



FINAL REPORT

Task Force on the Future of the Honors College // May 6, 2019

TASK FORCE ON THE FUTURE OF THE HONORS COLLEGE



Final Report // May 6, 2019

I. Introduction and Summary of Recommendations

The Task Force on the Future of the Honors College (hereinafter the “Task Force”) was created by Provost Robert H. Jones on September 12, 2018 and charged with developing “a strategy, consistent with the ClemsonForward Strategic Plan, to enhance the role and impact of the Honors College and to improve integration between the Honors College and the discipline-based colleges and departments. Above all, the goal should be a plan that advances the University mission by promoting education of Clemson’s high-achieving students.”¹ The Task Force interpreted its charge to include issues relating to the National Scholars Program as well as the Honors College.

The Calhoun Honors College, established in its present form in 1999², and the National Scholars Program, created in 2000, make critical contributions to the University’s mission and strategic goals, particularly in the areas of the Academic Core; Academic and Global Engagement; Living and Learning Environment; and Diversity. The Task Force noted the Honors College’s role as a strategic recruiting asset to the University; the impressive accomplishments of Honors students while at Clemson; and the growth of the Honors College in terms of number and quality of students since 2010 (see Appendix F for details on Honors College applicants, students, and courses).

Consistent with the original charge letter, the Task Force agrees that the Honors College can play “an even bigger and more direct role in advancing Clemson’s strategic goals. We envision a new college that is among the best of its kind in the nation in terms of the quality and quantity of experiences the students obtain, and the impact of those students on the quality and reputation of the university as a whole.

The impact of such an Honors College will be felt far beyond the Honors College itself. Academic research suggests that Honors students have a beneficial effect on all students—by serving as a model for other students; by engaging with other students in non-Honors classes; and by advancing the university’s reputation through their achievements as undergraduates and afterwards.³

To meet this vision, the Task Force believes that the Honors College should:

- Strengthen educational experiences and learning outcomes for Clemson’s highest-achieving students by:
 - creating a challenging Honors general education program for first- and second-year Honors students;
 - enhancing diversity of learning opportunities by adding new Honors courses for all Honors students;
 - broadening integrative/interdisciplinary learning opportunities such as undergraduate research, unique interdisciplinary curricula, and study abroad/global engagement.
- Develop a strategic enrollment plan that sets aspirational goals for enrollment that align with the College’s vision and university goals.
- Develop an enhanced marketing and brand strategy that leverages the College’s unique ability to enhance Clemson’s statewide, national, and international reputation; attract students; and draw in new financial resources.

¹ The Task Force was chaired by Anand Gramopadhye, Dean of the College of Engineering, Computing and Applied Sciences. A full list of the membership of the Task Force appears in Appendix A.

² The Honors Program of Clemson University was founded in 1962. In 1982, the Program was given the name “Calhoun College.” In 1999, by action of the Board of Trustees, the name was changed to its present form, “Calhoun Honors College.”

³ See, for example, James J. Claus, “The Benefits of Honors Education for All University Students,” (2011). Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council - Online Archive. 326.

- Develop a business plan to identify costs, facilities, and staffing needed to support an Honors College that expands in both learning experiences and enrollment.

II. The Student Experience

The Honors College currently offers students the opportunity to enhance their undergraduate experience through Honors courses and curricula; educational enrichment experiences outside the classroom; specialized advising and support; and a residential college experience in Des Champs and Cribb Halls. Most Honors students apply as high school seniors and join the Honors College when they arrive at Clemson as first-year students, but students can also apply to the College throughout their undergraduate careers. Honors students have the option of pursuing General Honors, Departmental Honors, and/or Interdisciplinary Honors (see Appendix E for details on Honors curricula).

The Honors College experience is a positive one for most Honors students, as indicated by increasing applications to the College, retention within the College, and student satisfaction surveys. The Honors College boasts a six-year graduation rate of over 95 percent, and students have had a high degree of success in competitions for major fellowships, acceptances to premier graduate and professional programs, and job offers from top national and international companies. Honors students are highly engaged in student life and in student organizations across campus. The past 19 Norris Award winners (a distinction given to the best all-around student in the senior class) have been Honors students, as have been four of the past six student body presidents.

Despite these successes, the Task Force believes that the Clemson Honors experience can be strengthened and deepened. In particular, we recommend that:

- The College develop an innovative and challenging Honors general education program for first- and second-year students, enhancing and in part replacing the general education program required of all Clemson students. The current Honors general education curriculum requires fewer credit hours and provides a less comprehensive and less integrated experience than that offered at top-ranked Honors Colleges (see Appendices D and E). The new Honors general education program should emphasize depth of knowledge in key areas; high-level critical thinking and communication skills; and the ability to work across disciplines and to integrate ideas drawn from different fields of study. It should provide students with exposure to the university's top faculty across a wide range of disciplines.
- The College, in coordination with disciplinary colleges, develop and offer new Honors courses and programs for all Honors students. Currently, many university departments lack the resources and incentives to offer a sufficient number of Honors courses, particularly at the junior and senior levels (see Appendix F). Likewise, the Honors College lacks the resources to offer courses or curricular options for advanced students who are not pursuing, or who have already completed, Departmental or Interdisciplinary Honors.
- The College develop and promote new experiential and interdisciplinary learning opportunities in the areas of undergraduate research, interdisciplinary curricula, and intellectual, cultural, and global engagement programs. Although current undergraduate research are strong, such programs could be strengthened, deepened, and offered to more students. Offerings in the areas of interdisciplinary curricula and intellectual, cultural, and global engagement programs fall short of opportunities at top-ranked Honors Colleges.

III. Strategic Enrollment and Diversity

The Honors College has grown by approximately 67% between 2010 and 2018, from approximately 900 students to more than 1500 today. The freshman class has grown correspondingly, from roughly 250 in 2010 to an average of 350 over the past two years. The College has accomplished this expansion while increasing student quality, as measured by

SAT scores and other common metrics (see Appendix F). The size of National Scholars cohorts has varied considerably throughout the program's history due to a combination of factors including available funding, recruiting strategies, and yield rates.

The College and the National Scholars Program have also taken steps to increase the diversity of their student populations, and, although they have made strides in this area, the percentage of African American and other underrepresented groups in the Honors College is lower than in the university as a whole. The Task Force notes that Clemson's relative shortage of merit- and need-based scholarships (as compared to peer institutions) has a significant impact on the Honors College recruitment efforts in general, and on its efforts to recruit nontraditional students in particular. The Task Force recommends that:

- The Honors College work with the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and the Chief Diversity Officer to develop a strategic enrollment plan that establishes aspirational goals, over time, for the size (as a percentage of the undergraduate student body) and composition of the Honors College, in alignment with the College's vision and the university's strategic goals. This process should take into account existing and projected financial aid resources, the capacity of the Honors College and the discipline-based colleges to provide housing, courses, advising, etc.; and other relevant issues and constraints. A University-level plan should also be developed to meet these goals over time.
- The National Scholars Program coordinate with the Office of Scholarships, development, disciplinary colleges, and other university offices, as relevant, to develop a consistent and systematic approach to program size and recruiting strategies.
- The Honors College continue its efforts to raise private funds to support its recruitment of underrepresented and nontraditional students, including those with financial need, to offset the cost of the Honors fee and promote academic engagement opportunities for such students.
- The possibility of Honors-specific need- and/or merit-based scholarships be investigated, in collaboration with the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, along with the possibility of raising the Honors fee and/or using a fixed percentage of the Honors fee to waive the fee for certain students, particularly based on need.

IV. Marketing and Brand Strategy

It is paramount that the Honors College develop an enhanced marketing and brand strategy that leverages the College's unique ability to enhance Clemson's statewide, national, and international reputation, attract top students, and draw in new financial resources. Such a strategy should emphasize the strengths and reputation of the Honors College while at the same time providing linkages to mutually strengthen the reputations of both the College and Clemson University. The National Scholars Program must develop a coordinated strategy.

A rebranding effort would enhance not only the reputations of these programs and of the University but would also strengthen efforts by the Honors College and the National Scholars Program to expand their fundraising capacity. This capacity is currently very limited; until 2010, the Honors College was not permitted to reach out either to alumni or parents for fundraising purposes, under a policy that limited such contacts to the alumnus's college and department or, in the case of parents, to the Division of Student Affairs. The National Scholars Program's scholarship fund received some university-level donations, especially in its early years. It has also had some success in raising funds from alumni and parents, although (having been established in 2000) its alumni base remains relatively young. Neither program had a development officer before 2010, and since then has been assigned a single development officer (to be shared with the Clemson Libraries) on a sporadic basis. Neither program has been assigned a dedicated development officer since Spring 2018.

The Task Force recommends that:

- The Honors College, in collaboration with key stakeholders, develop an enhanced marketing and brand strategy leveraging its unique ability to enhance Clemson's statewide, national, and international reputation by showcasing the potential and accomplishments of the University's top undergraduate students.
- Both the Honors College and the National Scholars Program be recognized and utilized as strategic assets for fundraising efforts at the University level, and for cooperative fundraising efforts with the discipline-based colleges and departments. The Task Force notes that a large share of any funds raised by the Honors College will directly benefit both students and the discipline-based colleges, as these funds would support scholarships, faculty lines or workloads, and other academic priorities inside and outside the College.
- The University should recognize that the Honors College presents a premier naming opportunity for a high-level donor, and aggressively pursue efforts to find such a donor and to rename the College in his or her honor.
- Similarly, efforts should be made to find a donor or donors to name the National Scholars Program and/or individual scholarships within the program.
- Given the opportunities, the Honors College and the National Scholars Program should be assigned a dedicated development officer to coordinate their fundraising and stewardship efforts.
- A focus of the Honors development efforts should be to raise funds to eliminate the Honors fee.

V. Business Plan and Organizational Structure

Business Plan

The Honors College is heavily dependent for funding on a student fee of \$500 per semester. This fee provides approximately 65% of the College's funding, with the remainder coming mostly from university appropriations and a small amount from Foundation funds. The College has built a new, state-of-the-art residential college facility providing housing for nearly 400 students; Honors office space; and seminar rooms, study rooms, and a large event space. The National Scholars Program also has its own dedicated space in the same building.

The Honors College staff is comprised of an Executive Director, a Senior Associate Director, three full-time advisors (including the Director of Advising and Student Development), a part-time adviser, and staff dedicated to admissions, international programs, and administrative support. The College and National Scholars Program share an Assistant Director who, in the Honors College, is responsible for diversity initiatives. In addition, the College employs a number of graduate and undergraduate student assistants. The College lacks key personnel found at peer institutions, including staff devoted to strategic communications, development, and alumni relations (see Appendix C).

With the exception of a small number of faculty hired on a per-course basis, the College does not directly employ faculty. Instead, it relies on resources provided by the discipline-based colleges to teach not only department-based Honors courses, but also Honors seminars. Many peer institutions have formalized faculty affiliates (see Appendix C) and Clemson lags far behind other top Honors Colleges in curricular requirements and course offerings (see Appendix D).

With respect to both staff and development resources, the College lags far behind its peer institutions and best practices for Honors Colleges (see Appendices C, D, and E).

These resources are not sufficient to meet the current mission of the College, much less the enhanced mission envisioned in this report. *In light of this reality, the Task Force recommends that the Honors College develop a business plan to identify costs, facilities, and staffing needed to support an Honors College that expands in both learning experiences and enrollment.* This business plan should take into account the following:

- The Honors College's staff and budgetary resources should be in line with its enhanced mission, best practices for Honors Colleges, and resources allocated to Honors Colleges at peer institutions, and should be guided by models in keeping with the University's approaches to similar resource issues.
- Staffing levels in the National Scholars Program should be brought in line with those at competitor programs
- To ensure appropriate revenue growth, the Honors College fee should be indexed to increases in University tuition and fees or otherwise benchmarked.
- Efforts be made to assess the extent of University resources currently allocated to Honors teaching and service, whether or not funded directly by the Honors College, and mechanisms developed to ensure that the Honors College has access to the faculty resources it needs to fulfill its responsibilities.
- Systematic mechanisms should be developed to assess the extent of college and departmental resources currently being dedicated to Honors teaching and advising, and, over time, to phase in budgetary and workload allocation practices to ensure that the Honors College consistently has the credit hour allotment of faculty time to reliably and successfully deliver its curriculum, engage in necessary service work, and fulfill its mission. Such practices might include, for example, the creation of Honors faculty lines or Honors Faculty Fellows which obligate departments and/or colleges to provide the Honors College with a fixed number of Honors sections or seminars per year or semester. These Honors teaching and service responsibilities should be distributed on a rotational basis, appropriately credited in faculty workloads and reviews, and maintained without sacrificing the needs of departments and/or disciplinary colleges.
- Long-term plans be initiated, as appropriate, to accommodate any increase in the size of the Honors College by expanding, as necessary, the Honors staff, office space, and/or residential facilities.

Leadership

The Honors College is currently led by an Executive Director, who reports directly to the Provost; the College has only one additional staff member with faculty credentials, a Senior Associate Director who also serves as Director of the National Scholars Program. The Executive Director is a non-voting member of the Academic Council, and chairs the Calhoun Honors College Committee, which serves as the College's curriculum committee.

This organizational structure does not follow best practices set forth by the National Collegiate Honors Council (see Appendix E) nor is it in line with the leadership structure of other top public honors colleges or honors colleges at peer institutions (see Appendices C and D). Clemson's Honors College's leadership team is smaller than that at peer institutions. Only one peer institution-- the University of Maryland-- does not have a Dean as the head of their honors college.

The Task Force finds these arrangements inadequate for the Honors College's current responsibilities, and woefully inadequate to meet the strategic needs of the University. Thus the Task Force recommends that:

- The academic leader of the Honors College should have the title of Dean, and should be included, as appropriate, in strategic discussions and decision-making at the University level. He or she should continue to report directly to the Provost.
- The Dean of the Honors College should be a standing member of the Provost's Leadership Team and a voting member of the Academic Council. The Dean should also make regular reports to the Provost, the President, and/or the Board of Trustees, in such form and manner as the University leadership deems appropriate.

- The current Senior Associate Director should have the title of Senior Associate Dean, and there should be one or more additional Associate Deans, perhaps drawn from the Colleges on a rotating basis, to assist the Dean in the fulfillment of his or her duties.
- The Honors College should have an External Advisory Board including appropriate representatives from academia, foundations, industry, and government.

The Relationship between the Honors Colleges and the Seven Discipline-Based Colleges

The Honors College enjoys strong and supportive relationships with the seven discipline-based colleges. Faculty enjoy teaching Honors students, and departments look to the Honors College as a way to expose top students to their respective academic fields and as a partner in the education of their best students. These relationships, however, are unsystematic and haphazard. The Honors College and disciplinary colleges coordinate very little and thus there is no systematic approach to the delivery of Honors curriculum. The Honors College and disciplinary colleges coordinate only minimally if at all on the number and quality of Honors sections taught within the many academic departments and the Honors College is largely dependent on the good will of the departments even to staff its basic curricular obligations, such as Honors seminars (see Appendix F for details on Honors courses). As a result, the Honors College lags considerably behind other top public Honors Colleges in its curricular offerings (see Appendix D). The College lacks the structural capacity required to coordinate Honors-related policies and programs in the colleges and departments, even when those policies and programs are central to its mission. We therefore recommend that:

- An Honors College Steering Committee (or Internal Advisory Board) be created, chaired by the Dean of the Honors College. The Steering Committee should include faculty with significant Honors teaching and/or service experience, Associate Deans or other high-level representatives of the discipline-based colleges, and others whom the Dean and/or the college representatives to the committee deem appropriate. This steering committee should have broad responsibility to develop and implement policies and practices relating to Honors courses, programs, and other initiatives based in the college and departments, including the authority to bring such proposals before the Academic Council and other University committees, and to advise the Dean of the Honors College on curricular and other matters.
- The Honors College should partner with the disciplinary colleges and departments to develop systematic mechanisms for the coordinated delivery of Honors curriculum. Efforts be made to investigate the benefits and feasibility of coordinating and/or integrating certain recruiting, advising, and other student-based Honors activities with the discipline-based college advising centers and other resources.
- Service to the Honors College should be systematically recognized and rewarded in faculty evaluation procedures at the departmental and disciplinary college levels.

APPENDICES

Honors College Task Force Report

Appendix A

Honors College Task Force Membership and Charge

- Anand Gramopadhye, Dean, College of Engineering, Computing, and Applied Sciences (committee chair)
- Scott Baier, Chair, John E. Walker Department of Economics
- James Burns, Chair, Department of History and Geography
- Lee Gill, Chief Diversity Officer and Special Assistant to the President for Inclusive Excellence
- Rick Goodstein, Dean, College of Art, Architecture, and Humanities
- Chuck Knepfle, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
- David Kuskowski, Director of Admissions
- Thompson Mefford, Associate Professor, Department of Materials Science and Engineering
- George Petersen, Dean, College of Education
- Bridget Trogden, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
- Cynthia Young, Dean, College of Science
- William Lasser, Executive Director, Calhoun Honors College (advisory member)
- Sarah Winslow, Senior Associate Director, Calhoun Honors College and Director, National Scholars Program (advisory member)

Appendix B. Honors College SWOT Analysis

The Honors College makes critical contributions to the University’s mission and strategic goals, yet faces considerable challenges in fulfilling its mission. The Honors College’s strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities are summarized in the table below. In producing this SWOT analysis, the Task Force examined data gathered from the Honors College and from peer comparisons, recommendations from the National Collegiate Honors College, and analyses by John Willingham, *Inside Honors: 2018-2019: Ratings and Reviews of 50 Public University Honors Programs* (Public University Press, 2018). The Task Force also received public feedback, including on the name of the Honors College.

| Strengths | Weaknesses |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to Clemson Forward goals with regard to student quality and success metrics • Student satisfaction with Honors experience • Global engagement and experiential learning • Honors academic, professional, and developmental advising • Honors Residential College and strong partnership with Clemson Home <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New facility combines living and learning spaces ○ Honors Residential College provides additional opportunities for academic engagement • Culture of support across the university | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of university-wide strategy and structure for recruiting and educating top students • Lack of an institutionalized yet flexible structure and process for Honors curriculum delivery • Honors College is not an “equal collegiate unit” • Administrative structure of the Honors College is not comparable to that of the disciplinary colleges • Development efforts lack visibility and are not coordinated with other academic units • Diversity lags behind university at large |
| Opportunities | Threats |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the Honors College in line with University enrollment management goals • Develop a systematic approach to Honors faculty recruitment, development, and recognition by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ creating Honors faculty lines or faculty fellows ○ leveraging Honors involvement to recruit/retain top faculty ○ systematically recognizing faculty for contributions to Honors teaching and service • Utilize Honors College as incubator for innovative curricular opportunities; e.g., mandatory first-year seminar, thematic General Education arcs, undergraduate research, interdisciplinary programs. • Expand diversity within the College in line with Clemson Forward strategic plan • Develop strategic development goals, including naming rights to the College and fundraising partnerships with disciplinary colleges, particularly for scholarship funding. • Coordinate with Graduate School to provide professional development opportunities for graduate students and research opportunities for Honors students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other universities utilize their Honors Colleges as a university-wide tool for achieving strategic goals, putting Clemson and Clemson Honors at a disadvantage • Merit and need-based scholarship environment hinders our competitiveness with peer and aspirational institutions • Although our metrics are improving, we are no longer in the top-ranked group of Honors Colleges. Other universities are outpacing our progress, particularly in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curriculum requirements ○ Honors courses offered, particularly in key disciplines ○ Ratio of staff to students • Link to John C. Calhoun raises concerns among students, faculty, and prospective families |

Appendix C. Peer Institution Honors College Comparisons

Peer institutions here are defined as ACC schools and/or other top-25 public universities with a standalone Honors College. Those schools are: Penn State, Pitt, Purdue, Rutgers, University of Maryland, UNC – Chapel Hill, and Virginia Tech. As our in-state peer, the University of South Carolina is included as well. We present the organizational structure of each Honors College and its USNWR academic reputation score. Following the summary and table, we provide full details on each Honors College, listed in order of USNWR public university ranking.

Summary

- **ENROLLMENT:** Clemson’s Honors College enrollment, as a percentage of university undergraduate enrollment, is slightly above the mean for peer institutions.
- **ACADEMIC REPUTATION:** With the exception of the University of South Carolina, all peer institutions have higher academic reputation ratings than Clemson.
- **LEADERSHIP:** Only one other peer institution Honors College is headed by an Executive Director rather than a Dean (University of Maryland). Most peer institutions have a larger leadership team than Clemson’s Honors College.
- **LEADERSHIP TEAM:** All peer institutions have a larger leadership team than Clemson’s Honors College.
- **KEY POSITIONS:** The majority of peer institutions have key positions that Clemson’s Honors College lacks, including a marketing and communications coordinator.
- **HONORS FACULTY:** The majority of peer institutions have an Honors faculty.

Table 1. Enrollment and key positions at peer institution Honors Colleges.

| | Honors enrollment* | Dean/Executive Director | Associate or Assistant Dean(s) | Marketing and/or Communications | Faculty |
|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Clemson (#24) | 1,554 (8.4) | Executive Director | 1 Senior Associate Director | | |
| UNC-Chapel Hill (#5) | 1,900 (10.1) | | 1 Associate Dean and 1 Assistant Dean | X | |
| Purdue (#17) | 2,060 (6.9) | Dean | 3 Associate Deans and 2 Assistant Deans | X | 9 Clinical Assistant or Associate Professors |
| Rutgers (#17) | 1,396 (3.9) | Academic Dean and Administrative Dean | 2 Associate Deans and 4 Assistant Deans | X | 2 Faculty Fellows and 13 Teaching Fellows |
| Penn State (#20) | 1,969 (4.8) | Dean | 2 Associate Deans | X | |
| Maryland (#22) | 4,000 (13.4) | Executive Director | 3 Associate Directors | X | |
| Pitt (#26) | 1,600 (8.3) | Dean | 1 Assistant Dean | X | 60 Faculty Fellows |
| Virginia Tech (#30) | 1,600 (5.9) | Dean and Executive Director | 1 Assistant Dean | X | 15 Calhoun Discovery Program Faculty |
| USC (#46) | 2,201 (8.6) | Dean | 3 Assistant Deans | X | 10 Faculty Fellows |

*Honors enrollment presented as N (% of undergraduate student population).

UNC-Chapel Hill (#5)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 18,862; Honors College enrollment: 1,900
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 4.1¹
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership²
 - Associate Dean
 - Assistant Dean
 - Director of the Office of Distinguished Scholarships
 - Director of Alumni and Career Networks
 - Director of Curriculum, Recruitment, and Operations
 - Senior Associate Director of Development
 - Director of Global Education and Fellowships
 - Director of Student Development and Special Projects
 - Assistant Director of Recruitment and Operations/Special Assistant to the Honors Dean (2 positions occupied by the same person)
 - Other
 - Marketing and International Programming Assistant
 - Advising and Career Guide
 - Events and Client Services Manager
 - Program Assistant, Office of Distinguished Scholarships and Honors Carolina
 - Enrolled Student Services Coordinator
 - Advising and Career Guide

Purdue (#17)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 30,043; Honors College enrollment: 2,060
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.8
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Dean
 - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
 - Associate Dean for Research and Creative Endeavors
 - Associate Dean for Student Life
 - Assistant Dean for Recruitment and Admission
 - Assistant Dean, National and International Scholarships Office
 - Director, National and International Scholarships Office
 - Director of Honors Study Away Programs
 - Director of Diversity and Global Awareness
 - Director of Engaged Learning
 - Director of the Visiting Scholars Program
 - Director of Grants
 - Director of the Faculty Honors Preceptors Program
 - Director of the Honors Mentor Programs
 - Director of Advising
 - Senior Director, Academic and Student Affairs
 - Faculty: 9 Clinical Assistant/Associate Professors, each of whom holds a Director/Assistant Director position
 - Other
 - Community Outreach and Events Manager
 - Dean's Administrative Office Manager
 - Recruitment Manager
 - Alumni and Outreach Coordinator
 - Student Engagement Program Coordinator
 - Data Coordinator
 - Communications Manager

¹ 5 points possible

² This category includes Deans/Executive Directors, those directly under the Dean, and those with the title of Director.

- Student Leadership and Engagement Manager
- Assistant Director of the Honors Mentor Program
- 2 Secretaries
- Administrative Assistant
- 5 Honors Advisors
- Media Coordinator
- Scholar Development Advisor
- Writing Consultant and Graduate Assistant
- 3 Postdoctoral Teaching Fellows

Rutgers (#17)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 36,168; Honors College enrollment: 1,396
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.4
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Academic Dean
 - Administrative Dean
 - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Research, and Innovation
 - Associate Dean for Student Affairs
 - Assistant Dean and Director for Academic Advising
 - Assistant Dean for Professional Development
 - Assistant Dean and Director for Admissions
 - Assistant Dean for Student Affairs
 - Director of Innovation
 - Director of Experiential Learning
 - Director of Marketing and Communications
 - Faculty: 2 Faculty Fellows and 13 Teaching Fellows
 - Other
 - Residence Life Coordinator
 - Program Coordinator
 - Coordinator for Admissions and Student Affairs
 - Student Affairs Program Coordinator
 - Business Manager
 - Senior Administrative Assistant
 - 3 Academic Advisers
 - Business Assistant
 - Community Based Counselor
 - Web Developer

Penn State (#20)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 41,329; Honors College: 1,969
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.7
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Dean
 - Executive Assistant to the Dean
 - Associate Dean for Student Affairs
 - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
 - Director of Strategic Communications
 - Director, Presidential Leadership Academy Coordinator of Diversity
 - Director of Career Development
 - Director of Student Programs
 - Director of Development and Alumni Relations
 - Director of Admissions
 - Other
 - Administrative Support Assistant, Student Programs and Strategic Communications
 - Administrative Support Coordinator, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

- Coordinator of Constituent Relations and Annual Giving
- Administrative Support Assistant, Career Development Receptionist
- Coordinator of Academic Services
- Administrative Support Assistant, Admissions
- Coordinator of Academic Advising and International Programs
- Administrative Support Assistant, Development and Alumni Relations
- Admissions Counselor
- Financial Officer
- IT Consultant
- Web Developer
- Public Relations Assistant
- Graduate Assistant
- IT Director
- Note: Schreyer Honors College also has an external advisory board “comprised of Penn State alumni, friends of the college, parents of Scholars, and others committed to the college realizing its mission.”

University of Maryland (#22)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 29,868; Honors College enrollment: 4,000
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.7
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Executive Director
 - 3 Associate Directors
 - Other
 - Assistant Director and Advisor
 - Business Manager
 - Business Coordinator
 - Coordinator for Communications
 - Coordinator for Recruitment and Programming
 - Program Management Specialist
 - 3 Graduate Assistants (Recruitment and Programming, Business, and Student Development)

Clemson (#24)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 18,599; Honors College enrollment: 1,554
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.3
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Executive Director
 - Senior Associate Director and Director of National Scholars Program
 - Director of Advising and Recruitment
 - Other
 - Honors Advisor and Recruitment Coordinator
 - Honors Advisor and Professional Development Coordinator
 - Assistant Director of the Honors College and National Scholars Program
 - Academic and Special Project Coordinator
 - Admissions Coordinator and EUREKA! Program Coordinator
 - Office Manager
 - 2 Administrative Assistants
 - Part-time Advisor
 - Part-time Administrative Assistant
 - Graduate Assistant, Advising
 - Graduate Assistant, National Scholars Program

- Note: Clemson also has a university-wide Office of Major Fellowships with a Director and (soon) Assistant Director.

Pitt (#26)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 19,326; Honors College enrollment: 1,600
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.5
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Dean
 - Assistant Dean
 - Executive Assistant to the Dean
 - Director of Administration
 - Director of Research and Creative Programs
 - Faculty: 60 Faculty Fellows
 - Other
 - Office Manager and Assistant to the Business Manager
 - Manager of Recruitment
 - Manager of Honors Housing
 - 3 Scholarship Mentors
 - Systems Analyst
 - Housefellow
 - Academic Community Engagement Advisor
 - Marketing and Communications Specialist
 - Receptionist
 - Graduate Student Assistant

Virginia Tech (#30)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 27,193; Honors College enrollment: 1,600
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.5
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Dean
 - Assistant Dean of Finance
 - Director of Experiential Learning
 - Director of Major Scholarships
 - Director of Admissions and Scholarships
 - Executive Director
 - Faculty
 - 16 Calhoun Discovery Program Faculty
 - Faculty Principal, Honors Residential Commons
 - Other
 - Communications Specialist
 - Student Life Coordinator
 - Program Manager, Calhoun Discovery Program
 - 2 Graduate Research Assistants
 - Business Manager

University of South Carolina (#46)

- University undergraduate enrollment: 25,556; Honors College enrollment: 2,201
- USNWR Academic Reputation: 3.1
- Organizational Structure
 - Administrative Leadership
 - Dean
 - Assistant to the Dean

- Assistant Dean for Student Affairs and Diversity
- Assistant Dean for National Fellowships and Scholar Programs
- Assistant Dean of Administration
- Director of Undergraduate Research
- Director of Major Fellowships
- Assistant Director of Alumni Engagement
- Director of Information Technology
- Director of Pre-Med Programs
- Director of Internships Programs
- Senior Director of Development
- Assistant Director of Development
- Director of Business and Human Resources
- Director of Communications
- Director of Scholars Programs
- Faculty: 10 Faculty Fellows
- Other
 - Administrative Coordinator and Webmaster
 - Administrative Assistant for Student Services
 - Coordinator of Student Services
 - Internship Coordinator
 - Service Learning Coordinator
 - Events Coordinator
 - Scholars Programs Coordinator
 - Recruiting Coordinator
 - Study Abroad Coordinator
 - Business and Human Resources Assistant
 - 13 Academic Advisors (with most holding other positions)
 - Writer/Editor
 - Communications Assistant

Appendix D. Public Honors College Comparisons

Inside Honors 2018 – 2019: Ratings and Reviews of 50 Public University Honors Programs is the latest in a series of reports, published every two years, that reviews and rates public university honors colleges and programs on a set of factors related to curriculum, resources and supports, and student success. Colleges and programs are not individually ranked, but rather are grouped into categories according to their performance on these metrics. In the most recent ratings, the Clemson's Honors College fell into the second grouping.

In what follows, we list the metrics used, their relative weights in the rating system, and the seven programs and colleges in the top grouping. We then summarize Clemson's strengths and where we fall behind relative to these higher-rated institutions.

Metrics

Honors colleges and programs are rated on a scale of 1 to 5 in each of the following categories. The relative weighting of each category in a college or program's score is in parentheses.

- Curriculum requirements (20%)
- Number of honors classes offered (10%)
- Number of honors classes in key disciplines (10%)
- Extent of honors enrollment (10%)
- Honors-only class size (6.25%)
- Overall class size (6.25%)
- Honors graduation rate adjusted to SAT (5%)
- Honors graduation rate adjusted to freshman retention rate (5%)
- Ratio of staff to students (7.5%)
- Priority registration for Honors students (2.5%)
- Honors housing amenities (7.5%)
- Honors housing availability (2.5%)
- Prestigious awards (7.5%)

Colleges and Programs in Top Group

- Arizona State, Barrett Honors College
- CUNY, Macaulay Honors College
- Florida Atlantic Wilkes Honors College
- Kansas Honors Program
- Penn State, Schreyer Honors College
- South Carolina Honors College
- UT Austin Plan II Honors Program

Clemson in Comparison

In what follows, we summarize Clemson's scores, grouping them into areas in which we scored relatively high (4.5 or 5) or low (3.5 or 4) in the ratings system. We elaborate each area with a comparison to institutions in the top group and, where relevant, overall averages of all rated colleges and programs. We also include information on other factors not explicitly included in the rating system.

Clemson's Strengths: Areas in Which CHC Received a 5 or 4.5

- The only area in which Clemson received the highest possible score (5) was Honors housing amenities, largely owing to our new facilities at Core Campus.
 - Of the top colleges and programs, only ASU's Barrett Honors College and South Carolina Honors College received the same score.
- Clemson received scores of 4.5 for:
 - Graduation rates, adjusted to both SAT and freshman retention rates.
 - Of the top programs, ASU's Barrett Honors College, CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, and Penn State's Schreyer Honors College received a 5 for graduation rates adjusted to SAT.
 - Of the top programs, ASU's Barrett Honors College and Kansas Honors Program received a 5 for graduation rates adjusted to freshman retention rates.
 - Honors-only class sizes, with an average of 16.4 students
 - Kansas Honors Program and Penn State's Schreyer Honors College received a 5 in this area.
- Together, the areas in which we received a 4.5 or 5 constitute 23.75% of the overall score.

Clemson's Deficiencies: Areas in Which CHC Received a 4 or 3.5

- CHC received scores of 4 for:
 - Number of Honors classes in key disciplines: Clemson offers one Honors section of a key discipline course for every 24.5 enrolled Honors students.
 - Clemson is at the average for all rated Honors programs and colleges.
 - Top programs receiving a score of 5—CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, Florida Atlantic's Wilkes Honors College, and South Carolina Honors College—offer a key discipline section for every 7-10 Honors students.
 - Extent of Honors enrollment: Clemson's ratio of Honors course enrollment for every member in good standing is at the average of all rated institutions (1.32:1).
 - Institutions receiving a 5 – CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, Florida Atlantic's Wilkes Honors College, South Carolina Honors College—have between 2 and 4 Honors course enrollments for every member in good standing.
 - Overall class size: The average size of Honors classes at Clemson (23.6) is slightly below the average for all rated institutions (24.9).
 - The average class size for top-rated programs receiving a 5—CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, Florida Atlantic's Wilkes Honors College, and Kansas Honors Program—is between 17 and 18.
 - Ratio of staff to students: CHC has 111 students per full-time staff member.
 - Top-rated programs receiving a 5 – CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, Florida Atlantic's Wilkes Honors College, and South Carolina Honors College – have 28-65 students per staff member.
- CHC received scores of 3.5 for:
 - Curriculum requirements: Students receive General Honors with 18 hours, Departmental Honors with 9 – 12 hours, and Interdisciplinary Honors with 14 hours; on average Clemson students can graduate in Honors with 9-28 hours of Honors credit.
 - The average across all institutions is 30 hours.
 - All top programs require more hours in Honors.
 - This is the most heavily weighted factor in the overall rating.
 - Number of Honors classes offered: Although a high percent of our courses are Honors-only, our ratio of Honors classes to enrolled students (16.6) is higher than the average for all rated institutions (15.0).
 - CUNY's Macaulay Honors College, Florida Atlantic's Wilkes Honors College, Kansas Honors Program, and South Carolina Honors College all received a 5.

- Only one top program, ASU's Barrett Honors College, received the same score as CHC (all others scored higher).
- Honors housing availability: The Honors Residential College offers a below average number of beds per 1st and 2nd year students.
 - Our rating is lower than all but one top-rated program (Kansas Honors Program).
 - We do not see this as a major issue; we have largely been able to meet student demand for Honors housing.
- Prestigious awards: We received a score of 3.5 for our receipt for prestigious nationally-competitive fellowships and awards.
 - Only one top-rated program, Florida Atlantic Wilkes Honors College, scored lower than Clemson on this measure.
 - We should see improvement in this area over the coming years with the university's new Office of Major Fellowships.
- Taken together, the areas in which we earned scores of 3.5 constitute 40% of the overall rating score.

Relevant Factors Not Included in Rating

- CHC's incoming students have strong SAT scores, class rank, and high school GPAs. Only two of the top 7 programs (South Carolina and UT Austin) are in the top SAT score group with Clemson.
- CHC benefits from Clemson's reputation. Only two universities in the top category receive higher scores for the perception of the university as a whole (Penn State and UT Austin).
- Four of the top 7 programs tie merit aid directly to Honors College membership; Clemson does not.
- Four of the top 7 programs have no Honors fees. Fees for other programs range from \$25-750 per semester. CHC's fee is \$500 per semester.

Appendix E. CHC in Comparison to National Collegiate Honors Council Honors College and Program Best Practices

The National Collegiate Honors College is the main professional association for honors programs and colleges and their deans, directors, faculty, staff, and students. The NCHC has identified a number of best practices for honors programs and colleges. Below we summarize whether and how the CHC meets the basic characteristics of fully developed honors programs and colleges. A full list of these recommendations and a description of our relevant attributes follows this summary.

The CHC meets most, but not all, of the basic characteristics of an honors program. The CHC exhibits approximately half of the basic characteristics of a full developed honors college. Below we list the key areas in which we do not meet recommended best practice standards. We denote after each attribute whether it is recommended for honors programs (HP), honors colleges (HC), or both.

- The majority of the Honors College operational budget is covered by a student fee (HP, HC).
- The Honors College operates with a comparably small dedicated faculty and staff (HP, HC).
- The Honors College lacks a systematic mechanism for ensuring course coverage and largely depends on the good will of particular faculty members and administrators (HP, HC).
- Honors College requirements constitute a smaller percentage of students' undergraduate coursework than recommended, particularly for that recommended for an Honors College (HP, HC).
- There are significant unrealized opportunities for the Honors College to serve as an incubator for curricular and instructional innovation (HP, HC).
- There is no systematic mechanism for ensuring that faculty teaching Honors courses have exceptional teaching skills, the ability to provide intellectual leadership and mentoring for able students, and support for the mission of Honors education (HP, HC).
- The Honors College has no formal articulation agreements with two-year institutions (HP, HC).
- The Honors College is not a fully equal collegiate unit (HC).
- The head of the Honors College is an Executive Director, not a Dean (HC).
- The choice of faculty members teaching Honors sections of departmental courses is completely at the discretion of departments (HC).
- There is significant unrealized potential for fundraising and alumni affairs initiatives (HC).

Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors Program

Although no single or definitive honors program model can or should be superimposed on all types of institutions, the National Collegiate Honors Council has identified a number of best practices that are common to successful and fully developed honors programs

1. The honors program offers carefully designed educational experiences that meet the needs and abilities of the undergraduate students it serves. A clearly articulated set of admission criteria (e.g., GPA, SAT score, a written essay, satisfactory progress, etc.) identifies the targeted student population served by the honors program. The program clearly specifies the requirements needed for retention and satisfactory completion.

Educational experiences are discussed below in response to other specific characteristics of fully developed Honors programs.

The Honors College has specific admissions criteria for both incoming and continuing Clemson students. New student admissions criteria are based on high school GPA and SAT equivalents, with emphasis on GPA. The application also includes a listing and description of activities and awards, responses to several essay prompts, and teacher and counselor recommendations. Continuing Clemson students may also apply to the Honors College. Continuing students applying for General Honors must have a minimum Clemson cumulative GPA of 3.5 and complete an application including three essays. Students pursuing Departmental Honors must have a 3.5 GPA and receive the endorsement of the departmental representative.

In order to remain in the Honors College, students must maintain a 3.4 cumulative GPA and successfully complete at least one Honors course each semester (with a grade of an A or B). Students who do not meet those requirements are placed on probation for one semester, after which they either return to good standing or are removed from the Honors College. In the case of extenuating circumstances and with a detailed action plan, the probationary period may extend beyond one semester. Students whose cumulative GPA drops below 2.8 are automatically removed from the Honors College.

To successfully graduate with General Honors, students must meet the following requirements:

- Completion of a minimum of 18 credit hours from three or more groups. The groups are: Communication; Mathematical, Scientific and Technological Literacy & Engineering; Arts and Humanities; Social Science; Cross Cultural Awareness; Science and Technology in Society; and Other.
- At least three hours from three or more groups.
- At least three hours in each of three or more subjects (e.g., ENGL, MATH).
- A cumulative grade point average of 3.40 or higher on all coursework taken at Clemson (non-honors as well as honors courses).
- A grade of A or B in all courses taken to fulfill the requirements of General Honors.
- Completion of all University requirements for graduation.

In order to successfully graduate with Departmental Honors, students must meet the requirements for Departmental Honors as laid out by the department and approved by the CHCC.

2. The program has a clear mandate from the institution's administration in the form of a mission statement or charter document that includes the objectives and responsibilities of honors and defines the place of honors in the administrative and academic structure of the institution. The statement ensures the permanence and stability of honors by guaranteeing that adequate infrastructure resources, including an appropriate budget as well as appropriate faculty, staff, and administrative support when necessary, are allocated to honors so that the program avoids dependence on the good will and energy of particular faculty members or administrators for survival. In other words, the program is fully institutionalized (like comparable units on campus) so that it can build a lasting tradition of excellence.

The Honors College has a self-generated mission statement. The current Honors College leadership is not aware of any university-generated charter document.

The Honors College has a standalone budget, although the majority of operational expenses are covered by a student fee.

The Honors College has a dedicated staff of two faculty members (the Executive Director and Senior Associate Director, the latter being a 50% appointment), three advisors, one admissions coordinator, one project coordinator, and three administrative staff. One additional advisor, one administrative staff person, and one emeritus faculty member are employed part time.

The Honors College lacks any institutionalized structure for course coverage and largely depends on the good will of particular faculty members and administrators.

3. The honors director reports to the chief academic officer of the institution.

As of 2015, Bill Lasser reports to Provost Jones.

4. The honors curriculum, established in harmony with the mission statement, meets the needs of the students in the program and features special courses, seminars, colloquia, experiential learning opportunities, undergraduate research opportunities, or other independent-study options.

The Honors curriculum features Honors seminars (taught under an HON rubric) and Honors sections of departmental courses. Departmental Honors curricula are largely research-based. Students may also complete Interdisciplinary Honors, including coursework in two disciplines and an independent research project.

The Honors College offers several Honors-only study abroad programs, including a London internship program, the Dixon Global Policy Scholars Program, and the National Scholars Program study-travel experiences.

The Honors College also partners with USC's Honors College to offer a Washington internship program. In the past year, we have passed curriculum modifications that allow students to receive a full semester of credit for this internship (thus making them eligible to also receive their financial aid).

5. The program requirements constitute a substantial portion of the participants' undergraduate work, typically 20% to 25% of the total course work and certainly no less than 15%.

Students may complete General Honors with 18 hours. For students in degree programs requiring 120 hours, this is 15%. For those in degree programs requiring more hours (many degrees), it is less than 15% (as little as 13%).

Departmental Honors curricula vary by department and require anywhere from 5 to 13 hours, with the majority requiring 9 to 12 hours. This constitutes anywhere from less than 5% to just over 10% of a student's required hours to graduate.

Students pursuing General and Departmental Honors are required to take between 23 and 31 hours. This constitutes between 17 and 26% of their required hours to graduate.

6. The curriculum of the program is designed so that honors requirements can, when appropriate, also satisfy general education requirements, major or disciplinary requirements, and preprofessional or professional training requirements.

General Honors courses (HON seminars and Honors sections of departmental courses) are frequently used to satisfy General Education requirements. Departmental Honors courses can frequently be used

to satisfy major requirements. Many departments offer Honors sections of major courses as well; these are either standalone or embedded Honors sections.

7. The program provides a locus of visible and highly reputed standards and models of excellence for students and faculty across the campus.

The Honors College is recognized for recruiting, admitting, and developing Clemson's top students. Our students are campus leaders who are highly sought after for research and intern positions. Our Interdisciplinary seminars and Honors program can serve as models for other such developments on campus. However, there are significant unrealized opportunities for the Honors College to serve as an incubator for curricular and instructional innovations.

8. The criteria for selection of honors faculty include exceptional teaching skills, the ability to provide intellectual leadership and mentoring for able students, and support for the mission of honors education.

Many Honors courses are taught by some of the most well-regarded and recognized faculty on campus, although there is no systematic mechanism for ensuring that this is case. Honors seminar proposals are vetted by the Calhoun Honors College Committee with an eye toward how they meet the unique challenges of teaching high-achieving students. However, lacking a systematic approach to Honors curriculum delivery, the faculty who teach Honors seminars are also those who have departmental approval to do so and/or agree to teach in Honors as an overload. Honors seminars are currently taught by a combination of tenured and tenure-track faculty members, lecturers and adjunct faculty members, retired faculty members, and those without academic department affiliations; approximately 60 – 65% of Honors courses are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty members. The choice of faculty members teaching Honors sections of departmental courses is completely at the discretion of departments.

9. The program is located in suitable, preferably prominent, quarters on campus that provide both access for the students and a focal point for honors activity. Those accommodations include space for honors administrative, faculty, and support staff functions as appropriate. They may include space for an honors lounge, library, reading rooms, and computer facilities. If the honors program has a significant residential component, the honors housing and residential life functions are designed to meet the academic and social needs of honors students.

The Honors College moved into Buildings C and D of Core Campus in August/September 2016. The combined first floor is the Honors Center which contains classrooms, student study space, an event space, two conference rooms, the Honors College offices, and the National Scholars Program offices and student study space. The Honors Residential College occupies the upper floors of Buildings C and D. Housing community directors are included in Honors College staff meetings and Honors College and Housing staff members meet regularly about curriculum and governance issues.

10. The program has a standing committee or council of faculty members that works with the director or other administrative officer and is involved in honors curriculum, governance, policy, development, and evaluation deliberations. The composition of that group represents the colleges and/or departments served by the program and also elicits support for the program from across the campus.

Calhoun Honors College Committee (CHCC) formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The committee consists of the chair (filled by the Executive Director of the Honors College), one faculty member from each college and the Library, a member of Faculty Senate, two faculty members appointed by the Executive Director of the Honors College, three Honors students (two appointed by the Student Advisory Board and one by the Executive Director), an Associate Director of the Honors College, an Assistant Director of the Honors College, and a representative from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. The faculty members on the committee with voting status serve as the curriculum committee for the Honors College.

11. Honors students are assured a voice in the governance and direction of the honors program. This can

be achieved through a student committee that conducts its business with as much autonomy as possible but works in collaboration with the administration and faculty to maintain excellence in the program. Honors students are included in governance, serving on the advisory/policy committee as well as constituting the group that governs the student association.

The Honors College has a Student Advisory Board, two members of which also serve on the CHCC. The Student Advisory Board serves as the main liaison between Honors students and the Honors College administrative team. One additional student also serves on the CHCC.

12. Honors students receive honors-related academic advising from qualified faculty and/or staff.

The Honors College has a Director of Advising and Recruitment and two additional full-time advisors. One of these advisors is also the Recruitment Coordinator and the other is the Professional Development Coordinator for the College. One part-time staff person and a graduate assistant also serve as advisors for Honors students.

13. The program serves as a laboratory within which faculty feel welcome to experiment with new subjects, approaches, and pedagogies. When proven successful, such efforts in curriculum and pedagogical development can serve as prototypes for initiatives that can become institutionalized across the campus.

Honors seminars encourage interdisciplinary exploration of key intellectual, scientific, and political topics. These frequently allow faculty to explore a topic in greater depth or breadth than common in traditional disciplinary courses. Interdisciplinary Honors, a program started in 2016, offers students the ability to explore connections across disciplines while also conducting original research or completing artistic/applied projects. However, there are significant unrealized opportunities for the Honors College to serve as an incubator for curricular and instructional innovations.

14. The program engages in continuous assessment and evaluation and is open to the need for change in order to maintain its distinctive position of offering exceptional and enhanced educational opportunities to honors students.

The Honors College completes a WEAVE report each year and engages in a continuous process of assessing its programmatic offerings.

15. The program emphasizes active learning and participatory education by offering opportunities for students to participate in regional and national conferences, Honors Semesters, international programs, community service, internships, undergraduate research, and other types of experiential education.

The Honors College offers dedicated Study Abroad and internship programs and a community service group. We also offer competitive funding to support internship participation, educational enrichment activities (e.g., experiential learning, unpaid internships, etc), departmental research, and conference attendance and presentations. The majority of students completing Departmental Honors do so on a research track.

16. When appropriate, two-year and four-year programs have articulation agreements by which honors graduates from two-year programs who meet previously agreed-upon requirements are accepted into four-year honors programs.

The Honors College has no formal articulation agreements with two-year institutions. However, students applying to Clemson as transfers from institutions at which they were an Honors student may apply to the Honors College concurrent with their transfer application to Clemson.

17. The program provides priority enrollment for active honors students in recognition of scheduling difficulties caused by the need to satisfy both honors and major program(s) requirements.

Honors students receive priority registration.

Basic Characteristics of a Fully Developed Honors College

The National Collegiate Honors Council has identified these best practices that are common to successful and fully developed honors colleges.

1. An honors college incorporates the relevant characteristics of a fully developed honors program.
See above.
2. The honors college exists as an equal collegiate unit within a multi-collegiate university structure.
The Honors College is not a fully equal collegiate unit. See answer to #2 above for more elaboration.
3. The head of the honors college is a dean reporting directly to the chief academic officer of the institution and serving as a full member of the Council of Deans if one exists. The dean has a fulltime, 12-month appointment.
Bill Lasser is Executive Director of the Honors College, not a Dean. He has a de facto 12 month true. Dr. Lasser attends the Provost's Leadership Team Meetings. The Honors College serves as a non-voting member of the University's Academic Council.
4. The operational and staff budgets of honors colleges provide resources at least comparable to those of other collegiate units of equivalent size.
The Honors College budget is funded largely through self-generated fees.
5. The honors college exercises increased coordination and control of departmental honors where the college has emerged out of a decentralized system.
Departmental Honors curricula are determined by departments and approved by the CHCC. The Honors College monitors progress toward and awards departmental honors but defers to departments on curricular matters.
6. The honors college exercises considerable control over honors recruitment and admissions, including the appropriate size of the incoming class. Admission to the honors college may be by separate application.
The Honors College controls its own admissions process (students must be admitted to Clemson in order to be admitted to the Honors College), including the requirements for admission and the size of the incoming class. Admission to the Honors College is by separate application.
7. The honors college exercises considerable control over its policies, curriculum, and selection of faculty.
The Honors College controls its policies and General Honors Curriculum. Departmental Honors curricula are determined by departments and approved by the CHCC. Faculty who teach Honors seminars (those with an HON rubric) are selected by the Honors College pending approval of the department chair. Departments determine which faculty teach Honors sections of departmental courses. The choice of faculty members teaching Honors sections of departmental courses is completely at the discretion of departments.
8. The curriculum of the honors college offers significant course opportunities across all four years of study.
Typically, students focus on Honors courses that satisfy General Education requirements in their first two years. Students pursuing Departmental Honors complete those courses and research hours in the Junior and Senior years.
9. The curriculum of the honors college constitutes at least 20% of a student's degree program. The honors college requires an honors thesis or honors capstone project.

Depending on their major, some students completing both General and Departmental Honors would have Honors curricula constituting at least 20% of their graduation hours. The majority of Honors graduates would not meet this 20% mark.

Most Departmental Honors curricula require a thesis or capstone project. Students pursuing General Honors are not required to complete an honors thesis or capstone.

10. Where the home university has a significant residential component, the honors college offers substantial honors residential opportunities.
The Honors Residential College in Core Campus is open to all Honors students, although most residents are first-year students. Approximately 75% of Honors first-year students live in the Honors Residential College. The Honors College and Residential Learning teams are currently developing specific guidelines for tailoring Housing's Residential Experience Model Curriculum to students in the Honors Residential College.
11. The distinction achieved by the completion of the honors college requirements is publically announced and recorded, and methods may include announcement at commencement ceremonies, notations on the diploma and/or the student's final transcript, or other similar actions.
Honors College status is noted in the graduation program and on students' transcripts. The Honors College hosts its own recognition ceremonies in May and December.
12. Like other colleges within the university, the honors college may be involved in alumni affairs and development and may have an external advisory board.
The Honors College engages in some development efforts, although these are not well coordinated with the academic colleges and have been hampered by the resignation of our dedicated development officer. The Honors College has no formal procedure for alumni connections and lacks an external advisory board.

Appendix F. Clemson's Honors College Data

Part 1. Honors College Applicants, 2015 – 2018

Highlights

- The number of applications to the Honors College increased by 23.5% from 2015 to 2018 (Table 1).
- Approximately one-third of applicants are from South Carolina (Table 2).
- Acceptance rates ranged from a high of 54.6% (2016) to a low of 42.2% (2018) (Table 3).
- Enrollment rates ranged from 33.7% to 41.8% (Table 3).
- The average ACT of enrolled Honors students is 32, with an average SAT between 1440 and 1480. Enrolled Honors students are approximately in the top 3 – 4% of their high school graduating classes and, in 2018, had an average unweighted GPA of 3.94 (Table 4).
- Our top 3 competitor institutions (those that students declining our offer attend) are UNC-Chapel Hill, Georgia Tech, and the University of South Carolina (Table 5).
- The most common reasons for declining admission to the Honors College are the academic reputation/availability of a student's desired major and affordability/financial aid packages (Table 6).
- The two most popular majors for incoming Honors students are Engineering and Biological Sciences; the former has declined in prevalence over time while the latter has increased (Table 7).

| Table 1 | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Honors College Freshman Applications Overview | | | | |
| | Fall 2015 | Fall 2016 | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 |
| # of Honors Applications | 1,572 | 1,729 | 1,829 | 2,057 |
| # of CU Undergraduate Applications | 22,396 | 23,506 | 26,242 | 28,845 |
| % Undergraduate Applications that Applied to Honors | 7.02% | 7.36% | 6.97% | 7.13% |

| Table 2 | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Honors College Freshman Applications by State: Top 10 | | | | |
| | Fall 2015 | Fall 2016 | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 |
| 1 | South Carolina (579, 36.8%) | South Carolina (551, 31.9%) | South Carolina (634, 34.7%) | South Carolina (660, 32.1%) |
| 2 | North Carolina (235, 14.9%) | North Carolina (267, 15.4%) | North Carolina (256, 14%) | North Carolina (282, 13.7%) |
| 3 | Georgia (97, 6.2%) | Georgia (119, 6.9%) | Georgia (153, 8.4%) | Georgia (154, 7.5%) |
| 4 | Virginia (83, 5.3%) | Virginia (98, 5.7%) | Virginia (85, 4.6%) | New Jersey (95, 4.6%) |
| 5 | Tennessee (63, 4%) | Tennessee (77, 4.5%) | Tennessee (74, 4%) | Tennessee (86, 4.2%) |
| 6 | Florida (62, 3.9%) | Maryland (60, 3.5%) | Maryland (58, 3.2%) | Virginia (84, 4.1%) |
| 7 | Ohio (58, 3.7%) | Florida (58, 3.4%) | New Jersey (55, 3%) | Florida (77, 3.7%) |
| 8 | Maryland (51, 3.2%) | New Jersey (57, 3.3%) | Ohio (54, 3%) | Maryland (69, 3.4%) |
| 9 | Texas (37, 2.4%) | Ohio (55, 3.2%) | Florida (50, 2.7%) | New York (67, 3.3%) |
| 10 | New Jersey (35, 2.2%) | Texas (46, 2.7%) | Pennsylvania (49, 2.7%) | Texas (60, 2.9%) |
| Format: State Name (# of Honors Applications, % of Total Honors Applications) | | | | |

*See Appendix I for list of all states (Note: No applications have been received from South Dakota from Fall 2015 – Fall 2018)

| Table 3 | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Honors College Freshman Application, Acceptance, and Yield Statistics | | | | |
| | Fall 2015* | Fall 2016* | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 |
| # of Priority Honors Applications | 1,200 | 1,328 | 1,456 | 1,559 |
| # of Non-Priority Honors Applications | 263 | 290 | 345 | 372 |
| # of Late Honors Applications | 55 | 31 | 22 | 46 |
| Total Reviewed Honors Applications** | 1,518 | 1,649 | 1,823 | 1,977 |
| # of Admitted Students | 771 | 945 | 993 | 867 |
| Acceptance Rate | 49% | 54.6% | 54.3% | 42.2% |
| # of Enrolled Students | 291 | 318 | 415 | 313 |
| Enrollment Rate | 37.5% | 33.7% | 41.8% | 36.1% |

*Some non-priority applications were reviewed in the priority round in Fall 2015 & 2016

**Numbers are smaller than total Honors applications reported in Table 1 because Table 1 includes applications that were withdrawn due to early decision elsewhere or were never completed (supplementary materials not submitted)

| Table 4 | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Enrolled Honors Student Academic Performance | | | | |
| | Fall 2015 | Fall 2016 | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 |
| Average SAT Score* | 1440 | 1441 | 1471 | 1482 |
| Average ACT Score | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Class Rank %** | Top 2.77% | Top 3.31% | Top 4.11% | Top 4.23% |
| Average Unweighted High School GPA*** | NA | NA | NA | 3.94 |

*All scores adjusted to match the New SAT scale

**Calculated by Clemson Undergraduate Admissions

***2018 was the first year we used this figure

Table 5

Declining Students Survey: Top Schools Attended (≥ 5 students)

| | Fall 2015 (N=112) | Fall 2016 (N=142) | Fall 2017 (N=149) | Fall 2018 (N=204) |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Georgia Institute of Technology (13) | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (11) | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (19) | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (21) |
| 2 | University of South Carolina (9) | University of South Carolina (11) | Georgia Institute of Technology (14) | University of South Carolina (17) |
| 3 | University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (8) | Georgia Institute of Technology (10) | University of Virginia (12) | Georgia Institute of Technology (12) |
| 4 | University of Alabama (6) | North Carolina State University (8) | University of Georgia (8) | University of Georgia (11) |
| 5 | University of Virginia (6) | University of Alabama (6) | University of South Carolina (8) | University of Virginia (10) |
| 6 | Virginia Tech (5) | University of Virginia (6) | North Carolina State University (7) | North Carolina State University (8) |
| 7 | | University of Tennessee (5) | | University of Notre Dame (7) |
| 8 | | | | University of Florida (6) |
| 9 | | | | Duke University (5) |
| Format: College/University (# of Declining Students Attending) | | | | |

Table 6

Declining Students Survey: Most Important Decision Factor

| Reason for Choosing University/College | Fall 2015 (N=112) | Fall 2016 (N=142) | Fall 2017 (N=149) | Fall 2018 (N=204) |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| “Academic reputation of/availability of my choice of major” | 47.32% | 52.11% | 48.32% | 46.57% |
| “Most affordable option of all schools to which I was accepted” | 13.39% | 16.20% | 12.08% | 19.61% |
| “Financial aid package offered by the chosen school” | 13.39% | 11.97% | 17.45% | 16.18% |
| “Admission to the chosen school” | 7.14% | 10.56% | 2.68% | 7.35% |
| “Family legacy (siblings, parents, etc., attended chosen school)” | 4.46% | 2.11% | 2.01% | 0.98% |
| “Many of my friends will be at the chosen school” | 1.79% | -- | 0.67% | -- |
| “The chosen school is close to home” | -- | -- | 4.7% | 1.96% |
| “The chosen school is far from home” | -- | -- | 0.67% | -- |

Note: Column percentages may not add to 100% because some survey takers did not indicate their most important decision factor.

| Table 7 | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Most Popular Majors of Incoming Honors Students ($\geq 2\%$ of incoming student population) | | | | |
| | Fall 2015 | Fall 2016 | Fall 2017 | Fall 2018 |
| 1 | Engineering - Engineering (All Majors) (148, 50.9%) | Engineering - Engineering (All Majors) (149, 46.9%) | Engineering - Engineering (All Majors) (145, 34.9%) | Engineering - Engineering (All Majors) (112, 35.8%) |
| 2 | Biological Sciences (18, 6.2%) | Biological Sciences (19, 6%) | Biological Sciences (40, 9.6%) | Biological Sciences (33, 10.5%) |
| 3 | Nursing (11, 3.8%) | Pre - Business (14, 4.4%) | Pre - Business (20, 4.8%) | Health Science – Pre-professional Health Studies (23, 7.3%) |
| 4 | Biochemistry (10, 3.4%) | Health Science – Pre-professional Health Studies (12, 3.8%) | Health Science – Pre-professional Health Studies (19, 4.6%) | Biochemistry (15, 4.8%) |
| 5 | Health Science – Pre-professional Health Studies (8, 2.7%) | Nursing (10, 3.1%) | Biochemistry (17, 4.1%) | Computer Science (15, 4.8%) |
| 6 | Chemistry (8, 2.7%) | Biochemistry (9, 2.8%) | Genetics (15, 3.6%) | Pre - Business (13, 4.2%) |
| 7 | Pre-Business (7, 2.4%) | Computer Science (9, 2.8%) | Computer Science (15, 3.6%) | Nursing (13, 4.2%) |
| 8 | Computer Science (7, 2.4%) | Genetics (8, 2.5%) | Nursing (14, 3.4%) | Mathematical Sciences (B.A.) (12, 3.8%) |
| 9 | Genetics (6, 2.1%) | | Chemistry (13, 3.1%) | Chemistry (9, 2.9%) |
| 10 | | | Animal, and Veterinary Science (10, 2.4%) | Political Science (8, 2.6%) |
| Total Degree Programs Represented | 47 | 52 | 53 | 56 |

Format: Major (# of students, % of incoming Honors class)

| | | Table 8 | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | | Continuing and Transfer Honors Student Admission Statistics | | | |
| | | Spring 2017* | Fall 2017 | Spring 2018 | Fall 2018 |
| Continuing Students | Total General Honors Applicants | 90 | 63 | 110 | 68 |
| | General Honors Acceptance Rate | 67% | 81% | 69% | 81% |
| | Average GPA of General Honors Applicants | 3.71 | 3.71 | 3.75 | 3.77 |
| | Average GPA of Accepted General Honors | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.89 | 3.81 |
| | Total Departmental Honors Applicants | 11 | 32 | 23 | 37 |
| | Departmental Honors Acceptance Rate | 55% | 94% | 100% | 89% |
| | Average GPA of Departmental Honors Applicants | 3.55 | 3.74 | 3.77 | 3.76 |
| | Average GPA of Accepted Departmental Honors | 3.78 | 3.76 | 3.77 | 3.82 |
| Transfer Students | Total Honors Applicants | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| | Honors Acceptance Rate | 0% | 75% | 100% | 50%** |

*No data available prior to the time Continuing Admissions was added to Admit system in Spring 2017

**One applicant canceled their application

Part 2. Honors College Students and Graduates

Highlights

- There are just under 1600 Honors students, comprising approximately 8% of the undergraduate population (Table 1).
- All disciplinary colleges are represented among Honors students. Majors in departments in CECAS and CoS are most common (Table 1).
- Approximately 300 students (just over 10%) of students graduate with Honors each May (Table 2).
- Honors College graduates have an average GPA of at least 3.8 (Table 2).

Table 1. Current Honors Students (as of October 31, 2018).

| | N | % |
|--------------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| Total currently enrolled | 1573 | 8.1% of Clemson undergraduates |
| Major College | | |
| CAFLS | 74 | 4.7% |
| AAH | 98 | 6.2% |
| BSHS | 235 | 15.0% |
| Business | 165 | 10.5% |
| Education | 22 | 1.4% |
| CECAS | 609 | 38.7% |
| CoS | 370 | 23.5% |

Table 2. Honors graduates: numbers, type of honors, and GPA at graduation, May 2016 – 2018.

| | May 2016 | | May 2017 | | May 2018 | |
|---------------------|----------|-----|----------|-----|----------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Total* | 309 | | 274 | | 294 | |
| General Honors | 182 | 59% | 150 | 55% | 153 | 52% |
| Departmental Honors | 49 | 16% | 54 | 20% | 50 | 17% |
| Both | 78 | 25% | 70 | 25% | 90 | 31% |
| GPA at graduation | 3.80 | | 3.83 | | 3.83 | |

*Total university-wide May graduates: 2654 in 2016, 2693 in 2017, 2977 in 2018.

Part 3. Honors Courses, Spring and Fall 2018

Highlights

- Exclusive of research hours and CIs, there were 128 Honors course sections in Spring 2018 and 141 in Fall 2018 (Table 1).
 - Over half of all Honors sections are embedded Honors sections of disciplinary courses.
- Exclusive of research hours and CIs, there were 1353 Honors seats in Spring 2018 and 1454 Honors seats in Fall 2018 (Table 1).
 - The most common type of Honors seat is in a standalone section of a disciplinary course.
- Standalone Honors courses constitute 8-9% of corresponding disciplinary course sections, but only 2-3% of corresponding disciplinary course seats (Table 1).
- Embedded Honors courses constitute approximately 40% of corresponding disciplinary course sections, but less than 5% of corresponding disciplinary course seats (Table 1).
- Honors section and seat allotments range considerably across courses and disciplines (Table 2 and 3).

Table 1. Honors Seminars and Courses, Spring and Fall 2018.

| | Spring 2018 | | | | | | Fall 2018 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| | N sections | % of Honors sections | Honors as % of course sections* | N seats | % of Honors seats | % of course seats | N sections | % of Honors sections | Honors as % of course sections* | N seats | % of Honors seats | Honors as % of course seats |
| Honors courses/sections | 128 | | | 1353 | | | 141 | | | 1454 | | |
| Honors (HON) seminars | 26 | 20.3 | --- | 343 | 25.4 | --- | 25 | 17.7 | --- | 384 | 26.4 | --- |
| Standalone Honors sections | 29 | 22.7 | 8.8 | 692 | 51.1 | 2.2 | 35 | 24.8 | 8.1 | 612 | 42.1 | 2.8 |
| Embedded Honors sections | 73 | 57.0 | 39.2 | 318 | 23.5 | 3.6 | 81 | 57.4 | 40.1 | 458 | 31.5 | 4.7 |
| Honors Seminars by Category | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CCA | 7 | 26.9 | --- | 47 | 13.7 | --- | 3 | 12.0 | --- | 37 | 9.6 | --- |
| Humanities | 8 | 30.7 | --- | 144 | 42.0 | --- | 6 | 24.0 | --- | 99 | 25.8 | --- |
| Social Science | 3 | 11.5 | --- | 70 | 20.4 | --- | 9 | 36.0 | --- | 109 | 28.4 | --- |
| STS | 3 | 11.5 | --- | 31 | 9.0 | --- | 4 | 16.0 | --- | 79 | 20.6 | --- |
| Other | 5 | 19.2 | --- | 51 | 14.9 | --- | 3 | 12.0 | --- | 60 | 15.6 | --- |

*For standalone and embedded Honors sections, the percentages refer just to the percentage of all courses with an Honors section that were Honors. Courses without any Honors sections are excluded from these analyses.

Table 2. Number of Honors standalone sections and their percentage of all sections of a given course.

| Subject | Course | Title | Spring 2018 | | | | Fall 2018 | | | |
|---------|--------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| | | | Honors sections | Honors as % of all sections | Honors seats | Honors as % of all seats | Honors sections | Honors as % of all sections | Honors seats | Honors as % of all seats |
| BIOL | 1030 | General Biology I | | | | | 1 | 20.0% | 28 | 2.8% |
| BIOL | 1040 | General Biology II | 1 | 25.0% | 18 | 2.9% | | | | |
| BIOL | 1100 | Principles of Biology I | | | | | 2 | 50.0% | 67 | 12.4% |
| BIOL | 1110 | Principles of Biology II | 2 | 50.0% | 48 | 15.9% | | | | |
| CH | 1010 | General Chemistry | | | | | 2 | 10.0% | 55 | 2.7% |
| CH | 1020 | General Chemistry | 2 | 15.4% | 100 | 9.6% | | | | |
| COMM | 2500 | Public Speaking | 3 | 7.5% | 62 | 7.9% | 5 | 11.4% | 77 | 10.2% |
| ECON | 2110 | Principles of Microecon | | | | | 1 | 2.7% | 22 | 2.0% |
| ECON | 2120 | Principles of Macroecon | 1 | 3.6% | 16 | 2.2% | | | | |
| ENGL | 1030 | Composition and Rhetoric | 1 | 1.4% | 19 | 1.8% | 2 | 2.3% | 29 | 2.3% |
| ENGL | 2120 | World Literature | 1 | 4.0% | 8 | 1.3% | | | | |
| ENGL | 2130 | British Literature | | | | | 1 | 4.8% | 16 | 4.2% |
| ENGL | 2150 | 20th - 21st Century Lit | 1 | 2.3% | 17 | 3.3% | 1 | 5.3% | 18 | 2.4% |
| ENGL | 3140 | Technical Writing | | | | | 1 | 5.0% | 15 | 4.1% |
| ENGR | 1020 | Engr Discipl & Skills | | | | | 3 | 9.7% | 102 | 8.9% |
| ENGR | 1410 | Program & Problem Solving | 2 | 9.1% | 79 | 9.0% | | | | |
| FDSC | 4020 | Food Chem II | 1 | 50.0% | 3 | 5.0% | | | | |
| MATH | 1060 | Calc of One Variable I | | | | | 1 | 3.8% | 8 | 0.8% |
| MATH | 1080 | Calc of One Variable II | 1 | 5.6% | 15 | 2.3% | 1 | 11.1% | 5 | 1.5% |
| MATH | 2060 | Calc of Several Vars | | | | | 1 | 7.7% | 44 | 4.5% |
| MATH | 2080 | Intro to Ordin Diff Eqns | 1 | 5.9% | 22 | 3.3% | 1 | 20.0% | 23 | 8.3% |
| MATH | 3110 | Linear Algebra | 1 | 11.1% | 14 | 4.4% | | | | |
| MGT | 2010 | Principles of Management | 1 | 12.5% | 12 | 1.4% | 1 | 14.3% | 12 | 1.3% |
| MUSC | 2100 | Music in West World | 3 | 25.0% | 56 | 16.3% | 2 | 14.3% | 28 | 6.8% |
| PHIL | 1010 | Intro to Phil Prob | | | | | 1 | 25.0% | 15 | 17.4% |
| PHIL | 1030 | Intro to Ethics | 1 | 11.1% | 18 | 6.9% | | | | |
| POSC | 1030 | Intro to Political Theory | | | | | 1 | 50.0% | 5 | 4.2% |
| PRTM | 3910 | Value of National Parks | 1 | 33.3% | 14 | 40% | | | | |
| PSYC | 2010 | Intro to Psychology | 2 | 25.0% | 38 | 5.6% | 1 | 20.0% | 19 | 2.4% |
| REL | 1020 | World Religions | 1 | 33.3% | 16 | 21.1% | 1 | 25.0% | 18 | 15.5% |
| SOC | 2010 | Intro to Sociology | | | | | 2 | 25.0% | 37 | 20.8% |
| STAT | 2220 | Stats in Everyday Life | | | | | 1 | 14.3% | 16 | 2.7% |
| STAT | 2300 | Statistical Methods I | 1 | 14.3% | 33 | 4.0% | 1 | 14.3% | 18 | 3.0% |
| THEA | 2100 | Theatre Appreciation | 1 | 12.5% | 4 | 1.9% | 1 | 12.5% | 15 | 6.4% |

Table 3. Embedded Honors courses, Spring and Fall 2018.

| Subject | Course | Title | Spring 2018 | | Fall 2018 | |
|---------|--------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | # Honors | % of sections | # Honors | % of sections |
| AAH | 1010 | Surv of Art & Arch I | | | 1 | 50 |
| AAH | 1020 | Survey Art & Arc Hist II | 1 | 50 | | |
| ACCT | 2010 | Fin Acct Concepts | 1 | 7.7 | 2 | 11.8 |
| ACCT | 2020 | Mgr Acct Concepts | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 11.1 |
| ACCT | 3030 | Cost Accounting | 1 | 20 | 1 | 20 |
| ACCT | 3110 | Intermediate Fin Acct I | 1 | 16.7 | 2 | 28.6 |
| ACCT | 3120 | Intermed Fin Acct II | 1 | 16.7 | 1 | 14.3 |
| ACCT | 3130 | Intermed Fin Acct III | 1 | 20 | 1 | 20 |
| ACCT | 4040 | Individual Taxation | 2 | 50 | 2 | 33.3 |
| AVS | 3700 | Prin Animal Nutr | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| AVS | 4530 | Animal Reproduction | 1 | 33.3 | 1 | 50 |
| AVS | 4800 | Vertebrate Endocrinology | | | 1 | 50 |
| BCHM | 4310 | Phys App to Bioch | | | 1 | 50 |
| BCHM | 4360 | Mol Bio Genes to Proteins | 1 | 50 | | |
| BCHM | 4400 | Bioinformatics | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 3020 | Invertebrate Biology | 1 | 50 | | |
| BIOL | 3030 | Vertebrate Biology | | | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 3040 | Biology of Plants | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4140 | Basic Immunology | 1 | 50 | | |
| BIOL | 4200 | Neurobiology | | | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4400 | Developmental Animal Biol | | | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4410 | Ecology | | | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4560 | Medical and Vet Parasito | | | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4610 | Cell Biology | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| BIOL | 4700 | Behavioral Ecology | 1 | 50 | | |
| CE | 2010 | Statics | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 12.5 |
| CH | 3310 | Physical Chemistry | | | 1 | 50 |
| CH | 3320 | Physical Chemistry | 3 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| CH | 4010 | Organometallic Chemistry | | | 1 | 50 |
| CH | 4020 | Inorganic Chemistry | | | 1 | 50 |
| CH | 4040 | Bioinorganic Chem | 1 | 50 | | |
| CH | 4130 | Chem Aqueous Systems | 1 | 50 | | |
| CH | 4210 | Adv Organic Chem | | | 1 | 50 |
| ECE | 2010 | Logic & Comp Device | | | 1 | 50 |
| ECE | 2020 | Electric Circuits I | | | 1 | 50 |
| ECE | 3200 | Electronics I | | | 1 | 50 |
| ECE | 3300 | Signals & Systems | | | 1 | 33.3 |
| ECON | 3150 | Intermediate Macro | 1 | 33.3 | | |
| EDEL | 4510 | Elem Meth Sci Tchg | | | 1 | 33.3 |
| EDEL | 4520 | Elem Methods Math Teach | 1 | 33.3 | | |
| EDF | 3020 | Educational Psychology | 2 | 33.3 | | |
| EDF | 3340 | Child Growth and Dev | | | 1 | 33.3 |
| EDF | 3350 | Adolec. Growth & Develop | 1 | 50 | | |
| EDSC | 4240 | Tchng Sec English | | | 1 | 50 |
| EDSC | 4270 | Tchng Sec Science | | | 1 | 50 |
| EDSP | 3700 | Intro to Special Ed | 1 | 25 | 1 | 33.3 |
| FDSC | 4010 | Food Chem I | | | 1 | 50 |
| FIN | 3110 | Financial Management I | 3 | 37.5 | 1 | 16.7 |
| FIN | 3120 | Financial Management II | 2 | 33.3 | 2 | 33.3 |
| FIN | 4020 | Corporate Valuation | | | 1 | 50 |
| FIN | 4040 | Financial Modeling | 1 | 50 | | |
| FIN | 4050 | Port Mgt and Theory | | | 1 | 50 |
| FIN | 4060 | Derivatives Analysis | | | 1 | 50 |
| GC | 1020 | Comp Art & CAD Found | | | 1 | 33.3 |
| GC | 2070 | Graphic Comm II | | | 1 | 50 |
| GC | 3400 | Digital Img & eMedia | | | 1 | 50 |

| | | | | | | |
|------|------|---------------------------|---|------|---|------|
| GC | 4060 | Pkg & Specialty Printing | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GC | 4440 | Cur Dev/Trends in Gr Com | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GC | 4480 | Plan & Cont Print Funct | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GEN | 3020 | Molec & General Genetics | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GEN | 4100 | Population Quant Genetics | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GEN | 4400 | Bioinformatics | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| GEN | 4500 | Comparative Genetics | | | 1 | 50 |
| GEOL | 2020 | Earth History | 1 | 50 | | |
| LAW | 3220 | Legal Env of Bus | 1 | 5.6 | 1 | 6.3 |
| MATH | 2060 | Calc of Several Variable | 1 | 11.1 | | |
| MATH | 3110 | Linear Algebra | | | 1 | 8.3 |
| MATH | 4400 | Linear Programming | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| ME | 3080 | Fluid Mechanics | 1 | 25 | 1 | 25 |
| MGT | 3070 | Human Resource Mgt | | | 1 | 12.5 |
| MGT | 3100 | Inter Business Stats | 1 | 11.1 | 1 | 25 |
| MGT | 3120 | Decision Models for Mgt | | | 1 | 25 |
| MGT | 4020 | Ops Pln and Ctl | | | 1 | 50 |
| MGT | 4150 | Business Strategy | 2 | 18.2 | 1 | 11.1 |
| MICR | 4000 | Public Health Micro | 1 | 50 | | |
| MICR | 4050 | Adv Microb Ecol of Human | | | 1 | 50 |
| MICR | 4110 | Pathogenic Bact | 1 | 50 | | |
| MICR | 4120 | Bacterial Physiology | 1 | 50 | | |
| MICR | 4130 | Industrial Micro | 1 | 50 | | |
| MICR | 4140 | Basic Immunology | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| MICR | 4150 | Microbial Genetics | | | 1 | 50 |
| MICR | 4160 | Intro Virology | | | 1 | 50 |
| MICR | 4170 | Cancer and Aging | 1 | 50 | | |
| MSE | 4150 | Polymer Sc Engr | 1 | 50 | 1 | 33 |
| MSE | 4570 | Color Science | 1 | 50 | | |
| MSE | 4610 | Poly & Fiber Sci III | | | 1 | 50 |
| NUTR | 4250 | Medica Nutr Thera II | 1 | 50 | | |
| NUTR | 4510 | Human Nutrition | | | 1 | 50 |
| NUTR | 4550 | Nutr Metabolism | 1 | 50 | | |
| PHYS | 1220 | Physics W/Cal I | 1 | 14.3 | 1 | 20 |
| PHYS | 2210 | Physics with Calculus II | 1 | 20 | 1 | 16.7 |
| PHYS | 2220 | Physics with Calculus III | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 |
| PHYS | 3220 | Mechanics II | 1 | 50 | | |
| PHYS | 3250 | Exper Physics I | | | 1 | 50 |
| PHYS | 4170 | Intro to Biophys I | 1 | 50 | | |
| PHYS | 4410 | Electromagnetics I | | | 1 | 50 |
| PHYS | 4460 | Solid State Phys II | 1 | 50 | | |
| PHYS | 4550 | Quantum Physics I | | | 1 | 50 |
| PHYS | 4560 | Quantum Physics II | 1 | 50 | | |
| PHYS | 4650 | Thermo and Stat Mech | 1 | 50 | | |
| PKSC | 3680 | Pkg and Society | 1 | 50 | | |
| PKSC | 4640 | Fd & Hc Pkg Systems | | | 1 | 50 |
| SOC | 4610 | Sex & Gender | 1 | 50 | | |
| SPAN | 2010 | Intermediate Spanish | 1 | 5.3 | 1 | 5.3 |
| SPAN | 2020 | Intermediate Spanish | 1 | 5.3 | | |
| WFB | 4620 | Wetland Wildl Biol | 1 | 50 | | |

Note: Having 50% of all sections with an embedded Honors section typically involves a small number of Honors seats in the only section offered of a given course.