National Collegiate Honors Council
Annual Business Meeting and Presidential Address

Sheraton – Boston, Constitution Ballroom A

Saturday, November 10, 2018 – 8:30 AM

1. Welcome (Naomi Yavneh Klos)

Yavneh Klos convened the meeting at 8:31 a.m. She congratulated Richard Badenhausen for a successful conference and thanked the Executive Committee members. She also acknowledged the Board members and thanked the Executive Director, Mary Beth Rathe.

1. Announcements and Introduction of NCHC Staff (Mary Beth Rathe)

Mary Beth introduced six staff members, Deanne McClatchey, Amber Brand, Edmund Tan, Rob Tualaulelei, Alana Giesemann, and the meeting planner, Julie Holm.

1. Adoption of the Agenda (Yavneh Klos)

Motion made by Ryan Diehl, seconded by Susan Dinan

The agenda was adopted by unanimous consent.

1. Approval of the 2017 Annual Business Meeting Minutes, as posted and distributed (Yavneh Klos)

Motion made by Eddie Weller, seconded by Ryan Diehl

The 2017 Annual Business Meeting Minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

1. Treasurer’s Report (Steve Engel)

Engel drew attention to the handout showing the past five years’ operating budget. He explained to the audience how the hospitality line works: NCHC pays for the food for the conference in order to receive free meeting rooms. He noted that the NCHC account broke even in 2013; however, the past three years, our account operated at a loss, and in 2017 we broke even again. He thanked the hard work of the National Office staff for reducing the overall line-item of staff salary. He noted that such a reduction would not be a long-term solution because the conference in Atlanta was much more economical than in Boston, which contributed to our account breaking even. He added that NCHC provided living wage for our staff but that it had not provided insurance benefit. In order for the organization to be sustainable in a long term, NCHC needs to provide insurance to our staff. In response to the question from the floor, Engel said that NCHC was not able to negotiate with the University of Nebraska Lincoln to provide health insurance through the university. Because the National Office is located in Lincoln, NCHC is looking into using insurance for non-profit organizations in Nebraska. To recruit and retain employees, providing the insurance is crucial.

Then, Engel explained the ballot proposal related to the dues increase. This involves modifying NCHC’s bylaws and constitution, and there will be a session on dues increase following the annual business meeting. Engel noted that the last dues increase was in 2005 and there had been inflation. In the meantime, NCHC added more publications such as *HIP* and *UReCA*, without adding funds to the organization. The Board started looking into the sliding dues two years ago. First we redefined the membership categories in order to prevent for-profit organizations becoming NCHC members. Engel added that the student paid-membership category was removed, so that any and all honors students at a member-institution would be considered members and eligible for all NCHC programs, including nominations for student of the year. Student members requested adding a one-year student member to the Board, to allow for students from community colleges, or juniors at four-year institutions, to participate. Engel emphasized that the 2-year, 4-year, small, medium, and large institutions categories were based on institutional FTE, not enrollment in honors. He encouraged the audience to seek administrative support for institutional membership. He asked the audience to vote on this matter. In response to the question from the floor about institutions that were in between two categories, Engel explained that the small/medium/large categories were based on the IPEDS data.

Engel then explained the endowment account. NCHC has around 2 million dollars in the endowment account. We annually withdraw 4% of interest to fund awards for students, faculty, and others. In 2018, NCHC spent approximately $67,000 for awards.

Engel encouraged the audience to join the information session following the business meeting.

1. Old Business
	1. 2018 Conference (Richard Badenhausen)—Badenhausen thanked people for attending the Story Slam. This year, the conference added some new sessions such as Professional Staff in Honors (PSIH) and had some exciting conversation in Teaching and Learning. He hoped these would continue in the next conference chaired by Elaine Torda. Badenhausen announced the registration for the 2018 Conference was 2,100, which was the second largest conference in NCHC’s history. The largest was the last conference in New Orleans. He asked the Conference Planning Committee members to stand and be acknowledged.
	2. 2019 Conference (Elaine Torda)—Torda hoped that the New Orleans Conference would have more registration than this year. She announced the next conference theme: Disrupting Education. This conference will celebrate honors creativity and innovation. Cartoonist, Lynda Barry (U of Wisconsin) will be the plenary speaker. Torda and Rathe invited the audience to email ideas to them to make the next conference more exciting.
2. New Business

Annual Report/Strategic Priorities (Yavneh Klos)—Yavneh Klos announced that the Board approved the Strategic Priorities at the Fall Board meeting. She explained that the process began well over a year ago and that during last year’s November Board meeting, the Board added diversity and inclusive excellence to the three existing priorities—Professional Development, Advocacy, and Research. The Board brought in an outside consultant in order to make the strategic planning, goal setting and timeline an inclusive process. In addition to one-hour phone conversations with each of the board members, a survey was sent out to the membership. The survey received about 120 responses, and 16 lapsed members were reached out to via phone calls. Based on the results of the survey, board member one-on-ones, and the lapsed member conversations, the Board added the fifth priority, organizational excellence. The draft action plan, including suggested responsible parties, and timelines, will be sent to the membership early December with a quick turnaround so that members will be able to get involved. The Board plan to discuss the Strategic Priorities at the next board meeting in Chicago in February.

1. Slate of Nominees (Art Spisak)

Spisak noted that the nominations were his last work as the immediate Past President. He noted that there was a strong slate of candidates. He recognized the Nominations Committee members.

**Officer Nominees**

**Vice Presidential Nominees (Vote for 1)**

Suketu Bhavsar, California State Polytechnic University – Pomona

Melissa Johnson, University of Florida

**Secretary Nominees (Vote for 1)**

Keith Garbutt, Oklahoma State University

Laurie Smith-Law, Iowa State University

Brian White, Graceland University

**Board of Directors Nominees**

**Board of Directors Nominees (Professional — Three Year Term—Vote for 3)**

Andrew Cognard-Black, St. Mary’s College of Maryland

Leah Creque, Morehouse College

Susan Dinan, Pace University

Trisha Folds-Bennett, College of Charleston

David Jones, University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

Kristine Miller, Utah State University

Clay Motley, Florida Gulf Coast University

Lynn (Eileen Preston), Tarrant County Community College

Jeff Vahlbusch, Appalachian State University

Eddie Weller, San Jacinto College District

**Student Nominees**

**Board of Directors (Student — Two Year Term—vote for 2)**

Olivia Fuson, Creighton University

Aline Webb, University of New Mexico

**Nominations from the Floor**

Vice President: None

Secretary: None

Board of Directors, Professional: none

Board of Directors, Student:

Suketu Bhavsar nominated Amber Bland (California State Polytechnic University-Pomona

Tom Jones moved to close the nomination from the floor; Eddie Weller seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Closed the nomination from the floor.

1. Recognition of Retiring Board Members

Kyoko Amano, Lock Haven University

Art Spisak, University of Iowa

Mary Kate Andrepont, Loyola University New Orleans

Coreen Jackson, Tennessee State University

Melissa Johnson, University of Florida

Lynn Preston, Tarrant County Community College

Rae Rosenthal, The Community College of Baltimore County

Keyashia Willis, Virginia State University

1. President’s Address (Yavneh Klos)--Appendix

President’s address received standing ovation

1. Passing of the gavel (Yavneh Klos/Badenhausen)

Yavneh Pinned Richard (NCHC President 2018-2019). Badenausen drew attention to

two important events today: Nikki Giovanni at 3:00 p.m. and the Award Ceremony at 5:00 p.m.

1. Adjournment (Badenhausen)

Motion made by Ryan Diehl, seconded by Andrew Cognard-Black. Meeting adjourned at 9:26 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyoko Amano

NCHC Secretary

Appendix

President’s Remarks

Naomi Yavneh Klos, Ph.D.

November 10, 2018

My children like to say that it is dangerous to ride on a plane or even an elevator with me. They know that, at some point, after the doors have closed or the seat belts are fastened, I am going to start talking about honors. As NCHC president this past year, it has been an honor to speak with a great many people about honors, and, especially, to address the false dichotomy so many minds between “high ability” students, on the one hand, and those who have “high financial need” or are considered in some way “high risk” -- students from low income families, or from under-represented groups, or who have disabilities, or who are first in their families to attend college. In airplanes and on elevators and on campuses and in organizational offices, I like to tell folks that NCHC member institutions are public and private, secular and faith based, 2 and 4 year, R1s and PUIs. They are HBCUs and HSIs. They are in The Netherlands and China and Siberia and Alaska and Boston. Honors students come from all academic disciplines, are citizens and undocumented, first generation and veterans. They are LGBTQA, as well as Straight, they are cisgender, transgender and non-binary, and they represent the full spectrum of racial and ethnic diversity in this country.

But that’s what I say in the elevator, in public. Here in this room, among ourselves, we know that honors is sometimes constructed as a locus of privilege, raising the rankings of its institution by using restrictive models of admission that fail to recognize the role of systemic bias in the traditional metrics of academic excellence. For example, we know -- and have known for a very long time -- that SAT and ACT tests favor the children of white, affluent, college-educated parents. They also offer an advantage to those whose parents can afford test prep tutoring and who can pay for their children to take the test multiple times, if necessary. We now have a mechanism in place that boosts that advantage: superscoring! So why, let me ask, beloved honors community, do we still rely on these tests for admission to honors and for high-stakes scholarships, even at some “test optional” institutions? And when we do, why are we surprised that an honors college (or program) might be “whiter” than its institution as a whole?

Even more holistic admissions processes may skew in favor of certain students -- like when we focus on how many AP classes a student has taken, but bypass the valedictorian at the underfunded school that offers no APs, and only 10% of whose graduates go on to college. When we look at a resume (rather than a list) of extra-curricular activities that doesn’t value “working in the family gas station convenience store” or “baby-sitting my siblings” or “mowing lawns” as highly as efforts like “captain of the lacrosse team” or an “unpaid internship at (my dad’s friend’s) law firm,” or “tutoring under-privileged children in Ghana.” I am not saying athletics or internships or tutoring are not worthy activities, but they cannot be the only measure of a student’s worth. I am a tremendous champion of community engagement and volunteering, but also somewhat suspicious of voluntourism that doesn’t require substantive reflection, or double hours earned because you stocked the food pantry at an inconvenient hour.

And once students are on campus, are we inadvertently sending a message of who and who does belong, through prompts and support mechanisms that privilege certain viewpoints or experiences? For example, is a student whose first language is not English best served by a writing center with a policy of not correcting grammar?

I am exciting by the work y’all are doing on your campuses, and NCHC is doing, discussing alternative metrics for admissions, new success scripts, and other efforts to recruit to and retain in and graduate from honors more students from marginalized backgrounds. Still, there is work to be done reframing the question, moving far beyond “how can we get more X students in honors?” to creating, and understanding, the value of an inclusive community.

As Georgetown historian Marcia Chatelain has written in the Chronicle about her work with students who are first in their families to attend college, “[they] are not recipients of institutional benevolence. Rather, they are members of our communities who remind us of our need to confront our histories of exclusion and choose a future of inclusion.”

I would just say, they are members of our communities. Period.

To quote Fr Greg Boyle, SJ, founder of homeboy industries and author of *Tattoos on the heart* -- a beloved first year read for many Jesuit honors programs -- “When we stand on the margins, the margins are erased.”

Honors is not a checklist of experiences, it is a community of relationships, and we are each strengthened by being part of a welcoming, inclusive community. If we want to teach our students to listen respectfully to others with divergent opinions, if we want them to be consensus builders who work collaboratively to find solutions, they must be educated in a diverse, inclusive community.

Let’s remember, too, that the margins are fluid, and that we have a history of change, for the better. What is transgressive now is status quo tomorrow. How many people in this room know what the term “parietal hours” means?

At the turn of the 20th century, most colleges and universities denied access to women, to people of color, to Catholics, to Jews. Back before Jews were considered white people, all four of my grandparents were refugees. My father, Raphael Yavneh, was the first in his family not just to graduate from college, but from high school. My mother’s mother, Grandma Anne, came to New York from Romania just a year before WWI began. And because New York City at that time, almost uniquely, was committed to free higher education for girls with high academic ability, regardless of religion, ethnicity, or race, Grandma -- a Jewish immigrant whose first language was Yiddish -- went to college. She couldn’t major in physics (I guess they weren’t that enlightened at Hunter), but she could minor in it, and major in math. Grandma got married after her junior year, but she still finished college, even when she became pregnant. There was a physical exam required for graduation, but the doctor (a woman) who examined my very gravid grandmother simply ignored her giant belly, and passed her without comment.

Grandma raised her children, including as a single mother during the four years of WWII, while her engineer husband (also an immigrant with a free education at New York’s Cooper Union) served as a CB in the Pacific theater. In her 50’s, she went back to school, earning a master’s at Columbia, and then teaching at a rural high school, where she prepared students for college. Grandma was the one the kids always asked to chaperone the dance, and proudly displayed her “teacher of the year” snow shovel when we came to visit her home in Napanoch, New York.

So, first of all, a big shout out to my STEM granda, who helped me with my trigonometry homework!

But also, shout out to New York City, and to Hunter College, which was committed to free education for academically gifted girls and women, including poor immigrants whose resume included “babysitting my younger siblings” and “working in the family linoleum store.”

We should also honor the high school guidance counselor, who saw Grandma’s ability and who told her, “You can go to college -- it’s free and here’s a scholarship so you can buy your books,” and even more importantly, “You should go to college; you belong in college.

Finally, I tell this story because when we share our authentic selves with our students or really anyone, they feel open to bringing their authentic selves as well. When a first generation student looks at me, she might see a privileged, curly-haired, white woman. I look at her and see Grandma Anne. And when I tell her about Grandma Anne, I generally find that she sees herself in Grandma Anne, and in me. I hope, when I share this story of Grandma Anne with you, together, we can see the power of honors education to transform lives.