507)	98 (46)	43 (5,478)	100 (51)	43 (5,924)	94 (48)	43 (6,359)	95 (40)	42 (6,369)
26-35 Years	2 (1)	29 (3,749)	0	29 (3,585)	0	29 (4,052)	2 (1)	29 (4,271)	2 (1)	29 (4,337)
36-45 Years	0	17 (2,197)	2 (1)	17 (2,189)	0	16 (2,300)	4 (2)	18 (2,671)	2 (1)	19 (2,807)
46-55 Years	0	6 (778)	0	6 (816)	0	7 (1,004)	0	7 (1,032)	0	7 (1,048)
56+ Years	0	3 (425)	0	3 (434)	0	4 (508)	0	3 (489)	0	3 (486)
GENDER										
Female	70 (33)	58 (7,418)	60 (28)	59 (7,325)	61 (31)	57 (8,023)	63 (33)	58 (8,557)	64 (27)	58 (8,763)
Male	30 (14)	42 (5,294)	40 (19)	41 (5,256)	39 (20)	33 (5,907)	37 (18)	42 (6,326)	36 (15)	42 (6,391)

Note: Figures in parentheses are Ns for the adjacent percentages.
*Statistics on CLC students include the Honors Program Fellows.

TABLE 17

ENROLLMENT OF HONORS FELLOWS AND CLC STUDENTS* BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Geographic Area	Fall 1987		Fall 1988		Fall 1989		Fall 1990		Fall 1991	
	HP N= 47	CLC N= 12,712	HP N= 47	CLC N= 12,581	HP N= 51	CLC N= 13,930	HP N= 51	CLC N= 14,885	HP N= 42	CLC N= 15,154
Northeast	35%	31%	32%	29%	35%	29%	19%	39%	36%	37%
Northwest	48%	47%	45%	50%	47%	49%	60%	27%	41%	26%
Southeast	0%	7%	4%	7%	9%	9%	6%	16%	0%	15%
Southwest	11%	9%	10%	9%	6%	9%	8%	14%	5%	7%
Out of District	6%	5%	8%	4%	2%	4%	6%	4%	17%	7%

*Statistics on CLC students include the Honors Program Fellows.

Admission Data

To guarantee that students with strong academic ability were admitted into the program, the following admission criteria were established:

A. Primary Admission (Must satisfy two of the three criteria). Intended for high school seniors.

1. Top 10% of high school class.
2. High school GPA of 3.5 in college preparatory classes.
3. ACT composite of 25 with 23 in English or SAT total of 1,200 with a 560 verbal.

B. Secondary Admission (Must satisfy both criteria). Intended for students already enrolled at CLC.

1. College GPA of 3.5 in a minimum of twelve hours of transfer credit courses.
2. Must have completed at least six hours of honors courses.

The academic profile of Honors Fellows shown in Table 18 approximated that established by the admission criteria. Table 18 provides detailed information on ACT scores, high school rank and high school grade point average (GPA). The average ACT composite was 24. No ACT subscore was consistently higher for each group of students although the maximum ACT subscore of 36 was more common in mathematics than in any other content area. Typical Honors Fellows were in the top 5% of their graduating class and had earned a 4.00 GPA in high school.

TABLE 18

ADMISSION DATA ON HONORS FELLOWS*

		MEAN	MEDIAN	ST DEV	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
FALL 1987	ACT (N=40)					
	English	22.325	22.000	3.369	16.00	29.00
	Mathematics	24.350	25.000	5.201	12.00	36.00
	Social Science	22.675	24.000	4.196	10.00	30.00
	Natural Science	25.750	27.500	5.163	14.00	33.00
	Composite	23.900	24.000	3.643	15.00	30.00
	H.S. Rank** (N=43)	.053	.050	.041	.01	.24
	H.S. GPA*** (N=37)	4.100	3.860	.638	3.48	6.15
FALL 1988	ACT (N=38)					
	English	23.132	23.000	3.215	14.00	29.00
	Mathematics	24.947	26.000	4.448	13.00	31.00
	Social Science	24.053	25.000	4.579	12.00	32.00
	Natural Science	27.947	30.000	3.911	16.00	33.00
	Composite	25.132	25.000	2.924	17.00	30.00
	H.S. Rank** (N=40)	.063	.050	.054	.01	.34
	H.S. GPA*** (N=31)	4.030	3.900	.638	2.98	5.80
FALL 1989	ACT (N=48)					
	English	23.104	23.000	3.263	16.00	33.00
	Mathematics	24.542	25.000	4.192	13.00	36.00
	Social Science	24.083	24.500	5.001	11.00	34.00
	Natural Science	25.958	27.000	5.243	12.00	36.00
	Composite	24.500	25.000	3.914	12.00	35.00
	H.S. Rank** (N=46)	.064	.060	.049	.01	.22
	H.S. GPA*** (N=39)	4.210	4.250	.639	3.14	6.11

TABLE 18--Continued

		MEAN	MEDIAN	ST DEV	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
FALL 1990	ACT (N=49)					
	English	24.041	24.000	3.963	16.00	33.00
	Mathematics	24.224	23.000	3.772	17.00	36.00
	Social Science	24.265	25.000	6.683	9.00	36.00
	Natural Science	26.776	27.000	4.515	16.00	33.00
	Composite	25.061	26.000	3.573	17.00	31.00
	H.S. Rank** (N=48)	.070	.060	.080	.01	.58
	H.S. GPA*** (N=43)	4.380	4.540	.567	5.90	5.90
FALL 1991	ACT (N=37)					
	English	24.324	24.000	3.675	15.00	31.00
	Mathematics	23.838	24.000	4.407	14.00	35.00
	Social Science	25.459	25.000	5.419	13.00	36.00
	Natural Science	23.973	24.000	4.670	16.00	34.00
	Composite	24.541	25.000	3.595	15.00	34.00
	H.S. Rank** (N=33)	.070	.070	.052	.01	.21
	H.S. GPA*** (N=26)	4.210	4.080	.460	3.51	5.12

*Profile of ACT scores, high school class rank, and high school GPA were not available for CLC students at large because the college does not require these records for admission.

**High school rank (for each Honors Fellow) was obtained by dividing the rank of the individual student by the total number of students in that class.

***High school GPA's are recorded in the format sent by each high school. These GPA's reflect a general pattern of 0-4 scales with weighted scales for Honors Courses.

Academic Ability

While the admission profile resembled that established at the program's inception, the students' academic ability became evident when they enrolled in CLC classes.

Faculty were clearly impressed with the academic potential of some of the Honors Fellows. A faculty member noted that one student was the finest she ever had. Another believed the "best were outstanding" (F14). Instructors were the most impressed with the honors students admitted during the first year. "Generally, the first year, though we had a very strong group, I mean, exceptional . . . there were occasional flashes of brilliance" (F7). This theme was repeated by another instructor who said "the students in the first semester were real thinkers, cracker-jack students" (F12).

The general impression, however, was "that while most were bright, they were not brilliant" (F14). One instructor explained that the " quality of their work is better than the average student, but not so much that I'd say it's a quality cut" (F20). Other descriptors included "they are usually talented" (F17), "slightly better than average" (F13), and "good students, but . . . probably not quite as good as they started out" (F7).

While the composite mean ACT scores for each year was 24, the range of individual composite scores varied greatly. In each of the five years, the ACT composite scores went as low as 12 and as high as 35 (see Table 18). Students with low ACT scores were admitted because they qualified under the two other criteria--

top 10% of high school class and high school GPA of 3.5. Low ACT scores correlated with poor academic performance in CLC courses. The Honors Program Evaluation described what happened to students with such scores.

> Of one-hundred nineteen students studied from the first three classes, fifteen entered the program with ACT composite scores of twenty or less. Of these fifteen, only one successfully completed the program. (Sherman, 1991)

High school class rank also varied. While every class included students who were in the top 1% of their class, the high school rank of one returning adult equated to 58%. This student was admitted to the Honors Program under the secondary admission criteria for college students. The mean high school rank of Honors Fellows decreased slightly each year. In the first year, the mean high school rank was top 5%. During the last two years, the mean was 7%.

Even though most of these students came from high school honors programs, they soon discovered the honors college courses were more difficult. Two instructors noticed that "it took the students a while to realize what my expectations were, but they rose to the occasion" (F19, F28). While the Honors Fellows were described by some faculty as "being capable of in-depth analysis" (F27), and "having the ability for creativity" (F20), others were "disappointed, on how they liked to do things by rote" (F11), on "their reliance on memorizing" (F23), and the "habit of mimicking back to you what had been discussed in class" (F11). A physics instructor explained:

> We expected more because they were an honors group than they were actually able to deliver . . . I didn't find that much difference between the regular class and an honors class . . . You know I expected them to have a lot more initiative and to be able to tackle things a lot more on their own better than they did. Which was probably kind of naive on

> my part since without experience in courses like that, that probably wouldn't have been the case with real, real bright students. And . . . the kids in the Honors Program are not like kids at the University of Illinois, you know these aren't people with 32 ACT scores. These are people with like 25, somewhere around there. They are bright enough, but they are not the shining stars that you could expect to see somewhere else. (F5)

Since administrative contact with the honors students was limited, their comments on the Honors Fellows' academic ability were brief. In general, they concurred with faculty that the students were above average in terms of ability, but not all that outstanding or creative.

Table 19 summarizes the academic records of these students as of January, 1992. These records indicated that the mean CLC GPA was above 3.2. Comparable information on the average GPA for CLC students-at-large was not available. The ratio of hours attempted as compared to hours earned was consistently very high. These data demonstrate that honors students completed the great majority of courses for which they were enrolled.

Study Skills

Faculty agreed that the Honors Fellows had learned how to be successful students. They attended class and read assignments. They worked hard and were motivated to do well academically.

> These kids that are honors students are not superhuman, they are not what I would say anywhere close to genius level or anything else. I think what distinguishes them a lot of times from a regular kid is simply their study habits and the skills that they have picked up that allow them to be successful in high school. Being in class, taking notes, doing the assignments on a daily basis. (F10)

TABLE 19

ACADEMIC RECORDS OF HONORS FELLOWS AS OF 1/92

Academic Records	Fall 1987 N=47	Fall 1988 N=47	Fall 1989 N=51	Fall 1990 N=51	Fall 1991 N=42
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
CLC GPA*	3.28	3.33	3.23	3.11	3.26
CLC Credit Hours Attempted	66.38	65.40	59.22	47.12	17.78
CLC Credit Hours Earned	62.34 (94%)	60.74 (93%)	55.88 (94%)	45.82 (97%)	17.24 (97%)

*Scale based on 0-4 range.

The students were described as conscientious, careful, and "better prepared to do all the work you asked " (F2). They completed assignments in a timely manner (F1, F9) and took good notes. They were so conscientious that they "hung on to every word and wrote down everything" (F11). "They were eager to seek help and had more questions outside of class" (F3, F10). Most had "mastered the game of being a good student" (F23). They even knew how to use the library.

While most faculty agreed that the students' writing abilities were strong, one faculty noted that "the students were not great writers" (F24). Three English faculty criticized the students' writing as "too programmed" (F30), "too careful" (F13), and "not creative" (F12).

Even though the faculty were quick to acknowledge the students' drive and motivation, faculty saw some negative aspects to their behavior. The students were very grade conscious. This behavior was probably influenced in part by the program's requirement that students must maintain a 3.5 GPA to retain their scholarships. Unfortunately, concern about grades appeared to be more important to some students than concern about learning. This behavior alienated some faculty.

> Eventually, one of the reasons that I left the program was I felt they were "grade rubbers" and that destroyed me . . . I had some students who were not performing, but because they were in the Honors Program, they expected that A or B and that is what soured it. (F12)

"The grade is what is vital to them, whether anything has been learned or not" (F3). Another instructor believed that the A-track mentality prevented creativity because the students "were afraid to break away from what was required for an A" (F23).

One honors student criticized her peers for their obsession with grades.

> . . . I had dated a guy in the Honors Program and we just had totally different views on stuff . . . I was glad to get a B on something. That was hard to him. That didn't make sense--you got A's. And I went and asked him, "What's the difference between getting an A and getting a B?" and his response was, I'll never forget was, "$10,000 a year!" and I said, "I don't think that's true." If I had been talking with someone who wasn't in the Honors Program, I don't think I would have gotten the same response. (S6)

Personality Types

Students, faculty, and administrative interviewees described Honors Fellows as shy and quiet. Other similar descriptors included cautious, reserved, introverted, and not easily sociable. Faculty had similar opinions about the students' behavior.

> They are very hesitant about offering their opinion because they don't want to appear to be foolish. And before saying anything, you can see that their eyes, they are watching one another hoping that somebody else will speak first. (F1)

"They wanted the right answer--they don't want to be wrong in front of their peers" (F6).

Other faculty were more critical of character faults they perceived of these students. They described them as uptight, focused, rigid, one-sided, and closed-minded. Instructors explained the challenge of teaching these students.

> . . . not always realistic, not always very giving . . . I think they have some very exalted notions about themselves that "We are honors so we don't . . . we are different." (F3)

> . . . very closed-minded . . . they already think they've found it . . . they felt that they knew more about what honors was than the instructors . . . that is a sense of elitism. They are not humble so that there is a real thin line for a teacher on how to instruct them. (F28).

Another instructor was disturbed by a class with whom she saw serious attitude

problems of "arrogance . . . they thought of themselves as better than having to work for it" (F12). An episode in which an honors student from an honors class used profanity towards him convinced an instructor (F16) that he wouldn't ever work with honors again. Another instructor who had honors students in his regular classes described honors students as being:

> . . . very annoying students at times. They become very cliquish and tended to take liberties in the classroom that normal students wouldn't do . . . talking to each other, coming in late, thinking they were better than the rest of the students. (F22)

Several encounters with honors students led an administrator to describe them as being:

> . . . intolerant, difficult to work with another person and group. They were used to being taught and told right answers. The students were so structured themselves just because they were used to getting good grades and that's all they saw and so they had little imagination, little creativity, lacked group skills . . . they were intolerant and they just didn't have those group skills. (A2)

One instructor, however, viewed these students differently and explained that they were "loveable, able to laugh at their mistakes" (F29).

Motivation for Program Participation

While several factors influenced the students' decisions to join the Honors Program, the common motivator was financial. All of the Honors Fellows interviewees mentioned that they and their parents were motivated by the full-tuition scholarship. However, the majority of interviewees admitted that they would have participated in the program without the scholarship.

Other related factors also influenced their decisions. For some students, the

community college meant an easier transition to a four-year college. They (S11, S22, S24) admitted that they were not ready to move away from home.

> At the time, going between high school and college, I was scared. When I came here, it was nice. I liked it. I didn't want to go away. I was scared of the world. (S3)

For other students, the community college represented an opportunity to develop strong study habits and complete general education courses. Others were also attracted to CLC because of the faculty's reputation and the opportunity to receive better instruction and more attention in smaller classes.

Many of the honors students were attracted to CLC for reasons similar to typical students, the convenience and the opportunity to have smaller classes.

> Initially I planned on attending U of I, but after some trouble with my math class in my senior year in high school, I decided that if I went to U of I, I probably wouldn't get much attention there, that I would be better off with smaller classes at CLC. (S2)

Five students liked the idea that they would become part of a special group and said that recognition would look good on their resume and transcript. Enrolling in CLC classes while still in high school helped two students feel more comfortable about continuing at CLC.

The following comments reflected the typical honors student's motivation.

> Because it was a full scholarship and I couldn't pass that up. But I knew Mr. Sherman told us there would be opportunities of smaller, special classes, special for the Honors Students, and I had planned to come to CLC anyway and I just thought it would be specialized and I would get more attention and I thought that would be really beneficial. (S12).

Background Experience

Since 230 of the Honors Fellows joined the program directly after high school, their background experience was typical for most eighteen-year-old suburban students. That limited amount of experience presented some challenges for faculty. One instructor who planned a field trip for her class met real resistance when that trip meant travelling away from campus.

> . . . A lot of them were frightened to death. They had never driven out of this immediate area and they got lost going to the hospital and they didn't like driving on Hwy. 41 and were very nervous about this . . . I really feel that they are very bright students who have really not been challenged and that they are also very nervous and they don't go beyond some things . . . We were going to take another trip. It was going to be to Forest Hospital. They didn't want to go. I mean they said, "You mean we will have to take the tollway?" and they said, "No, they were not going to go to Des Plaines." They said "that was too far away." They had no idea they might know a little bit about going around Lake County, but to have to actually go to Des Plaines and take the tollway seemed horrendous to them to do. (F2)

One instructor described how their limited world views influenced their curiosity about the world and willingness to take risks.

> Compared to other classes . . . it is a very . . . non-diverse . . . monolithic class. You know the same kinds of kids and they are talking to each other . . . They are quiet and hesitant because . . . they have too much to lose . . . one of the things I had hoped for is that they would be a little more talkative . . . let their hair down, come on, relax . . . you know how sometimes in some classes, kids . . . even though you don't like it, they just go off the deep end, they want to go on and on and on. I wish they would do more of that. Let their hair down. They are a little bit too uptight, I think. And I think though, maybe, they don't know what they really do and maybe they are not as open as they should be in terms of . . . they all come, they have their majors chosen and the track is out there and sometimes you think, "Well, are you sure you want to be so pat?" (F9)

Her perception about their majors was confirmed by the 1988 Honors Program Status Report which noted that only eight students out of 94 Honors Fellows indicated they were undecided about their majors (Sherman, 1988). It became painfully obvious to many of the Humanities and Social Science faculty that the majority of Honors Fellows were majoring in science, mathematics, business, and engineering. Teachers expressed their frustration with their rigidity and resistance to new ideas.

> They are not in the humanities so they do not have a humanities mind set. They tend to be very conservative, very narrow, very set, they are not imaginative or creative, gifted . . . I think that they have often been in groups that are very, very single dimension as far as ethnic differences or where religious difference is concerned . . . they haven't traveled much, but they knew what they liked. (F3)

> They are attentive, but they lack a lot of life experience. And they also, quite often, have no great interest or passion for the topic you are teaching. . . . and they have no idea what they are getting into so then some of them - they do respond. But some of them I can see really have no idea what is happening to them. They come out of backgrounds that emphasize science, math, business. That's a real limitation. (F1)

Several other faculty added that since many of them knew the same kinds of kids, they "needed to be exposed to a wider range of people . . . they haven't lived much and don't understand everything" (F3). Faculty described them as being from similar backgrounds and having been insulated from the real world (F1, F26). Other faculty members were challenged by Honors Fellows.

> [They were] . . . more competitive, more self-confident, more cliquish, more complaining . . . more comfortable, they'll stick with it, more Christian and I know this is a peculiar thing. In my one course I had literally more students who wanted to do only Christian Philosophers and Reborn Philosophers . . . more one-sided . . . less creative; at the same time, equal potential for creativity . . . They have all had to jump

> through the hoops and so I think they could probably, given the choice, could do it, could be more creative because I saw it happen at the end. (F28)

One Honors Fellow looked at her peers in a similar way.

> I don't know if we think that we know more than other people. You would think that a lot of times honors people would be more flexible and willing to take more opinions . . . but, it was kind of a surprise, people who were supposed to be more intellectual and into critical thinking, that they would be so rigid and inflexible where they don't want to hear someone else's point of view. (S6)

Finally, several faculty also noted that the Honors Fellows weren't honors in every subject and resembled a lot of other community college students in may ways. While the majority of honors students were praised for their constant attendance at class, a few faculty and administrators described them as being frequently tardy for class, immature, and having poor study skills. One administrator believed:

> Honors students attend community colleges because they're not ready to accept the socialization factors that go along with the process of transitioning to residence at a four-year school. (A6)

Another administrator who had taught honors students in high school explained why some community college honors students have unique characteristics but are also, in many ways, similar to their peers.

> CLC was an option for the honors level student who was not ready to go away or who was not ready to make the financial commitment of going to a four-year college or university . . . there's a myth that surrounds any group. Unless you have pierced whatever that shield is, that sort of separates them and generally the shield is created in our head . . . they are just people like everybody else. . . . I think that very often when we say 'honors' we think of somebody who is intellectually creatively, motivationally, you name it, superior. And that fact is in many cases of all the 'lys' that we can think of, maybe one is true. So the thing that we often times discover I think when we deal with honors students is that in a lot of ways they are not different.

> They might not be as motivated. They might be more motivated and maybe not even as academically talented as a regular student. (A4)

The counselor echoed her statement.

> In terms of working part-time, going to school full-time, multi-interested, very intelligent, I didn't see them as really being different. [They were] involved in a lot of things. I didn't see them as really being different other than maybe having a lot of ability in most cases. (F31)

Students' Work and Academic Success

Like typical community college students, most CLC honors students worked while in college. Twenty of the student interviewees worked while enrolled in the program. Specific hours worked per week ranged from six to fifty.

Sherman and other faculty were concerned about the negative impact that working had on students' academic success. In the Honors Program Evaluation, Sherman summarized the results in Table 20 and noted:

> A comparison of work hours versus success rates revealed a specific trend. Those students who worked ten hours per week or less were much more likely to complete the honors program successfully than students who worked more than that. (Sherman, 1991)

A comparison of the numbers and percentages of successes and failures in maintaining a 3.5 GPA, however, provided no significant differences that demonstrated the negative impact of working on academic success.

The coordinator persisted in his conviction and explained his concerns to students.

> Most of these kids would still work and I would warn them, I would say, "Hey look . . . I did the study and you saw that in the report, if they worked more than ten hours you couldn't really tell, it was an individual kind of a thing. They work less than ten hours, they were

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF WORK HOURS TO SUCCESS MAINTAINING 3.5 GPA

Hours of Work Per Week	% Success (N=64)	% Failure (N=58)
0-10	16	8
11-20	20	20
21-30	14	16
31-40	2	3
40+	0	1

highly successful. If they worked more than ten hours it was up and down. If they worked more than forty hours it was almost guaranteed that they weren't going to succeed" . . . I don't know that I was that successful because a lot of these kids felt that they really had to do it in order to have enough money to go on. (F14)

Instructors believed that free tuition weakened students' commitment to school and made it easier to work to buy cars or other products.

> They get a job and their main interest was to find some kind of a fancy car or something. And they put themselves in a situation whereby [our] paying their tuition, we actually made it possible for them to become more removed from the institution because they got themselves into buying things that definitely interfered with their ability to succeed in school. (F11)

> It was a concern on behalf of the faculty that the students were getting a tuition-free scholarship and yet they were still working 20 to 30 hours and . . . their priorities were not on school. They were like other students in that it was important in terms of working and going to school. (F3)

One student who completed only 26 out of 47 classes and earned a GPA of .76 explained how difficult it was to work full-time and go to school.

> One of the major problems that I saw was the fact that I was living at home and I planned to work 40 hours a week . . . plus doing school full-time and taking a lot of hard classes. It just didn't benefit me . . . With the way I was raised with my father, he gave me the support, but if I needed something I had to work for it. So I had to work 40 hours a week for my car and a lot of the other bills that I had . . . I was only getting maybe five hours of sleep at night, maybe less, because I would have to come home and do my homework. I lost a lot of interest in it and I just began to hate the whole idea. (S21)

Another honors student who succeeded academically but not socially explained her situation. "I was also working full-time so I didn't get a chance to do the social scene. That was kind of unfortunate" (S8). Another student who also had heavy work commitments discussed her schedule.

> I did a lot of work when I was in school. The first year I went to school during the day and worked at a hospital at night. The second year was even harder because I went to school five days and then worked five nights. I only had Tuesday night off. It was a little hard. (S6)

Amazingly, this student earned 63 hours of credit with a 3.70 GPA.

Perceptions of Program's Effects on Students

CLC developed and implemented a course-centered honors program for a special group of students. While they were typical community college students who were attracted to CLC because of its convenience and low cost, they were also atypical because their high school records and scores on standardized tests were high enough to qualify them for admission to four-year colleges and universities. The next part of this chapter explores what effects the honors program had on these young, full-time, serious students.

Cognitive Skills

Writing Ability. Even though these students came from high school honors programs, many realized their writing ability needed to be strengthened. The majority of students believed that the program's focus on writing was valuable because it strengthened their ability to focus on topics, express ideas clearly, and learn how to think.

> Writing has always been difficult for me in high school. I came here and I did better which was a positive influence because I felt I can write now, which is good because it helped to push me along. (S2)

> It sharpened me. When I am dealing with certain subjects I have to be more direct and to the point rather than blabbing more or less. It centered me. It focused me more on what I was doing. (S3)

> It helps you learn how to express yourself and it tends to get you away from the idea of jotting down an answer so that nobody else can tell you what it was you did. (S19)

> We even had a journal that we kept for Honors Calc I . . . he gave us a question that wasn't directly related to what we were talking about but it encouraged you to stretch what you learned and use it in a different way. And I liked it because it made you really think about what he was telling you. (S15)

One student described how the strong writing ability of his classmates challenged him to consider his audience and revise his papers.

> The honors classes, just because of the typical people you have in here, you don't have anybody who is going to totally blow off a paper and try to BS their way through it. Excuse my French, but I think in a certain positive sense, I think it encourages everybody to be honest about it. Did that make me a better writer? I'm not sure, it made me a more blunt and honest one. (S13)

Not all students were able to handle the writing component of the program. An honors student who came into the program with an English ACT score of 15 left

in his second semester and admitted, "English really isn't one of my strongest things. I struggled a lot in that class only because my writing skills weren't that good" (S21).

Some students weren't impressed with the program's writing focus. A new student admitted in the Fall, 1991 semester did not see any difference in his honors class.

> So far, it hasn't had a big effect . I am only taking one honors class, that would be English and I haven't done much else around the school except just come to my classes and study and just kind of get used to the stuff. (S25)

One African-American student admitted there is a lot more writing in the honors classes, but he didn't believe that it made him a better writer, "No, I feel I've always written this way" (S22). An Honors Fellow who transferred to a private four-year college after finishing the program believed that the writing component should have been stronger.

> It does encourage you to think because you are writing a lot even though I didn't feel prepared for essay questions as far as papers and analyzing information and putting it together at some point in some kind of logical way. (S16)

Finally, one student's complaints with his English teacher left him uncertain as to how much his writing improved.

> I have to say that it may have had some small effect . . . But in English I wasn't really sure, it seemed more intense than the other classes, but I also was saddled with what I would term a bad teacher which we filed a complaint against so I don't know how it really compares. (S17)

Reading Ability. Several students mentioned that they had more reading and different types of reading that they had not been exposed to in high school such as

short stories, novels, primary sources, and so forth. The extra reading assignments became part of what students assumed was part of the challenge and heavier workload of an Honors Program.

Critical Thinking Ability. Interviews with the Honors Fellows confirmed that these students believed their critical thinking abilities improved because of the various activities faculty introduced into the honors sections.

Although these students came to the program with solid memorization skills, their potential for higher level intellectual activities was challenged through the honors program. These abilities developed in various ways.

Faculty designed classroom activities which forced students to see both sides of controversial issues. They were expected to evaluate the merits of others' ideas and opinions. Moreover, they had to defend their own beliefs both in writing and in classroom discussion. Students learned how to listen carefully to others and support their own ideas with facts gleaned from their readings or class lectures.

Many students believed that the discussion in their classrooms made them better thinkers. The ways that classroom discussion impacted thinking skills varied.

> I had a biology class where we had to take sides . . . it was just neat because you had to think and be on your toes and listen to other people and be able to come back with something else against them. It gave me an opportunity to think as well as read out of a textbook. (S8)

> Students in the Honors Program are more opinionated, and do want to speak and try to prove themselves right. They really discuss things . . . sometimes they don't listen. Most people listen, but . . . they listen to what you say so they can refute you. And it really does, I think, help in creativity and really critical thinking . . . a lot of times you have an opinion but until somebody forces you to support your

> ideas, you may never get them to understand why you think that way, but I think as people grow a lot better doing that. (S6)

Although five students indicated that they felt tests in honors were the same as those in non-honors, several students believed the difficult tests in honors courses strengthened their thinking abilities.

> It's not just definitions. You have to be able to pull all your knowledge together and find out why . . . he gives you certain problems and you have to gather everything you know and just go by that and not necessarily that he has ever given the answer to those problems. You just have to go by what you know. (S24)

> You also have to just see the way he words it and the options that he gives are . . . they really make you think, "Well, could that be the answer or not?" There are usually two that you have to fight between. And then there are also essays in which he'll give you a problem. From what you've learned you have to either try and so we try it or see what happened. Just evaluate what other people . . . like certain articles of scientists, if what they are really saying is really true or if they are just going by correlation and not cause and effect. (S24)

> In the Honors Program, the tests were more thought-provoking. They were more essay type questions which got your opinions on certain concepts. I had one math course . . . which contained thought questions [essay questions] in math which is unheard of. It made me think more of how my English related to math. It broadened everything. It made you think more. Not so much if you could add one plus one, but if you could see why you are doing it. It was a new way to look at questions. (S3)

Critical thinking developed in other ways. Students appreciated the challenge of special projects where they worked independently.

> They didn't give you information. They also tried to make you think about things. They posed problems and extra things, like one of my professors . . . would give us special projects that the other courses didn't get. We would be on our own. It was like a lab that we had to do. We had to start from scratch, pick what we wanted to do, figure out what we were going to do, do, get the information, write it up, and it was all your own thing. (S2)

> They required more than just homework problems. You were required to write more. That helped my critical thinking process. We had to go through a different thinking process. In Honors Physics I we had a mouse trap car as our project that we were required to do. It was our project for analysis. Other classes were not required to do that. It helps. (S18)

One student enrolled in the only honors critical thinking class explained how this class affected her performance in upper division classes.

> It was all about different ways of seeing things. You get a different view, creative thinking. It just helped me out so much. I could see myself a cut above the rest--in my senior year at ISU--because they had a book called Creative Thinking in Business. Everybody was shocked at all this stuff and I had already had it before. (S8)

Discussion Ability. Honors classes differed from regular classes because they were smaller and incorporated discussion. Students who described themselves as quiet or shy explained how the smaller classes decreased their anxiety about participating in class discussion.

> I am the type of person, I don't normally talk. If someone asks a question I can answer it, but I won't answer the question. In those classes I felt that I was able to answer because I know the people there and I wasn't afraid to answer. (S1)

A computer science major discovered that discussion in honors courses outside his major exposed him to new ideas and expanded his understanding of the world.

> In some courses it forced me to look at things differently and think a lot. Like in the English courses and the humanities courses, when we had those discussions you had to think about how you were going to approach the questions that were given to you and you had to organize things a lot better. (S1)

Students also valued how discussion improved their understanding of the course concepts and increased their self-confidence.

> In the Honors Program more people are active in the classroom. It is a better way to grasp the concepts that you need. It brings more out in you because you want to be there. (S3)

> In my philosophy and American politics class, we had a lot of discussion in there that they didn't have in normal classes and it helped you think about yourself. (S5)

> Because classes were small and she encouraged class participation and we were able to see different points of view as far as whatever it was we were talking about or whatever she wanted us to write on. So . . . it was a learning experience altogether. (S10)

> My psychology class . . . the whole thing was a big conversation, and you had to get involved, so that was nice. (S15)

> They were good because the whole class participated. They were the caliber where they wanted to get into the discussion and talk and most of them were aware of what was going on and cared about the end result so discussions were really a lot better than normal classes. (S17).

> In the class itself, there was very good discussion with the teacher/student which I benefitted from, I learned from them while taking the notes. And some of the discussions we had were on the topic . . . you just get so engrossed in it, you don't take notes. (S21)

> Well, I never really liked talking much in class, but I think by the time that I was done at CLC I was more at ease with it. That helped out a lot. (S19)

Understanding of Interdisciplinary Connections. Although the faculty did not discuss the program's interdisciplinary focus, two students admitted in the first year of the program discussed its effect.

> It gave me a broader aspect of how all the different subjects related to one another. That's what the Honors Program did, it wrapped up everything in one nutshell. It took math and English, it combined everything, it related everything. It was great. (S3)

> A lot of the classes in the Honors Program were intertwined. You would be learning about something in one class and it would relate to another class. I thought that was really helpful. (S8)

This aspect was not discussed by students admitted after the first year. This emphasis probably became less evident because neither faculty nor the coordinator were intentionally including this focus in their classes.

Computer Literacy. None of the student interviewees mentioned the impact of computers in either honors or non-honors classes.

Preparation for Transfer. Ten students believed that the honors program prepared them well for the rigors of coursework at a four-year college or university. The experience of being in small classes with good teachers provided them with a strong foundation for upper-level work.

> If they're looking beyond CLC and getting ahead, the Honors Program will give them a strong base to prepare them for the challenges that lay ahead. (S18)

Even a non-honors student who took math classes with honors students believed that the challenge of the honors program better prepared students for transfer.

> Just the regular classes here prepare you really well for classes at other schools. But the honors classes must prepare you a lot better, I'm sure. (S14).

Several students equated preparing for transfer schools with having all their CLC courses count at the four-year college. Some students credited the facility of transferring courses with good advising from honor and non-honors faculty, as well as the structure of the program.

> I had no problem transferring. I came in as a Junior and finished in four semesters and without any difficulty . . . I think the requirements of the program are shaped along with what you have to do to get your Associates' Degree, are shaped well enough so that most schools you can transfer into without any difficulty if you take the right classes. (S7)

Another student appreciated the articulation between colleges.

> I really found that everything I took pretty much transferred. I was really happy with that and a lot of it met the general requirements at other schools. (S9)

A few students had problems. One science major felt somewhat unprepared for the rigors of upper-level science coursework. "But in the science area I didn't feel quite prepared for a junior level course in that area" (S7). One student felt she was unprepared for the lack of personal attention she received at the university.

> I probably went to Northern expecting to be treated like I was here. You kind of get thrown in with everybody else and you're not treated that way anymore. I think it would have been helpful if . . . they made students more aware of what a larger university is like. I really hadn't been to one before I went. It was pretty much of a change. I think that if they had students or the faculty or whatever just to tell you more of what it is like, then you'd expect it. That would have been helpful. But I mean material-wise, they prepared us very well. You could even see a difference just between kids that came from a community college and the kids that were there and had been at Northern . . . the teachers could tell . . . I know they used to tell us we had better writing skills and we had better study skills [than the native students]. (S12)

Readiness for upper-level coursework at a four-year college was evident in the reported GPA's of eleven student interviewees who transferred (see Table 21). All students reported GPA's of at least 3.00 at the transfer institution and the mean GPA's at both institutions were very similar.

TABLE 21

GRADE POINT AVERAGES AT CLC AND TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

Honors Fellows	CLC GPA	Transfer Institution GPA*
S1	3.47	3.25
S2	3.75	3.50
S3	4.00	3.89
S6	4.00	3.80
S7	3.45	3.00
S8	3.30	3.20
S10	2.63	3.90
S11	3.17	3.00
S12	3.67	3.40
S16	3.60	3.50
Mean GPA	3.47	3.44

*Self-reported

Affective Variables

Self-Esteem. While the emphasis of the Honors Program focused on providing a curriculum which strengthened students' thinking skills, the program had other effects on the students.

Being a member of a special group provided some honors students with a comfortable sense of belonging as well as a sense of pride. The expectations of others became a self-fulfilling prophecy for some students.

> When people find out you are in honors, they say, "Whoa", like it's real good. It has given me a lot of self-confidence that I can make it through. (S5)

> When I was in high school, I was very shy. I wouldn't even say "boo" in a school day. Then I got here and things were different because the classes were smaller and I had that group, the honors people, that I hung around with all the time. I became more outspoken and more confident even in other courses. I think that carried over into my other classes, that confidence. I felt like I belonged. (S15)

Six students believed that program participation improved their confidence and self-esteem.

> I think it gave us more self-confidence. We were treated kind of special. That made you feel like somebody had finally realized what you could do and they were willing to give you a chance to prove yourself. (S12)

That inner growth helped one student see herself in relationship to the other honors students and to enhance her self-awareness.

> The teacher would give us an assignment that was due in two weeks. These [honors] people would start it immediately. I would kind of procrastinate and wait until one of the last days to do it. I'm not saying that's good or bad, but I realized that I am a lot more laid back and relaxed than I thought I was. It just took more intense people who were much more intense than I was to realize that. It made things, after coming here, I take things a lot more easy. What's going to happen is going to happen and there are certain things I can change and there are certain things I can't change. (S6)

Interpersonal Relations. A student body of 15,000 commuters can contribute to students' feelings of isolation from CLC's campus. The Honors Program, however, provided a special quality of community between students and faculty. A typical honors class included fifteen students who were expected to become actively involved in challenging classroom discussion, projects, and exams. This atmosphere created an environment which encouraged socialization both within and outside of the classroom.

One administrator believed that socialization at a large community college campus was important for honor students.

> I think it gives students another opportunity to identify with another group of students. The college is big. It's fragmented and I think it gives them some touchpoint, to say: "I am part of this group." (A2)

Another administrator explained why community college students usually find it difficult to socialize and become a part of campus activities.

> They are here for a relatively brief period of time. We have any number of factors . . . which tend to isolate students that have nothing to do with the honors programs. We are a commuter institution. How much fostering of anything really exists in a commuter institution? I mean it is sort of like going to work. . . . You come to school. It is . . . like going to work. You are going to be there 'x' number of hours and then you are going to go do whatever else it is you do. (A3)

Honors Fellows who participated in the first four years of the program were enthusiastic and positive about getting to know other honors students.

> We got to know one another really well. (S1)

> It was good for me because I was able to interact with a lot of different people that I wouldn't have seen otherwise . . . I made some good friends . . . We often got together to do things and go places. We went to the beaches a few times, had parties, kid stuff. There were a few of us who were really close and hung around together all the time. (S2)

> The Honors Program had people in every field you can imagine. It was great to talk to them and hear their viewpoints [and] . . . become good friends with most of them actually. It really was great. I enjoyed it. (S3)

> I made more friends through honors because we have meetings and we end up sitting together. You see the same faces because the program is so small. You make a lot of friends that way. (S5)

> Like I said, one of my best friends was in the program. I dated one guy from the Honors Program. I went with one or two other ones. (S6)

> It's just a great all around experience. You get to meet so many different people. (S8)

Honors classes gave some students an opportunity to study together and work collaboratively. These efforts improved the learning outcomes.

> Since we were with each other a lot of the times, almost everyday I got to be friends with a lot of them and we had lunch breaks at the same time so we'd have lunch. And we'd also study together in groups for a big project or just to quiz each other . . . we studied in groups and worked in groups a lot, it was good. It was different from before because before I came into honors and in high school, it was just me studying by myself and like just as in discussion in class, working or studying as a group they would pick up points that I probably wouldn't or I'd probably overlook, I should say that. So, we'd learn that way. (S10)

One student compared his typical interactions with those in non-honors classes.

> There was a certain amount of camaraderie there that you don't bump into in your typical class. I'm not saying we're clannish. I'm saying after class we'd go down and have a cup of coffee or something like that and talk about what was going on. (S13)

Another student described the effects of such interactions similarly.

> It was great my first semester. That Calc I class, it was a very tough class, and we had this group, it was at least half of the class. We would all study together in the cafeteria . . . we were a group, we were all in the same situation and all understood. I'm still interacting with them. They are at U of I, they're here, they're there. My best friend, I met her the first day of registration and we've been best friends ever since . . . I had some boyfriends from here . . . I've made more friends, most of my friends are from the Honors Program either in the same classes as I am or the classes below mine. I really don't have any friends that I didn't come into school with that are from the other classes. Like I said, there wasn't, I don't know, we had this camaraderie. We were all in the same thing and we'd go together. A group of us would be at 'Sheer Madness' or a group of us would be

> here or there because we were required to go to so many things. I met a lot of people that way. I've kept in touch with a lot of people. (S15)

Although one student found it difficult initially to interact with some of the students, she eventually felt as if she belonged to the group.

> Some of them came from Zion . . . they all knew each other from before, it was a little cliquey . . . if you were all smart in high school you get together, they all knew each other and everything . . . even though we really didn't get together outside of class when the honors kids did get together there was some unity there . . . even if you didn't do more than say 'hi' or wave or just acknowledge each other there was always one more person who you were familiar with. So that was nice. (S16)

Honors Fellows admitted in the fourth year continued with the same theme of belonging to a comfortable blend of people with which to study and socialize.

> It gave me an instant group of friends . . . some of it was social. I met a lot of my friends here. A lot of my friends are from the Honors Program. But even more so was the homework help. Study groups, everything. It was just instant groupie, to get together. You don't have qualms about asking them to get together. (S17)

> I went out with a couple of them once in a while . . . weekends or whatever and I worked with a couple of them . . . studying together all the time . . . it is something I didn't really do that much in high school . . . just making friends, that's a big part of it too because it gave me that chances to meet a lot of people I'm friends with now. (S19)

The two student interviewees admitted in the Fall, 1991 semester did not share the former students' enthusiasm for the interaction with their peers. They both mentioned studying with their peers, but not with Honors Fellows.

> In the geology class we have a group paper so we are meeting a lot and working on that. (S24)

> A little bit, not so much with honors students, there is a friend of mine and we have three classes the same, we're in the same chemistry, the same engineering graphics and the same English. So we hang around a

> bit. We haven't really made a lot of friends with the other students in the Honors Program particularly. (S25)

A student who dropped out of the program after one semester wishes he had been more involved with the other Honors Fellows.

> I wasn't interested in the social part of it. Looking back now in my present situation, it would have been interesting. I would have attended in order to talk to some of these people and see what their goals are, what's driving them. (S4)

The only African-American student in the program seemed somewhat isolated socially. He spent his time with his peers, "sometimes to study, but that is the extent of it" (S22).

Two faculty criticized the program because of the negative aspects of honors students' interaction within classes. One perceived a sense of hypocrisy while the other thought inclusion in the program encouraged immature behavior.

> Because of the tight cliques they had, it was like, "we're going to pull each other up." And there was a lot of, "Oh gee, that was so good, that was so good," very nicely and loudly within my ear shot. (F23)

> It just seemed to me like maybe what we created was a clique of people who thought of themselves as better than the normal CLC student because they didn't really want to be taught anything. I mean, they would go out of their way to ask questions that had nothing to do with not only the subject at hand, but nothing to do with anything that one could identify as Economics . . . I had one girl, she was throwing spitballs at her friends. This is the only class I've had recently where I actually had to stop it several times and address myself to their infantile behavior . . . I can't say what the problem was except that it looks like they had moved together as a group and this was honors students and they thought of themselves as sort of automatically entitled to success rather than having to work for their success. (F16)

Even though another instructor left the program, he believed students benefitted from a sense of belonging to a campus group.

> Honors Programs . . . should build a sense of community and . . . sometimes it does. Some of those kids hung out together, I will say that. I watched them, I could see them together down at Lancers. . . . a lot of them became senators here, a lot became sort of student politicians and joined the student activities staff. And I think some of them hung around together who wouldn't have otherwise. I think there was probably . . . thanks to the program, some of those meetings and stuff and I think there was a sense of community among some of them. So, I mean, there is an advantage, that was nice. If we could do that, it would be great. (F13)

The social interaction which occurred between students also extended to faculty. Such socialization facilitated the beginning of a unique learning community between honors students and honors faculty in which both groups shared academic goals and worked together within and outside of class.

Some of the interactions were informal such as seeing each other after class or in the faculty's office for help with assignments. Students believed that faculty helped them during their office hours and during informal meetings around campus.

> You were a lot closer with the teachers and the teachers were a lot more willing to help you because they had fewer students. They knew that you were a motivated student or you wouldn't be there. And I think the teachers actually helped more, and they gave you good ideas. They gave you studying ideas. They helped you through material. I think that was the best part of it. The teachers could show you how to do things better and accomplish things. (S12)

> I often went to teachers for help on assignments. Outside of class, if I saw a teacher in the hall, I'd say 'hi' to her. One of the honors teachers, I took another class of hers because I liked her so much from the one I had to take. This wasn't an honors class. I wanted to take it because she was teaching it. (S11)

> If I saw a teacher passing in the hallway, I'd stop and small talk. And every now and then they'd tease us for studying and for socializing, but all in all, like if we needed help then that would be another time. (S10)

> I liked the teachers, their encouragement and how they, they take the time to know you, know who you are, what you are studying, know how you're doing and follow your progress. (S15)

Some students mentioned that the faculty made themselves available for more than class related issues.

> My philosophy teacher . . . she helped me go through some personal problems I had outside, that was nice of her. (S5)

> My English teacher for second semester was a very caring teacher. She tried to help us outside with our personal lives. We talked outside of class. (S17)

One student appreciated having the opportunity to meet his classmates at the teacher's home.

> The professors got to know you really well. I remember in my humanities class, we even met over at the professor's house one night because we had a guest speaker come in. We got to know each other in the classes. We had good conversations and good discussions, a lot better than the normal classes where only one or two people speak up. In the honors classes, there was a lot more participation. (S1)

An instructor explained why he believed such student and faculty interaction was so important.

> I think for many people they can come here for two years and really not have a conversation with anyone. So I think in an Honors Program, it is important to have not just formal activities that we require them to go to . . . I think it is also important to have social gatherings once in a while where you sort of come together with faculty members and very relaxed, you all sit around and sort of talk about things and have a cup of coffee and have maybe something to eat. Maybe have some excuse for coming together. (F1)

Several faculty mentioned how important these informal gatherings with faculty had been during their own undergraduate years at residential colleges and that they hoped these students would also find these opportunities beneficial.

While the students appreciated the availability and interest they experienced with faculty, they unanimously praised the program coordinator. His history and position within the program made him the authority on how students could complete program and graduation requirements. His attention to details and to each student made him become their advocate, counselor, teacher, advisor, and confidant. His interest in them provided them with a sense of importance and belonging which can be rare for many community college students. This student's comments reflected how much they valued his support.

> I really appreciated the time [he] took in organizing classes and taking the time to pick out the best teachers. He really helped me a lot. Whenever I needed him, I could just go and talk to him. I don't know whether other students talked to other faculty members. He was always there for me. (S9)

Even a student who criticized many aspects of the program commented on how the coordinator helped him with career choices and college options.

> If I had an idea, he would be willing and open to talk about it and explore the possibilities that way. You know he didn't go in for making suggestions. I'd say, "Okay, I'm looking at becoming an English major. How do I go about this? What are some decent schools in the area?" I was looking at Lake Forest College for a while and on his own he went in and got me a lot of information. (S13)

Cultural Awareness. Although the cultural enrichment activities resulted in complaints by the students and frustration for the coordinator, the majority of students believed that they benefitted from their attendance. Some students said that these activities opened their eyes to many other activities they never knew were offered on campus. Most admitted that initially they didn't want to attend, but enjoyed them. This student's comments represented the opinions of several students.

> At first I felt they were a waste of time, but then I enjoyed going to them, I got to like them . . . It was something to do besides sit home and watch T.V. It was something to get out and do . . . it was getting us to see something different, which is good. (S1)

Two other students were more specific when they explained how the activities expanded their awareness of different cultures.

> They make you go to cultural events so that forces you to be a more rounded person . . . I went to a Mexican folklore dance. I would have never gone. I would look at the paper and say, "they'll be another one" but it was great. (S5)

> I was glad for those because it was stuff I wouldn't normally go to. Like I went to the Chamber Orchestra which I never would have gone to. They were really good. Some of the speakers I would never have bothered to take a couple hours out of my night to do. I was really glad that I kind of had to go because they were really good. (S16)

On the other hand, the two students admitted in the Fall, 1991 semester had no idea about what the cultural activities were. They expressed an interest in attending meetings and different functions and were angry because they perceived that they were excluded from such activities.

Some students admitted that they didn't go to these events for personal reasons. While their opinions reflected a minority of student interviewees, both were clear opinions against the cultural activities requirement.

> I didn't like the fact that they seemed to be mandatory. I felt that we should have been encouraged, but not required to go. The impression that I got from it is that they are trying to get us to do things as a group and to see the horizons at CLC. So they are forcing our eyes up and making us look toward the horizon, hoping we'll catch something, catch our attention or something. I think that is ludicrous, because all that happened in my experience was everybody resented it. That I knew of, very few did do as much as they were supposed to. And then it wasn't enforced anyway, so where do you go from there? (S13)

> The stuff that I went to, they honestly didn't thrill me, but because they said to do it, I did it. The only good thing out of all the extracurricular activities [was], Second City, probably the best one I went to. That was worth taking the time off to go see, but as far as the other stuff it was really kind of hard, really discouraging. You know having to do this, it was hard enough having to take the classes, plus work, do all the homework. (S21)

Involvement in Extracurricular Activities. Ten of the student interviewees were involved in various student activities on campus. Their involvement included membership in student clubs and Phi Theta Kappa, the national honors fraternity for community college students. Two became student representatives on the Honors Program Committee while another joined Student Senate. Five honors students tutored other college students on campus.

These experiences provided multiple effects on students. Several students became empowered by realizing that faculty would actually listen to their opinions. The students began to realize that they could make a difference in the quality of the honors program and the quality of student life on campus.

> It helped it [self-confidence] a lot . . . we all got together with the faculty and made important decisions and I thought, Wow, this is great! (S16)

Other students were motivated to become involved in extracurricular activities by seeing their peers participating in extracurricular activities.

> A lot of the people that I met in my Honors class were involved in Student Senate and I started thinking about Student Senate. Once I joined Student Senate . . . I learned communication skills and leadership qualities. I got to know some of the instructors better because Student Senate went to meetings with the faculty. I was on Governance Coordinating Council last year. That kept me in contact with what CLC was doing in the college. I got to see what the Faculty Senate were trying to do. We got to tell them the students' point of

> view. I think it helped. It showed me that the administrators are out of touch with the students and that there are people who are letting them know what we want and we can tell them what we're thinking. It's encouraging to know that. (S18)

One administrator saw multiple benefits of involvement for honors students and non-honors students. He believed the honors students learned how to get things accomplished. He also saw the honors students take risks and learn how to work with a variety of other students so that the interaction benefitted all of those involved in the political process.

> The end result was that they learned about themselves to a large extent and others found out that they really could do some of these things with others and everything wasn't like on a pass/fail basis or that you have to have an A. You give it your best shot and there is value in putting forth good effort and it may fall short of what you have set--originally decided what you want to do--but there is value in the effort . . . and it challenged them in a way that they had not been challenged in a classroom setting. So they came out, I think, better for having done it. Last year's group was really quiet, they didn't ask all that many questions. This year they are just all talkers. And some of them--the honors students--would ask really tough questions. And they did a good job of challenging other students . . . and that kind of, again, raised the level of inquiry, dialogue and the end result was probably, I think, better. (A2)

Tutors expressed personal satisfaction in helping other students. One student described the tutoring services as he would to a high school senior.

> There is always someone to go to if you need to get something answered or you need some help with something, there is always someone there. Being a tutor, I know that if somebody has trouble they can find someone to help them. That's good. (S1)

Profile of Honors Faculty

While the Honors Program was designed to impact academically elite students,

it also involved another special group--the faculty. In addition to being responsible for the design and delivery of the curriculum, their involvement with the program was critical to its on-going operation. Their insights provided valuable information on the program's effects on students and themselves as participants.

Motivation

Faculty from four academic divisions taught in the program. Motivation to participate in the program varied. Table 22 details their reasons for teaching in the program.

TABLE 22

MOTIVATION OF FACULTY (N = 26)

Reason	N
1) Hope of getting good students	9
2) Opportunity to design challenging course	9
3) Request from coordinator or others	7
4) Curiosity to try new experience	6
5) Opportunity for release time	6
6) Experience as an honors student	3
7) Membership on Honors Program Committee	3
8) Rotating assignment in department	3
9) Convenience	2
10) Desire to see program succeed	2

The following comments reflected the faculty's interest in working with students who want to be challenged.

> I have always had the feeling that we've never demanded enough of our students and I think we've allowed ourselves to get into a mold of not demanding much from people and the honors students gave me a perfect forum to demand something from people. (F11)

> Two things. One, I was curious about the students and whether they would be in fact different from our other students, and I think, two, and probably maybe more motivating, is the fact that it would be a chance to do something different in composition instead of going through some of the elements of composition and finding different books to teach basically the same concepts. I was excited about getting people . . . who would have the basics and you could explore and get writing about more intellectual things and focus on more content, on broader ideas and really kind of engage a class writing about ideas rather than how to. I was very sick of students doing comparison/contrast between two cars or two places they had lived or all of those things are intended to bore everybody including the writer. . . . I think it was mainly the opportunity for change and something new because I found I need that personally. I can't teach the same class the same way consistently. (F30)

Selection Process

The Honors Program Proposal provided extensive details on how honors faculty would be selected.

> Honors Faculty will be chosen by the Honors Committee working in concert with the Associate Deans. Selection of Honors Faculty will be based on student evaluations and classroom visitations by the appropriate Dean. Those faculty chosen to teach honors courses will present a detailed syllabus to the Honors Committee for their approval. This syllabus should include: reading and writing assignments, i.e. papers, projects, texts, and other primary materials to be used and the type of exams, elements of critical thinking, writing across the curriculum and the relationship of the course to other courses in the honors program and where appropriate computer literacy should be evident in the syllabus. (Sherman, 1985)

This proposed plan was problematic from the programs's inception. The major barrier to its implementation was that it was contrary to established college procedure whereby Associate Deans were responsible for the assignment of faculty to

courses within their divisions. While the proposal stated faculty would be chosen by the Honors Committee, there was little evidence that the committee members had ever been involved in the process.

Divisional Procedures. The actual selection process was handled differently among academic divisions. The Engineering, Mathematics, and Physical Science division assigned faculty who had met the training criteria. The Social Science division assigned faculty on a rotational basis. The Humanities, Communications, and Fine Arts division assigned English and philosophy faculty based on their interest after copies of the original goals and requirements were circulated throughout the division. Biology faculty generally were not interested in teaching in the program, so those who eventually taught the Environmental Biology classes included one full-time instructor and a part-timer. Chemistry faculty refused to teach in the program.

In his resignation letter, the coordinator expressed concern that the selection process as it was implemented provided no assurance that only highly qualified faculty with training and ability to teach critical thinking skills were assigned to teach honors classes.

Colleague Response. Faculty response to the proposed process and its actual implementation fell into two opposite camps.

Some faculty believed that it was important to choose the best faculty who could relate to this type of student and were willing to spend the extra time to make the class succeed.

> I think it's important we choose our best staff members. . . . You've got to have teachers who students can relate to. You have to have teachers that are willing to spend the time. (F6)

Others resented the idea that some faculty were considered "better qualified" to teach honors students.

> There was a great deal of resentment from the first . . . it was very clear from the language in the proposal that there were few to several faculty who really weren't of the caliber who should teach an honors program . . . that kind of statement . . . could incite antagonism. (A7)

> If there is any credibility to an honors program, anyone on the faculty ought to be able to teach it as well as anyone else. (F21)

One faculty member described her feeling of isolation when the first group of honors faculty were selected.

> I wondered what qualified them because there was a little group that was sort of asked and looked at and not everybody. And in some cases, I knew what qualified them. I could understand that I respected that difference, and in some cases I thought that this is a kind of closed society. (F3)

Only three of the faculty interviewees said that they were treated any differently by their colleagues for teaching honors courses. The rotational type of assignment seemed to dissipate opposition (F2, F7, F18, F21, F25, and F28). Some faculty believed that their colleagues either didn't know or didn't care if they were teaching honors courses. "I don't think they knew about it" (F2).

> We were selected by our . . . Associate Dean . . . I mean they had a hard time finding people usually. I mean almost anybody who wanted to be in the Honors Program could be in it because it wasn't particularly sensitive because most people didn't want to bother with it . . . I don't think anybody gave it a second thought that I know of. (F13)

Some instructors who taught classes from the beginning of the program experienced some challenging attitudes from their colleagues.

> I got a lot of flak from--I did at first--from some of my colleagues, but it wasn't personal, it was just criticism of the program as being elitist. But I mean people are still friendly, they still talk to me. I don't think there is any problem . . . it was meant as kind of open friendly criticism. It was one individual and it was just an honest disagreement of opinion, that's all. (F1)

Others sensed some resentment from their colleagues.

> I didn't talk about it that much . . . go around wearing an arm band that said honors faculty on it or something, but once or twice there was a remark made of the thing--"You can teach honors, but I can't," that type of thing that was made sarcastically indicating they felt every bit qualified to do it, but they just didn't just because they didn't decide to go to some seminar or something that they were discriminated against in some way. (F11)

One instructor believed that some faculty may have turned against the program because they were not initially selected as honors faculty.

Evaluation Process

Although the Honors Program Proposal stated that the selection of Honors Faculty would be based upon student evaluations and classroom visitations by the appropriate Associate Dean, there is little evidence that either happened regularly. The main complication of this proposed evaluation process was that it was inconsistent with the established CLC tenured faculty evaluation procedures which had been completely handled by peer evaluation committees.

The proposed honors evaluation system had some positive as well as negative consequences. One Associate Dean explained how the evaluation component enhanced his understanding of the teaching which was occuring within his division.

> It gave me a little more insight at least in terms of faculty members as they changed in that assignment as to what they do and what their approach is. And frankly it was very reinforcing. I mean, these people do a very good job at what they are attempting to do and while I may have thought that, now I had a way to say, "Well, now I have observed this as well," I could answer more questions about it than I would have been without that. (A3)

This administrator also explained how the proposed evaluation system elicited faculty concerns and resistance because it was contrary to existing procedures.

> On one occasion, the coordinator requested an evaluation of classes and those were to be sent to him. I wasn't real comfortable with that. We have an evaluation system in place and . . . my view was that we should use what we have and not have more than one evaluation system here . . . so I did not comply with that request to do that. The other reason I didn't was that I sensed some resistance to that idea from the honors faculty. They perceived me as having a right to ask them to do that. They did not perceive the Director of the Honors Program as having the responsibility to ask them to do that . . . they just didn't think the evaluation should go over there, but over to me . . . They wanted us, I thought to make a fairly subjective judgement. You know, "Who is the best person for this?" That is deadly administratively . . . I simply would not have tried to predict anything on students' evaluation of the instructor, but rather try to evaluate it in a larger context in terms of what we were trying to achieve from the faculty member's perspective, how well did we achieve it and then take a look at what students' expectations were and to what extent they were met. (A3)

Some faculty believed that the honors program's faculty evaluation plan interfered with the college's peer evaluation procedures and set up a dynamic which caused faculty to believe administrators were going to evaluate faculty.

> This is just an example of a danger . . . on the insularity of this program . . . An instructor came up to me a couple of years ago, and said "What's going on here? . . . I've got an honors class and there is this form that I am supposed to give my students to evaluate me in the course and it goes back to the coordinator" and I said, "Don't do it" and he said "I'm not going to." The college policy of peer evaluation states that the evaluation goes to the faculty committee. So here is a

> program that is saying, "No, we are outside of that policy and here is an evaluation that you are to give that goes back to the honors administrators to test how well you are doing as an honors teacher." (F24)

Interaction

As the faculty discussed the effects of the program, it became evident that they became involved in interpersonal dynamics that impacted the course of the program.

Honors Program Coordinator. The faculty's response to the importance of the coordinator's role in establishing the program and keeping it running smoothly was generally positive. Many acknowledged the important contribution he made by utilizing his interpersonal skills and recruitment experience in bringing competent high school students into the program.

The consensus among faculty was that the coordinator's workload was overwhelming. They believed that despite the fact that he organized his time and efforts well, the amount of released time provided was insufficient for his broad range of responsibilities. Several faculty (F9, F18, F26) argued two or three people should have been given released time to share these responsibilities.

While faculty criticized the coordinator's workload, they also acknowledged the importance of having a faculty member to lead the program, especially during its establishment.

> You've got to have somebody, a great person who really believes in it to shepherd it through the . . . barriers that are going to be created in a college simply because it's a new idea. (F11)

Faculty agreed that the position required a person with enthusiasm, someone who

could get excited about the program and convince students and faculty about its importance.

After the program became established, it appeared as if the coordinator's time became consumed with recruitment activities and informal interactions with the honors students. This resulted in less time and energy for involvement in activities in which the coordinator had little control--faculty development, selection, and evaluation. One instructor wished he could have given her more attention with her honors' lesson plans. Another faculty member quit the program when he heard that the coordinator criticized him in front of his student.

> I was not going to be involved in the program where someone I felt was as unethical as that to actually be publicly declaiming that I am a bad teacher to students who wanted to take my classes. (F13)

In addition, the coordinator's attempts to become involved in faculty selection and evaluation alienated several faculty who believed that these activities were pro-administration and anti-faculty.

Honors Program Committee. In addition to teaching in the program, some faculty also became involved in the Honors Program Committee. This group included six faculty members who were expected to meet several times during a semester to refine program goals, review syllabi, supervise the inclusion of critical thinking, reading, writing, and problem solving skills in the honors courses, and meet with Associate Deans to discuss the selection and assignment of honors faculty. In addition, these faculty served as academic advisors and were expected to assist with recruitment of students.

Information gleaned from interviews revealed that the Honors Committee met two or three times within a semester when the program was initially established. Discussion at those meetings focused on concerns about individual students, suggestions for guest speakers, and shared ideas and experiences about the curriculum, for example, "What worked and what didn't" (F8).

There was no evidence that this faculty group became involved in program evaluation, supervision of curriculum, and assignment of faculty. As the program continued, Honors Program Committee meetings became less frequent.

Honors Faculty Meetings. Faculty teaching honors courses were involved in honors faculty meetings when the program was first established, but the frequency of those meetings diminished as the program continued. Meetings were informational. Faculty discussed students' progress and possible concerns about their progress. The coordinator would ask for suggestions on different speakers to bring to campus. Finally, the meeting included informal conversations related to curriculum and pedagogy.

> We would sit around kind of talking about what we tried and what worked and what didn't work. (F8)

Some faculty believed the meetings were neither necessary nor beneficial.

> Even then they are from such different disciplines, I am not sure that there was anything that would be helpful. I mean the basic techniques of teaching we already know . . . I don't think there is probably anything they could have learned from me and me from them. (F13)

Three teachers who had begun teaching honors after the program had been operating for several years expressed their feelings of isolation and disappointment in

not being able to participate in these informal meetings.

> I imagined that all the great minds teaching the great books in the Honors Program were going to get together before, but not once did they. I think at the beginning that was the idea and that wasn't true all of last year. I really did feel like a lone person. (F3)

> I was always left alone. Being part-time instructor is probably one of the loneliest occupations because they assume you know what you are doing and you do it and no one discusses anything with you which can be a terrible handicap . . . no, I was essentially winging it . . . it would require meetings, it would require information, some kind of newsletter, it would require more than . . . certainly more than what's not being done now. (F29)

> I will say very honestly I felt very alone . . . once I kind of got the class in my mind no one contacted me during the semester . . . I many times suggested that I would love to have been a part of a group . . . that those who were teaching honors should have some sort of workshop that they are required or expected to attend three times a semester where you could do what you're saying, share ideas and that didn't happen. (F20)

Another instructor believed the faculty should have taken on a more visible role in guiding the program and evaluation whether it was meeting its goals.

> I don't know if we really did much in the form of that kind of stringent evaluation, but where to go from here . . . I think we need to revitalize our faculty group, get together and discuss what we want to do with it . . . maybe reassess what our goals are. (F27)

Informal Faculty Interaction. Three faculty (F23, F24, and F29) said they talked to no other faculty at the college about the Honors Program. Others explained their discussions were minimal either with a spouse (F27 and F29), or an office mate (F12). Most interaction occurred frequently when the program was first established. The physics instructor explained:

> Especially with the math people because a lot of times we have the same students . . . so we would talk to see where he was, what things

> that he was covering and what things that I could reinforce from the math end of it. That worked out well because I hadn't done as much of that with a regular class. (F5)

Topics discussed during these informal conversations related to the program and included "general chit-chat" (F3), "how much work students are willing to do" (F6), "what we're experimenting with" (F8), "about articles for the honors classes" (F27), "commiserating" (F13), and "advise on how to set up ground rules" (F15).

Faculty Perception of Program's Effects on Non-Honors Curriculum and Teaching Techniques

Faculty who taught in the Honors Program believed that that experience affected their teaching non-honors courses several ways. First of all, it caused some faculty to reconsider the academic standards they were currently expecting in their regular classes. It made them think that they had perhaps settled for too little and could demand more from their college-level classes and even their remedial classes.

> Honors kind of got me back into the groove a little bit of making those same kinds of demands of all my students. Because why should we just challenge the allegedly already high ability students when . . . we ought to be doing the same thing with all our students. (F11)

> It does make whoever is teaching the course really assess what material they are covering, what standards that they have for students. Do they have expectations for students who are brighter to challenge them? And what do they do in a regular class with students who may have those abilities? Do they actually do anything to help students in your regular class? So in that sense, I guess it does change you or make you better in that you try to think about students that you have in your regular class . . . it makes you focus on what you do for students who are bright, do you challenge them in a regular class. (F2)

> I think I realized that some of what I was sort of assuming or automatically expecting in honors classes and so I was approaching

> them differently. I thought, "I can do this with any students, why not?" and it's true. So then I think I realized that some things that did not need to be taught to honors students probably don't necessarily have to be taught to any student. Either the student will pick it up or there are different ways to hand it to him so he can pick up very quickly. I certainly could see I could deal with [remedial] students differently. Honors students are accustomed to, they are often the big men and women on campus. They are respected as relatively equal minds to their instructor. Other students are not. And I thought, "I don't think that is fair." I think sometimes I have treated honors students differently and I ought to be treating all students as people with equivalent minds. (F3)

Secondly, the opportunity to redesign a class for these academically elite students was a refreshing experience for some faculty. It forced some of them to delve more deeply into their disciplines to identify primary sources and review the theories of key authorities in their fields.

> When I had to pick an article to do in class not only did I have to go back and review some of the classic articles which was good for me to pick what I was going to use, but then secondly, when leading a discussion on an article, damn it, you have got to know that article inside and out . . . I had to work on those graphs because I can read it and understand it, but another thing was to explain exactly why things did this and what if I changed this and if I did that, I had to go back, and it was a developmental thing for me to really analyze that article so in-depth . . . that I could explain it. And so for me, as an instructor, I think it was a developmental issue. So in that sense I enjoyed it. (F27)

Moreover, expecting that a competent, motivated group of students would be looking for something new and challenging stimulated faculty and facilitated the design of a new course.

> The honors class . . . gave me the courage to go ahead and try some things and find out, "Hey, this could work." (F4)

> If you have good, working, thinking students in your class, it encourages you to continue to advance yourself and keeps you fresh. (F8)

Faculty who incorporated new aspects into the honors courses extended some of the same innovations into regular classes. They included journals, primary sources, exercises in critical thinking, expanded reading and writing assignments, and different types of tests which included essays. One instructor even developed a model for a new mythology class from the work he did within another honors course.

Not all faculty saw only positive effects of the Honor Program on the regular courses. Some believed that an honors section in certain departments meant that there wouldn't be enough students to fill another regular section. This happened in physics, engineering, and calculus classes. Other math faculty voiced a more common concern--honors sections took good students away from regular classes.

> I think some people don't like the idea of honors classes because they are taking the better students away from regular classes, so their classes are being diluted along the way, too. So I got that feeling sometimes . . . by the time the second semester came around . . . sometimes we had to kind of go looking for other people to fill up the [honors] class, so we ended up taking some of the better students . . . from the other classes and putting them in there. (F7)

An honors instructor explained that students can see the positive and negative effects of having honors students in regular classes.

> From what I understand a couple of times there had been complaints from some students of a class with mixed honors and non-honors that the honors students drag up the curve so they get penalized . . . on the other hand, I think that it benefits the other students in the class . . . if you can get honors students to discuss topics. Then they see the spin-off so they start to say, "Yes, if I'd have read that, I could have said that" and realizing that perhaps they have capabilities. (F8)

One instructor cautioned that expecting that teaching honors students will have immediate effects on improving teaching techniques is presumptuous and not based on

the day-to-day reality of teaching community college students.

> This sounds like a lot of educational theory in which you are treating teachers as wizards. They are going to accomplish all these magnificent things. And in fact, teaching is a very hard business in which the threat of failure is always there. I have techniques that worked for years and my ethics class always responded and I'd go into class and people just sat there and looked like I were a madman. The things that always succeeded in some class I have no idea why they just don't [in another class]. (F1)

Summary

This overview of College of Lake County's Honors Program from 1985 to 1991 reveals a course-centered program which emphasized certain elements included within the proposed model. While the applications varied, the faculty incorporated writing in all honors classes. The quality and quantity of reading assignments increased. Critical thinking became a common goal and was strengthened through exposure to primary sources, controversial issues, and frequent opportunities for students to participate in class discussion. Extra projects and challenging exams gave students opportunities to apply the new concepts and theories they had been introduced to in the classroom. However, two elements of the proposed curriculum, interdisciplinary focus and computers in the classroom, were rarely mentioned as being developed for honors students.

Although some honors faculty were involved as honors advisors, the program coordinator provided additional academic and transfer advice whenever needed. The cultural activities component exposed students to a variety of speakers and diverse musical, dramatic, and artistic events.

Available documents revealed that honors program expenses exceeded initial projections and costs continued to grow each year of its operation.

The Honors Fellows were very similar in their background, age, race, and experiences. Their admission data revealed a general profile of good academic ability and strong study skills. While their primary motivation to join the program was prompted by tuition scholarships, they also were attracted by small classes, strong faculty, and convenient location. Many students also wanted to belong to a campus group which was recognized as being special. Both faculty and students described Honors Fellows as shy and quiet, as well as reluctant to leave home and hesitant to try new experiences. Even though they received full tuition scholarships, the great majority of Honors Fellows worked while enrolled in the program.

The students enthusiastically affirmed the effects the program had on their cognitive skills. They believed that their writing skills and critical thinking skills had been strengthened. Even though most were initially reluctant to participate in discussion, they acknowledged that it increased their confidence in their ability to defend their ideas in front of their peers. Only a few students in the program's first year discussed the advantage of understanding interdisciplinary connections. Computer literacy was never mentioned by students. Ten students who were enrolled at four-year colleges or universities believed the program prepared them for transfer work. They also acknowledged that the structure of the courses within the program transferred readily to other colleges and universities.

Participating in the program enhanced their self-confidence and self-esteem.

The honors students enjoyed the frequent opportunities to interact with their peers and the faculty. They experienced a sense of belonging to a special community of learners who worked together on class projects and socialized frequently. The program coordinator played an integral part of their feelings of positive identification with the program and the college. Although they initially resisted attending cultural activities, students acknowledged that they were exposed to new ideas and cultures as well as increased campus connections. Those Honors Fellows who participated in student activities and were involved on campus in other ways affirmed that these activities benefitted both themselves and others.

Most faculty joined the program because they wanted to work with motivated students and to explore developing new elements within their courses. Others participated because of divisional assignments or requests by colleagues.

Although faculty were to be selected based on training and specific criteria, the assignments varied because of established divisional procedures. The fact that some faculty were initially identified over others resulted in initial feelings of alienation and resentment, but those feelings dissipated after the program had been operating for several years. The proposed evaluation process which incorporated the coordinator's collection of students' written evaluations and classroom visits by the Associate Deans was contrary to accepted faculty evaluation procedures and was eventually dropped.

At the program's inception, formal and informal interaction between the coordinator and faculty was frequent. Honors Program Committee and Faculty meetings occurred regularly but then diminished in frequency. Some faculty who

joined the program in the third, fourth, and fifth year expressed feelings of isolation from their honors colleagues. Informal discussion between honors and non-honors faculty on honors program's issues was rare. Many honors faculty, however, believed the honors program improved the quality of teaching and enhanced the curriculum in non-honors classes.

The following chapter will summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the program based on the students, faculty, and administrative responses.

CHAPTER V

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

This chapter summarizes each subject group's perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Honors Program. It starts with an analysis of the program's strengths according to the students' views, followed by similar analysis from the administrators and then the faculty. This section concludes with a summary of common themes which emerged from all three groups. The second part of the chapter addresses the program's weaknesses. Students' ideas on the program's weaknesses are presented first, followed by administrative and faculty perspectives. A summary of the participants' opinions of the program's weaknesses concludes the chapter.

Program Strengths

Student Perceptions

Overall, student satisfaction with the Honors Program was high among the students regardless of ethnicity, gender, major, or GPA. However, the two Honors Fellows admitted in Fall, 1991 displayed weak dissatisfaction and identification with the program. Student satisfaction related to specific program components is summarized in Table 23.

TABLE 23

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF HONORS PROGRAM'S STRENGTHS

Strengths	N=25
Taught by Excellent Faculty	18
Provides Challenge to Students	13
Provides Opportunities for Social Interaction	13
Prepares Students for Transfer	10
Offers Special Features:	
- Classroom Discussion	6
- Small Classes	5
- Early Registration	5
- Cultural Activities	4
- Writing Focus	4
- Critical Thinking	3
- Advising	3
- Scholarships	3

Honors Fellows. While Honors Fellows identified excellent teachers as the program's greatest strength, 11 students were quick to point out that they believed CLC honors and non-honors faculty were of equal quality. The students praised their instructors' flexibility, availability, and encouragement. The students believed faculty gave them respect and valued their opinion.

> That was important at that point because, you know, you come out of high school and you are just sure nobody is ever going to listen to you ever again. (S16)

Twelve honors students also explained that they liked the challenge of the program. One student explained how the high ability and strong motivation of his peers reinforced his resolve to concentrate on academics.

> I could associate with the group I was with better because we were all on the same level. I don't know if it's called intelligence or education level. We were all going for advanced classes. We got along better. There wasn't the struggle in the class that some don't want to learn this. Everyone was real serious about the work. It made it easier for all of us to focus on that kind of work, including myself. (S4)

Non-Honors Fellows. The two student interviewees not in the Honors Program believed that the strengths of the honors program centered around the curriculum. They agreed that the challenge of harder classes and the competition of better students within the classroom raised the level of academic performance and helped prepare students for the demands at four-year colleges and universities. One former athlete explained:

> If you surround yourself with better players of any kind . . . of sport . . . it would bring your level of play up. So, . . . if you are in a classroom with better students, it can only add to . . . [your] own learning. (S23)

The other student pointed out how his attitude toward learning changed by studying with honors students.

> At first, I really didn't care, it was--you know--just get done here as quickly as you possibly can. But I think the turn-around was when I started tutoring and got to know a lot of brainier people, as they call them. I realized that they are pretty interesting people . . . and there is nothing square or dorky about studying and doing well in your classes. (S14)

Administrative Perceptions

Administrators believed the Honors Program had many strengths. Their comments focused on the benefits for students, faculty, and the college. See Table 24 for a summary of their comments related to each group.

TABLE 24

ADMINISTRATIVE PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS

Strengths	N=10
STUDENTS:	
- Challenges Students	7
- Appeals to "Above Average" Student	6
- Involves Students in Cultural Activities	5
- Brings Students Together	4
- Provides Comprehensiveness, Structure	3
- Incorporates Quality Faculty Teaching Classes	2
- Enhances Transfer to Four-Year College	2
- Ensures Personal Attention to Students	2
- Fosters Student Recognition	1
- Provides Group Advisement	1
- Encourages Participation on Campus	1
FACULTY:	
- Renews Faculty	4
- Provides Comprehensiveness, Structure	3
COLLEGE:	
- Can Become a Marketing Tool	4
- Contributes to the Comprehensiveness of Community College Mission	1
- Provides Opportunities for Associate Deans to Observe Faculty in Classroom	1

One administrator described those multiple benefits.

It obviously appeals to the student who is above average in high school that is going to be coming to a community college. So for that segment of the population, I think, it serves them well. It could be that it is a breath of fresh air for some faculty also to be able to deal with that population of students in a homogeneous group. Going to the more superficial, it might have some potential as a marketing tool in the sense that if the college does attract and well serve bright students then other people will be aware of that. . . . so by the same token, if the College of Lake County recruits honors students and enrolls honors students and those students go back to their home communities well pleased, it adds something to the understanding of the comprehensiveness of the community college. (A1)

Other administrators believed the quality of classes was another important aspect.

> One strength is that it is a place for students who have identified themselves as honors students who are not going off to a four-year college or university. It is a place that they can come to and believe that they are still going to be honors students, so it is another offering. (A4)

> From the faculty who are involved with the program and regardless of their concerns, they teach the coursework at a strong caliber. They pay attention to the students and they are very committed to the students. And the actual instructional experience is good. (A6)

Administrators also recognized the importance of community that the coordinator established with the students.

> He formed a group and it brought about that connectedness to college that I think is so important. He had a group of students who associated with one another. They had a faculty member that they worked closely with and just that alone - forget any of the other opportunities - that provided, I would hope, a very positive experience. (A9)

> The program is clearly defined and another strength was the amount of personal attention that [he] gave students . . . from the recruitment through the advisement, he was really kind of an ombudsman for them. (A10)

Faculty Perceptions

Honors Faculty. The honors faculty's perceptions of the program's strengths reflected their experiences with the students and interaction with their colleagues. The faculty's comments are summarized in Table 25.

Faculty identified the program's major strength as being able to provide a learning community for motivated students.

TABLE 25

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS

Strengths	N=31
STUDENTS:	
- Fosters an Intellectual Community of Bright Students	13
- Challenges and Stimulates Students to Think	13
- Provides Enriched Classes for Students	8
- Provides Financial Support for Students	5
- Gets Students Involved on Campus	3
- Establishes a Structured, Comprehensive Program for Students	3
- Identifies a Special Advocate for Students	3
- Enhances Students' Self-esteem	2
- Involves Students in Cultural Activities	2
- Enhances Faculty and Student Interaction	1
FACULTY:	
- Challenges Faculty to Assess Material and Standards for "Regular Classes"	7
- Challenges Faculty to Grow	7
- Enhances Faculty and Student Interaction	1
COLLEGE:	
- Promotes Positive PR for the College	7

One of the great lacks here is that there are no opportunities for students to share ideas. Many people can come here for two years and really not have a conversation . . . It's quite possible that we would have these students come here anyway, but the important thing is that we are getting them together in one room. They are meeting other bright people . . . they create a kind of environment where they need one another to stimulate one another. And it is really difficult, I think, for a rather bright student in this general mileau to find a kind of intellectual whole where they can communicate with people. (F1)

Students seem to really know each other and they work well together in groups. I think that's part of learning, to learn how to work, not just

> by yourself, but with other people and it seems like these people have some sort of sense of community. (F10)

Teaching academically competent students energized faculty and motivated them to cover more material and to present more advance concepts within their honors courses.

> The students who have been recruited are certainly suitable students for the program. They are students who are different in capacity to understand and in capacity to incorporate their understanding in their work . . . They can set a thesis down and develop it. They can find their own errors to a much greater extent. They can revise on a much deeper, wider level . . . they don't resist being taught. They don't resist learning and therefore they make good students because they are students. (F3)

> You didn't have to spend all the time going over all the basic stuff and you could go ahead and do more advanced things and get more knowledge in terms of what you were doing. So I think they have accomplished a lot and they've gotten a real good education out of daily dealings in this whole process. (F7)

> For the faculty . . . it is renewing, it's invigorating, it makes you kind of rethink yourself. (F9)

> It does make whoever is teaching the course really assess what material they are covering, what standards that they have for students, do they have expectations for students who are brighter to challenge them and what do they do in a regular class with students who may have those abilities, do they actually do anything to help students in your regular class. (F2)

One instructor discussed the political and financial benefits of changing high school students' image.

> It provides positive PR through peer communication and keeps taxpayers from going to a different institution on the basis of an inaccurate perception of academic quality. (F4)

Non-Honors Faculty. Three non-honors faculty stated that the honors program

had no strengths. One admitted, however, that the only redeeming value of the honors program was the scheduling of nationally known speakers which the college community could enjoy.

Summary of Perceived Programmatic Strengths

Overall, there was some consensus in perceptions of program strengths. All three groups of interviewees said the program challenged and stimulated both faculty and students. It created an intellectual community which enhanced social interaction among faculty and students both in and outside of class. Some faculty and administrators also agreed that the program challenged faculty to compare the approaches in honors courses with techniques and materials prepared for non-honors classes.

Program Weaknesses

Student Perceptions

Honors Fellows. While the administrators praised the program's structure for its comprehensiveness and ability to fill both general education and transfer requirements, 14 students discussed problems posed for them because of the program requirement to complete 18 hours of honors curriculum courses with at least one course from each of the major disciplines, for example, science, math, social science, and humanities. They complained that they had to combine the honors requirements with graduation requirements and large numbers of specific courses required for transfer programs. This was especially difficult for students in the structured sequence designed to parallel the first two years of engineering at the University of

Illinois at Urbana. Since all of the science and engineering majors were required to take General Chemistry I and II and these courses were not a part of the Honors Program, many carried heavy loads and also had to resolve scheduling conflicts of honors courses offered at the same time as pre-engineering courses.

A student who eventually earned 85 credit hours at CLC explained:

> The courses that I had to take often conflicted with other things that I had to take for U of I or that I had to take to graduate . . . If you didn't fulfill the honors graduation requirements, you would be dropped from the program. If you didn't fulfill the Associate Degree requirement, no big deal because you would be going on to a Bachelor's Degree, but I felt it would be neat to have an Associate's Degree. (S2)

Several students recommended that the number and variety of honors courses be expanded.

> The types of classes that you can take in one given semester you only had a choice between about six or seven honors classes. They sometimes didn't always fit right. I think they should have more honors courses available. Figuring your schedule out was very hard because you only had a few courses to choose from. (S3)

> There should be more choices of which classes you can take or maybe more honors classes period, which would make it easier for you to fit it into your schedule, because I found I had a hard time scheduling my classes and trying to get my honors classes in at the same time. (S11)

Some students specifically complained that not having an honors chemistry section forced them to take additional courses. They also believed regular chemistry and biology classes could have been more challenging.

> . . . That was the semester I had to take honors courses in social sciences because there was nothing else to take and then I had to fit some of those time slots and they didn't coordinate at all with where I would need to take my chemistry and my math and my physics courses

> . . . that whole semester had nothing to do with my major at all. They paid for it, but it had nothing to do with my major. (S15)

> I would have liked to have seen an Honors Biology and an Honors General Chemistry. . . . I got B's in both my chemistry courses but I think I would have done better if I was more challenged whereas I felt it was a little bit easier I got a little more complacent because of that. The biology [class], I definitely thought, could have been more difficult the first semester. (S7)

Non-science majors also believed that more courses in a variety of departments should have been offered.

> I guess the one thing that I didn't like is how we had four different areas and we had to take an honors course in three of those four and me, not being a math or science person, I had to choose between two of them . . . I would think that you could take your eighteen hours in--choose more of your area. (S12)

> How about a broader variety of classes for one thing . . . I also disliked the fact that there were very few English classes obviously. And also one of the things that bothered me about it from the start was if these students are supposed to be a cut above the average, why are there entry level honors classes to begin with? Shouldn't that be, say secondary level? . . . I'd like to see an Honors Shakespeare class. (S13)

Some students felt that maintaining a 3.5 GPA was too difficult. Two students who dropped out of the program explained:

> The grade point is high. [I'd like to change] probably just the grade point average. (S20)

> I think the grade point average you have to get is high . . . If they would lower it a little bit I think most students could handle it better. (S22)

Although some faculty and students believed that the Honors Fellows were shy and quiet, a few students said they would have liked more opportunities for socializing.

> It might be nice if they had more things to bring them a little closer together and do stuff . . . have a picnic on Saturday . . . where it's just fun, volleyball, softball. And with 100 people, even if you got half of them to come that would still be a big group to be able to do stuff. That might be nice. (S6)

While the majority of students praised faculty, they were also quick to criticize those who didn't meet their expectations. Five students complained about ineffective teachers who were teaching honors courses. Two students criticized some teachers whose courses required more memorizing than understanding of complex issues.

> I felt the program could have been much more in-depth. They were in-depth but the material being covered wasn't really that complex. (S13)

> I don't think the exam was really more than just a memorization game. Just memorize it and write it down. There wasn't much real learning involved, just memorizing the material. (S1)

Honors students also believed that they should have had an active role in selection and evaluation of honors faculty, but some appeared to be confused about their own expectations.

> Not all the teachers are at the same level. Some won't go the extra mile, they're too hard. They expect too much. I guess it's kind of hard to decide what the line is. I guess it's experience that helps. I'd suggest that teachers be interviewed before they are selected to be an honors teacher. They need a strong evaluation before they can be in the program. (S18)

> I would definitely make the student advisory group a greater influence in the teacher selection . . . we talked to [the coordinator] about an ineffective teacher and we talked to the teacher's supervisor and we went as a group, the whole class, and talked to her and told her our problems. She is still teaching again this semester and the semester after we left her, our class went in groups to another teacher . . . she is still teaching but a lot of things she was doing has changed . . . We were able to get that done. (S17)

Additionally, some students were concerned that the program set up a dynamic which caused non-honors students to feel resentful because they were excluded from specific courses or received differential treatment.

> I think some people were a little resentful of the Honors Program . . . I don't think at least when I was here, a lot of people knew about the Honors Program . . . There may have been students who were resentful because they couldn't get into a class they wanted because it was an honors class. (S6)

> It's almost like in trying to make it sound better than it actually is, they are unintentionally demeaning the other sections which aren't the Honors Program and as a result, a lot of us didn't really feel superior, but we felt guilty because it seemed we were expected to feel superior. (S13)

There was some evidence that some non-honors students may have resented honors students getting scholarships. In a survey distributed to 99 chemistry students in the Spring 1990 semester, 25 students said that scholarships at CLC should only be awarded to students who are in need of financial support (R. Brasile, personal communication, November 5, 1991).

Non-Honors Fellows. An engineering major who was not in the program believed some of the honors courses weren't any more difficult than regular classes. ". . . I don't know that those classes were so much harder than any normal class" (S23). This student didn't qualify for the program in high school and criticized admission criteria for high school students. As a current CLC student, he received no response to his inquiry about admission criteria and quit trying to be admitted.

> It should be judged not solely on GPA. I worked all through high school and played football and track. None of that is taken into account. They simply looked at the GPA's and selected who would be in the Honors Program. However, if they actually looked at like

> maybe a transcript which would show that a student is active in Student Council, extracurricular activities, an interview may have helped . . . if I had been asked or given an opportunity to apply I definitely would have. (S23)

The other non-honors student complained that the honors program course requirements were difficult for some pre-engineering students . He also argued that the program should be more accessible to currently enrolled students.

Table 26 summarizes all of the students' perceptions of the program's weaknesses.

TABLE 26

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE HONORS PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

Weaknesses	N=25
Incorporates Complex Course Selection Requirements	13
Mandates Cultural Activities	9
Assigns Ineffective Faculty	5
Includes Insufficient Opportunities for Socialization for Students and Faculty	3
Provides Poor Communication on Program Requirements and Activities (Fall, 1991 Students)	2
Offers Inadequate Career Guidance and Transfer Information	2

Administrative Perceptions

Administrators believed the program suffered from a lack of perceived access to currently enrolled students, diverse students, older students, career students, and part-time students. This was not only most frequently identified as a weakness, but also noted as the one aspect that needed to be changed.

> I think Honors Programs could have people from any age group in them, from any racial, ethnic group in them. . . . there are a lot of reasons why they tend not to be that way. That doesn't mean they have to be that way just because they are. I think those things are problems. (A4)

> Have an Honors Program that allows more entry to the program, allows access to at multiple points and takes challenges that students understand and want to succeed with. What we tried to do was build a very closed narrow program. We need to expand the track a little bit more. . . . I think one of the things you want to try to do is help those [honors] students get some differing experiences . . . and I am not so sure but what we couldn't profit from having an adult or two in the program as opposed to traditionally aged students. (A6)

One administrator explained that the lack of perceived access may have negatively impacted faculty perceptions about the program.

> I think that we need to open up the program to our present students, especially to those who are older students. Right now, it is virtually impossible . . . if you are a full-time student or nearly so and come into the program with anything meaningful because essentially you are there for one semester before you find out about it. You have to take the honors courses before you are eligible--then you have to apply for it. By that time, you are in your last semester if you are full-time. So there is no point. If you are a part-time student, you might be able to string that out several years and be eligible for it. The program is basically set up for full-time, young, college transfer students. I am not sure that is wise. Again, that is part of what hurt it in the acceptance with the faculty. They said, "Well, we have other good students. We have other scholastically excellent students as well as needy students, but if we are rewarding scholastic excellence, we can't just award kids that tuition scholarship. We have to also award it to our older students who are also very good." (A7)

Administrators also believed the program should be more accessible to career students, minority students, and students in financial need.

> I am not sure we've truly been open to people who have proven themselves at CLC. I'm not sure we have really promoted the program for career students so I am not sure we have promoted the program for all students. (A9)

> It's the only group getting that kind of full ride and they are mostly white middle-class kids with the means to pay for it. I think another weakness, though I think it's understandable, is the inability of the program to attract minority students. . . . I think a weakness of the program is the lack of openness to currently enrolled students . . . (A10)

An administrator questioned the impact of pulling high ability students out of regular classes.

> I still think the presence of people in classes who have a greater level of--I don't want to say intelligence because that is maybe not the right word--but they have a history of performing better academically and I think that helps a class. (A3)

Administrators criticized the program's establishment of a structure that functioned outside of already established college-wide systems. The college admission process was separate from the honors program admission process. This separation prevented other offices from being involved with the program and also caused a heavy workload for the program's coordinator.

> The recruitment office staff weren't welcomed by the program's coordinator. The college's Public Relations Office was not involved in promoting the program. (A6)

> It really needs to be integrated into on-going campus functions and that would take some of the burden off the coordinator. (A10)

Four administrators said they believed the retention requirements were too high. Others expressed serious concern that no faculty stepped forward to take on the coordinator's role. Furthermore, no evaluation system was established to assess whether the program was needed and if it was achieving its goals.

> [The coordinator] made some conclusions about the [abilities of] students who came to the College of Lake County. I am not sure whether those were representative or not. I guess what I am saying is

> that he may have been looking at a biased sample in trying to show that his program did attract them. I know that he feels it did and significantly increase it. I have not personally seen or done any research that would say one way or another. (A1)

> I don't know if the Honors Program has been evaluated in the context that we evaluate other programs . . . without sounding accusatory, he [the coordinator] also has the most to gain by having the favorable impression represented of it. (A3)

Since the goals of the program never were accepted by all of the faculty, there were problems at its establishment and during its on-going operation.

> It may just be that the egalitarian values of CLC, especially of the faculty, are so widely spread that this culture just can't support an honors program. (A10)

> Part of their, chemists', antagonism for the Honors Program had to do with ideas of elitism and spending college funds for these scholastically bright, but not necessarily financially needy students. (A7)

> I believe more could be done to have the program gain greater acceptance within the college. Greater acceptance by faculty, by all of the faculty. (A4)

Other administrators believed that the quality of the Honors Program was weakened by scheduling faculty to teach honors who are neither trained nor suited to work with these students. In addition, the quality of the courses themselves had to be special and challenging.

> It wasn't just simply an accelerated class, same subject, same delivery, only maybe a few more topics, but rather it was a different approach. That it was giving a greater emphasis to critical thinking skills. (A5)

One administrator believed that faculty's focus on academics in these courses was too narrow and needed to be expanded to be more effective.

> How that instructor then, can, from my perception, deal with the whole student rather than just their subject matter. (A2)

Finally, one administrator worried about the negative impact these honors courses could have on grading procedures in regular courses.

> If my course is at freshman and sophomore level and I give A's in my course, are you saying that an A in the honors section is more valuable than the A? . . . Several things are bothering me . . . I hear from some faculty that whether it is our placement method, whether it is a fact that we have established prerequisites or have not established prerequisites, whatever it may be at least in some areas, they feel like they are really watering down their courses. I don't want to do anything to promote that, and if through the Honors Program we are saying, "Your course is a second level" then we are doing something that I think is wrong. (A10)

Table 27 summarizes administrators' perceptions of the program's weaknesses.

TABLE 27

ADMINISTRATIVE PERCEPTIONS OF HONORS PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

Weaknesses	N=10
Does not Represent Diverse Student Population	6
Operates Outside of Existing College Systems	6
Utilizes No Evaluation System to Measure Program's Goals	4
Lacks Faculty Acceptance	4
Functions Without Coordinator	4
Requires Excessively High GPA for Retention	4
Promotes Values Inconsistent with Community College Mission	4
Fails to Utilize Honors Program Committee	2
Demeans Non-Honors Classes	1

Faculty Perceptions

Honors Faculty. The faculty's comments on the program's weaknesses were

similar in some ways to administrators and students, but in many ways reflected unique perspectives.

Students' homogeneity was the programmatic weakness most frequently discussed by faculty.

> The students are so stylized, both in ages and experiences, all being recent high school graduates . . . I would certainly try to bring in older students. (F1)

> They tend to be very conservative, very narrow, very set. They are not imaginative or creative, gifted . . . they have often been in groups that are very, very single dimension as far as ethnic difference or where religious difference is concerned. (F3)

> We don't have older students in the program and having a variety of students, in terms of cultures and so forth, does enrich a class. And that is something that's missing. (F18)

> I think the other weakness is the fact that it really does limit the program to high school graduates, recent high school graduates. I think it would be better for the students in there if they could have some of these same experiences that our non-honors students have. Having older students, having people who take a different look at things who, you know, I really feel that they miss that as well as I miss that. (F30)

On a related issue, four faculty specifically talked about some students who weren't of the caliber they expected from an honors student. One instructor questioned whether their high school programs had prepared them for the rigor and challenge of the honors courses.

> They were students who had learned how to write a paper and to proofread it . . . they weren't going much beyond. I didn't see many of them more challenged to really broaden themselves. (F2).

> Their dependency on this memorizing everything and the fact that they don't have any inductive reasoning skills . . . some of their writing skills I found deplorable. (F19)

The retention rates of honors students within the program disappointed some faculty.

> . . . we're finding out that of the fifty that started, you might only have fifteen or twenty that actually have the grade point average left to actually say they were in honors . . . whether that's because of outside jobs or whether it's maybe they weren't able to do the coursework. I'm not sure. (F10)

Some faculty believed that the GPA maintenance requirements were too high and caused unnecessary stress and attrition and prevented students from taking risks.

> We lose a lot of kids out of the program because they can't maintain their grade point average. And maybe again, there should be more of a support system or counseling. (F9).

> . . . 3.5 is a high grade point average and I wonder if it keeps people from taking risks, exploring . . . I'm wondering if we don't really make them stick to the safe and narrow, the familiar because of that . . . I looked at the statistics and there were a lot of people between 3.0 and 3.5. Are those kids failures? I mean, we're talking if they had three classes, they had an A, a B, and a C or two A's and a C. I mean, that's not a terrible thing. (F30)

A few faculty also disliked the honors students' disrespect for learning.

> Some of these people who have scored very high have a very bad attitude toward learning and they are actually . . . screwing up the program, negatively contributing to it. (F16)

> There is an attitudinal kind of confrontation that I had to overcome that if they had had bad experiences in an honors course before, I was on a kind of probation . . . I almost had to pass their test before I was considered respectable. (F28)

Even though the honors program required students to take only eighteen hours of honors courses, many faculty worried about the effect of siphoning good students from their class. They believed honors students and regular students benefitted academically from being in the same class.

> Syphoning them off from some of the regular classes may be weakening some of the other classes, perhaps making them more homogeneous, but more homogeneous in a bad sense. So I mean they are kept together as a group all the way through here and I mean not just in certain classes which would be okay, but I mean in all their classes they are taking all the same classes together and they are throughout their entire college experience here. Some of the other classes have probably suffered by not having some of these people in their classes. (F7)

> It really didn't help your calculus class in general. When you right away took these persons who . . . had a high probability of doing real well in the calculus and isolating them by themselves and not giving other students the benefit of an opportunity to interact with these people and raise their own achievement levels that was kind of unfortunate when . . . a positive point was isolating them, well that is also a negative point because it takes them out of the mainstream. (F11)

Seven faculty believed that providing scholarships to entice these students to attend CLC was unnecessary, inappropriate, and alienated many faculty.

> I think it is a good program. I think we ought to have it, I just don't like them getting tuition-free . . . a number of teachers do not like the program . . . they believe we're trying to be the Harvard of the West, if you will, by setting up an honors program. These students get their tuition free and that irks many faculty who have poor students in class who can barely pay tuition and the honors people, most of them from middle-class or wealthy homes who are perfectly able to pay tuition and they are given it free. That irks a lot of faculty and it irks me too. I think our tuition rates are much too high here for the kind of people we need to serve and that is people who are poor and don't have any skills. (F6)

> One of the causes of poor feeling among some of the faculty that they told me why they didn't support honors was that the honors students received tuition-free courses and these students usually are not really needy so that they were really rewarding the affluence with their offering. (F29)

> The free tuition aspect is problematic. Not because they get free tuition, but perhaps because there should be a stipend after the course is over with, not before. They earn it . . . There is some sense that

> they're here for a free ride and there is something unethical about that . . . they feel like they have already merited it. (F28)

Faculty also criticized the inadequacy of the science component of the honors curriculum.

> They didn't have this rounded program since they couldn't get the chemistry in there. And the first couple of semesters we did have a lot of science majors and that was a real problem for them. (F12)

Faculty also needed more written and verbal communication from the coordinator. New honors faculty should have received more information on the goals of the program and more faculty meetings should have been held to share concerns.

> As it turned out, there is nothing printed, there is no pamphlet that I know of, nothing was given to me. I should have been asked, "What do you intend to do or this is what has been done in the past" . . . so the weaknesses are lack of communication. (F29)

> There probably ought to be more interaction among the faculty that are teaching it . . . in terms of colloquium or in terms of trying to prepare certain things together, but a variety of things like that. (F2)

> I did feel very alone once it started and I would have liked to have known if what I was doing was what Doug wanted. I guess I'd like to have see more camaraderie between faculty that were doing it that semester. (F20)

Some faculty believed the program was weakened when unqualified and unprepared instructors taught in it.

> It is important we choose our best staff members . . . We have too many three o'clock faculty who are just going to teach their classes and not be here when the students need them for other kinds of things. You've got to be careful with faculty and teaching it. (F6)

> They were doing it on a rotational basis in the social science department. They weren't meeting the criteria that we initially established to have met certain requirements for teaching an honors class. (F14)

> Originally I think it was set up so that [the coordinator] probably picked or asked people to be in the program and teach the classes school wide. And then it got to the point where just anybody that volunteered would be assigned to teach the class and I think that was a mistake. (F5)

Although no full-time faculty were willing to take the coordinator's position, they believed that the program would weaken quickly without a leader.

> One of the biggest downfalls of the program now that he has gotten out of it, I don't know who will step in there and really do the job. (F5)

> It may not even be around a year from now, to be quite honest, I don't really know. But it is going to have to have some kind of leadership. (F1).

> Unless you have somebody who is really gung-ho, pressing it all the time, it could fall apart. (F18)

Several faculty discussed the heavy workload as a major stumbling block which prevented faculty from volunteering to take on the coordinator's role.

> It can't be run the way it is. It takes one person's obsessed, driven commitment to take it to make it run, and it can't go that way. It has to be backed off in terms of workload. (F4)

> I fear the program is going to go down the drain now that [the coordinator] is not handling it, not that anybody else couldn't handle it, but I don't think there are teachers willing to spend the time that [he] did. (F6)

One faculty member believed that if the coordinator had shared some of his responsibilities with other faculty from the beginning, their response at his resignation might have been different.

> Let me play devil's advocate here. If [the coordinator] had handpicked all of the teachers at the beginning, why wasn't he successful in convincing any of them to take on the program when he was tired of it? What I've seen at CLC is that when you have a faculty member who is committed to an idea, the idea flourishes as long as that faculty member

> is committed to it and . . . when they decide to do something else there is no one there to step in and perhaps if [he] had taken the circle of original faculty into a closer knit group, then if perhaps [he] gave them some of the responsibilities, maybe that would have continued. (F18)

Non-Honors Faculty. The non-honors faculty criticized the honors program because it promoted a sense of elitism. They argued that "community colleges by their very nature have been very egalitarian and we thought this [honors program] was in direct opposition to that" (F22).

All three teachers explained that they preferred to have a mix of students in their classes. They believed diversity enhances learning for both the bright students and the weaker students.

> We want all the good students in our class that we can get so they can interact with the other students. Separating these students away from the general population . . . was a mistake . . . they are really a benefit to those students. (F22)

> Those [honors] students might . . . do better in a rough-and-tumble class where there's more diversity certainly of ages and racial backgrounds, occupations and everything because they are pretty insulated eighteen-year-olds. (F24)

> If this program succeeded in attracting your better students out of your other sections . . . then you diluted the classes that are their bread and butter at this place. If you syphon off three or four or five outstanding students who then are not part of the discussion in the regular class, you may actually have caused some deterioration in the quality of that class. (F21)

> You want that diversity, that's what makes our classes good is we get a diversity . . . in age and social class and race and sex . . . you need people to draw on different experiences when you get into a discussion. (F21)

These faculty also criticized the program because it gave scholarships to students who were not required to demonstrate financial need. They believed the

program should be more accessible to non-traditional college students, older students, career students, and minorities.

They also argued that the college's resources should be to assist students who were more at risk.

> The way it is set up where the honors students get into smaller classes is topsy-turvy. I think the students who have more problems should be in smaller classes because they need more attention. (F24)

They believed smaller classes offered at prime times should be available to academically weak students and that faculty should be given release time to design curriculum and explore new techniques to enhance their learning.

Two faculty shared concerns about quality and academic standards that reflected the core of much of the controversy connected to the program from its inception.

> I think if a college is worth a damn, it doesn't need an accelerated track. In other words, there is college level instruction or there isn't. I mean if you've got a remedial class, that's one thing. If somebody can't cut it, you create remedial programs. But to suggest that the mainstream curriculum is somehow remedial and that if you want truly a college level class, well then you have to get it in this special accelerated program. Again, it is an inditement of the average college level class [in the community college]. Every college level class ought to be taught in such a way that it doesn't seem simplistic to an A student who I presume are the kinds he thinks he's attracting with the program. (F21)

> I think that good instruction is expected at college and people get good instruction in . . . honors and they get good instruction in . . . non-honors. (F24)

Each of the non-honors faculty had specific criticisms of the program. One noted that the program lacked sufficient opportunities for faculty to interact with one

another and also operated outside of CLC's standard procedures. Another instructor believed that one of the initial premises of the program which claimed that CLC did not attract top-notch students was incorrect. He also criticized the program for not incorporating an evaluation component to measure the program's effects on students.

Table 28 summarizes the faculty's perceptions of the program's weaknesses.

TABLE 28

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE HONORS PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

Weakness	N=31
Does Not Accommodate Student Diversity	16
Syphons Off Good Students from Regular Classes	8
Provides Insufficient Communication Opportunities to Faculty	8
Assigns Faculty Without Training	8
Offers Scholarship Based on Academic Merit, Rather Than Financial Need	7
Incorporates Excessive Workload for Coordinator	7
Lacks Sufficient Cultural Enrichment Activities	6
Ignores Students' Need for Counseling	6
Operates Without Comprehensive Faculty Approval	6
Admits Unqualified Students	4
Curriculum Requirements:	
- Incomplete (No Chemistry)	4
- Excessive GPA Retention Standards	2
- Insufficient Interdisciplinary Focus	2
- Insufficient Variety of Classes	2
- Demeaning to Non-Honors Classes	2
Allows Students to Work Excessively	3
Promotes Values Inconsistent with Community College Mission	2
Encourages Curriculum and Program Development Without Opening Discussion to All Faculty	2
Lacks Diverse Faculty Assignments	1
Provides Insufficient Opportunities for Informal Interaction Between Students and Faculty	1

Summary of Perceived Programmatic Weaknesses

The weaknesses of the Honors Program can be considered from two different perspectives. One major problem related to administrative concerns. The initial program design may have been unrealistic. It created such an extensive workload for the coordinator so that no other faculty would assume those responsibilities when he resigned. It also excluded several other college offices (i.e., admissions, recruitment, and public relations) from participating in the program. The initial plan also proposed procedures for faculty selection and evaluation which were contrary to current college procedures and thus were doomed to fail. The high retention requirements reinforced the students' pre-occupation with grades and quickly eliminated many students from the program.

More importantly, the concept of the Honors Program established dynamics which were contrary to values expressed by all three groups. Isolating academically elite students from regular students produced feelings of resentment by regular students and their faculty, and prevented both groups of students from interacting with one another. The Honors Program promoted a sense of elitism which was contrary to the college's commitment of access to students with financial need. It also implicitly communicated to students and faculty in regular classes that they were "second class" in quality and importance.

The following chapter will summarize the key findings of this study and discuss their implications as they relate to the community college's mission of access and commitment to quality.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Researchers and practitioners agree that students' cognitive, affective, and behavioral development can be affected by the college environment. This study sought to examine what effects the Honors Program at the College of Lake County had on the students who participated in it. This study also set out to assess what effects the program had on the faculty, administrators and other students within the larger college community.

The methodology was based on Scriven's Goal-Free Evaluation Model which considers multiple perspectives from a variety of sources to achieve a more valid and reliable examination of data. The researcher interviewed 66 subjects who were involved with the Honors Program. They included 25 students, 31 faculty, and 10 administrators who participated in a standardized open-ended interview to determine their perspectives about the program's effects. Information from the transcripts of these interviews was coded and organized into matrices related to the expected and unexpected outcomes of the program. Documents associated with the program were also analyzed and incorporated within the study.

This chapter summarizes and discusses the findings and their implications for

community colleges and future research related to student development, faculty development, and the mission of the community college.

Honors Program's Effects

Honors Fellows

This investigation indicated that the Honors Program affected students in several positive ways. Essentially, the Honors Fellows reflected a similar profile--18-year-old Caucasians--who were shy, quiet, and cautious. The students described how they became comfortable in small classes with their peers and began to enjoy participating in class discussions. Students who had relied on memorization and standard formats for research papers improved their writing skills while gaining confidence and clarity in expressing their own ideas. Increased writing activities in various courses reinforced concepts and helped students see connections between disciplines. As they had to take stands on controversial issues and were expected to identify fallacies in others' thinking, their critical thinking skills developed and self-confidence increased. Honors courses which required group projects encouraged different types of study. Honors students began collaborating on homework assignments and class projects. Although their academic profile was not as strong as faculty initially expected, the students' motivation and study habits enabled them to meet faculty's challenging academic demands.

Additional requirements to attend cultural activities and opportunities to participate in campus government and clubs resulted in new friendships, enhanced opportunities for personal growth, and encouraged a sense of belonging to the campus

community. Finally, the personal attention they received from the Honors Program Coordinator significantly impacted the students' self-esteem, their positive identification with the college, and their satisfaction with the program.

Students who completed the honors program also believed that the challenges they met through the honors courses prepared them well for the academic rigors that they encountered when they transferred to a four-year college or university. As they made those transitions, they also maintained friendships with students and connections with faculty they met in the program.

These findings are consistent with the majority of researchers who claim that the primary reasons for establishing honors programs in four-year and two-year schools are to challenge academically elite students (Austin, 1986; Aydelotte, 1944; Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Piland, McKeague, & Montgomery, 1987). These findings also are consistent with the evaluation literature which indicates that honors programs increase intellectual self-esteem, interpersonal self-esteem, faculty-student interaction, and student satisfaction with the quality of instruction (Astin, 1977; Montgomery, 1991; Pflaum, Pascarella, & Duby, 1985; Ory & Braskamp, 1988).

Honors Faculty

The Honors Program's effect on the faculty is another important issue of this study. The majority of faculty assigned to teach the Honors Fellows expressed greater satisfaction in working with more prepared, motivated, and able students than they have in regular classes.

The faculty's incorporation of additional readings, writing assignments, critical thinking activities, and classroom discussion reflected their commitment to challenge students to higher levels of academic achievement. Their curricular modifications enhanced the quality of honors courses by exposing students to primary sources, requiring writing which encouraged reflection and careful examination of ideas and facts, and encouraging students to participate in classroom discussions.

Furthermore, designing new activities and assignments for these students encouraged some faculty to experiment with new pedagogy and also to introduce similar activities in their non-honors courses. After their honors experience, some faculty reported that they exposed non-honors students to primary sources, asked them to discuss controversial issues, and required different types of writing in a wide variety of courses. These findings are consistent with those researchers who believe that establishing honors programs renew faculty in all types of institutions and strengthen the quality of academic programs (Armstrong, 1989; Austin, 1975; Friedlander, 1982; Friedman & Jenkins-Friedman, 1986; Halverson, 1973; Parsons, 1984; Skau, 1989).

On the other hand, the establishment of the Honors Program had different effects on other faculty. Six faculty who taught in the program left it because they discovered that they did not enjoy teaching these students. They disliked the attitudes many of the students displayed toward learning and believed the students were more interested in grades than learning. They disliked the students' arrogant attitudes and their cliques. One instructor's observations reflected the feelings of several teachers.

> They have some very exalted notions about themselves that "we are Honors . . . we are different" . . . the grade is what is vital to them. (F3)

The assignment of honors faculty was also problematic. The Honors Program Proposal stated that:

> Honors faculty will be chosen by the Honors Committee working in concert with the Associate Deans. Selection will be based upon student evaluations, classroom visitations by their respective Associate Deans, and evidence that they have completed coursework necessary to provide suitable instruction in writing and critical thinking. (Sherman, 1985, p. 11)

While it appears that the Honors Program Coordinator intended to work with the committee in the faculty selection process, it soon became apparent that such decisions were fraught with political and personal ramifications.

Historically, assignment of faculty for courses had been the responsibility of the Associate Dean. The actual process varied within departments and divisions but usually was the result of mutual decisions and compromises by administrators and faculty. It appears that the actual selection process of honors faculty was eventually left to the Associate Deans who interpreted the selection criteria differently. While one division followed the rules very literally and only assigned those who had participated in training, another Associate Dean assigned the responsibility on a rotating basis. A seasoned part-timer was assigned to teach in the program because there were so few full-time faculty in that division willing to teach in the program. There was also some evidence that initial selection of certain faculty over others may have been related to some feelings of faculty resentment and resistance to the program.

Also, having the coordinator visit classrooms and collect student evaluations created some faculty hostility because both procedures were contrary to college practice. Tenured faculty evaluations were normally handled entirely through faculty peer review committees and the results have not been shared with the Associate Dean. While it was unclear how many faculty cooperated with the honors faculty evaluation process, some faculty resisted any involvement by the Honors Program Coordinator in faculty evaluation. Thus, when students complained about specific faculty teaching in the Honors Program, the Coordinator had no power to intervene. Some honors students recommended that they participate in the selection and evaluation process of faculty.

The Honors Program Proposal noted that the honors program committee would meet monthly to monitor the goals and objectives of the program, review syllabi for honors courses, and supervise the inclusion of critical thinking as well as expanded reading and writing skills within honors courses. While the role of faculty was integral to the delivery and oversight of the program, it appears that the involvement of the honors committee diminished as the program became operationalized. As the program entered its third and fourth year, there was little evidence that honors faculty and honors program committee members met regularly to share their vision for the program and to support those new faculty who were assigned to teach in it. While some faculty explained that they had other priorities that prevented them from attending meetings, other faculty believed their teaching and their connection with the program would have been enhanced by more formal and informal interactions.

Administrators, Faculty-At-Large, and Students-At-Large

Administrators agreed that the primary benefactors of the honors program were the honors students. They acknowledged the positive effects of a challenging curriculum as well as the sense of community that the program promoted. Some administrators also believed that the honors program renewed faculty and could have become a marketing tool to recruit students.

The Honors Program established procedures which also affected administrators and other faculty. The program's structure was intended to ensure quality control while functioning outside of already established college-wide systems. All recruitment, public relations, and admission functions were handled through the Honors Program Coordinator. Program information for new and currently enrolled students not seen by the Honors Program Coordinator could not be circulated by the Office for Student Recruitment. Program brochures were developed by the coordinator, not by Public Relations. Moreover, information about individual student records was not always readily available to staff from the Admissions Office. Eventually, this heavy workload became overwhelming for the coordinator and he resigned. Faculty's perception of his heavy workload prevented others from coming forward to take his place. Consequently, the program was without a coordinator for a year.

Since there was little information on the extent of informal communication between honors and non-honors faculty during the program's establishment, it was difficult to assess the program's effect on more than 130 faculty who did not

participate in it. Documents related to the establishment of the program provided some evidence that non-honors faculty were most affected during the year when the program was being discussed and the structure of the curriculum and related elements were being explored. As the Honors Program Committee met during the summer of 1985 to develop the structure for an Honors Program, the news of their project circulated to the divisions. It soon became clear that there were faculty in several divisions opposed to the concept of an honors program. Much of their resistance was based on their interpretation of the egalitarian mission of the community college. The chemistry faculty were most vocal in their opposition, and copies of their opinions were circulated to their Associate Dean and the Vice-President for Educational Affairs.

Faculty who resisted the establishment of the Honors Program believed it represented elitist values. First of all, they opposed segregation of students in class according to ability. They were convinced that learning was enhanced when students of all abilities were grouped together. A memo summarized their attitudes.

> The chemistry department unanimously voted disagreement with the Honors Program Proposal submitted to them this week . . . The concern of this group centers around the separation of the superb student from the rest of the student population even if it is only for a portion of his/her course work at the college. Awarding of scholarships when no financial need is demonstrated was also a concern. The program, in general, seemed too elitist in nature. (R. Brasile, personal communication, October 4, 1985)

This memo identified another program component that many faculty opposed--the awarding of merit scholarships. Honors faculty voiced a common concern.

> I really don't believe these people deserve the free tuition when we have so many other people who need money for tuition . . . we have bright, poor students . . . who have difficulty paying for the tuition and books and I think that is where the money ought to go rather than for honor students who, for the most part from what I could determine, are from middle-class or upper [class] families. (F6)

This issue reinforced administrators' views related to merit scholarships.

> I also know that merit in many cases is also socially determined. If you are white and if you are upper-middle class, you have a much better chance of being academically meritorious than if you are black or hispanic or poor. And to the extent that the community college is about equal access to all those people I'd rather see . . . the scholarships of Honors Fellows based on some kind of need basis . . . my gut tells me that the values of the organization just don't support [merit scholarships] very fully. (A10)

The fact that the honors students were essentially a young Caucasian group of students enrolled in a transfer program reinforced faculty perceptions that this group did not visibly represent the characteristics of non-traditional diverse students who populate community colleges--students who were older, minorities, of lower socio-economic status, part-time, and interested in career or technical programs. While scholarships represented a significant expense, additional administrative costs exacerbated the perceptions that these funds could be better spent to benefit needy students. There was also some evidence that the Honors Program was perceived by some students as a closed group. A few honors students stated that they believed non-honors students resented being excluded from specific courses. Two non-honors students argued that the program should be more accessible to currently enrolled students.

Another more significant issue arose--the quality of the courses. Some students, faculty, and administrators argued that the honors program set up a dynamic which suggested that regular [non-honors] courses were second-rate.

> We can best serve the superior student NOT by developing special chemistry courses, but by keeping up the quality of what we offer . . . How does placing the gifted students in a special program upgrade the non-honors courses? The people with the gifts will be in a class by themselves rather than providing role models for the "regular" students. (R. Weichman, personal communication, October 2, 1985)

Other faculty and administrators expressed concern about the value of grades in honors courses vs. non-honors courses. They explained that grades in honors courses may be perceived as having more value than those in non-honors courses.

Much of this discussion focused on a primary question: What is the best learning environment for college students? These questions have circulated and been widely debated in American higher education for 80 years. Even when Aydelotte argued in 1924 that it was important to separate bright students from those less interested in intellectual pursuits, his approach was perceived as being contrary to the egalitarian principles of the American educational system. Thus, it should be no surprise to discover that honors programs may be contrary to the ethos of the community college advocates who perceive community colleges to be the ports of entry into higher education. These findings reinforce Olivas' (1975) findings about how honors programs create feelings of elitism and antagonism on community college campuses.

One faculty member discussed how the program was problematic because it encouraged a sense of elitism even among the faculty.

> Given all the factors that lead towards democratization of the college, the absence of rank for themselves, those kinds of things are a part of many people's principles and therefore the concept of selecting out an elite group [of faculty] disrupts the wrong way. (F8)

An administrator agreed.

> There are a lot of faculty that believed that all faculty are equal, that they are all professionals and one is not any better than the other . . . there are some people at CLC that would not support segments that way. (A1)

An honors instructor reflected on the meaning of honors within the context of the egalitarian mission of the community college.

> I think what bothered me even more is the notion of honors itself. And because I was an honors student, it bothered me even more. I know that is peculiar. I have a lot of students who are honors in my mind, my other 150 [students]. And I think that there is honors in everybody. I know that sounds weird. What I found most problematic, and what I would have liked to have talked about is their self image, that they seemed to think they were better than a lot of other students and they came into the classroom with a lot of elitist opinions about what other students were in honors and what other students weren't . . . as a matter of fact, I asked what makes something honors. They just literally think that they are more intelligent human beings and I don't think that is what honors means. . . . I think what honors means is it is striving for excellence . . . I am learning quickly that there is a real different kind of bifurcation between faculty. What the goal of CLC was supposed to be. So I think it is a natural outcome of what I think are two philosophies of what a community college should be. . . . that we should pursue educational excellence. That there should be ways to liberate the mind . . . and the other side of it is . . . that we should reach out for everybody and for everybody it is an open door . . . it's mostly my responsibility to bring out the best in a student, so everybody has equal potential for whatever kind of excellence is possible for them here. (F28)

This instructor's comments reflect a definition of excellence more consistent with the broad mission of community colleges and the diverse student body they attract. Her

comments also indicate a growth in her appreciation of the various talents and experiences community college students bring to the classroom.

Implications for Community Colleges

This study attempted to identify the effects of a community college's honors program on its students and faculty. The findings suggest that the program benefitted students because they made significant gains in cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, and self-esteem. The program also benefitted individual faculty who were renewed by teaching small groups of motivated students. The program also strengthened specific courses in the curriculum because faculty introduced new techniques and ideas which they had successfully implemented in honors courses.

The honors program, however, was beset with obstacles from its inception. These difficulties interfered with its smooth operation as well as its integration within the college community. These problems can occur when community colleges set up educational programs for special populations. Questions can focus on why college resources are being diverted to one group of students and not to another program. Faculty may question the rationale for the program and ask whether faculty within curriculum review committees or the governance system were involved with the program's feasibility. Community college leaders who initially solicit faculty's input through generally accepted channels of communication can address and dissipate feelings of antagonism and resentment. Friction about CLC's Honors Program developed because some faculty perceived that there were no opportunities to discuss the program openly during its inception. This study reinforces the critical role faculty

play in the design and delivery of courses and programs and the importance of soliciting their input from a program's inception. While no one could realistically expect complete faculty consensus, the need to provide opportunities to participate in the initial discussions cannot be ignored.

Designing evaluation criteria for new programs prior to their establishment encourages a sense of fairness and objectivity about the program's goals. Asking others outside the program to participate in those evaluations can also result in clearer information and more objective results. Designing CLC's Honors Program without an evaluation component which included specific goals and details on how and when those goals would be achieved made it an easy target for criticisms of favoritism and ineffective use of college resources. These perceptions were reinforced when the program's only evaluation was written by the program coordinator.

He contributed significant amounts of his time and energy during the program's inception, its establishment, and on-going operation. His leadership simplified the communication process to prospective students and their high school counselors. It also reinforced the coordinator's sense of control over administrative decisions related to the admission process and related paperwork. This type of operation, however, prevented other offices from being able to serve honors students when the coordinator was unavailable. Expecting that the honors program could operate outside of long established systems of faculty assignment and evaluation was politically naïve and resulted in unnecessary roadblocks, resistance, and criticisms by faculty.

While it was important to identify a person who was responsible for a program's operation, that person should work within the structure of an organization to maximize the use of resources, to share program information with a wide constituency, and to function efficiently. In times of dwindling resources, duplication of those resources cannot be justified.

Most importantly, community college leaders who are considering establishing honors programs at their institutions must be prepared to respond to the critics' charge of elitism. These leaders must be able to demonstrate that their program will not promote separation of a group from the general student body. The goal should be focused on the development of an honors program that can promote the best learning environment for those students who can benefit from a more challenging curriculum and opportunities to interact with faculty.

Admission criteria and enrollment opportunities must reflect the characteristics of the general student body. Thus, one should expect that high school grades and ACT scores would not be the sole criteria because that process would discriminate against older and minority students as well as those "late bloomers" who did not achieve in high school. Honors programs must also provide opportunities for career students who represent a significant part of the community college mission as well as those students who are enrolled on a part-time basis. Encouraging students to apply at any point during their enrollment will increase the likelihood that honors students will resemble the general student body.

In addition, scholarships to such programs should be based on financial need.

Merit scholarships can be problematic at a community college because they can create antagonism among faculty and students. Because community colleges typically serve those students who come from a lower socio-economic class, it is critical to utilize these resources in ways that are consistent with its mission.

But a larger issue should be addressed before establishing a community college honors program. What is the primary reason for such a program? If the reason is related to changing the college's image, antagonism among faculty and staff towards those who want to change the image can develop. Although most of the researchers believe an honors program can improve a college's image, it is almost impossible to measure if that effect occurred. In addition, the number of people who may view the college's image as changed will probably be very small. More importantly, the effect may be just the opposite.

> So [the college] is basically confirming the worst suspicions of the community by suggesting "You could come here being a bright high school graduate who would otherwise go to a different college and you will not have to sit elbow to elbow with the chaff and grit of our student body. We'll put you in a special enriched program where you will be all by yourselves with presumably learning on a higher plane than ordinary students." So it seems to me the very assumption of it confirms the fact that we are a second class institution, that the very fact that we have the need to create such a program to otherwise attract these people. (F21)

The primary reason to establish an honors program should be to provide the best learning environment for the community college's most talented students. Faculty and administrators should carefully consider if an honors program will provide the best learning environment or if segregation of honors students from other

students reinforces the development of cliques and unnecessary isolation of some groups of students from others.

Implications for Future Research

The validity of the rationale for the establishment of honors programs, the need to develop a distinctive curriculum to challenge the academically elite, has been a primary issue from their inception in 1914. While proponents argue that the brightest students need challenges that entail separate courses and other special options, critics complain that elitism and continual tracking prevent average students from maximizing their potential and collaborating with bright students. The results of this study suggest that these issues are even more critical at a community college.

Since this study's results are limited to one college, more research needs to be conducted to explore the effects of honors programs at other community colleges. It would be valuable to learn if honors students at other community colleges perceived that they had experienced similar gains in cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, and self-esteem. It may also be helpful to explore if any other groups of community college honors students have a personality profile similar to the students in this study. Additional research needs to be conducted to explore the program's effects on students not admitted to honors program. More information is needed on how honors curricula have been developed and whether certain types of courses or innovations result in specific effects on honors students. Do faculty at other community colleges participate in training before teaching honors courses? How do or might honors courses for career students differ from those for students in liberal arts? It would also

be very helpful to determine if other honors faculty introduce new pedagogy from their honors courses within their non-honors courses and the effects those innovations had on those non-honor students.

For those interested in issues of student development, more research is needed to determine how honors programs enhance students' self-esteem. Greater understanding of honors students' strengths and weaknesses could facilitate the development of successful courses, appropriate student support services, and relevant student activities.

Because there is so little known about the characteristics of honors programs in both two-year and four-year colleges and universities, additional studies are needed to determine how extensive they are, what common elements exist, and how other institutions address issues of elitism as well as achievement of excellence within the curriculum. Also, are there common differences between honors programs at community colleges and those at four-year colleges and universities?

The role of the Honors Program Coordinator in establishing a sense of community between students and faculty within the program was critical in this study. More research is needed to identify what interpersonal qualities of coordinators encourage that sense of belonging for the students. More information is also needed to learn how the coordinator can maintain a critical sense of connectedness with the honors faculty and the honors committee. What criteria do other institutions use for selection of honors faculty?

Future research should explore the effect of honors programs on community

members' perception of a community college. One may want to consider those perceptions of individuals closely connected with the college such as high school counselors and human resource professionals at local companies and compare their perspectives with those of the public at large.

More information is also needed to determine whether honors program participation enhances a students' opportunities to transfer to specific four-year colleges or universities. Similarly, researchers should examine whether honors program participation enhances the opportunities for students at four-year colleges and universities to be admitted into specific graduate schools and professional schools.

Ultimately, studies such as these may help researchers and practitioners address the difficult challenge of ensuring that the wide array of academic programs available at community colleges represent the highest quality education possible for all of their students.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Honors Fellows:

(1) Why did you join the Honors Program?

Probes:

(A) How did you find out about it?

(B) What about it appealed to you?

(2) How did the program affect you personally?

Probes:

(A) What changes in yourself do you see as a result of the program?

(B) What have you learned from the program? Did it improve certain abilities? If so, in what areas?

(C) What opinions do you have about the quality of teaching you experienced in honors classes?

(D) Was that teaching different than the teaching in non-honors courses? If so, how?

(E) What is your opinion of the quality of advising you received?

(F) Did advising help you with your plans for a career? If so, how?

(G) Did advising help you with your plans for enrollment at a four-year college?

(H) Have you had interactions with the Honors Faculty outside of the classroom? If so, what kind?

(I) Have you had interaction with the Honors Fellows outside of the classroom? If so, what type?

Honors Fellow - cont.

(3) Based on your experience, what would you say are the strengths of the program?

(4) What are its weaknesses?

(5) If you had the power to change things about the program, what would you make different?

(6) Describe to a prospective CLC student what it's like to be in a class within the Honors Program.

(7) Describe to that student what it's like to be in a non-honors class at CLC.

(8) Imagine that I am a senior at a local high school looking at colleges. What would you tell me about the College of Lake County?

(9) To what extent has CLC's Honors Program improved the image of the College?

Appendix B

Interview Questions

Honors Program Faculty:

(1) Why did you decide to be involved in the Honors Program?

(2) What effects, if any, has the program had on you professionally?

Probes:

(A) What types of teaching techniques did you utilize in Honors classes?

(1) What types of classroom activities did you utilize to improve writing abilities of Honors students?

(2) What types of classroom activities did you utilize to improve critical thinking skills of Honors students?

(3) Do you discuss your teaching in these courses with other honors faculty? If so, what do you discuss?

(4) Do you discuss your teaching in these courses with non-honors faculty? If so, what do you discuss?

(B) Did that experience have any effect on the way you taught your other classes?

(C) Have you noticed that other faculty treat you differently because you teach in the Honors Program?

(3) What opinions do you have about the quality of students you experienced in Honors classes?

(4) Based on your experience, what would you say are the strengths of the program?

Honors Program Faculty - cont.

(5) What are its weaknesses?

(6) If you had the power to change things about the program, what would you make different?

(7) What effect has the Honors Program had on the curriculum?

(8) To what extent has CLC's Honors Program improved the quality of students enrolling at CLC?

(9) To what extent has CLC's Honors Program improved the image of the college?

Demographics:

(1) Male _____
Female _____

(2) Division _____

Appendix C

Interview Questions

Student at Large/CLC Staff at Large/Community at Large:

The College of Lake County established an Honors Program in 1986.

(1) To what extent are you aware of the college's Honors Program?

(2) Has the program affected you personally? How?

(3) What opinions do you have about the quality of the college's Honors Program? What are its strengths? Weaknesses?

(4) Describe for me what you think an ideal Honors Program should include.

(5) If you had the opportunity to participate in an Honors Program, would you?

(6) What effects, if any, has the program had?

(7) To what extent has CLC's Honors Program improved the image of the college?

Appendix D

HONORS PROGRAM SURVEY FOR STUDENTS

Please complete this form by providing answers to each part of this survey.

1. Male _____
   Female _____

2. Birthdate
   ____/____
   MO. YR.

3. Hispanic _____
   African American _____
   Asian American _____
   Caucasian _____
   Other _____

4. Current Year in College:
   Freshman _____
   Sophomore _____
   Junior _____
   Senior _____

5. Currently Enrolled in Grad School _____

   Plan to attend Grad School _____

6. G.P.A. at CLC: _____
   Current G.P.A. at Four-Year Institution: _____
   (based on a 4-point scale)

7. Number of Credit Hours Earned at CLC: _____

8. Number of Credit Hours Earned at Four-Year Institution:
   Semester: _____
   Quarter: _____

9. Did you earn an Associate's Degree at CLC? _____

   If so, which one: A.A. _____
   A.S. _____
   A.A.S. _____ Date of Graduation: _____

10. Did you earn a Bachelor's Degree? _____ Date of Graduation: _____

11. Major: _____

12. Did you work while attending CLC: _____

    If so, what was the number of hours you worked weekly: _____

13. During what years were you a CLC Honors Fellow? _____

Appendix E

Project Title: *An evaluation of the Honors Program at College of Lake County*

I, _____, state that I am over 18 years of age and that
(Name of subject)
I wish to participate in a research project being conducted by *Carole Bulakowski*.
(Name of investigator)

Description of purpose and explanation of procedure.

Risks and discomforts: None

Potential benefits: Expanded understanding of the effects of the Honors Program

Alternatives: Interviews with other subjects

I acknowledge that *Carole Bulakowski*
(Investigator)
has fully explained to me the risks involved and the need for the research; has informed me that I may withdraw from participation at any time without prejudice; has offered to answer any inquiries which I may make concerning the procedures to be followed; and has informed me that I will be given a copy of this consent form.

I understand that my remarks will be kept confidential.

I freely and voluntarily consent to my participation in the research project.

_____ _____
(Signature of Investigator) (Signature of Subject)

_____ _____
(Date) (Date)

COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY

Interoffice Memorandum

Appendix F

TO:

FROM: Carole Bulakowski

DATE: February 25, 1992

RE: Honors Program Evaluation

As you may know, I am in the midst of my dissertation research which focuses on an evaluation of CLC's Honors Program. I have interviewed 66 faculty, students, and administrators to determine what impact the program has had at CLC. I am also reviewing reports, proposals, newspaper clippings, and other pertinent documents.

In my interview with Bob Brasile, he explained his views on the program and shared some of the materials he had collected related to the program. He let me make copies of responses from other Chemistry faculty when the Honors Program was at the proposal stage. Since these responses could be helpful to my research, I would like your permission to use them. Attached is a copy of your response. If you agree to give me permission to use your response, please sign the form below and return it to me. Thank you for your cooperation.

Carole Bulakowski has my permission to use my comments on the 10/2/85 memo from Bob Brasile as a document to be reviewed and included in her dissertation research. All information included in that response will be kept confidential.

_____ _____

Name Date

CB:rlv

REFERENCES

Alland, A. (1981). To be human: An introduction to cultural anthropology. New York: Random House.

Alvarez-Harvey, M. L. (1986). Minorities and women and honors education. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs (pp. 41-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Armstrong, W., & DeMeo, L. (1989). Honors program evaluation 1987-1989. San Diego, CA: San Diego Community College District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 066)

Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes and knowledge. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 297-308.

Astin, A., Henrand, M. K., & Richardson, G. T. (1982). The American freshman: National norms for fall, 1982. Los Angeles: University of California.

Austin, C. G. (1975). Honors learning in the seventies. Educational Record, 56, 160-169.

Austin, C. G. (1985). Honors teaching and learning: An overview. Engineering Education, 76, 85-88.

Austin, C. G. (1986). Orientation to honors education. In P. C. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs, (pp. 5-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, C. G. (1988). Report on honors programs at the University of Arizona, Arizona State University. In The Arizona Board of Regents' task force on excellent, efficiency, and competitiveness, final report and working papers, 1. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 805)

Adyelotte, F. (1944). Breaking the academic lock step. New York: Harper & Row.

Aydelotte, F. (1924). Honors courses in American colleges and universities. Bulletin of the National Research Council, 7, 4.

Backus, A. (1989). Linking honors programs and occupational programs in a community college. Vision '89: The Maricopa Community College's Journal of Teaching and Learning, 1(1). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 321 792)

Bay, L. (1978). Honors programs revisited. Community and Junior College Journal, 49(3), 18-21.

Bentley-Baker, K., Bartel, N., Lightsey, C., Link, R., McGrath, T., Romney, J., Siesweirda, D., Thomas, S., Uejio, C., & Vaughn, S. (1983). Honors in the two-year college. Washington, DC: National Council of Instructional Administrators. Cranford, NJ: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 933)

Bernstein, A. R. (1988). Urban community colleges and a collegiate education: Restoring the connection. In J. S. Eaton (Ed.), Colleges of choice. New York: Macmillan.

Bers, T. (1991). Persistence of community college students: The influence of student intent and academic and social integration. Research in Higher Education, 32.

Bhatia, V. H. (1977). What honors has done to American education. Forum for Honors, 7(3), 22-25.

Breneman, C. W., & Nelson, S.C. (1981). Financing community colleges: An economic perspective. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Brick, M., & McGrath, E. J. (1969). Innovation in liberal arts colleges. Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Bridges, J. B. (1988). Honors composition: A possible alternative in the two-year college. Teaching English in the two-year college, 15(1), 38-40.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. (1982). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. (1987). The collegiate function of the community colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. (1989). The American community college (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, L. L. (1985). Honors programs in the community college: Reality and promise. Princeton, New Jersey: Mid-career Fellowship Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 906)

Collison, M. (1991, April 10). More traditional-age students consider community colleges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 37, 30.

Coursol, D. H., & Wagner, E. E. (1986). Prediction of academic success in a university honors program. Psychological Reports, 58, 139-142.

Cross, K. P. (1971). Access and the accomodation in higher education. Paper presented to White House Conference on Youth. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Research Reporter, 6(2), 6-8.

Cummings, R. J. (1986). Exploring values, issues, and controversies. In. P. C. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs, (pp. 17-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deegan, W., & Tillery, D. (1985). Renewing the American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). Sociological methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Doucette, D., & Roueche, J. (1991). Arguments about which to combat elistism and ignorance about community colleges. Leadership Abstracts, 4(13).

Doucette, D. S., & Teeter, D. J. (1985). Joint ventures in research, evaluation and planning: University and community college collaboration. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for College and University Planning, Chicago, IL.

Edmon, L. (1992). Two-year colleges and academic excellence: Not a contradiction in terms. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 62(3), 25-28.

Etchison, J. C. (1973). An evaluation of an innovative junior college program for honors students. Naples, FL: Walden University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 076 189)

Farnsworth, K. A. (1982). Addressing the needs of the highly talented. Community and Junior College Journal, 52, 32-34.

Feldman, K., & Newcombe, T. (1969). The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Florida State Department of Education. (1983). A longitudinal study comparing university native and community college transfer students in the state university system of Florida. Tallahassee, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 405)

Friedlander, J. (1983). Honors programs in community colleges. Community and Junior College Journal, 53(5), 26-28.

Friedman, P. G., & Jenkins-Friedman, R. C. (1986). Implications for fostering excellence. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs (pp. 109-115). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gabelnick, F. (1986). Curriculum design: The medium is the message. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs (pp. 75-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, D. (1977). Five evaluation frameworks: Implications for decision making in higher education. In C. F. Conrad (Ed.), ASHE Reader on Academic Programs in Colleges and Universities, (pp. 371-387). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

Gillen, F. (1986). The honors edge: Honors programs, the job market and graduate schools; research in progress. Forum for Honors, 16(2), 15-19.

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. Social Problems, 12, 436-445.

Goldfarb, T. D. (Ed.). (1991). Taking sides. Clashing views on controversial environmental issues. Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Halverson, W. H. (1973). Report and recommendations of the ad hoc task force on honors. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Harvey, M. L. A. (1987). I like to examine insects . . . An honors program come of age. The College Board Review, 144 (Summer), 13-15, 30, 31.

Heck, J. (1986). Establishing community college honors programs (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 25-36-A.

Irby, J. (1986). The status of honors programs in two-year and four-year public and private colleges in Texas (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 39-93-A.

Jenkins-Friedman, R. C. (1986). Identifying honors students. In P. C. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs (pp. 29-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). The academic revolution. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Karabel, J. (1972). Community college and social stratification: Submerged class conflict in American higher education. Harvard Educational Review, 42, 521-562.

Kiltgaard, R. (1985). Choosing elites. New York: Basic Books.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Larson, M. (1986). Honors comes to the provinces. Focus: A forum on teaching and learning in Utah community and technical colleges (Vol. 5). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 264)

Levine, A. (1978). Handbook on undergraduate curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lindblad, J. (1988). The promise of honors. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 58, 26-27.

Link, R. (1988). The pitfalls of honors programs. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 58, 27-28.

London, H. (1978). The culture of a community college. New York: Praeger Publishing.

Mathiasen, R. (1985). Characteristics of college honors students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(2), 171-173.

McCabe, R. (1986). As noted in Heck, J. (1986). Establishing community college honors programs. Paper presented at the Annual National Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 134)

McGrath, D., & Spear, M. (1991). The academic crisis of the community college. Albany: State University Press.

McKeague, P. (1984). The role of the honors program in the community college curriculum. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Teaching Excellence, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 260)

McKeague, P., White, C., & Wilders, M. (1984). Survey of honors programs. A resource inventory and directory. Palos Hills, IL: Moraine Valley Community College.

McKuen, P. (1992, November 22). College honors programs shift to put students on higher track. The Chicago Tribune, pp. 7-8.

Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure. New York: The Free Press.

Miami-Dade Community College 1984 institutional self-study. Vol. V: South campus studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 773)

Miami-Dade Community College 1984 institutional self-study. Vol. VI: South campus studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 774)

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Montgomery, W. L. (1991). Factors affecting student satisfaction in community college honors programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, Normal.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1984). Two years after high school: A capsule description of 1980 seniors. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

O'Banion, T. (1989). Innovation in the community college. New York: Americal Council on Education and MacMillan.

Olivas, M. (1975). A statistical portrait of honors programs in two-year colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 890)

Ory, J. C., & Braskamp, L. A. (1988). Involvement and growth of students in three academic programs. Research in Higher Education, 28(2), 116-129.

Parsons, M. (1984). Has the time come? A formative assessment model for honors programs in two-year colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 683)

Pascarella, E. (1990). The impact of college students revisited: Some observations on the nature of the evidence. ASHE Presidential Address.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Patton, M. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Perry, W. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Pflaum, S., Pascarella, E., & Duby, P. (1985). The effects of honors college participation on academic performance during the freshman year. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(5), 414-419.

Piland, W., & Azbell, J. (1984). The honors program student - a typical profile. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(7), 45-47.

Piland, W., & Gould, K. (1982). Community colleges and honors programs. Are they mutually exclusive? The College Board Review, 123, 25-27, 36.

Piland, W., McKeague, P., & Montgomery, W. (1987). Serving academically gifted students in community colleges. The College Board Review, 143, 20-23, 34-37.

Piland, W., Montgomery, W., & McKeague, P. (1987). Academically gifted students and the community college experience. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 11, 119-133.

Piland, W., Rothschild, J. N., & Sanchez, A. B. (1990). Preferred learning styles and teaching strategies in the honors classroom. Community and Junior College, Quarterly and Research Practice, 14, 227-237.

Pincus, F. L. (1980). The false promises of community colleges: Class conflict and vocational education. Harvard Educational Review, 50, 332-361.

Rankin, K. (1989). Interaction between the community college and high schools: What the college can do to attract better-prepared students. Princeton, NJ: Mid-Career Fellowship Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 937)

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade. American Education, 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Rendon, L. (1990). Implementing a diversity restructuring program. Leadership Abstracts, 3(18).

Richardson, R. C., Jr., Fisk, E. C., & Okun, M. A. (1983). Literacty in the open-access college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, R. (1978). Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scriven, M. L. (1983). Evaluation idealogies. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebean (Eds.), Evaluation models: viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Sherman, D. B. (1985). Honors program proposal for the College of Lake County. Unpublished manuscript, College of Lake County, Grayslake, IL.

Sherman, D. B. (1988). Honors program status report. Unpublished manuscript, College of Lake County, Grayslake, IL.

Sherman, D. B. (1991). Honors program evaluation. Unpublished manuscript, College of Lake County, Grayslake, IL.

Skau, G. (1989). Honors programs at the community college. Princeton University, NJ: Mid-Career Fellowship Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 938)

Steenstra, D. J. (1985). College honors programs: An analysis of perception. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University (47-02-A).

Tacha, D. R. (1986). Advising and interacting outside the classroom. In P. G. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence through honors programs (pp. 53-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Terrill, M. (1991). Tailoring an honors program to your institution. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 953)

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac. (1992). 39(1).

Todd, S. M. (1988). Scholars and strategies: Honors programs in community colleges, part I. Community College Review, 16, 18-26.

Todd, S. M. (1988). Scholars and strategies: Honors programs in community colleges, part II. Community College Review, 16(2), 24-29.

Triplet, R. G. (1989). The honors program. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 098)

Veysey, L. (1973). Stability and experiment in the American undergraduate curriculum. In C. Keipen (Ed.), Content and context: Essays on college education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

von Oech, R. (1983). A whack on the side of the head: How to unlock your need for innovation. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Wentzlaff, S. L. (1988). Honors students and a basic speech-communication course: Techniques for meeting their needs. Paper presented at the Midwest Basic Course Directors Conference, Dayton, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 401)

Whitehead-Jackson, J. (1986). The growth of honors programs in small and community colleges. In P. C. Friedman & R. C. Jenkins-Friedman (Eds.), Fostering academic excellence througy honors programs (pp. 65-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, R. (1992, September 9). A community college propels graduates to top universities. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 34(4), A33, A34.

Wolosin, M. A. (1973). An interview with faculty members and their involvement with the honors division. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, Bureas of Educational Studies and Testing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 083 917)

Zwerling, L. S. (1976). Second best: The crisis of the community college. New York: McGraw Hill.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Carole Bulakowski has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Barbara K. Townsend, Ed.D., Director
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Steven I. Miller
Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Terry E. Williams
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/1/93
Date

Director's Signature