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GENERAL NARRATIVE
1. INTRODUCTION

Hampshire College was invited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges to stand for accreditation in the spring of 1974, prior to the graduation of its first full class. The Accrediting Team recommended accreditation for three years, and in their letter of transmittal referred to ten specific problem areas which they stressed should be addressed by 1977: complexity of its governing structure, financial situation, adequacy of internal controls on the quality and number of course offerings, faculty workload, academic advising, quality of and responsibility for keeping records of students' academic progress, Hampshire's participation in Five College course interchange, appropriate turnover of faculty to promote revitalization, orientation of new faculty, and the housemaster system.

The Self Study will refer to those issues individually as they appear in the narrative. Since 1974 considerable progress has been made in the areas of governance, advising, curriculum planning, central records, Five College course interchange, orientation of new faculty, and financial planning. Problems persist within the House system, with the general questions of faculty load, and with the control of faculty turnover which several years of experience with contract termination and reappointment have produced. Emerging problem areas, notably admissions and attrition, have become apparent since the spring of 1974, and efforts to define and resolve them have been ongoing.

Overall Hampshire College has experienced four years of solid achievement by faculty, students, and administration. The building years are behind
us, and we are now functioning at an impressive level of achievement by graduates, scholarship by the faculty, and service by the administration. This Self-Study will be the first step in a new series of analyses and assessments to be carried out in preparing the College for its role in the 1980's.

A number of important changes have occurred since Hampshire College was initially granted accreditation. Physical expansion of the campus has continued, although it has slowed from the rapid rate of growth in the early 1970's. New construction is under way for an Arts Village. The Painting Barn was completed last year; the Music and Dance Building is now almost complete; and plans are progressing for the Film Building. A Theatre Building is also planned for the solar-heated complex.

The size of the residential student body has stabilized at approximately 1200 and the faculty at 122 persons, comprising 81.5 FTEs this year. An Affirmative Action Plan has been filed and its provisions implemented from the Office of the Vice-President.

There have been major changes in personnel since the last Accrediting Team's visit. A new President has been recruited to succeed Charles Longsworth, who left Hampshire in June 1977 to become President of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. She is Adele Smith Simmons, former Dean of Student Affairs at Princeton University. In 1976 Allen Torrey succeeded Kenneth Rosenthal as Treasurer of the College. The post of Dean of the College has been abolished and a new position of Dean of the Faculty established to oversee faculty matters and academic planning. The position is occupied by Professor Penina Glazer, an historian who has taught for several years in the School of Social Science. Professor
Barbara Turlington, who served as Acting Dean of the College for two years, is now Dean of Academic Affairs. She recently accepted a new post with the Association of American Universities, effective April 1. With her departure a new position, Dean of Student Affairs, will be created to replace the Dean of Academic Affairs position. Recruitment for this post is now under way. Also under way is the recruitment of a new Director of Admissions.

There is also new leadership at the School level. The School of Humanities and Arts has as its new Dean Barry Goldensohn, a poet and literature professor. Professor Lynn Miller, a biologist, is serving as Interim Dean in the School of Natural Science until the newly hired Dean assumes duties at the beginning of the next academic year. The Schools of Language and Communication and Social Science utilize a rotating leadership model, and Professor Christopher Witherspoon, a philosopher, and Professor Louise Farnham, a psychologist, are serving as School Coordinator and School Dean respectively in their Schools.

This Self Study is designed to present the current state of the College in two ways. First there is a comprehensive review of all phases of the College, with special attention to the recommendations of the past Accrediting Team. Second, there are sections devoted to several special emphases which the College believes require attention and advice from the accrediting visitors. The emphases selected are: admission, retention of students, faculty teaching load, the long-range strategy for the development of financial support for the College, and the special problems which have arisen from Hampshire College's atypical student record-keeping systems. The faculty load and record-keeping questions are a carry-over from the period evaluated in
April 1974. The other items reflect emerging problems which the College will face over the next five years. Advice and counsel from the Accrediting Team regarding the adequacy of the College to face them will be welcomed.
2. ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL

2.1 Board of Trustees

The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees describing the composition and characteristics of the Board may be found in Appendix A. At this writing the Board consists of nineteen members of the twenty-three possible total. Balloting is currently being conducted for two slots, and qualified members are being sought for the remaining two vacant positions. Since 1973 two cohorts of four persons have ended service on the Board, and ten persons have joined the Board to take their place. In January 1975 John P. Kendall, President of Faneuil Hall Associates, succeeded Hampshire's Founder President Franklin Patterson as Chairman of the Board. The list of the present members of the Board and its officers is contained in Appendix B.

The annual four-meeting schedule has been sustained throughout the life of the College, and the committee structure remains intact, with the addition of two ad hoc committees. The standing committees are Nominating, Educational Policy, Finance, Development, Five College Cooperation, Campus Life, Compensation, and the Executive Committee; an ad hoc Committee on Long-Range Planning and a Sub-committee on Investments were created in the spring of 1977.

During the past three years the Board has been called upon to conduct a search for the new President and to plan a $31.8 million Capital Fund Drive. The Fund Drive has been met with one hundred percent participation by members of the Board, and the Trustees continue to provide advice and support
of a high order.

2.2 Administration

The current table of organization of the College is set out on the next page.

There have been several changes in supervisory assignment in the table of organization over the past four years. A new Treasurer has been named, and Health Services, Data Services (formerly Management Systems), and Personnel supervision has moved from the Vice-President to the Treasurer. Central Records has come under the supervision of the Dean of Academic Affairs, having formerly been overseen by the now eliminated office of the Director of Management Systems. The supervision of the Houses has moved from the Dean of the College to the Vice-President (during the period of reorganization in the Deans' Office) to the Dean of Academic Affairs. Admissions has been reassigned from the Dean of the College to the President's Office. A change in title and function has occurred with the position of January Term Coordinator which has been transformed into the Director of Cultural Affairs, who oversees Fall Colloquy, January Term, and Collegewide academic, intellectual, and cultural events.

Student services have been expanded, and in the absence of a Dean of Students' position at Hampshire, reporting relationships have been somewhat diffuse. An Office of Options/Graduate Relations has been created to assist students with graduate school admissions, career exploration, foreign study, leave-taking, and field placement. A half-time Associate Dean of Advising (a position filled by a Hampshire faculty member) oversees the advising system, works on problems of students' academic good
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standing, provides orientation meetings for new faculty, and coordinates a network of advising centers. The original Humanities and Arts Advising Center has been joined by one in each School, plus special centers for Third World students and women.

The directorships of the Office of Management Systems and Institutional Research and Evaluation have been abolished. Remaining personnel and functions have been absorbed by the Data Services Office and the Office of the Vice-President.

In the past four years the Development Office has been changed radically. Specifically, it has grown from a small operation of three persons to its present size, consisting of the Director, Assistant Director, Director of the Annual Fund and Parent Relations, Director of Public Relations, Assistant Director of Public Relations, and Director of Alumni Relations, and two secretarial support staff. These positions give Hampshire a sound basis for mounting a capital campaign, maintaining a strong public relations effort, cultivating support from parents, and laying the foundation for a strong alumni organization.

The College's Affirmative Action Plan was completed and adopted by the Board of Trustees for implementation in 1977. The Affirmative Action Officer is the Vice-President of the College. Under the Plan stringent Collegewide procedures have been set up for searches and hiring which require serious efforts to secure female and minority employees, as well as careful record-keeping to verify the success of the search procedures in producing minority and female candidates. The long-term goal is to have an administration and faculty composed of fifty percent females and
fifty percent males at each level of rank. At the time the Plan was filed, fifty-one percent of the total administrative positions in the College were occupied by women, although only seventeen percent of senior positions were held by women.

A status report for the first year of effort to meet our annual goals in 1977 appears in Appendix C. Progress was made in most areas with first year goals being met.

2.3 Five College Participation

Five College participation continues unabated, with Hampshire's role on a par with the other four institutions. The College's contribution to the Five College budget this year was $145,610, 20% of the whole. Administrative officers regularly meet with their Five College counterparts, not less than quarterly and usually once a month. This holds true for the Presidents, Deans and Deputies, Treasurers, Personnel Officers, Librarians, Registrars, and Financial Aid Officers. Other administrators meet on an occasional basis for more general discussions, and the Five College Coordinator's Office sponsors an annual meeting of Five College Department Chairpersons. Semi-monthly meetings of representatives from each institution's chief academic committee are held jointly with the Deans/Deputies group.

A new program has been started under which faculty members are appointed for two or three-year terms to serve as Five College appointees. A three-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education
supported five junior appointments, of which two have been based at
Hampshire. Internal funds supported three one-year senior appointments.
The possibility of increasing the number of jointly sponsored faculty
within the Valley, supported by a bequest to Five Colleges, Inc., appears
to have good prospects. A Five College Dance Department has been voted
by four of the five faculties, and it seems likely that vital appoint-
ments required for the sustaining of specialized study will, from time
to time, be designated for Five College sponsorship and support. In
addition, faculty from all five institutions occasionally teach at in-
stitutions other than their own, either on an overtime basis or on an
exchange basis; several Hampshire faculty have participated in these
exchanges, and the College has benefited by teachers from the other col-
leges as well.

We have chosen not to focus extensively on Five College cooperation in
this report since Mount Holyoke College, Amherst College, and the Uni-
versity of Massachusetts have covered this topic quite completely in
their Self Studies this year.

Reference to Five College course interchange is made in the section on
the Academic Program, and interchange tables and figures constitute Ap-
pendix G.

2.4 Governance

Appendix D, "Governance of Hampshire College," describes the present
governance system. The Accrediting Team in 1974 urged that Hampshire
College simplify its governance, and since that time considerable simpli-
fication has taken place, following studies conducted by a Governance Review Committee and a Constitutional Reform Committee. The Academic Council, which was a comprehensive body composed of all faculty, twenty percent of that number of students, and five percent of that number of staff, has been replaced by a representative twenty-seven member Senate composed of four faculty members from each School, five students, two representatives of the administration or administrative staff, and the President, Vice-President, Dean of Faculty, and Dean of Academic Affairs. The Senate has created standing committees on Educational Policy and on Budget and Priorities, as well as an Agenda Committee. The governance year-end report, Appendix E, details the performance of the Senate and other governance bodies this year, and the exact nature of the changes which had to take place under the constitutional form of governance adopted at Hampshire.

The Community Council, College Council, and College Judicial Board have remained intact. An Arbitrator's role has been established to mediate disputes growing out of matters of social discipline, and a half-time paid Ombudsman, who reports to the College Council, services the entire College to mediate all manner of grievances brought from one party to another. The log and testimony of the work carried out in these offices (some fifty cases per year) support the conclusion that they are well used and valuable additions to the governance structure. The Constitutional Reform Committee's final report, Appendix F, reflects the many viewpoints extant in the community on this topic.
The full time position of Coordinator of Governance in the Deans' Office has been abolished and the monitoring of governance delegated to various offices within the College. Thus far the experience with new structures and systems seems to be mixed, with improvement needed.

The Educational Policy Committee, a subcommittee of the Senate which is charged with advising the Dean of Faculty on academic programs and reviewing educational policy issues and proposals, has labored hard on curriculum and faculty appointment issues and gained valuable experience during the past year. Recent months have been devoted to a critical review of the Division I curriculum (the relationship of Division I courses to examinations, the mix of divisional levels within courses, and adequacy of course descriptions, and the benefits of year-long curricular planning), which has resulted in a series of motions which have been voted by the Senate. The faculty workload situation will be studied during the spring semester in an attempt to clarify and alleviate some of the problems.

In past semesters the Educational Policy Committee or task forces which it has appointed have conducted reviews of Division II and III and of the Educational Studies Program, language studies, January Term, and other special programs. Recently the EPC moved from a retrospective, evaluative review of courses given, to a prospective monitoring of course proposals with advisories to the Schools when questions of appropriateness arise. Recommendations are made to the Dean of the Faculty regarding allocation of faculty FTEs for new positions. Last year's EPC Task Force on the Houses figured prominently in the resolutions regarding the Houses which were put before the Senate (see Section 5.1).
In the two years since its inception, the Senate has successfully negotiated several important votes which testify to its vitality. Specifically, in the face of a disappearance of voluntary faculty support for teaching in January Term, the Senate voted to return to an earlier practice requiring each School to provide a certain proportion of its faculty for January Term teaching on a rotating basis. It also took the important step of abolishing the Division III Standards Committee at its own request and returning to the Schools the important task of monitoring Division III procedures and progress by faculty and students. Task Force reports on Division II and III also were received and discussed, and by Senate mandate Task Forces on Student Records, Advising, and the Academic Calendar were created. House staffing has been discussed in detail in the Senate, and last spring it endorsed the plan for the creation of the Hampshire House Unit, which represented an important step in the evolution of a strong House system. The Senate reaffirmed its conviction that the House masterships should be filled by persons with a primary identification as scholars and teachers, rather than student life administration.

Several Senate meetings addressed questions of consultation and coordination between the Senate and various offices of the administration. Mutual understanding of jurisdictions, mode and order of consultation, and respective authority continue to be matters which will require careful cultivation as the College gains experience with the Senate system.

The faculty now meets as a body four times a year, primarily to vote degrees and to address any issues which specifically impinge on faculty conditions of employment. These faculty meetings continue to be moderately attended, and improvement in this area is needed.
The College Council, established by the original constitution to monitor all decision-making bodies in the College and to hear complaints, decided last fall to recommend its own abolition. Complaints and grievances are now handled by the Ombudsman or by the Staff Grievance Committee; decisions or minor changes in the constitution could be made by the Senate. The President has asked College Council to investigate and make recommendations on the dispute-settlement procedures of the College and on the operation of Community Council before taking its recommendations on its abolition to the Senate and Community Council for their required votes.

The Community Council is charged with determining policies having to do with the quality of life on campus. Its membership includes seventeen students, two faculty members, one member of the administration, two members of the administrative staff, two House staff members, and a representative from the Dean of Faculty office. In 1975 it drew up a code of conduct, and it has approved various changes in disciplinary procedures, including the establishment of the Arbitrator and of a Hearing Board. Through a student activities fee, the Council finances social and cultural events on campus and various student organizations, such as the student newspaper, Third World Organization, and Women's Center. The Council has experienced problems with continuity of membership (partly caused by student leaves) and with a certain degree of apathy, reflected in low numbers of candidates and voters in its elections and difficulty in maintaining a quorum for its meetings. Another problem has been in establishing accountability by its funded committees, organizations, and activities. There is a growing sense that some student organizations need to be able
to count on more stable year-to-year funding than the present system of term-by-term requests and allocations allows. One of the tasks of the new Dean of Student Affairs will be to attempt to assist Community Council in its efforts to deal with real issues concerning the quality of campus life.

2.5 Summary

Since 1974 Hampshire's governance system has been simplified and clarified. An experienced cadre of faculty has developed to give committee and Senate deliberations greater focus and decisiveness. The quality of documentation and agenda preparation has greatly improved. Student participation has become an accepted, and appreciated, feature of all governance bodies of the College, including those traditionally thought to be most sensitive, the College Committee on Faculty Reappointments and Promotions and the Board of Trustees. Openness, accountability, and responsiveness by all those with responsibility remains a shared goal of the community, and is maintained to a high degree. Especially noteworthy has been the close cooperation between the administration budget-making process and the Budget and Priorities Committee.

Problems continue to center on definitions of responsibility itself, with some constitutional phrases continuing to be subject to disparate interpretation. Successful consultation, the sine qua non for legislative efficiency, remains an elusive goal for many. The result is continued disappointment for hard working groups whose recommendations are not adopted, and increased difficulty of recruitment for persons for governance service. Students, in particular, show much less interest in participation
despite the obvious personal educational benefits to many who take part. It has frequently been difficult to find student candidates for important committee assignments. Many students have expressed a sense of alienation from governance activities. Some have formed alternative bodies to discuss campus issues, such as a student collective which was active for several years and a group called the Grass Roots Organization.

Overall, there has been progress, but much remains to be done before high morale and excellent levels of performance will be achieved.
3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Hampshire's academic program is different from that of most other American colleges in that academic progress is not measured by the accumulation of course credits and grades but by the passage of examinations which demonstrate the student's mastery of progressively more sophisticated methodology and bodies of knowledge in several fields. It differs from that of most European universities which also measure progress by examinations in that Hampshire's examinations are not set by the faculty to evaluate knowledge of a pre-designated body of material, but are designed by the student, in consultation with faculty, to demonstrate understanding of subject matter and method chosen by the student.

Because we do not measure progress by the number of courses satisfactorily completed, we do not grant "credit" for courses. An understanding of this is crucial for an understanding of how the curriculum is put together, how courses are taught, how students are evaluated, and what records are kept. The lack of course credit is probably also an important factor in the difficulties most first-year students have in becoming fully engaged in the academic program, and in the "floundering" typical of many first- and second-year students at Hampshire which is addressed in the section on retention.

3.1 Division I

The stated intention of Division I is to introduce students to the "mode of inquiry" appropriate to the groups of disciplines represented by Hampshire's
four Schools: Humanities and Arts, Language and Communication, Natural Science, and Social Science. Students are required to demonstrate, through the Division I examination in each of the four Schools, their understanding of those modes of inquiry and their ability to work within them. The belief of the founders and early planners of the College was that students would best learn the modes of inquiry by working closely with a scholar on a limited topic that was of vital interest to that teacher ("watching the scholar at work"), rather than by taking the more usual introductory "survey" courses. It was assumed that the particular topic of the Division I seminar was of no particular importance (we even considered at one time placing students into Division I seminars solely by lot rather than by expressed choice, which overlooked the fact that the topic was of importance to the student!); what counted was students becoming aware of the way in which a scientist or a linguist or a social scientist or humanist or artist attacked problems, and developing a beginning skill in that methodology. Subject-matter survey courses, it was assumed, could be done at the Division II level, either at Hampshire or at the other four colleges in the consortium, after the student knew why he or she wanted to take the courses and what s/he wanted to know. There was also an assumption that once a student knew the "mode of inquiry" of the School, it would be possible to go on to do more advanced work in any of the disciplines of the School without specific course prerequisites in that discipline.

The Making of a College had laid out Division I as a one-year course of study, assuming that students would do work in Science, Humanities and
Social Science and in what was then called the Case Study of Man (which later became the Human Development Program) and Language, Logic and Value (which became the Program, and later School of Language and Communication). During the Planning Year of 1969-70, the planning faculty decided that the Division I examinations would ordinarily require two courses in each of the three Schools (Social Science, Natural Science and Mathematics, and Humanities and Arts), and a combined lecture-seminar course in each of the two Programs (Human Development and Language and Communication). That moved the Division I program to three or more terms for completion rather than two. It also meant that the three-week period set aside at the end of the academic year for a reading and examination period would not be enough for getting all students through all four Division I examinations. (The requirement for five examinations for Division I was modified in 1970-71 with the dropping of the requirement for the Human Development examination.)

During the first two or three years we learned several things which began to change some of the directions of the Division I program. First, it turned out that students could not be weaned from attraction to particular topics in the Division I courses; "mode of inquiry" didn't mean much to them; "photography," "the environment," "community," and "physics" did. Faculty developed a group of very serious courses and seminars with somewhat "gimmicky" titles: "The Red Barn" (a course in architectural design), "Clear Thinking from the Whole Earth Catalog" (a course in logic and semantics), "Good Things to Eat: Organic Farming at Hampshire" (a course which covered agricultural methods and nutritional principles, among other
things), and other courses which appealed to students who wanted to know how they could do "normal" introductory work: "Plain Old Chemistry," "Introductory Linguistics," "The Eighteenth Century: Selected Works."

Second, it became clear that the best and most productive student work on Division I examinations was that which students themselves proposed, in consultation and negotiation with faculty members. Therefore, the original requirement that at least half of a Division I examination must be comprised of questions proposed by the student's course instructors was changed in 1971. Students are now responsible for developing their own examination proposals, with the guidance of a faculty member, to demonstrate that they know not only how to answer questions, but how to ask them.

We also discovered that students were often very imaginative in proposing new kinds of formats for the Division I examination. Although in some of the Schools the most common format for an exam is still a paper and a discussion with the evaluating committee, exams cover a broad range of formats, from laboratory experiments to music performances to classroom lectures, from gallery shows to mock trials to discussions of films. Some of the examinations are thus shared with other students and faculty. A number of exams have been done on a group basis, with from two to four students working together on different aspects of a common problem.

While working with students on the development of examination projects is often one of the most rewarding parts of a faculty member's work, it also tends to be very time consuming. Originally each Division I exam required
two faculty evaluators. That requirement was changed three years ago to the requirement that only the chairperson must be a faculty member; the other evaluator may be a faculty member, an advanced student, or other person knowledgeable in the subject. While this has cut down somewhat on the number of occasions for faculty cooperation on examinations, and thus possibly on wide agreement within the Schools on standards for passage of Division I examinations, the use of advanced students as evaluators has generally worked very well. Most faculty agree that these students have high standards for their fellow students and are often very helpful in assisting younger students to understand the type of work needed. School-wide standards are monitored by an examination committee in each School which reads both the examination proposal and the evaluation; the extent to which proposals or evaluations are questioned or returned for re-writing varies from School to School. A number of students still choose two faculty members to evaluate their examinations, and new faculty are usually encouraged to serve on evaluating committees with experienced faculty before chairing committees themselves.

A third aspect of the Division I program that became clear during the first few years was that teaching courses which were not only upgraded, but for which no credit was given, involved a whole new set of teaching skills for most faculty, even the most experienced faculty. No longer could the teacher "build up" to the interesting parts by presenting the necessary background first, if that material was unduly dry or difficult; by the time the class reached the parts of interest to students, two-thirds of them might have disappeared. No longer could faculty count on getting students
involved with the materials through having them work on assigned papers, the results of which would be presented to the class; half the students, through indecision or laziness or conviction that required papers were "high school stuff" might not even attempt the project. (It takes most students more than one semester to discover that the absence of immediate negative consequences for not doing work doesn't mean there are no consequences for their own sense of satisfaction or for their learning.) Others might do it so late that it would not be shared with the class. Many young teachers (and some experienced ones) were devastated by the drop-out rate in their classes. Most revised their methods and their order of presentation. For several years, some stopped assigning papers altogether. (The latter situation has been mostly reversed now, since faculty began to realize that students who reached the end of an entire academic year having done no written work at all could be demoralized by that fact.)

The positive side of these problems is that most teachers have risen to the challenge of this new kind of teaching and have re-thought both their subject matter and their methods of presentation. New attempts are made each year by individuals and groups to develop courses which will fully engage students at all levels and help to develop their skills of perception and analysis. A number of formats are tried at the Division I level, ranging from the small seminar in which each student is expected to work closely with a faculty member to develop a project which contributes to the class, to unlimited enrollment lecture courses which may or may not be connected with smaller discussion groups or seminars. The Educational Policy Committee has recently recommended to the Senate that any Division I
course which consists primarily of large lecture sessions must provide for small discussion groups as well, on the premise that faculty attention to the individual student's progress is essential at the Division I level. As of this writing, that question remains unresolved.

A fourth development during the early years was that the faculty began to develop differences of opinion about the proper connection between Division I courses and Division I examinations. For the first few years, there was a strong emphasis on the belief that Division exams must be work done in addition to courses; the exam project could grow out of the work done in the course, but it should not be possible to pass an examination by course work alone. That concept began to be challenged quite early by a few faculty members in the School of Language and Communication, who set up their courses in such a way that satisfactory completion of the requirements of the course would also constitute passage of a Division I exam, although L&C School policy continued to be that Division I in L&C required a work in addition to courses. Some faculty in Social Science began to express satisfaction with the number of Division I exams that stemmed from their courses, but in that School there was a clearer distinction between course assignments which all students were asked to do and the special independent projects which constituted the exam. The School of Humanities and Arts faculty debated and passed a motion several years ago that Division I H&A exams could be passed by the satisfactory completion of two H&A courses, as attested to by the instructors; that policy was rejected by the College Educational Policy Committee and was never implemented. Last year, however, faculty in the School of Humanities and Arts began
developing courses which were specifically designed to get students through Division I examinations. Course descriptions for the Spring Term 1978 include such statements as "Students will be expected...to write a final paper suitable for a Division I exam in Humanities and Arts," or "Participants in the class can work towards completion of a Division I exam in Humanities and Arts," and even "Work in this course under certain conditions may be presented in fulfillment of Division I examination requirements in Humanities and Arts."

While the College Educational Policy Committee has questioned the appropriateness of such statements, some of the origins of the move in this direction seem clear. First, many faculty prefer working on Division I examinations with students whom they have taught in class; the "walk-in exam" by the student who approaches a faculty member with the statement, "I thought I'd like to try an exam on X" and who has no previous course work in that field or with that faculty member, is increasingly discouraged because of the additional workload it places on faculty, who feel they must give almost an individual tutorial to such students. Second, the problems that arise when students delay Division I exams until well into their third year, or even into Division III, have become more obvious. Students who do that have frequently completed no courses in that School. The Division I exam becomes a chore to get through under the pressure of deadlines, rather than an opportunity for a learning experience; it is frequently unrewarding to both the student and the faculty member under such circumstances.
The move toward establishing a closer connection between Division I courses and Division I exams is thus related to a general effort on the part of the Deans' Office and many faculty to encourage students to complete their Division I examinations earlier than has been the case for most students in the recent past. The original catalog stated that students were ordinarily expected to complete all four Division I examinations by the end of their second year. That expectation has been honored more in the breach than in the observance. Because the lack of progress in Divisional examinations often indicates lack of engagement with the academic program, the Dean for Advising has begun to ask questions about students' academic progress if they have passed no examinations after two semesters here, or have passed only two exams in two years, or have not filed a Division II concentration statement by the end of the third year. (See section on advising.) There is still a fairly large number of students who have spent four or more semesters without having completed any Division I examinations, and six or seven semesters with only one or two exams completed. While Hampshire has never been on a strictly time-based system, and has stated that students may progress at their own pace, the majority of students have financial or other constraints that make them want to finish in no more than four years. Our concern is that the delay on completion of Division I examinations tends to get in the way of adequate time spent on the later stages of Division II and the beginning of Division III work. In addition, the student who is completing Division III work, and who comes to a faculty member in another School in a panic about passing the last Division I exam by the deadline for graduation, puts pressure on the faculty to lower standards for that exam.
Hampshire's curriculum in Division II, especially, is supplemented by courses offered at the four other colleges in the consortium. (Hampshire's participation in interchange is illustrated in Appendix G.) Most students include at least one off-campus course each term in their work in the concentration; many include two courses a term and some even three or four. While course interchange offers definite advantages in enrichment of students' programs, some problems have also appeared. Students who do a majority of their course work off campus, especially in the absence of close planning in advance with Hampshire faculty, may find it difficult to put together a Division II or Division III committee which includes two Hampshire faculty members who know their work and who have expertise in their area(s) of study, especially if the concentration is done in an area not well covered at Hampshire, such as art history or foreign language literature. On rare occasions an exception can be made to the policy that Division II and III committees must include two Hampshire faculty members, and a faculty member from one of the other colleges may become the project supervisor of a Division III student, especially if he or she has worked on the student's Division II committee and knows the Hampshire faculty member who chairs the Division II committee. Faculty at the other colleges have been extraordinarily generous in donating their time to serve on Division II and III committees for Hampshire students (we give a very modest honorarium for such participation at the Division III level), but they do have limits on their available time.

The other potential problem of so much work in the concentration being done off campus is the lowered participation of Hampshire students in Division II
courses given on campus. While the expectation has been that most Division I courses would have the format of fairly small seminars and that most Division II courses would be larger lecture-discussion classes, in fact enrollments in Division I courses have been larger than in most Division II courses. Fewer than half of the Division II courses offered in the Fall Term 1977 had more than ten students enrolled; only sixteen of sixty-seven Division II courses had more than fifteen. While small Division II courses may be desirable for some purposes, some faculty members have expressed concern at their inability to attract enough Division II students to give viable courses and at the lack of contribution to Hampshire's intellectual life on the part of our more advanced students. This is particularly significant in those areas in which Hampshire faculty have been working on developing team-taught interdisciplinary courses at the Division II level. Several of those courses (for instance, "Capitalism and Empire" and "Seventeenth Century Studies") have drawn good enrollments of thirty-five to forty-five, but they involve four or five faculty members. The phenomenon of students going off campus for advanced courses is to some extent self-perpetuating; the more who go off, the fewer courses we offer; the fewer courses we offer, the more students choose to go off because they cannot find what they want at Hampshire. The problem is further exacerbated by student attrition, which creates a student body with a large percentage of first-year students, which forces us to offer more Division I than Division II courses, and by the fact that many students take more than two Division I courses in some Schools, which has the same effect.
In addition to its concern about the relationship between Division I courses and examinations, the Educational Policy Committee has expressed concern about the number of courses which are listed at both the Division I and Division II levels. This practice has been especially common in the School of Humanities and Arts, and somewhat less common in Natural Science. It is rare in Language and Communication and does not exist in Social Science. The Educational Policy Committee has expressed its belief that the intent and mode of teaching in the two Divisions should be quite different, and except in the rare cases where there is a special pedagogical reason for listing a course as I/II, they recommended that double listing not be permitted. The Senate agreed, and Division I/II courses in the future must include an explanation of the different levels of work expected from students who enroll at the Division II level.

3.2 Division II

The Division II concentration is the nearest equivalent to a "major" in more traditional programs. However, it ordinarily bears little resemblance to the traditional disciplinary major, although some students do plan their concentrations to follow traditional major requirements, especially in areas such as pre-medical programs or the arts. More often, the student, in consultation with an academic adviser and other faculty members, puts together a plan (contract) for a group of courses and projects which cross disciplinary lines and address a general area of concern. It is the student's responsibility to define the areas in which he or she wants to work, to develop questions which will serve as a focus of the concentration, and
to decide, with advice from the faculty, what skills and bodies of knowledge must be mastered in order to deal with those questions, and then to plan what courses and projects will help to develop that knowledge and those skills.

That planning does not always take place as early as the policy says it should, that is, "at the outset" of the concentration. Sometimes the planning has been informal and has simply not been committed to a written contract. However, it sometimes happens that the work has proceeded in a haphazard fashion and the student attempts to put together a Division II committee (which must include at least two Hampshire faculty members, and may include faculty members from one of the other colleges or an advanced student) only after all the courses have been done. That may lead to difficulties and delays in completion. There is some evidence that this problem is becoming less frequent as faculty advisers encourage students to file preliminary statements early.

An Educational Policy Committee Task Force study in 1976 outlined a number of various models of Division II programs and procedures. Students' programs for the concentration range from a fairly tightly structured sequence of six or eight courses, with most of the evaluation being done by the course instructor and summarized by the student's committee, to programs with only a few courses and large amounts of independent work, in the form of a number of papers based on independent reading, or of creative work in the arts, or of field study experiences described in journals and paper.
While the expected imbalance in Five College interchange courses between Hampshire students taking courses at the other institutions and their students taking Hampshire courses continues, we have been pleased to note an increase over the past several years in the number of Five College students taking courses at Hampshire.

Standards at the Division II level, as at all Divisional levels, are enforced primarily by the faculty members of the student's Division II committee. Division II concentration contracts and examination proposals and examination reports are routed through the Schools, and are read by the School Dean and/or a School examination committee. The Deans report that little questioning of the content of concentration proposals occurs. The School's examination chairperson may suggest changes in the evaluation if it seems inadequate; it is now generally recognized by all faculty that the Division II evaluation is one of the most important documents in the student's file, since it often forms the basis for graduate school applications which must be submitted before the Division III work is completed. Division II evaluations therefore usually include a fairly complete summary of the student's work in the concentration and thorough comments on the quality of the work.

3.3 Division III

For Division III, students are required to complete an independent project on an advanced level, to engage in integrative work which demonstrates that they know how to approach a problem from more than one disciplinary
perspective, and to share their increasing knowledge and skills with the community through some community service activity. The guidelines suggest that the project will "normally" take half the student's time for one academic year, that students are encouraged to fulfill the integrative work requirement through participation in a Division III integrative seminar "designed to address a broad topic or problem area requiring the application of various disciplines and involving diverse values and judgments as well as data and methods" (although the integrative work may be part of the project instead), and that the service requirement, although normally expected during the Division III year, may be fulfilled earlier if earlier service demonstrates the sharing of sophisticated skills and knowledge.

The primary complaint voiced by Division III students is that concentration on the independent study project tends to make the Division III experience very lonely and isolated. A study done by a task force appointed by the Educational Policy Committee last year confirmed that feeling and recommended a change of emphasis in the importance given to the three parts of Division III. The student's Division III committee usually sees its task as overseeing and evaluating only the project; work in an integrative seminar and the service activity are normally evaluated by others and those evaluations are appended to the committee's evaluation of the project. Students are therefore under pressure to concentrate primarily on the project; their perception is that the committee views the other parts of the Division III contract as much less significant. For most committees that is true; no students have been denied recommendation for graduation because the evaluations for integrative work or community service were weak.
In addition, the majority of students have not completed all their work on Division I and II examinations before they begin their final year. Work on these examinations, which must be passed at least two months before completion of the Division III project for the student to receive the degree that term, can also be isolating, since most of the work must be done independently. The time needed for work on Division I and II exams may also push the Division III project work into a very concentrated period in the last semester, giving the student very little time to participate in other activities.

Although some faculty do not view this isolation of Division III students as a serious problem, but rather as a reflection of the realities of the loneliness of scholarly work, others share the concern of the students and would like to develop more ways for students to share their work with each other and to be more involved with other students at all Divisional levels. Some changes do seem to be under way; for instance, the proportion of students fulfilling the integrative work requirement through an integrative seminar rather than including it as part of the independent project has sharply increased this year. At the request of a group of Division III students last fall, the Senate appointed several Division III students to serve as a task force to study the problem of isolation and to recommend solutions.

Procedural changes were made last year in the way Division III contracts are reviewed. The all-College Division III Standards and Procedures Committee was abolished, and the review of Division III contracts and progress reports was turned over to the individual Schools. Records are still kept centrally by the Assistant to the Dean of Academic Affairs,
who also checks final evaluations and recommendations for graduation for completeness before sending them to the School Deans for review. Through this revised process, the Schools are gaining information which is expected to be helpful in their long-range planning.

Several problems and issues remain to be solved concerning the Division III program. There have been some questions raised about whether it is appropriate to expect every Hampshire student to be able to do an advanced independent study project for Division III--projects which often approach the level of a master's thesis. A small number of students and faculty maintain that a combination of advanced level courses and a portfolio of work would be more appropriate for some students. Questions have also been raised about the usefulness of leaves taken during Division III and about whether or not they tend to delay completion of Division III work.

One of the more serious questions raised about Division III has to do with the fact that a great many students do not follow the original policy which requires that all Division I and II examinations be completed before the student begins work on Division III. In some cases, a left-over Division I examination causes no problems for Division III work, and may in fact offer some relief from too great a concentration on the independent study project. In other cases, however, especially where more than one Division I examination remains incomplete, it has been evident that the necessity to complete those examinations seriously interfered with the completion of adequate Division III work. There are seven students currently who have completed Division III work but who have not graduated because of incomplete Division I examinations. In addition, faculty complain that Division I examinations done under the pressure of Division III deadlines are often of
poorer quality than examinations done earlier in a student's career. Some faculty felt pressured by Division III students to pass unsatisfactory Division I work because the student is about to pass Division III and wants to graduate. In 1975, the Academic Council voted to impose an absolute deadline on the completion of Division I examinations for students planning graduation. This helped to insure that students had two months free of Division I pressure to work on their Division III projects, but it simply moved back two months the pressure on faculty to pass Division I work by the new deadline. The problem can probably be solved only by a change in student and faculty perceptions about the importance of completing Division I and II examinations before Division III is begun.

In general, despite the problems with Division III, most faculty and students are still committed to the basic concepts and requirements. Although there are some projects which "scrape through," all the evidence we have indicates that for the most part, Division III work is of very high quality indeed, and that a very high percentage of Division III projects are truly of graduate school quality. (See Appendix H for a list of Division III projects of May 1977 graduates.) Like the rest of Hampshire's program, when Division III works, it works extraordinarily well.

3.4 Curriculum--General Comments

The best available description of Hampshire's curriculum is in the 1977-78 Hampshire College Catalog. Individual disciplines covered by the faculty are listed on page 45. Areas of study are described on pages 46-115, with the names of faculty who teach in the area, representative course titles, and the titles of recent Division III projects completed in those areas. Some of these areas are covered in more or less formally organized "Programs,"
such as those in Legal Studies, Human Development, Environmental Science and Public Policy, and Education Studies. These are programs which have been approved as special emphases by the Educational Policy Committee; some have a small operating budget for special events such as lectures, films, or field trips. Other programs are less formal but operate in much the same way; faculty members in history, cognitive studies, mathematics, or women's studies, for instance, may meet with each other and discuss curriculum and coordinate their offerings. In other areas, faculty cooperation ranges from contact through students' Division II or Division III committees to frequent joint teaching. Many faculty members are listed under more than one area of study. Some of the areas have developed because of specific planning by the Schools and the College in the hiring of faculty in particular fields; others developed after faculty already here discovered common interests. None of the areas has rigid boundaries; they are not "majors" with set sequences and requirements, but rather examples of the kinds of work that faculty and students do.

It is frequently said that Hampshire College has 1200 different curricula, since each student negotiates his or her way through the distribution requirements of Division I, the concentration, and the independent project and integrative requirements of Division III without any specific required courses or sequences of courses. On the other hand, the expertise of the faculty whom we hire and the courses we offer, in combination with the courses available to students through the Five College consortium, determine the breadth and depth of the curricula available to our students. Although there is a great range of courses available, Hampshire does not try to be all things
to all students. The Schools have concentrated their efforts in developing strength in a few areas, and there is an increasing attempt to identify, for ourselves and our students, those "clusters" of disciplines and problem areas where we offer particularly strong programs. Examples of special School strengths developed to complement rather than duplicate strengths at the other colleges are human biology, cognitive studies, and intellectual history.

The 1977-78 Hampshire College Catalog was the first formal attempt to describe the curriculum in terms of these problem areas, and to provide an index of academic disciplines covered (see page 168 of Catalog). It was compiled with the assistance of the EPC, Dean of the Faculty, the School Deans, and other faculty, and has been well received by the community as a good description of what we are doing. It has not yet been used either by the Schools or by the Educational Policy Committee as a basis of curriculum review or long-range planning.

One major concern of the EPC about the curriculum has been the apparent lack of long-range curricular planning by the Schools. Course descriptions for each term have been proposed by the faculty and approved by the Schools during the preceding term only; between 1971 and 1976 the EPC did not review the proposals except when possible policy problems were brought to their attention by one of the Deans. The descriptions are voted by the Senate after they are printed, and usually others are added just before the beginning of the semester with approval coming from the School Dean concerned. The EPC has done several post-hoc reviews, usually concentrating on the distribution of courses among the Divisions rather than among the disciplines within the Schools. Curricular planning was also addressed by the EPC during 1974-1976
when it was asked to advise the Dean of the College or Dean of the Faculty about all new and replacement faculty positions.

Each School has been responsible for the distribution of courses between the Divisions and among the disciplines of the School. (In the early years the Deans' Office suggested the number of Division I courses that would be needed if all new students took three Division I courses per term and most second-year students took two the first term and one the second term.) Some Schools appear to have thorough discussions of their own curriculum before they approve the course descriptions (Natural Science and Language and Communication have done this); the other two Schools appear to rely on more informal conversations among the faculty or between individual faculty members and the School Dean or Policy Committee (in Social Science) or Curriculum Committee (in Humanities and Arts). Although there have been several attempts to include in the Fall Term listing of courses the proposals for Spring Term courses, that has not recently been done. The EPC last fall recommended, and the Senate approved in February, a policy requiring year-long planning by the Schools, with flexibility to make changes when needed but with the basic curriculum laid out for the year. This is especially important to Division II courses, since students are urged to plan their Division II concentrations well in advance.

3.5 January Term

January Term offers a deliberate change of pace from Fall and Spring Terms, a unique opportunity to focus on one topic for a full three weeks, as well as the time to participate in conferences, symposia, and seminar series which contribute to the intellectual and cultural life of the College.
Projects and courses take a variety of forms: the study of a specific subject in depth, practical work or training, field work and travel, learning a skill or craft, participation in a book seminar led by various members of the faculty and staff, or assisting a faculty member in current research.

In May 1977, the College Senate passed a motion requiring faculty participation in January Term activities on a three-year cycle. Faculty may choose to offer courses, workshops, or group independent study activities. Participation may more often take forms different from the traditional course or independent study supervision: conferences and symposia, book seminars with a sequence of faculty leaders, or current research seminars.

During January 1978 a total of 63 courses were offered, ranging from "Demystifying Marx" to "Piano Tuning and Repair" to "Medieval Cooking and Culture." A total of 436 students enrolled in these classes, a 50% increase over January Term 1977. In addition, various film series, performances, and lectures added to the intellectual life of the College during January.

3.6 Academic Advising

Faculty advising is central to the success of a Hampshire College student. With no course grades or required plan of studies for a given concentration, the role of the adviser is far more important at Hampshire than at most other colleges. Initially the adviser must help the student choose courses and plan appropriate Division I examinations. Next, the adviser must guide the student in the arts of designing a Division II concentra-
tion. Finally, the adviser needs to support the student in choosing a suitable and manageable Division III topic. Throughout all stages the adviser helps the student evaluate his or her completed work and document it in the student's Central Records file.

A half-time Associate Dean of Advising, a faculty member with released time from teaching, coordinates the advising system, maintains close contact with faculty, and works with individual students on a variety of matters. The Associate Dean has responsibility for assigning new students to advisers, facilitating adviser changes, working with individual students and their advisers on academic problems, interviewing students withdrawing or going on an independent study leave or leave of absence, supervising orientation and support programs for new, transfer, and older students, and communicating with parents about the academic good standing of their children. She also oversees the four School advising centers, works with faculty to improve advising, and conducts an orientation to advising for new faculty.

Each School is assigned the number of advisees proportional to the total number of FTEs within that School. Full-time faculty typically have fifteen or sixteen advisees, with the exception of new faculty whose advising load is reduced to eight or nine students. In an attempt to lessen the advising load on faculty, a staff advising program also exists. Approximately twenty members of the non-teaching administration each have responsibility for advising between two and six students, usually students in their first or second year. The staff advisers are first granted membership in a
School before they are assigned advisees—a procedure intended to assure that the staff advisers have appropriate background and knowledge to advise students on academic matters. Four School-based advising centers supplement the formal adviser-student relationship. Each advising center is supervised by a faculty member and staffed by upper Division students. The centers provide advice for students seeking faculty for exams on particular topics, as well as help on the mechanics of designing and implementing the exam; they contain material on Five College courses (evaluations by students of many courses), files of Divisional contracts and sample examinations, information about faculty interests, and material on graduate schools. Workshops and gatherings are organized for students with common interests or at a common point such as filing Division II or III. A Third World Advising Center acts in a broader capacity, giving advice about academic and non-academic matters to Third World students.

Students are initially assigned advisers on the basis of information contained in their admissions file; transfer students' advisers are selected on the same basis except that there is usually more specific information on their expressed field of interest. Inevitably a number of mismatches occur, but adviser changes can be arranged through the Associate Dean of Advising. The Dean of Advising has proposed that next fall some new students may be randomly assigned to advisers to determine whether or not preselection of advisers leads to less dissatisfaction. Through the years some problems with the present means of advising assignments have become evident, and several recommendations are currently under consideration. For example, a recent study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation showed that advisees of first-year faculty subsequently have a higher withdrawal rate than those of faculty familiar with the College. The staff
advising program enabled the assignment of fewer advisees to new faculty this fall, and a more extensive orientation program was offered for new faculty. New faculty met for weekly lunches with the Dean of Advising, the Dean of the Faculty, and various administrators such as the Director of the Options Office, Director of Central Records, House Masters and others to discuss questions concerning advising, Division I examinations, and building an academic file.

Frequently there is little academic overlap in the student-adviser relationship. It is often the case that the adviser is a person with whom the student has not worked in a course or on an examination. Although some students and faculty prefer this type of relationship, there is also sentiment that there should be more of a formal academic connection between the student and his or her adviser.

With a highly individualized academic program which necessitates so much one-on-one interaction between faculty and students, it is impossible to insure an even quality of advising and uniform academic standards. The Associate Dean of Advising makes a concerted attempt to maintain contact with advisers, but often such contact is made only in infrequent group meetings on the various aspects of advising, or when a particular problem arises about a student's academic standing or a student's expressed dissatisfaction with an adviser.

The guidelines on academic good standing stated in the Faculty Handbook are abstract: "A student making progress toward Divisional examinations is considered to be in academic good standing." Obviously this in interpreted by faculty in various ways. Although no hard and fast rules concerning
sufficient progress have been set out, the Deans' Office has defined the "average" rate of progress as follows:

One Division I exam passed after two semesters
Two Division I exams passed after four semesters
Three Division I exams passed after six semesters
Division II contract filed after five semesters
Division II complete after six semesters

Students whose progress is slower than this rate are reviewed by the Associate Dean of Advising. Because Division I examination contracts are often not filed until shortly before the examination is completed, students are sometimes making good progress without that fact being known in any formal manner. Faculty members' delinquency in submitting the required examination evaluation to Central Records may also serve to misrepresent a student's progress. However, when evidence of "insufficient" progress comes to the Associate Dean's attention, the adviser is contacted, and when a problem is verified the Associate Dean and adviser work out a plan---either an informal approach to the problem or a formal contract with specific academic goals and a timetable---to help the student along. Unfortunately too many students fall into the slow-rate category (approximately 150 students who had completed three semesters by fall 1977). In the absence of a larger staff within the Deans' Office to follow individual problems, earlier identification of problems experienced by students within their first two years can probably be facilitated only by more support from the advisers.

Through the years experience has been gained by the Dean of Advising in helping students with their academic problems. In the future it is hoped that better training of advisers and more frequent contact by students with
advisers, plus more emphasis on good advising at the School level, will prove beneficial. Improving student-adviser interaction also requires that better record-keeping systems be created. New programs set up by the Deans' Office to formalize "advising" contacts between older and new students and older students and new faculty are proving to be an effective way of providing ongoing orientation and support to advising.

3.7 Leaves

The flexibility of the academic program at Hampshire permits students to create a multi-dimensional educational experience. For all Hampshire College students, their education combines coursework and independent study, and for many it also includes specialized study, research, work, or life experience off campus.

From the time Hampshire students first entered in September 1970, they have had the opportunity to interrupt their campus studies at almost any time on their own initiative. In recognition of the belief that students would wish to "stop out" for various reasons, the College instituted three types of leave: the leave of absence, the field study leave, and the independent study leave. The leave of absence permits students to sever their academic ties to Hampshire in order to travel, work, or "distance" themselves from the College at minimal cost ($50 per year in the past; next year the fee will be $100) and planning (only the approval of the adviser is required). Although some students do academically-related work while on leave of absence and then link it to their examinations upon their return, many students take a leave of absence simply to "get away." The two study leaves are designed for students who have clear
reasons for retaining an academic link to the College during their absence. They may wish to hold an internship, conduct on-site research, or work in depth on a writing or artistic project. Students on study leave pay one-third regular tuition ($785 per semester during 1977-78) and are entitled to such academic privileges as filing contracts, completing examinations, and correspondence and periodic meetings with faculty. A student choosing a field study leave or an independent study leave is required to designate a faculty supervisor and to secure the approval of that person, the adviser, and the Field Study Coordinator for a definite plan of study or work which will require that the student not be enrolled. Nearly all students who go on a study leave are in Division II or III.

From three to four hundred students may be on leave in any given semester; fifty to sixty on study leave and the remainder on a leave of absence. Approximately 85 percent of each entering class takes leave at some point, and many of these students (50%) never return to Hampshire. The lack of advance planning for leaves of absence is believed to contribute significantly to Hampshire's attrition rate (currently about 40%). (See the report of the task force on retention in Section 8.)

Obviously many of the students who withdraw from Hampshire should do so. Some have used the Hampshire experience to clarify their personal goals, which cannot be met by the College. Others are not yet ready to take full advantage of the options Hampshire offers, while still others determine that they prefer more traditional student responsibilities. Many students take leave because they are "floundering"; they may not have a supportive adviser or they may feel pressure to complete examinations or file a con-
centration without having a clear idea of where their academic interests lie. They view a leave as a way to escape an uncomfortable situation, and because many leave-takers do not have any academic ties to Hampshire or any accomplishments behind them, they are not inclined to return. In the wake of a declining applicant pool, the College has recognized the need to serve as many students as possible, and thus to provide careful advising and support so that leaves are well planned and lead to a return to full enrollment status. Although the College does not want to diminish the flexibility or scope of undergraduate education that leaves often permit, it is clear that the role of leaves needs to be reevaluated. The attrition problem is being especially emphasized this year, and Section 8 of this document is devoted to a thorough discussion of the problem.

3.8 Summary

There is no question that the advisers of Hampshire students do an extraordinary job of providing time and attention to students whose collective impact presents a wide range of personal and academic demands. Experience suggests that a faculty member takes two years to become fully effective. Surveys of student satisfaction with advising show a large majority endorse the quality of the advising they get.

Still, the margin of inadequacy in the system, though absolutely small, is still greater than the welfare of both students and College can reasonably tolerate. Greater benefits to both can be realized if Hampshire can devise means of further improvement.
4. FACULTY

4.1 Distribution of Interests and Disciplines

The four Schools are the home of all but a small fraction of Hampshire's faculty—the exception is one faculty member who provides language instruction in Spanish on a course-by-course basis. The College's total FTE faculty in 1978 is 81.50--25.83 FTE in Humanities and Arts, 21.67 FTE in Social Science, 19.67 FTE in Natural Science, 18.83 FTE in the School of Language and Communication, and .50 language instruction.

With Hampshire's creation of schools instead of departments, the College developed a distribution of faculty that differs significantly from that found under a departmental system. The four Schools bring together faculty representing a variety of disciplines and interests and foster collaborations and colleague relationships that are unusual in American higher education. (Appendix I lists the faculty employed by the College during the 1977-78 academic year, showing their School affiliation, their rank, and their discipline. Appendix J contains biographical information about all faculty serving on regular contracts.)

Similar disciplines, however, are often found in more than one School. For example, there are historians in three Schools, philosophers in four, mathematicians in three, and psychologists in two. This reflects the different emphases within fields covered by a given discipline and the need of various Schools to have those disciplines and fields represented in their overall program.
While faculty have their basic identification with Schools, they also join together in programs either within a given School or across Schools. In Social Science, for example, the Law Program defines a set of interests for both faculty and students that centers on the place of the law in the broader political and social system. The Law Program is staffed by two lawyers, an anthropologist with an interest in conflict resolution, and a political scientist in American government and public policy. In Language and Communication there is a Language Studies Program involving linguists and sociolinguists, as well as a part-time French language teacher. There are also cross-School programs to which faculty devote their time and energy. Environmental Studies and Public Policy has one physicist who has also done considerable work in technology assessment and science and public policy and draws on other faculty from the School of Natural Science as well as from Humanities and Arts and the School of Social Science. Education Studies has a 1.50 FTE in Social Science and 1.0 FTE each in the Schools of Language and Communication and Natural Science.

In 1976, the College, with funding from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, established an Emeritus Professors Program that brought retired academics living in the Amherst area to Hampshire to teach during a given semester. These older, experienced faculty serve to create a mix and contrast with the youth of Hampshire’s own faculty. The College has involved emeriti during Spring Term 1977, Fall Term 1977, and Spring Term 1978. The people who have participated and the variety of activities they have offered are listed in Appendix K.

Since the College opened, there have been a variety of attempts to develop policy and procedures for the review of available instructional positions
for allocation to one of the four Schools. These attempts have gone from
deliberation and "horse-trading" among the four School Deans themselves,
to a central role for the Educational Policy Committee in advising the
Dean of the College on the disposition of all available positions, to the
recent policy of Educational Policy Committee involvement only in those
cases where a new field of study would be introduced into the curriculum
by the allocation of an available position. In other cases, the allocations
are made by the Dean of the Faculty after reviewing proposals from
each of the School Deans.

Within the current budgetary constraints, the review process will not likely
result in any major changes in the existing distribution of faculty. Most
of the areas covered by the faculty are basic to our general program and/or
complement the offerings at the other Five Colleges. It is difficult, there-
fore, to plan major shifts in emphasis or provide significantly greater
strength in a given area. Nevertheless, in the past three years we have
built a few new programs. After several years of planning, the College
now has a program in Education Studies which involves faculty from each of
the four Schools. We are also in the process of developing a new approach
to the place of foreign languages in the liberal arts curriculum. The
approach seeks to integrate language instruction with the teaching of lin-
guistics and related disciplines, to involve faculty and students with the
use of language in different social and cultural settings, and to emphasize
field study by students among different language groups. This effort has
involved the appointment of 1.0 FTE in Language Studies in order to repre-
sent this interest in the curriculum and to plan a program.

As with almost all of our faculty and curricular planning and decisions,
we have to be very mindful of our place within the Five College context. Neither we nor the other colleges have to staff as broad and deep a range of offerings as we would if we were an isolated college. We continue to benefit from our Five College relationships through the interchange system and to, thereby, provide students with much of what they cannot find at Hampshire. The Five College arrangement has also meant our participation in a number of joint ventures with the other institutions that maximizes all of our resources. There are Five College departments in Astronomy and Dance, and a Five College major in Black Studies. In addition, the Five Colleges have sponsored, with funding from The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, a Five College faculty program whereby the combined institutions have hired and shared the work of six junior professors and two full professors. These faculty hold appointments at a host school and teach on one or more of the campuses. For Hampshire's part, it has hosted two Five College junior appointments. One has been an Assistant Professor in Women's Studies and Medical Ethics and the other an Assistant Professor of Technology Assessment. In keeping with one of the main themes of the program, these faculty did not represent fields that we would have staffed if left to our own priorities and resources. We were encouraged to try them out because of the support, interest, and collaboration provided by the Five College connection.

We have tried to plan our faculty staffing so as not to overlap in areas of great strength at one or more of the other five institutions. This effort, however, is very complicated, since there is a minimal level of staffing required in almost any area in which Hampshire wants to encourage and support student/faculty work. We have, therefore, made appointments in fields that are also represented in the faculties of one or more of the other insti-
tutions. In many areas, however, we have either complemented the strengths at the other institutions or simply chosen not to duplicate their efforts at all. Film and photography, for example, represents an area where there is little or no work at the other institutions and which is Hampshire's particular and unique contribution to the overall Five College offerings in the visual arts. In foreign languages, moreover, we have chosen to offer a bare minimum in foreign language instruction—two courses each in French and Spanish—and instead to develop a language studies program that takes a very different approach to the place of foreign languages in a liberal arts curriculum.

4.2 Scholarship

The 1974 accreditation expressed concern about the ability of Hampshire's faculty members to be actively enough involved in scholarship to further their own professional careers and to maintain the involvement with their field that is essential for good teaching. We have not solved all the problems created by the demands of the Hampshire program in this area since 1974. There are still serious and complicated issues to be resolved around this matter, some of which are treated in the section on Faculty Load. Nevertheless, the record of scholarship and professional involvement of this young faculty is very impressive, as the faculty biographical forms in Appendix J show. In order to encourage professional development, the College's sabbatical policy provides for early eligibility of faculty to take a semester's sabbatical. Faculty are eligible for a semester's sab-
batical after two years on the faculty and for a full year after five years.
4.3 Appointments and Reappointments

The contract system and the reappointment process which has accompanied it have been the subject of interest and concern. Four years ago the question was raised whether or not such a process would lead to adequate screening and turnover of faculty. (See table in Appendix L for summary Record of Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions.)

With the experience we have now had, it is fair to say that the process is a viable alternative to the tenure system. An elaborated reappointments process (pp. 9-16 in the Faculty Handbook describe the process) has emerged which is not tenure in the traditional sense. The system provides a very careful and considered review of faculty performance which then serves as the basis for reappointment or non-reappointment and provides constructive criticism and support. In addition to the outcomes of the process itself in defining and upholding high standards, the anticipation of the thorough review insured by the process has encouraged some faculty to resign rather than face the high probability of non-reappointment.

This is not to suggest that the system is free of problems. An ad hoc task force on the reappointment process issued a preliminary report suggesting certain areas of weakness. (See Appendix M for copy of draft report.) In brief, they argued that the current system is very labor intensive. Each candidate's file is compiled, reviewed by all School members, and then considered by the all-College committee. Over the past three years, for example, the College Committee on Reappointments and Promotions considered 26, 19, and 18 candidates.
Secondly, the task force pointed out that the process can be very anxiety-producing for many of the strongest faculty as well as those facing a difficult reappointment. While this is no doubt similar to the anxiety of a tenure decision, it happens at regular and repeated intervals here.

Third, the task force was concerned about some structural inhibitions in obtaining critical reviews of candidates because colleagues writing evaluative letters would themselves be candidates in a short time. In addition, there is often a conflict between writing a critical letter to the candidate's file and the ability to maintain a colleague relationship either in the candidate's terminal year in the case of non-reappointment or during the candidate's next contract period in case of reappointment. For students, there is also an inhibition to write critical letters since the candidate criticized may be the only faculty member available to chair their examination committee. It is yet to be determined whether this problem is a function of the contract system or rather of the policy of open file.

Finally, one of the main virtues of the contract system was to be the flexibility provided in considering curricular needs as well as individual performance. Thus far, this has been the most difficult feature to build into the system. Candidates are considered individually and only peripherally in the context of how they fit into a larger curricular picture. Most candidates do indicate their plans for the proposed contract period. This is a useful device. Nevertheless, the thrust of the review remains a consideration of past performance, and the evaluation of students and colleagues has been the critical material in reaching a decision.
These criticisms have resulted from a lengthy and introspective consideration of the process. The faculty is probably more sensitive to the dynamics of this system than most other faculties are. Criticisms and self-reflections abound, but heretofore there has been little consensus about proposed changes.

We are currently considering a one-year moratorium on all reappointments. In lieu of the normal case load, the College would spend a sizable amount of time evaluating the system and effecting necessary changes on the basis of seven years experience. We have also completed a substantial document, to be presented this spring by the Board of Trustees for adoption, which elaborates a detailed, comprehensive policy on Academic Freedom to ensure high commitment to these standards outside a tenure system.

4.4 Summary

It is gratifying to report that some of the concerns expressed in 1974 have not proved to be major threats to the integrity of a strong faculty at Hampshire College. Academic freedom is secure, and becoming more so both by tradition and regulation. The system of renewable contracts has proved discriminating, and there has been substantial faculty turnover of a healthy kind. Scholarly and artistic work is produced and recognized well beyond the confines of the College. Voluntary resignations frequently occur because faculty are called to challenging opportunities elsewhere. The faculty recruitment process produces highly qualified appointees. The maturing of this faculty should provide a secure future for Hampshire College.
The outstanding problems continue to be those which the original design of the College acknowledged as central to Hampshire's experimental thrust. The redefinition of the faculty member's role by a system emphasizing individualized study programs continues to evolve. Orientation of new faculty, issues of specialization of role, distribution of work load, and techniques for combining advising, teaching, and examining all continue to absorb time and thought. They were remarked upon in 1974, and constitute one emphasis in this self-study four years later.
5. SUPPORT SERVICES/SYSTEMS

5.1 Houses

The House System at Hampshire represents an original commitment by the College to forge a strong bond between a student's intellectual growth and her or his daily life in residence. While staffing patterns vary somewhat across the Houses, the general model is that of a faculty Master working with three professional staff persons. The operating budgets of the five Houses total $51,000. These resources are intended to provide a menu of options reflecting both the distinctiveness of a particular House and a common concern for joining the formal structure of the academic program with the more informal nature of residential life.

The Houses differ in their architecture. Two (Merrill and Dakin) are dormitories with single and double rooms. The other three (Prescott, Greenwich, and Enfield—named for the towns submerged by the Quabbin Reservoir) offer apartments in which six to eleven people live together, cook together, and with some negotiation, mutually share household responsibilities. As a rough generalization, Greenwich and Enfield attract advanced students and Merrill, Prescott, and Dakin have a mix of students, with predominantly more in the early stages of their academic work. In addition, approximately one hundred students have off-campus residence permission—a group that would be larger if all requests were granted.
The central objectives of the Houses are not well described by the terms "nonacademic," "primarily social," or "extracurricular." Rather, the Houses operate in a more free-wheeling, open-ended arena. A sampling of recent offerings may help clarify this point:

- House-based classes in weaving, auto mechanics, and solfege
- A House reading seminar on Love and Death
- Student-organized film series
- Advising forum for transfer students
- Advising sessions on the Division I examination process
- Community woodworking shop
- Health series (films, presentations, demonstrations, discussions)
- Desserts/informal discussions with faculty and staff
- Housemaster's "Travelling Advising Center/Cider Emporium"
- Rotating weekly coffee house
- Guitar workshops
- A lecture series on "Political Activism in the '70s"
- Sunday brunches
- House courses on "Tibetan Buddhism" and "Alternative Healing"
- House-sponsored art exhibits
- Community forums on "The Connection between Academic Experience and Living Experience at Hampshire," "The Image of the College," etc.

One House has several faculty-in-residence; another has a group of faculty
who consider themselves Associates of that House. As a general rule faculty will accept invitations by the House to lead or participate in one-time events. Overall, however, faculty involvement in the Houses is substantially less than that envisioned in The Making of a College.

The three Houses with the most first-year students have student interns who provide informal peer support, act as liaison with the House staff, and initiate House-based academic, social, and cultural activities. During the past year increasing attention has been given to academic support and advising activities, both by interns and House staff. A growing number of students have been attracted to these activities, particularly those initiated by student interns. Still, many students do not participate fully in House life, and the role of the Houses in the total Hampshire experience continues to lack clear definition. There are many elements unique to Hampshire which serve to cloud potential directions for development of the House System. These constraints and the attempts to reconcile them are referred to in the following paragraphs.

The concerns raised by the Visiting Accreditation Team in 1974 have a familiar sound today:

- the lack of an overall sense of community stemming from an individualistic approach to academic progress;
the absence of a collegewide common space in which people can meet together over coffee;
the living context defined by apartment or floor rather than by the House as a whole;
the continuing tension in role expectations for House Masters between senior scholars-in-residence and counselor/consultant on issues of personal and corporate living.

Without question, two of these concerns dominate student criticisms of life at Hampshire. First, the need for a common coffee shop milieu which serves as an informal place for people to meet at all hours is paramount. Second, the desire by students to break through the individualism of Hampshire and do more collective work is a recurrent demand.

These issues have been reviewed, refined, and rehashed many times. Self-studies of individual Houses in 1975 addressed these same concerns in somewhat different terms. They spoke to the effort to define the "educational" role of the Houses as distinct from, but complementary and supportive of the "academic" task of the Schools; they emphasized the importance of developing the skills and experience of community/neighborhood living in the Houses; they articulated their position that programming, community development, governance, and counseling are integral to the educational tasks of the Houses; and they detailed the strengths and weaknesses of the five separate Houses, each with its own philosophy, its own
geography, its own staffing pattern, and its own way of engaging in its task. Although these reports provided a substantial basis for discussion of the role of the Houses, no recommendations were agreed or acted upon.

In 1976 the Educational Policy Committee of the College Senate established a task force to study the role of the Houses with particular emphasis on the educational aspects of this role. Their report sought to delineate an educational role for the Houses in support of academic progress, of enrichment of the learning potentially available in residence life, and of students addressing the issues of their own personal growth. This report emphasized the need for skills in community building and human development as integral to the fulfillment of the educational role of the Houses. The task force recommended a new, distinctly differentiated staffing pattern designed to implement these emphases. The recommendations were, however, voted down by the Senate last winter. At this time the Senate affirmed its support of the staffing pattern which had existed in most of the Houses since the opening of the College: a Housemaster (a half-time faculty member), an Assistant Master, and a Resident Associate, each with a differentiated function. In particular, the Senate stressed the importance of the faculty status of the Housemaster as a link between the academic and residential components of the College. Four of the Houses have maintained or returned to the Housemastership, and the fifth House, which currently has a scholar-in-residence, two Assistant Masters, and a Resident Associate, is searching for a Housemaster to begin duties in August.
A third attempt to clarify the role of the Houses centered on the administrative organization of residential units. In the spring of 1977 the Vice-President of the College initiated a proposal to create a House Unit, whose members would undertake a common approach to personnel and budget. This proposal was adopted and the effort to transform the House Unit from an idea to a reality has consumed much of the concern and energy of the House staffs through the first part of the current academic year. A Housemaster, reporting to the Dean, serves as the Unit Coordinator. Four operating committees have been established in the areas of Staff Development, Operations, Programming, and Personnel. Overall coordination and agenda setting rest with a Core Committee, comprised of the Master or budget supervisor of each House and the Dean of Academic Affairs. On alternate weeks the House Unit as a whole meets to discuss the work of the Houses and act on the recommendations of the several committees. The entire process has been time consuming and often frustrating. A major review of the strengths and weaknesses of this structure is forthcoming.

These studies and actions indicate that the House-related issues that were before the College in 1974 have been confirmed and reconfirmed and remain the issues in 1978. The perceived polarities of intention and experiences with regard to the Houses are sometimes debilitating and at other times provide the impetus for creative efforts. The position descriptions of the Housemasters both define the educational role of the House as a prime locus for academic growth but also as academically unrelated and therefore
unimportant. The recent votes of the College Senate in support of the searches for Housemasters in Enfield and Prescott Houses—the residential units which have tried alternative modes of staffing—seem to have reaffirmed their commitment to a more significant educational role for the Houses. Tension continues to exist between the individualistic self-directing thrust of Hampshire's academic program and the emphasis within the Houses on developing a stronger sense of common endeavor. The movement in the three Houses which have the largest percentage of new students each year towards the development of student staff to maintain more immediate personal contact with students, the encouragement of special interest groups to establish residence together, and the efforts to encourage the development of support networks for students all speak to efforts to deal creatively with this issue.

Another major issue revolves around the tension between the geographic and psychological dispersion of students on one hand, and the increasingly felt need for the creation of a community spirit on the other. This need is evident in recurrent and increasing demands for space where the whole community can gather and be at leisure together, in the rising concern to provide some form of continuing support for students' activities, and also in the expressed concern of the House Unit, Community Council, and Office of Cultural Affairs to provide for a more coordinated and comprehensive approach to the rituals and celebrations essential to the creation of such a spirit. The Administration is currently reviewing various proposals for the establishment of common social space.
Although the position of the Houses within the Hampshire experience is still in flux, the many attempts to grapple with the issue have illustrated its complexity and have contributed to the definition of the parameters within which the role of the Houses must be viewed. Progress has taken place, but the issues will continue to be explored.

Summary

The last of the new Houses at Hampshire was opened in the Fall of 1975. The full complement of Masters and staff was achieved in that year, and even now the staffing pattern has not stabilized. One consequence of the former administrative arrangement by which each House was an individual budget unit was a rapid diversification of philosophy, practice, and effort. Houses offered students a wide range of living arrangements and atmospheres; students were and are permitted to change places each semester; and communication between House staff was uneven at best. Much that was useful and creative occurred under these conditions, but the effects were transitory and non-cumulative. Above all, the major effect seemed to be confusion—of purpose, of understanding by others, and of administrative role on the part of the Masters themselves.

Despite the presence of excellent support services to students in personal need, and of many events of considerable intellectual worth, there remained a sense among the Houses that these achievements were unnoticed and unappreciated by most faculty and administrators. The plea for a
centralization of effort under a Dean of Student Affairs first arose in 1975, and helped move the College to its present search for the first such appointee.

The original aim of the House System was to confront the basic issues of educating for citizenship in the last quarter of the 20th Century. The willingness to create a single budget unit under the leadership of a Dean represents a second major effort to address the task.

5.2 Financial Aid

Although Hampshire College's heavy reliance on student fees to meet operating expenses necessitates a high tuition, the College does make a concerted effort to attract students from a diverse spectrum of income levels by offering several forms of financial assistance. The proportion of the College budget earmarked for student financial aid has been maintained at approximately ten percent of the income from tuition, room and board over the years. During the past year the College has recognized that in addition to promoting social, economic, and cultural diversity, the financial aid program contributes directly to the academic and financial well-being of the institution. It is essential that financial assistance be available for highly qualified students if we are to maintain enrollment levels without compromising admission standards. Therefore, a continuing commitment to a financial aid program which provides aid to at least twenty percent of the student population has become a part of long-range planning.
Financial aid at Hampshire College is viewed as a fixed cost. The percentage of student fees allotted to financial aid is 12.3% this year, up from just over 10% in previous years. During the 1976-77 academic year, 10.4% of the total student fees ($6,737,000) went to student financial aid, with 248 students as grant recipients. The College itself provided approximately 71% of grant assistance, with Federal Government monies (BEOGs and SEOGs) contributing 20% and private sources the remainder of the funds. Other assistance is available to needy students through National Direct Student Loans, Hampshire College loans, Work-Study jobs, state grants, veterans benefits, Social Security, and outside scholarships. The tables in Appendix N offer pertinent data on the distribution and sources of financial aid.

The directorship of the Financial Aid Office changed hands in the spring of 1976, following the six-year tenure of the original officer. The current Director brought with her several years of experience as a bank credit officer, and has ably transferred her skills to an academic environment. The Director is advised by a Financial Aid Advisory Committee which reviews policies, procedures and special cases, and makes recommendations to the Director. In addition to chairing this committee, the Director sits on the Student Employment Task Force which has been working to develop a system of student employment which will balance the needs of both student employees and College employers.

In recent years Hampshire has made some provisions for the awarding of financial aid monies to students for off-campus activities. Financial aid
students at the Division II or III level are eligible to take their financial assistance off-campus for a semester if they have planned a field study leave which is verified by their faculty advisers to be a necessary part of their study contract. Funds are made available in the form of a loan whose repayment obligation is cancelled upon successful completion of the project and the student's subsequent full-time enrollment.

5.3 Options/Graduate Relations

In fall 1974 an Office of Options/Graduate Relations was created to respond to the needs of students for guidance for post-graduate planning. This office corresponds to vocational planning offices on more traditional campuses.

Until Hampshire graduated several classes and the College and its unusual transcript became known to graduate and professional schools, the Options/Graduate Relations Office spent much of its time cultivating relationships with graduate programs and advising students on how best to present their undergraduate work to programs in the form of a Hampshire transcript/portfolio. Although by now most universities to which Hampshire students apply are accustomed to working with the Hampshire evaluation system (see Appendix 0 for the list of institutions which have accepted Hampshire students for graduate study), the Director of the Options Office still spends much time advising Division III students on graduate and professional programs, providing guidance in transcript/portfolio preparation, chairing the pre-medical committee and graduate fellowship competition screening committees, working with the Law Program faculty, and hosting representatives from graduate-level programs.
In addition to this service, the Office has developed an extensive library of resources on career options and how to prepare for them. Workshops on life planning techniques, job-hunting strategies, interviews, and resume-writing are regularly offered for students who do not necessarily plan to enter graduate schools upon graduation from Hampshire, and individual career counseling is provided.

The Options/Graduate Relations Office at Hampshire does not provide a placement function. Few recruiters visit the campus, although Hampshire students often speak with recruiters at the University of Massachusetts or the other Five Colleges. The office puts out a weekly newsletter with information about job openings, summer jobs, internships, visits of graduate school representatives, and activities of the office. The staff helps students make contact with persons and organizations which can help students begin the kind of careers which are an outgrowth of their Hampshire education. With the help of the Alumni Office, this liaison function should grow to include putting Hampshire students in contact with alumni and parents of students. Many students have requested help with starting careers and locating jobs which are consistent with the goals and principles of the College.

Hampshire has now graduated four full classes, and we are just now beginning to receive any significant amount of feedback on the post-graduate activities and career directions of our alumni. While we do know how many of our graduates enter graduate or professional programs (see Appendix P), it is still too early to know whether they will choose "typical" professions. The Director of Alumni Relations has recently
initiated a concerted effort to determine the kinds of jobs Hampshire graduates are presently engaged in. A partial list of graduates' occupations forms Appendix Q. A wide array of activities is represented; in particular, there seems to be a tendency for Hampshire graduates to choose jobs in social change, social action, community service, education, and research areas in which many of them were active as undergraduates. The Options Office generally focuses its advising and resources on the kinds of activities which the academic program and individualized learning at Hampshire prepares students well for and encourages students with more traditional occupational leanings to avail themselves of the resources in the vocational offices elsewhere in the consortium.

The Options/Graduate Relations Office also provides information and advice for students planning off-campus experiences as part of their undergraduate education. A half-time professional provides guidance on internship, work and educational opportunities during periods of leave, summer jobs, local volunteer work, and specialized study programs outside the Five College area. The Field Study Coordinator has responsibility for reviewing all applications for field study leaves and verifying the academic necessity of funded leave requests by financial aid students. She also develops internship and field placement sites. This person additionally takes initiative in maintaining contact with students on leave as part of the retention effort by preparing and distributing periodic newsletters, school newspapers, and other information which will keep them abreast of new developments on campus. Information about foreign study opportunities is also provided by the Options Office.
5.4 Recreational Athletics and the Outdoors Program

Recreational activities at Hampshire College vary considerably from those on other small liberal arts college campuses. The term intercollegiate college athletics has no applicability on this campus where individualized activities and skill-building take precedence over team sports.

Hampshire College opened in 1970 with a campuswide Outdoors Program which generated enormous appeal to the initial class of students and has since grown to enjoy somewhat of a national reputation. The Program's staff view the Program as "The Person in the Outdoors"—a combination of outdoors skills, the experience of nature in the outdoors, and conscious reflection upon the person and his or her skills and environment.

The Outdoors Program focuses on such skills as mountaineering, kayaking, canoeing, winter camping, cross-country skiing and caving, and instruction and guidance is provided by persons with very high (and often nationally recognized) levels of proficiency. Appendix R describes the philosophy of the Outdoors Program and the interface between its approach and some specific types of activities.

Through the diverse offerings of the Outdoors Program, as well as specific courses in teaching outdoors skills, many Hampshire students have had the opportunity to develop leadership and teaching skills in outdoor education which they may then apply through an internship at an outdoor education center or work with a local conservation group. Some students have used the Outdoors Program as the basis of Divisional work, and a number of ex-
aminations and concentrations have centered on outdoors interests. Several faculty members have active interests in the Program which permeate their professional work at the College and lead to involvement in student examinations. Conversely, several Outdoors Program staff hold faculty appointments. Such cross interests are indicative of the Program's attempt to provide opportunities for students to integrate their intellectual, physical, and experiential approaches to their work.

Until 1975 the Outdoors Program provided the only campuswide "recreation" program. During that year, however, the College's physical plant was expanded by the addition of a recreation/athletic facility, the Robert Crown Center. A director was hired to oversee the operation of the Center and to develop programs which would make use of its facilities. Although Recreational Athletics and the Outdoors Program are both housed in the Robert Crown Center, their administration is separate and programmatic interface is small.

The Center includes a swimming pool, sauna, playing floor, climbing wall, trampoline, weight machine, gymnastics equipment, and lounge where martial arts are taught and practiced. The Recreational Athletics Program oversees informally organized volleyball, badminton, fencing, Red Cross lifesaving courses, women's basketball, first aid and CPR courses, and provides instruction in martial arts. Hampshire maintains twelve tennis courts, four of them covered by an air structure, and soccer and softball fields.
The student body seems well satisfied with Hampshire's recreational offerings. Although students may arrange athletic competitions on an ad hoc basis with local campuses, it seems unlikely that Hampshire will change the direction of its recreational/outdoors programs in the foreseeable future.

5.5 Health Services

Hampshire College provides health care services for its students through a contractual arrangement with the University of Massachusetts Health Service. Outpatient services are available on a daytime basis on the Hampshire campus while students requiring inpatient care are treated at the University Infirmary, a licensed hospital. After-hour emergency cases are treated by the University, and surgical care is provided at Cooley Dickinson Hospital in Northampton.

The College's Health Services staff consists of one FTE Medical staff (the part-time services of three physicians), two FTE Nurse Practitioner Staff (four nurse practitioners), 1.8 FTE Mental Health Staff (two clinical psychologists), .1 FTE Health Educator, and .1 FTE Dietician/Nutritionist.
Individual consultation and treatment by the professional staff are provided for all Hampshire students seeking such services at no charge in addition to the College's comprehensive fee. Outreach programs on health care are also held each year by the Health Educator and Nutritionist. A recent community care program covered emergency care, self care, rape, health issues for men, cessation of smoking, dental health, and nutrition. Weekly education sessions on issues of birth control have been held for several years, and a BYN reference library was recently established. During the 1976-77 school year, the Health Services also undertook a needs assessment survey of students to determine areas of potential focus for the future.

The mental health staff meets regularly with members of the House staffs to facilitate communication among the persons in the College most involved with student mental health problems.

The most recent annual report of the Health Services (Appendix S) details the activity of the health and mental health staff.

5.6 Cultural Affairs

Beginning in the fall of 1977, Hampshire supplant its January Term/Fall Colloquy Coordinator position with that of Director for Cultural Affairs. The new position was created in an attempt to centralize cultural, social, and academic programming on campus—functions which previously had been administered by such diverse units and committees as the Schools, college-wide programs, the Houses, Community Council, Speakers and Artists Committee, the Committee on Cultural Affairs, and various administrative units with discretionary funds. The office is staffed by a Director who holds a .67 FTE administrative appointment and a .33 faculty appointment and a part-time
secretary.

The responsibilities of the Office of Cultural Programming are to organize and plan the academic program of January Term and Fall Colloquy with the help of a committee, administer the budgets for the two programs, and take the initiative for their evaluation; to administer the scheduling, funding and publicity of cultural events during the academic year by developing a master calendar, allocating funds for events, and fund-raising for cultural programming; and to coordinate the activities of such college-wide programs as the Law Program and the Environmental Science and Public Policy Program. The Director works in consultation with the committees, governance units, and administrators with direct responsibility for organizing and sponsoring the activities. She resides on campus in an apartment which is used to house speakers, artists, and other visitors who are official guests of the College.

5.7 Library

As a new college, Hampshire's library witnessed rapid growth in its collection and services for several years. Budgetary constraints in more recent years have slowed growth toward the target of 150,000 (the collection now numbers approximately 60,000 volumes), but use and services have nevertheless increased the library's utility considerably. Direct access borrowing at the other libraries within the Five College consortium has been introduced, and in four years the per capita borrowing by Hampshire students has increased thirty-six percent; borrowing at Hampshire alone is up twenty-nine percent. At the Hampshire library, non-Hampshire students represent twenty-four percent of its book users, which indicates that the Harold F. Johnson Library Center certainly contributes its share to Five College co-
When Hampshire first began to build its library collection, it was guided by the expectation that its library would not duplicate strong collections elsewhere in the Valley but would develop in areas where the College offered curriculum and resources not represented extensively in the other four colleges. The Film Office is one service which receives Five College use on a large scale; fifty percent of the users are from the other consortium institutions. By acquiring films requested by Five College faculty and joint academic departments, the Hampshire office has already laid the groundwork for the proposed Five College Non-Print Media Facility.

The Educational Technology unit within the library, which houses audio-visual and television services, also contributes strongly to the Hampshire library's use. The television studio has been used for full-scale production projects as well as for frequent classes and students' divisional examinations.

The professional staff of the Harold F. Johnson Library Center consists of:

- Director of the Library Center
- Director of Educational Technology (on leave 1977-78)
- Two Media Resources Advisers
- Media Resource Adviser/Cataloger
- Cataloger
- Acquisitions Librarian
- Chief of Engineering Services
- Operations Manager
- Television Producer

The staffing pattern has been modeled on interdependence and complementarity
which permit the librarians to develop their professional skills more fully. Each librarian participates in one of Hampshire's Schools, a kind of outreach which promotes useful liaison with faculty. The development of the collection benefits from such interaction; the librarians know of teaching interests and plans and can also receive feedback on book reviews which come to their attention.

The library staff has also taken the initiative in creating a variety of instructional modes with the purpose of introducing students to the services of the library. Eighteen courses were taught during the spring of 1977, and forty research guides (both course- and subject-oriented) have been written. The Educational Technology staff has produced several short courses on the use of audio-visual equipment. During the summer of 1975 the staff produced a full-length library orientation program titled "Alec in Libraryland" which received national recognition.

The introduction of Five College direct access borrowing prompted a re-vamping of record-keeping procedures which resulted in a strengthened circulation system. Uniform billing procedures and borrowing guidelines have been developed on a Five College basis. Despite direct access borrowing, interlibrary loan (OCLC) has experienced no decrease in work load. This system provides a source for verification of the majority of interloan requests and location information for those titles. It seems that such automation will continue to increase in the future, with benefits to the many services provided by the Hampshire College library.

A three-year statistical summary of circulation patterns, acquisitions, interlibrary loans, direct access borrowing, and other equipment and facility use is contained in Appendix T.
5.8 Summary

Student services at Hampshire reflect the educational philosophy of the College in many ways. The House system has evolved in response to the individual character of each student's program of study, and also the stated aspiration to provide young adults with the opportunity to learn how to be socially responsible for one another. The time-variable nature of degree progress has produced accommodations in the use of financial aid, and the creation of services to leave-taking students. The decision to concentrate athletic resources on carry-over skills for lifelong use has relegated team competition to the informal level. And the decision to emphasize a modern working library collection forces students to learn to use a variety of collections and reference services at an early stage of their careers.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty these services face is the effect their very presence has on student service expectations. Good service begets an appetite for better service—without end. The personnel in these units constantly see new possibilities for developing greater services—if additional resources can be found. Given our limits there must be a willingness to concentrate on improving rather than expanding service.
In the three fiscal years that have passed since the previous accreditation study, Hampshire College has continued to grow in financial strength. From a budget of $4.8 million for the fiscal year 1972-73 the budget has grown to $8.4 million for the current fiscal year. The College has reached its full enrollment and is now consolidating and stabilizing its resources. We are still highly dependent upon tuition income, necessitating annual increases in our student fees and severely constraining salaries and other expenditures. Our endowment is small by comparison to our neighboring colleges but has increased very significantly in terms of percentage growth. The physical plant growth of the College continues on a pay-as-we-go basis. In three of the last four years we have had year-end surpluses in our operating budgets; the immediate past year reversed this trend but even then the deficit amounted to only about one percent of the operating budget. We continue to meet our financial obligations and improve our financial management capabilities.

6.1 Financial Summary

The College is audited annually by Coopers and Lybrand. Copies of their annual audit report and management letter are on file for examination in the Treasurer's Office. In Appendix U are a number of exhibits from the past year's Financial Report, including:

- Exhibit A, a two year comparative Statement of Financial Condition (balance sheet);
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- Exhibit B, a two year comparative **Statement of Current Funds, Resources Used, Expenditures and Other Changes**;

- Exhibit C, the same statement except broken down on a per student basis;

- Exhibit D, the **General Fund Historical Summary**, since the opening of the College;

- Exhibit E, a **Statement of Gifts** for the immediate past year;

- Exhibit F, a **Student Loan Funds Summary**;

- Exhibit G, the **Plant Funds Historical Summary**, illustrating the total investment to date in the College; and finally,

- Exhibit H, the **Statement of Notes and Mortgages** outstanding as of June 30, 1977.

The above listed statements provide a fair and accurate indication of the College's financial condition. Table I on the following page is a composite five year summary illustrating the growth of income and expenditures since July 1, 1973.

6.2 **Budget Making Process**

The preparation of the annual budget is a long and involved process designed to involve a broad segment of the College community. Since the College is operating within very tight budgetary constraints, budget development places heavy emphasis on "level funding." The process begins with the preparation of a series of budget guidelines or parameters developed through a series of meetings involving the College's senior administrators, the Budget and Priorities Committee and the Treasurer and Controller. These guidelines are then submitted to the fall and winter meetings of the Board of Trustees for their approval of the enrollment target, tuition, room and board charges for the ensuing year. The Budget and Priorities Committee is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES USED</th>
<th>Actual FY-74</th>
<th>Actual FY-75</th>
<th>Actual FY-76</th>
<th>Actual FY-77</th>
<th>BUDGET FY-78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Other</td>
<td>$4,211,064</td>
<td>$4,913,744</td>
<td>$5,363,558</td>
<td>$3,467,280</td>
<td>$5,868,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>88,568</td>
<td>85,695</td>
<td>55,393</td>
<td>67,727</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Expenditures</td>
<td>316,187</td>
<td>246,741</td>
<td>153,546</td>
<td>119,343</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research</td>
<td>74,617</td>
<td>132,136</td>
<td>109,449</td>
<td>111,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>128,846</td>
<td>246,392</td>
<td>302,906</td>
<td>310,884</td>
<td>269,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>1,268,449</td>
<td>1,402,411</td>
<td>1,424,763</td>
<td>1,469,671</td>
<td>1,595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>204,670</td>
<td>177,826</td>
<td>164,452</td>
<td>207,511</td>
<td>223,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESOURCES USED**

$6,292,401 $7,204,945 $7,574,067 $7,754,256 $8,285,350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>$ 658,091</td>
<td>$ 680,943</td>
<td>$ 737,701</td>
<td>$ 825,262</td>
<td>$ 802,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>1,872,881</td>
<td>2,155,235</td>
<td>2,252,351</td>
<td>2,334,191</td>
<td>2,476,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educational Activities</td>
<td>99,207</td>
<td>95,108</td>
<td>193,302</td>
<td>166,210</td>
<td>157,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Expenditures</td>
<td>197,543</td>
<td>183,839</td>
<td>118,698</td>
<td>119,343</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research</td>
<td>26,229</td>
<td>132,136</td>
<td>109,449</td>
<td>111,860</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>357,729</td>
<td>417,127</td>
<td>486,637</td>
<td>560,708</td>
<td>664,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>264,887</td>
<td>360,108</td>
<td>411,428</td>
<td>421,267</td>
<td>464,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and Security</td>
<td>416,005</td>
<td>586,416</td>
<td>578,552</td>
<td>555,471</td>
<td>646,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180,787</td>
<td>357,973</td>
<td>393,734</td>
<td>410,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional</td>
<td>467,968</td>
<td>194,630</td>
<td>116,461</td>
<td>157,400</td>
<td>129,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>1,404,154</td>
<td>1,477,592</td>
<td>1,415,525</td>
<td>1,518,679</td>
<td>1,601,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>415,885</td>
<td>530,332</td>
<td>616,635</td>
<td>640,526</td>
<td>818,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>257,545</td>
<td>31,013</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS**

$6,438,124 $7,025,316 $7,479,512 $7,838,991 $8,432,113

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING EXCESS (DEFICIT) AND TRANSFERS</th>
<th>(145,723)</th>
<th>179,629</th>
<th>94,555</th>
<th>(84,735)</th>
<th>(146,768)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition, Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>6,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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comprised of three faculty members, three student members and one member of the Administration. While a committee like this has existed for a number of years, it was revitalized last Spring by the College Senate and has been fully consulted under the new administration of President Simmons. Its purpose is to widen input to the budget and to help keep the College community informed about budget development. Obviously it is not easy for anyone to vote for tuition increases, and they must be convinced that the need is real and beneficial to the general student body. At weekly meetings during the budget season the senior administrators discuss priorities and financial allocations, furnishing advice to the President and Treasurer.

Actual budget preparation follows the sending of a budget package consisting of instructions, a budget calendar and forms and guidelines to the twenty-five or more individual budget managers. Each manager submits by the end of January a comprehensive budget for his/her budget area, together with appropriate justifications. Simultaneously during this time the President meets with the Treasurer, Controller, Personnel Officer and other specialists to review the general institutional expenses of the College. A final budget package is then prepared by the Business Office staff in time for submission to the March Trustees' meeting where adoption may take place. Due to important other considerations last Spring, actual budget adoption by the Trustees was postponed until their June meeting. All budget making procedures are cumbersome if multiple sectors of the College are to be involved, but we are convinced that a broad-based budget process is well worth the time and effort required.
6.3 Financial Planning

Increased annual giving and endowment is essential to the College. Endowment grows slowly despite the welcome assistance investment provides to our budget. Last Spring Hampshire divested itself of a number of stocks alleged to benefit from the South African economy, and, through a very democratic process, developed and adopted an overall investment policy to guide future investment of College funds. The bulk of current giving to the College is devoted to completion of the "missing links" in our physical plant.

Hampshire, with its small endowment income, is heavily tuition dependent. Consequently, the annual budget increases have forced a long series of progressive tuition increases. Table II below illustrates tuition growth over the past nine years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY71</th>
<th>AY72</th>
<th>AY73</th>
<th>AY74</th>
<th>AY75</th>
<th>AY76</th>
<th>AY77</th>
<th>AY78</th>
<th>AY79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$3,626</td>
<td>$4,090</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TRB</td>
<td>$3,800</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$4,986</td>
<td>$5,590</td>
<td>$5,940</td>
<td>$6,350</td>
<td>$6,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, we do not foresee a leveling off of the tuition increases in the next several years. Tuition increases will be kept to the absolute
minimum but the combination of an annual decrease in the value of the dollar and the slow growth of income other than tuition forces the College administration to lean heavily upon tuition to provide the funds to maintain competitive salary levels, increase student aid and meet the general running expenses of the College.

Two examples which demonstrate our concern for broadening our revenue base are (1) the greatly increased emphasis on Development and fund-raising with increased staff and budget and (2) opening our campus to a wide variety of summer programs designed to increase non-student income.

6.4 Summer Programs

The past four years have brought significant growth in the number and variety of programs using Hampshire's facilities during the summer. The mix includes sponsored programs, such as the highly successful National Science Foundation Summer Studies in Math for high school students under the direction of Professor David Kelly for the past six years; a two-week workshop conducted by the American Recorder Society; a four-week summer Film Institute sponsored by M.I.T.; and an eight-session tennis camp operated by All-American Tennis, Inc. All told, seven groups came to campus to study, deliberate, practice, and exercise. Last summer, Hampshire took its turn hosting the Five College Alumni College and, despite the small number of its own alumni, enjoyed a well attended and successful week of seminars and lectures. Most recently the income from summer programs has risen to the point where, for the first time, the College has created a full-time Summer Program Director's position to administer those activities and promote further growth.
6.5 Financial Concerns

Hampshire College is well aware of the problems facing small independent colleges in the next decade. We have directed increased portions of our scarce budget dollars to funding and staffing Admissions. We have substantially increased the staff of the Development Office. We have provided approximately twenty percent of the student body with financial aid in the past five years in order to meet our enrollment goals with highly qualified students. We have added needed facilities to our physical plant to provide specialized academic facilities for the arts. We have maintained a very effective energy conservation effort over the past three years. In short, we are doing everything possible to stabilize and strengthen our financial condition. Even given our concerns about enrollment and other problems, we have not developed a retrenchment plan as yet, feeling that to do so would be a serious inhibition to recruitment and to fund-raising and would cause a general decline in morale.

Since a strong faculty is maintained by a competitive faculty salary scale, our strong rankings reflect our efforts well. However, it is a fact that the entire profession, with few exceptions, continues to fall behind in real income. Unlike our three private neighbors, Hampshire does not have the endowment income necessary to provide scales which match the price index or real income growth rates. Thus we face serious discrepancies in compensation with our immediate colleagues before long. At the same time, there is no reason to believe our tuition increases can fill the growing gap. Effecting greater income for the College will remain a primary concern for the years ahead, whether it means increased enrollments, endowment, or both.
Finally, any examination of Hampshire's future must take into account the many financial assets of the College. These include a magnificent, unmortgaged 550 acre site; more than $30,000,000 worth of relatively new buildings and facilities; an extremely low debt structure, approximately eleven million dollars, of which ninety-three percent is in the form of HUD or HEW low interest mortgage loans; reserves to meet government mortgages or for maintenance totaling almost $400,000; our own repair and replacement reserve of $250,000; and a small but growing endowment fund. We have operated within our own cash flow without need to borrow operating funds for the past three years. Hampshire is a full partner and owner of the Three College Computer System along with Amherst College and Mount Holyoke College. We are a full participant with the other area colleges in the organization known as Five Colleges, Inc. Our contribution to this consortium amounted to $105,000 during the past year.

Hampshire is not without its fiscal weakness. Perhaps its greatest financial asset may be its awareness of the fiscal facts of life. Prudent and concerned management by the entire College community will hopefully guide the College into the future.
SPECIAL EMPHASES
7. ADMISSIONS

Like many small private liberal arts colleges, Hampshire has experienced a declining applicant pool in recent years. During the first three years of the College's existence, the applicant pool numbered approximately two thousand students each year. By 1974 it had dropped to under sixteen hundred and has since further declined to just short of eleven hundred students last year. The quality of applicants has remained high, however, and the decrease can be partially attributed to declining numbers of college-age students nationwide and partially to a growing degree of self-selection among potential applicants. Earlier applicants were attracted to Hampshire because of the new educational values which grew out of the student unrest in the late 1960s, as well as the extensive favorable national publicity which accompanied the birth of the new college. Applicants now know how the College works and what attributes are necessary for a student to succeed, and thus there are fewer applications prompted mostly by curiosity.

The initial deluge of applicants caused the Admissions staff to channel most of their activity into interviewing applicants, reading files, making decisions, and explaining negative decisions to applicants and their families and guidance counselors. There was little need to spend much time in the direct recruiting characteristic of most colleges. By the mid-1970s, however, it was apparent that applications were declining. Increasing numbers of high school students were choosing public education, as opposed to expensive private four-year colleges. Emphasis was being
placed on career education and skills training. In short, the educational philosophy and tenets espoused by Hampshire were being questioned by college-bound students and their families.

7.1 Characteristics of Applicants and Accepted Students

Despite the general decline in the overall number of applicants, the College has not encountered significant changes in the academic and personal qualifications of the students who apply and who are accepted, although more bring with them "traditional" high school backgrounds today. The applicant and accepted student pools have had roughly sixty percent women and forty percent men since 1975. The majority of the students (sixty-five percent) continue to come from the East Coast, with twenty percent from the Midwest and ten percent from the Far West and Southwest. Few foreign students apply to Hampshire due to limitations on financial aid as well as the incompatibility of Hampshire's program with their secondary school preparation and higher education aspirations.

From the early years of the College there has been somewhat of a shift in the type of high school applicants come from. Currently seventy percent of the students are from public high schools, twenty-five percent from private schools, and five percent from a dwindling number of alternative high schools and programs. In the early 1970s over thirty-five percent had a private high school education, fifteen percent came from alternative schools, and half had public high school backgrounds. The majority of Hampshire students are in the top two-fifths of their high school classes
with forty percent in the top fifth. The class rank of accepted students is only slightly higher on the average than those of the total applicant pool.

SAT scores are not required for admission to Hampshire, but a number of applicants do submit them. There has been a decline consonant with the national trend in the scores of Hampshire applicants over the past four years. The average verbal score is now approximately 550 versus over 570 in 1974. Math scores have declined from the mid-560s to approximately 540 on the average.

Full demographic data on Hampshire applicants is available from the Admissions Office upon request.

7.2 The Changing Applicant Pool

The table below provides statistics on Hampshire's applicant pool since 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>1974 (fall only)</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Early Decision)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Delayed Admission)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(February)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>1974 (fall only)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matriculants</th>
<th>1974 (fall only)</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In tandem with the declining applicant pool, Hampshire has had to cope with a high attrition rate; at the same time graduating classes have grown larger. These latter two factors have put a great deal of pressure on the Admissions staff since ideally each student who withdraws or graduates should be replaced by a new student. Currently between 450 and 525 new students are needed each year to hold the size of the student body steady.

Although seventy-two percent of last year's applicants were admitted—a figure which implies decreasing selectivity in admissions decisions—Hampshire applicants of today have usually correctly judged that they are academically prepared for a self-designed education. Thus, declining applicant numbers should not be interpreted as a negative statement about the
College. It has been encouraging to see that the yield rate of accepted students has remained fairly steady at approximately fifty-five percent (seventy percent for February entering classes), an indication that most applicants' first commitment is to the Hampshire style of education.

A second positive trend worth noting in conjunction with applicants' self-selectivity is the sophistication with which students are currently exploring colleges. Parents are more involved in the exploration process, and hard questions are being asked about precisely what Hampshire has to offer, what the student's experience is likely to be, and what the results of their investments in Hampshire can be. Students are seeking to link their interests and goals in skill development and subject content with the flexible learning process Hampshire offers to achieve them. Five College academic cooperation is mentioned by more and more applicants as an important factor in their decision to apply to Hampshire. The political, social, and cultural ambience of the College have apparently become less significant to those considering coming to Hampshire.

For a number of years, a roughly fifty-fifty balance of female and male applicants was maintained, and admissions decisions aimed to represent this balance in the composition of the student body. However, since 1974 female applicants and matriculants have outnumbered men, and the present female: male ratio is sixty:forty. In 1976 the College Senate instructed the Admissions staff not to act overtly to change these proportions, except by more active recruitment of male students. The College was not to change its acceptance standards to create a more equal sexual balance. With the tendency of increased attrition of women over men, the balance has not changed significantly.
A fourth trend within the applicant pool has been a decrease in the number of applicants requesting financial aid. Currently less than thirty percent of applicants seek financial assistance as compared with approximately forty percent in the early years of the College. This is another form of self-selection; prospective applicants from low and middle income backgrounds have decided that they cannot afford a Hampshire education before filing an application for admission. Nearly three-fourths of the applicant pool is in a position to finance their own education, whereas the remaining fourth requires substantial amounts of college-based financial aid. The disappearance of middle income applicants represents a particularly frustrating problem.

These same factors have contributed to a significant drop in the number of minority applicants as well. Despite the addition of a minority person to the professional Admissions staff four years ago, and more recently the hiring of an Associate Director with extensive experience in pre-college counseling of high school students in Harlem, focused efforts on the recruitment of minority students have not paid off. The minority applicant pool has decreased from a high of one hundred and sixty in 1971 (thirty-two matriculants) to only thirty (ten matriculants) in the past academic year. (The figure of one hundred and sixty in 1971 is unrealistically high; that year the Admissions Office contracted with an agency which brought many applications from unqualified minority candidates. There were sixty-eight minority applicants in 1970 and seventy-eight in 1972.)
Data are beginning to be collected and organized, and as the size and comprehensive of the data base grows, it is hoped that some of the subtler shifts in the applicant and matriculant groups can be analyzed and understood.

7.3 The Admissions Process

Since 1969 Hampshire has attempted to design and maintain as humane and efficient an admissions process as possible. This process has been marked by a deep commitment to an individualized assessment and personalized follow up as well as to as honest and open a presentation of the College as possible.

Guided by the realization that many students are directly encouraged to apply to a college like Hampshire by the quality and uniqueness of its application forms, the Admissions staff has made special efforts to design a set of application forms that is both attractive and engaging as well as effective in gathering the academic and personal information needed. The application forms permit students to express themselves in various ways and yet insist upon a substantial volume of personal material which will reveal both academic and personal strengths. In addition to asking for a solid sample of applicants' thinking and writing and allowing them to submit examples of creative work, substantial pieces of academic work, or a description of a significant job experience, a formal high school transcript and formal school recommendations are required. Applicants may also submit individual teacher or counselor recommendations in a non-pro
forma format if they will add to the understanding of the applicant.
Finally, students are urged to provide some personal advice on how to read
the application materials—a request which leads many applicants to devote
considerable thought about the quality of their records and the relative
weight they wish to put on various parts of the application.

Students tend to view the Hampshire application forms as challenging and
rewarding to complete, and thus the College has been encouraged to con-
tinue the use of broad, option-filled, and open-ended forms.

The Admission staff reviews the application materials with three major
perspectives. First, evidence of self-motivation, maturity, and general
readiness for the challenges of a Hampshire education is sought. Personal
interviews, samples of work, and comments of teachers all reveal the
applicant's ability to handle an individualized education. Unfortunately,
aplications during the past few years have indicated that decreasing
numbers of students have had an opportunity to exercise to any significant
degree education freedom or responsibility in their high school careers.
Thus, potential rather than direct evidence of the ability to take charge
of one's own education is now sought.

Second, high school transcripts and samples of work are studied to deter-
mine whether the applicant has sufficient reading and writing skills to
handle the workload and examination demands of a Hampshire education,
especially at the Division I level. Like many other colleges, Hampshire's
Admissions staff has found that the general quality and volume of written
work at the high school level has declined over the past few years. To offset this trend, it has been necessary in some cases to take a risk on a student who appears to be on the threshold of the personal maturity and judgment needed to handle Hampshire well rather than on a student who obviously lacks the skills to survive in the Five College academic environment.

The third criterion necessitates examination of application materials for evidence of the kind of contribution the student might make to the life of the College. A wide mix of student interests, activities, travel experiences, and the like is sought.

Hampshire is intent on diversifying the student body as much as possible, given the constraints imposed by high costs and limited financial aid. Occasionally admissions criteria have been stretched to allow for the acceptance of students with unusual backgrounds, experiences, and records whom the Admissions staff believe can benefit from and contribute to Hampshire's uniqueness. Although such liberal interpretation of admissions criteria occurs in relatively few cases, occasional exceptions can and have represented some positive risk-taking for the good of the individual and for the good of the college community.

7.4 Recruitment Strategies

Since 1974 the Admissions Office has been gathering information on how prospective applicants first heard about the College, what motivated them
to sustain their interest in Hampshire, and who influenced their decision to apply and to matriculate. Simultaneously, Admissions personnel began to expand their travel schedules, a mailing campaign was organized around College Board Search names, and more on-campus meetings with teachers and guidance counselors were instituted.

By mid-1975, these surveys yielded some significant information. More than eighty percent of the applicants had heard about Hampshire from another person, implying that a vast human network of students, parents, teachers, and other friends of the College was actively and successfully at work. This knowledge made clear the need for a strong outreach recruiting strategy which would ultimately prove more effective than our competitors' recruitment methods.

Hampshire's answer to this need was the concept of an Admissions Network Coordinator. Geographic regions of the United States where the human network needed to be cultivated would be pinpointed, and intelligent, sophisticated, articulate adults who were visible and active in their communities would be hired on a part-time salaried basis to "spread the word" about Hampshire among prospective applicants and their families. The Network Coordinators would periodically come to the Hampshire campus for intensive orientation and meetings; the members of the Admissions staff would plan their travel schedules to include visits to the targeted areas. Initially Network Coordinators were designated in Westchester and Nassau Counties in New York State, in the Philadelphia metropolitan area, and in Montgomery County in Maryland. In the Spring of 1976, the network of
Coordinators was expanded to include several new areas of the South and West where there was potential for building inquirer and applicant pools: Miami, Chicago, Dallas, Phoenix, Los Angeles, and Seattle. This past year the Network Coordinator group grew to twelve with the addition of northern New Jersey and the San Francisco Bay area. The table below illustrates the effectiveness on the applicant pool of the Network Coordinators in the first four geographic areas designated.

**Admissions Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network Coordinator Areas - Initial Comparative Statistics 1975-77*</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Acceptances</th>
<th>Matriculants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester-Putnam Counties New York</td>
<td>1975 51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976 52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977 83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County New York</td>
<td>1975 65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976 67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977 97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1975 53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976 46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977 69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, Maryland and Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>1975 58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976 54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977 54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for these four initial areas</td>
<td>1975 227</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976 219</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977 303</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These are the only comparative statistics on Network Coordinator performance now available. Our other Coordinators have not yet worked through two admissions cycles.
Through the contacts of the Coordinators, as well as through another special mailing to 10,000 high school students whose names had been purchased from the College Search Service, visits to the campus and interviews were encouraged. Much attention was focused on training the Admissions staff for good interviewing and maintaining a high quality group of student guides and interns. Feedback about the helpfulness of the Network Coordinators was positive, and the number of applications from the regions in which Hampshire was represented by a Coordinator either rose or remained stable as the applicant pool as a whole declined.

Because the Admissions Network Coordinators have proved to be so effective, mass mailings to thousands of students have ceased, and the travel budget has been substantially increased to permit more in-person contact with students, their families, and teachers in the twelve areas served by the Coordinators. The professional staff in the Admissions Office has increased to include a half-time Dean of Admissions, and full-time positions of Director of Admissions, three Associate Directors, and an Assistant to the Director who coordinates the Network Coordinators.

On-campus admissions activity has had to intensify as well in order to meet applicants' expectations of the admissions process and to compete favorably in the college admissions marketplace. Applications have had to be reviewed earlier, early-action decisions made by a reasonable date, and much follow-up done on accepted students during the Spring to maximize the yield of matriculants. Unfortunately it has also been necessary in recent years to continue recruitment, interviewing, and decision efforts during the Spring and Summer. Thus admissions activity has had to continue year-round at an intense pace.
Sufficient numbers of entering students have been provided at the beginning of the last two academic years, but it is clear that if enrollment needs are to be met in coming years, a large staff and budget must be maintained.

The hope is that the annual inquiry pool of eight to ten thousand can be maintained and that sufficient follow-up and personal contact can take place so that the applicant pool can be stabilized at or slightly increased above 1,250 each year.

7.5 New Perspectives

Last year a consultant from the educational division of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund was engaged to take a critical look at the College's admissions situation and provide advice on future directions. During his six-month review, outreach efforts, publications, staffing, and admissions strategies were examined. Extensive consultation with the Admissions Office staff took place, dozens of current and prospective students and parents were interviewed, input from guidance counselors and educators familiar with Hampshire's admissions efforts was sought, and publications and correspondence materials were reviewed.

The consultant concluded that the expansion of the network of Admissions Coordinators has strengthened Hampshire's recruitment effectiveness and that a better articulation of a theme which suggests Hampshire's concrete strengths and how they relate to the present concerns of prospective students and their families was appropriate. However, he questioned other of
Hampshire's positions on admissions: the notion that positive experiences during applicant's campus visits is paramount; the rejection of the practice of most schools of travelling to many high schools; the rejection of the mass mailings and mass media; and the belief that substantial use of students and alumni in publicizing the College is not particularly effective.

He recommended that the College utilize some new (and some previously rejected) approaches to reaching potential Hampshire students. He suggested that a larger audience could be created by deemphasizing the College's alternative and undertaking a more generalized effort to describe its aims and processes in a more conventional fashion, with its unique features cast more in a methodological light. He also stressed a need to capitalize upon the student advising system's ability to "compensate for admission miscalculations and particularly the self-selecting misjudgments of youthful candidates..." By doing this, he believed that the criteria for selection can be broadened. The consultant also set out some devices for identifying a wider applicant pool.

The full report is contained in Appendix V.

The report was influential in increasing the professional Admissions staff and the budget this year, and it is providing a forum for discussion about long-term admissions efforts and possible comprehensive policies which will link admissions and retention.
7.6 Current and Future Outreach Efforts

Clearly the principal task at hand is to first stabilize and then expand the applicant pool. The Admissions staff is continuing to spend the vast majority of its time on outreach and follow up efforts. Specifically, the staff will spend thirty weeks this year travelling to high schools and other public forums. A multi-stage mailing program is being utilized to insure that prospective students and their parents receive a variety of Hampshire publications on at least three different occasions after making the initial inquiry. In concert with the Development Office, twenty-five major luncheons, receptions, and dinners will be held this year for school heads, teachers, counselors, parents, and other friends of the College.

All of these activities have as their purpose maximizing the number of students who will visit the College this year. The Admissions staff continues to believe that once prospective applicants have had some exposure to the Hampshire campus and engaged in a meaningful interview dialogue, students will be better prepared to make an intelligent decision about applying to and matriculating at Hampshire.

An ambitious effort to follow up applications and acceptances is also being undertaken. Individualized, hand-written notes are being sent by the Admissions staff to each accepted student and another letter to the parents of each student, with an invitation to participate in a series of on-campus events to be held in April aimed at further exposing them to faculty and enrolled students. It is hoped that such periodic
communications will convince students that the Admissions staff (and indirectly the entire College) wants them to matriculate at Hampshire. These outreach efforts are believed to be necessary to maintain the fifty percent plus yield rate.

The increase in last year's budget and subsequent expansion of the Admissions staff has permitted the College to meet its core admissions needs of at least four hundred new students each Fall. A further modest increase of eight percent in the Admissions budget is being sought for next year to enable the hiring of two additional professionals in the Admissions Office: a Third World admissions officer (that slot has been vacant for two years) who, it is hoped, will be able to reverse the long, steady decline in the size of the minority applicant pool; and a person to work half-time in the Admissions Office and half-time in the Deans' Office to recruit and advise transfer students interested in Hampshire. Currently transfer students constitute just over fifteen percent of the applicant pool, and by the early 1980s an increase to thirty to thirty-five percent is sought. The requested budget increase will also go in part toward an effort to initiate a research and pilot testing program for targeted mailings to specific groups of students in selected communities and settings which can be identified as prime areas for Hampshire's recruitment efforts. After additional data has been gathered and a variety of mailing options developed by next year, a major investment of funds in targeted mailings of new and improved publications produced by the Public Relations Office is foreseen.
7.7 Admissions Summary

The College is currently engaged in a nationwide search for a new Director of Admissions. Consultation with persons close to admissions continues. Alumni groups in major cities are being formed to work with the Network Coordinators. Hampshire is well aware that competition for students with the characteristics we now enjoy will become increasingly severe. We are assured by our graduates, parents, and colleagues that there is definitely a place for Hampshire's program in the future, and we intend to see to it that future is secure.
3. RETENTION

In this period of economic flux, financial pressures, and concern for the student as a consumer, student enrollments in colleges and universities are declining, and there is reason for more than usual worry about student attrition. Student attrition is not a new phenomenon; it has been recognized for a long time that large numbers of students who matriculate at a given institution will not graduate from that institution. In different periods of history, this fact has been viewed at one time as beneficial and at others as detrimental to both the institution and the student. Currently student attrition, while not necessarily seen as negative, at least raises questions about educational quality and financial viability of colleges where attrition is relatively high. Although some institutions, such as Reed College, have combined high quality and high attrition for much of their history, most institutions with a high attrition rate need to examine its meaning and significance for the overall quality of the college's program as well as its implications on the institution's financial capabilities.

The national average of student attrition for all colleges and universities is forty percent. This figure includes community colleges where attrition is often as high as eighty percent and elite, private colleges where it is often as low as ten percent. For Hampshire, the attrition rate was forty percent for the Fall Term entering classes of 1973 and 1974; based upon the current rate, the attrition rate for the Fall 1975 entering class will be higher than forty percent. (Appendix W illustrates the College's attrition rate for each entering class.)
Hampshire has researched and studied the complex phenomenon of student attrition, and considerable discussion—and a certain amount of controversy—has ensued. There is consensus, however, that no matter what the causes of attrition at Hampshire, or whether or not it has its roots in negative features of the College, a forty percent rate has intolerable consequences for the future of the institution.

A high attrition rate puts a severe burden on admissions. For every student lost by attrition, the Admissions Office must have four applicants and accept two students to replace the student who has withdrawn. With a very competitive admissions situation, a small applicant pool, and the prospect of a drop in the college age cohort of three percent a year beginning in three years, it is probably impossible to rely entirely on admissions to replace so many students lost by attrition.

A high attrition rate probably means, moreover, that the College is losing too many students who could have succeeded at Hampshire and who leave with negative feelings about themselves, with lowered self-esteem and a sense of failure. (This is not to say, of course, that there are not students who leave for appropriate and positive reasons, too.) Since the majority of students who withdraw do so at the Division I level, a high attrition rate also suggests that the student community, the overall academic program, and the intellectual life of the College potentially lack the positive influences of maturity and continuity provided by large numbers of advanced students. The balance among the three Divisions becomes undermined, and with large numbers of Division I students and small numbers of upper Division students, the faculty finds itself teaching as if in a large junior college and at the same time in a small honors program.
Hampshire's problem, simply put, is that it cannot survive with a forty percent attrition rate—even if that rate represented something positive about the College. To some extent it does, since Hampshire students are encouraged to think of their educational experience as embracing opportunities beyond the classroom, to believe that they are not fated to spend four uninterrupted years at the college they initially entered, and to take a large share of the responsibility for their own education. We believe this point of view is positive, but it does encourage student withdrawal. This fact means that an attrition rate of ten to fifteen percent is unrealistic. While forty percent is untenable, twenty-five to thirty percent would be both realistic and acceptable for the College's educational quality and financial survival.

8.1 The Nature of Student Attrition at Hampshire

As with most students who withdraw from college, students who leave Hampshire do not "drop out" of higher education. According to "The Study on Attrition" conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation at Hampshire, eighty-five percent of students who withdrew from Hampshire transferred immediately or within a short time to another college or university. Hampshire students drop out not because they are giving up on a college education completely, but rather because they feel they can get elsewhere something better or cheaper than what Hampshire can offer.

Students, moreover, usually withdraw after having tried some experience away from Hampshire, usually by taking a leave of absence. Approximately sixty-five percent of Hampshire's withdrawals come from students while on
leave. Most withdrawals occur after two, three, or four terms in residence, and before the student has filed a Division II proposal.

8.2 Possible Reasons for Attrition

The literature on attrition suggests that the students who drop out of a given institution usually have the following characteristics: (a) they feel isolated or alienated from the college's social and/or academic life; (b) they feel an incompatibility between what they seek and the college's curriculum and/or social life; (c) they are bored; and/or (d) they have significant financial problems. The study conducted by Hampshire's Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation is compatible with these general findings. The Hampshire study found that sixty percent of the students withdrew for reasons related to the academic life of the College, twenty percent for reasons stemming from social isolation, and fifteen percent for financial reasons.

Both the literature and the Hampshire study indicate that in order to analyze the attrition issue both characteristics of the students and the characteristics of the institution need to be studied. Few existing studies of the subject point to the interactions between the student and the institution as central to understanding attrition. They rarely characterize the nature of that interaction which leads to attrition as opposed to that which leads to graduation.

Interactions which produce a sense of engagement and commitment that is satisfying to the student will result in his or her graduation. When the
interactions fail to produce this engagement, the student may withdraw. This is especially true in an institution where academic progress is so closely tied to the student's sense of self-esteem. For sixty percent of a Fall Term entering class at Hampshire, the students' interactions with the institution are positive enough for them to persist and graduate. We need to extend or create more appropriate ways for fostering such good interactions among the forty percent who will not graduate from Hampshire.

8.3 Actions Taken

The seriousness of the student attrition problem at Hampshire became increasingly apparent during the 1976-77 academic year. Much discussion took place which led the academic administration of the College to initiate several "interventions" during the current academic year. Simultaneous with the introduction of these "interventions," a College Senate-mandated Task Force on Retention began examining the attrition problem in detail and formulating recommendations for long-term actions aimed at retaining a larger percentage of each entering class.

Among the immediate actions taken this Fall was a continuing orientation and support program. Upper Division students were recruited to welcome new students and provide support throughout the year, to act as assistants to new faculty, and to run a seminar with the purpose of improving students' examination skills. Starting in February 1977, new student support groups were formed for those who wanted to participate. Means have been created to provide special advising throughout the year for older students, transfer students, and foreign students. The Associate Dean for
Advising held a series of meetings for new advisers to introduce them to
the various facets of the Hampshire program and to clarify the advising
role. Seminars on the examination process are being run this semester
for new advisers.

Attempts are being made to identify and help students in particular aca-
demic difficulty. The Academic Deans and Academic Counselor regularly
meet together to identify and monitor students with problems. They also
meet with students who have been identified as not making sufficient
academic progress via examinations and their advisers to assess the prob-
lem and adopt a plan for dealing with it.

Careful reviews of leave request forms are taking place. Students whose
reasons for leave or withdrawal seem vague or vacillating are followed up;
advisers may be contacted by the Deans' Office about their knowledge of
and perspectives on the student's plans, and individual students may be
contacted for conversations with a member of the Deans' Office staff.

The Associate Dean for Advising is beginning to devise some new ways of
improving the overall advising process. She is attempting to identify
those faculty with particular advising problems and to provide special
assistance. She also hopes to develop a more specialized student-based
advising program which will provide special training for advanced students
to enable them to assist in the advising of a specific number of entering
students.
The Deans' Office is involved in certain activities focusing on the Houses and quality of life on the Hampshire campus. A resident adviser program in the three Houses having the largest number of new students has been prepared. Critical periods of time during the year for student morale and sense of satisfaction about themselves in relation to the College are being identified, and efforts to help students severely affected by these periods are being devised. In addition, an informal task force to study the nature of extracurricular activities, their relative importance in the overall life of the College, and the possible need for further development and/or support is being created.

New approaches to leave advising within the Options Office which will help students view a leave as part of a well-developed academic program are being considered, and the leave of absence fee structure is being reviewed.

As these steps toward creating positive interactions on a broad base were being effected, the Task Force on Retention was working diligently on its examination of the attrition problem. Through the 1977 Fall Term it identified the four primary focuses of its work—the Division I academic program, the advising system (especially at the Division I level), the House system and the quality of life, and leave taking—and explored the strengths and weaknesses of each as they affect students' engagement or alienation from the College. The Task Force completed its work in January 1978 and submitted a substantive list of recommendations to the President. The Task Force's report follows in its entirety.
8.4 Report of the Task Force on Retention *

I

INTRODUCTION

The President’s charge to the Task Force in October 1977 asked us to examine the problem of student attrition and make recommendations. We have now completed a series of meetings and want to report our progress and recommendations.

The Task Force's introduction to the issue of student attrition and the existing data and conclusions about it came in the mini-retreat on October 24, 1977 held at the UMass Campus Center. The retreat forwarded to the Task Force four areas related to attrition for its examination: Division I Academic Program, Division I Advising, Houses and Quality of Life, and Leave Taking. The Task Force discussed each of these areas, but has focused most of its attention on the Division I Academic Program and Division I Advising.

II

SOURCES OF ATTRITION

At the time the Task Force was formed, the College's existing data on retention had been summarized in Richard Alpert's September 22, 1977 memo, "Retention." The memo suggested that the roots of attrition were in the failure of the College to involve and engage students early in the academic and/or social life of the College and to build a commitment to graduate even in the face of frustrations and difficulties. This did not mean that everyone who entered would or should graduate, but rather that too many students were leaving who could have had a constructive and satisfying experience. The memo further suggested that since sixty percent of students who enter do graduate, we should try to extend the elements of the experiences of this sixty percent to the other forty percent.

The Task Force decided that it would begin with the data and analysis contained in the Alpert memorandum and the minutes of the mini-retreat, rather than begin anew to generate data and further study before it developed proposals and made recommendations. At the same time, the Task Force did request a number of studies to be done by Carla Jackson's office.

The assumption was that engagement, involvement, and commitment were essential for retention. The Task Force concentrated its efforts on generating ideas about how these characteristics could be developed and sustained.

* Members of the Task Force were Richard Alpert, John Boettiger, Raymond Coppinger, Nancy Frishberg, Linda Gordon, Leslie Hiebert, Douglas Morrison, John Runyan, Michael Sutherland, and Ruth Washington.
Retention Task Force Report

Since the largest proportion of students who withdraw usually do so within the first three semesters and before having filed Division II concentration statements, the Task Force was persuaded to follow the suggestion of the mini-retreat that retention efforts concentrate on Division I. The Task Force's most extensive efforts, therefore, have gone into an examination of how the Division I academic program and advising for students in Division I could better promote involvement and engagement of students. The Task Force, however, adopted another criterion for evaluating ideas and suggestions. It sought to develop proposals that would not only serve the retention effort but also improve the quality of the academic experience for both faculty and students.

III

DIVISION I: BARRIERS TO INVOLVEMENT AND COMMITMENT

1. Lack of close articulation between the course and examination systems.

Hampshire's faculty simultaneously support two systems for student learning and evaluation. Faculty teach as many courses per semester as at most other small private liberal arts colleges and at the same time run an individualized examination system. Each system demands considerable commitment of time, energy, and creativity from faculty. The course system especially requires regular preparation for each course taught, class time, discussion with students outside class, and evaluation of student work. The examination system is also very labor intensive, often calling on faculty members to repeat at length what they had just discussed in class. Faculty spend a great deal of time maintaining this dual system. A large proportion of this time goes into Division I courses and examinations and there is not a commensurate reward in the number of students who successfully complete Division I examinations and file Division II concentration statements. From the perspective of many students, Division I is a minefield of false starts, unrealistic expectations, and self-imposed barriers to academic progress.

2. Lack of a clear conceptual focus.

As pointed out in the minutes of the mini-retreat and the Educational Policy Committee's "Report of Curriculum" of December 8, 1977, Division I lacks a clear definition of purpose and reflection of that purpose in the Division I curriculum. It lacks a clear conceptual focus and emphasis on specific methodological, artistic, thinking, and other skills that students should learn.
3. Confusing and contradictory incentives for faculty and students.

a. Faculty spend a great deal of time preparing for classes, teaching classes, working with students on course-related projects. Students, however, do not make academic progress by successfully completing courses. In too many cases during every semester, faculty continue to prepare for courses while student attendance and involvement in those courses often decline. There are many reasons why this happens, but among the more significant, we believe, is the shift in the student's attention away from coursework to the development and completion of exams.

b. Students are also caught in a confusing crossfire of incentives. Courses are in fact the main vehicle by which students gain the understanding, skills, and experiences to make academic progress. They are also the main sources for developing early relationships between faculty and students. Despite all our rhetoric and wishes, courses are the center of the student's academic life in Division I. Courses, however, are not central to how a student's academic progress is evaluated. Both faculty and students have to step out of the course setting and relationship and establish a somewhat new relationship and definition of the student's work and define the direction of the student's academic program. Faculty and students, however, are not encouraged by the present system to do course evaluations. Examination evaluations, which the system does encourage and support, occur infrequently and often have little relationship to the nature and rhythm of the main body of the student's work. Examination evaluations at the Division I level, moreover, take on an exaggerated importance. They offer no opportunity for the student to accumulate small victories and/or defeats and develop confidence to do more substantial and difficult work. This situation discourages students from taking Division I examinations.

IV

PRINCIPLES FOR REVISION OF DIVISION I PROGRAM

1. Division I examinations be course-related.

a. Examinations would be done in conjunction with Division I courses. An examination would include the common work of the course and a specific project which each student would design and complete in a contractual relationship with the course's faculty member(s).
b. Walk-in exams would be the exception and would only be done on an independent study basis. This is to insure that they are comparable in content, scope, and quality with those done in conjunction with courses.

2. All Division I courses have the following objectives:

a. Introduction to the purposes of liberal education at Hampshire.

b. Development of specific intellectual and behavioral survival skills for successful academic work at Hampshire.

c. A study and evaluation of the methods of inquiry within a particular discipline and the problems and values of interdisciplinary inquiry.

d. Frequent contact and evaluation between faculty and students around clear and coherent intellectual and/or artistic work from early on in the life of the course and throughout the term. Assignments would be substantial. Early and continuous faculty attention would be given to developing the quality of student writing and other appropriate skills. Students might well be engaged in collaborative work and in criticizing one another's work, but direct faculty guidance and response to the work of students would be essential.

3. While maintaining courses that have a specific focus and are intense experiences with a particular discipline or problem, there should be more courses that are broad in focus and designed to respect both the area of study and the students' natural and likely interests.

4. Courses team taught by faculty within a given school and from different schools should represent a significant proportion of Division I offerings, and students should be encouraged to do at least one cross school examination.

5. Courses of substantial size should provide for close faculty-student interaction in small group discussions.

Our belief is that this revision of Division I policy could have a significant impact on the student retention issue through (a) assuring early and mutual working contact with more than one experienced faculty member; (b) offering early and continuous feedback on the quality of student work; (c) incorporating more directly into the Division I academic program some guidance in intellectual and behavioral "survival skills"—essentially those skills necessary to take responsibility for the appropriate design and conduct of one's own education; (d) the creation of a relationship between course instructors and students that is analogous to the adviser/advisee relationship; (e) responding to student interest in broader
orienting studies in Division I, as well as studies designed to develop better skills of inquiry; (f) offering a more substantial background or context of studies out of which there can emerge a clearer more consensual agreement as to the nature of a good Division I exam; and (g) redressing the widespread sense of dispirited nominalism that attaches now to too much Division I course and exam work.

Furthermore, it looks to us as if this may well have a healthy effect on the faculty load problem, which, unless addressed, cannot help but indirectly contribute to the exacerbation of the attrition problem. We're proposing to gather into a workable and potentially efficient integrity one's course and examination commitments to Division I work. Less directly, we should be addressing the demoralizing impact on everyone involved of student carelessness in attending and doing the work of Division I courses, which has damaging precedent-setting impact for student attitudes toward academic work in general.

V

DIVISION I ADVISING

The main contact for students and faculty both officially and, for many, informally, is through the student's academic adviser. This relationship is crucial, especially in the first years. Although the advising system—especially the academic adviser—is a key contact, advising is fragmented and available in small pieces. A student looking for coherence is faced with fragmentation. Disjunctions exist, moreover, among academic work, advising, and community relationships. This set of proposals attempts to create an advising framework that makes the relationships of students with their academic advisers, House staff, and other students more coherent and mutually supportive. It attempts to make the advising system and all its interactions contribute more to the total educational experience of students.

VI

BARRIERS TO STUDENT INVOLVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT WITH THE ADVISING SYSTEM

1. The academic adviser has limited information and perspective on his or her advisees. The adviser can only know that the student reveals or what is in the College's records, such as whether or not the student
has registered for any courses, completed and received course evaluations, filed Division I. The adviser may not know of the student's difficulties with academic and/or other aspects of the College.

2. The academic adviser has limited access to the student. If the student does not volunteer his/her presence, the adviser has difficulty making contact with the student and assessing the student's situation.

3. On the other side, House staff have the opportunity to be in touch with the student informally and socially, but not to observe the student's academic work nor to evaluate the student's academic program or progress.

4. It is often the case that students in difficulty will not present themselves as having problems to the available sources of help.

VII

PRINCIPLES FOR A REVISED ADVISING SYSTEM

Students in Division I especially have a variety of advising needs. Advising provided by the College should respect this variety and develop a system that is responsive to it. The first step in this response is to put academic advising by faculty and general advising by House staff and students in a complementary and supportive relationship to each other.

1. Each new student would have an advising team consisting of a faculty member, student staff, and member of the permanent House staff.

2. New students would be assigned to faculty by the student's housing location, i.e., any given faculty member's new advisees would be all living in contiguous areas of a House.

   a. All advisers with space for new students will be assigned those students by geographic location and not by field of interest. We would recommend that no adviser be assigned only one new advisee, as part of the rationale for our proposal is the benefits gained by contact among advisees having the same adviser. These would often be only first semester assignments. Faculty would be encouraged to meet periodically with their group of students as a whole, sometimes in the students' residences. During these group meetings, basic issues such as approaches to exams and the academic program generally would be addressed, paving the way for substantial individual meetings that will be more concrete and personalized.
b. House and student staff would work with the new students in cooperation with the faculty adviser assigned to these students. These would include such responsibilities as being in regular contact and communication with the students, informal discussion of exams and academic work, encouragement and facilitation of a sense of community within their area, working with the adviser to set up the group meetings, contributing to the agendas of these meetings based on their familiarity with the students and with the residential aspects of their education. They could also enable the adviser to have a fuller understanding of the pressures and stresses that any particular advisee might be feeling and that might be having an impact on that student's total education. The House staff person could also serve as a link between the faculty adviser and the resources of the House.

The advising system would benefit also from a clear statement of what is minimally expected of faculty and students in the adviser/advisee relationship. We suggest the following:

1. Adviser
   a. The adviser is responsible for face to face communication with his/her advisee at a minimum of twice a semester. If at any one of these conferences the adviser feels he needs more information regarding a particular advisee's potential, the adviser should read the Admissions folder.
   b. During the initial meeting, the adviser and advisee should discuss their expectations of each other. These mutual expectations should be listed to form a solid commitment.
   c. In the instance of a new faculty adviser working with a new advisee, the appropriate School Dean should enlist the support of an experienced faculty member whose office is close by.
   d. The adviser should be committed to assist with the advisee's academic planning in addition to discussing various modes of inquiry for Division I examinations.
   e. The adviser is the student's advocate in working through academic and related issues.

2. Advisee
   a. The advisee is responsible for making his/her appointments and keeping them. He/she should have no fewer than two appointments per semester.
b. He/she must also take the initiative to seek his/her adviser for those issues that arise concerning his/her educational life.

c. The advisee is responsible for keeping the faculty adviser abreast of all academic endeavors and future academic plans.

d. The advisee should give a current copy of learning activity sheet to his/her adviser.

e. The advisee is responsible for keeping his/her record up-to-date in Central Records, in consultation with his/her adviser.

f. The advisee is responsible for seeking necessary resource people on campus in consultation with his/her adviser.

VIII

LEAVE TAKING

The most common pattern of student attrition is for a student to take a leave of absence and then withdraw from leave status. According to current data, fifty percent of the students who go on leave withdraw. It is crucial, therefore, that the College examine more closely the leave-taking phenomenon and take steps when appropriate and possible that will increase the chances of a student returning to Hampshire.

Leave advising in general is seen as the "stepchild" of the advising system. Because of lack of faculty time, skill, or interest, and lack of student initiative, leave advising very often is not done at all or, if done, is not done well. For many students, the choice is a response to stress in their involvement with the system and an avoidance in making difficult personal and academic choices. Leave advising should be sensitive to this and offer students an opportunity to think about a leave in relationship to their experience at Hampshire, their academic and personal goals, and the ways in which a leave relates to their experiences at Hampshire and their current objectives. Leaves should be purposeful and the choice to go on leave should make sense in terms of objectives understood by the student. Leaves are not an end in themselves, but a way for students to fulfill known personal and educational purposes. Leaves are too easily taken and more students should be forced to consider more seriously leaves in relation to the other alternatives--staying, withdrawal, field study. While on leave, students would have contact with the College and should be able to plan re-entry to the College with their advisers, other faculty, and the Options Office.
Retention Task Force Report

The easy choice of going on leave should be eliminated. Students should be encouraged to come to terms more directly with why they want to go on leave and how that choice relates to their experience at Hampshire and their personal and academic goals. Students should, therefore, be encouraged to use the Options Office, to write a leave planning document, and each School should assign one faculty member to do pre-leave advising in addition to the student's adviser. The College should consider raising the leave of absence fee with part of it refundable if the student returns. A higher leave of absence fee would encourage students to think more seriously about why they are going on leave and to compare leave of absence more with withdrawal and field study as viable options. An increase in the leave of absence fee would also allow the College to provide more services to students while they are on leave of absence.

While students are on leave of absence, the College should sponsor regional meetings with faculty and counselors.

More training should be given to faculty and students to do pre-leave advising.

IX

NEXT STEPS

The Task Force has outlined a set of principles for revision of the Division I Academic Program and Division I Advising, and for Leave Advising. In a number of cases, it has also made specific recommendations of action to be taken. We now need a planning and implementation process to put these principles into practice and a decision-making process and timetable for taking action. We would, therefore, like to meet with you and the Dean of the Faculty as soon as possible for a discussion of both the report and the next steps to be taken.
9. STUDENT RECORDS

To speak of student records at Hampshire is really to speak of the academic program itself, the quality of advising and teaching, administrative staff support, and the motivation and survival skills of the student. In order for records to accurately reflect the scope and quality of students' work, good academic planning, accurate assessment and reporting by faculty, adequate consultation between the student and his or her adviser, competent service by the Central Records Office staff, and careful monitoring by the student are all required.

The creation and maintenance of records of students' academic work in an institution where learning is so individualized and where there is an absence of grades and credit hours is a complex and time-consuming task—one which requires active and extensive involvement of the student, faculty, and the Central Records Office staff. Although certain documentation of progress by examination, i.e. Divisional contracts and examination evaluations, is required for official record-keeping and subsequent generation of transcripts, most files, especially those of upper Division students, contain additional documentation of learning activities, i.e. the portfolio. Even though the Academic Council in 1974 abolished the requirement that students and faculty write course evaluations, many students (especially those who intend to transfer to another college, apply for fellowships, study abroad, or attend graduate school) still wish to include course evaluations in their Central Records file. Some files also contain write-ups of internships or field experiences, summaries of community service work, evaluations of independent study projects, and periodic overviews of a student's progress during a given term or year. This documentation later may become the student's portfolio, a critical addition to the simple
transcript of the examinations passed. Obviously the burden on students
and faculty to produce sound documentation and on the Central Records
Office to record and file the documents and to transform them upon re-
quest into an official Hampshire College transcript is not inconsiderable.

9.1 The Student File

Before it is possible to discuss the responsibilities of the various per-
sons involved in creating a cumulative record of a student's work at Hamp-
shire, it is necessary to briefly describe the basic components of student
records.

Course registration materials. During each semester a computer-generated
student schedule lists the courses and formal independent studies, both at
Hampshire and at the four other institutions in the consortium, in which
the student is registered. A copy of this form is sent to the student's ad-
viser.

Due to an extremely high (approximately 70%) course change rate during the
drop/add period, in the fall of 1976 Hampshire eliminated pre-registration
and replaced the practice with in-class registration. (Students must still
preregister for Five College courses and adhere to those institutions' drop/
add periods and other registration policies.) Now students have two weeks
at the beginning of each semester to "browse" among course offerings before
they are required to commit themselves to official enrollment. After two
weeks each faculty member is responsible for compiling the enrollment list
and sending it to the Central Records Office. Further into the semester
each teacher is asked to verify the accuracy of the computerized enrollment
list.
Course evaluations. Since the 1974-75 academic year, course evaluations have been optional. Faculty write evaluations only for those students who request them and meet the criteria for evaluation set out at the beginning of the course. Evaluations are "stored" in the student's Central Records file. Occasionally students will write self-evaluations without requesting feedback from the instructor, and these one-way evaluations are found in some students' files. Course evaluations are not considered official records by which to measure progress.

Five College grades. Records of Five College grades are automatically sent to the Central Records Office by the Registrar's Offices at the respective institutions and included in individual student files.

Examination contracts. Division I contracts are filed in the respective School office, Division II contracts in Central Records, and Division III contracts with the Division III coordinator in the Deans' Office. There are no deadlines for filing contracts except at the Division III level. Division I contracts do not arrive in the Central Records Office until after the examination has been passed and the evaluation written. Students are expected to file their Division II contract at the outset of their work.

Examination evaluations. Examination "passes" are initially logged in the School offices at the Division I and II levels and in the Deans' Office at the Division III level (in practice the School of Social Science records the "pass" before contacting the Deans' Office), either in advance of or accompanying the examination report, and then are forwarded to the Central Records Office. The examination contract and subsequent "pass" constitute the only official measure of progress. The Schools may send copies of Division I and II examination evaluations to advisers.
Learning Activities Sheets. College policy requires the student to compile a list of learning activities (courses taken, exams completed, January Term activities, House courses, extracurricular activities, and so forth) at the end of each semester. Such lists serve to help students reconstruct their Hampshire experience when it is time to develop a transcript.

Leave Forms. Requests for leave of absence, field study leave, or independent study leave are initially lodged in the Deans' Office and are subsequently sent to Central Records for inclusion in student files.

Transcript. College policy states that a Hampshire College transcript shall consist of a) a list of the examinations that a student has passed and the dates on which they were passed, b) a list of learning activities prepared by the student and identified as such, and c) any supporting materials the student chooses to include, e.g. evaluations of examinations and learning activities that the student chooses to include. The certified cover page gives dates of the student's entrance and termination, tasks completed for examinations, dates passed, and the names of Division II and III chairpersons. Central Records will type the learning activities list the student has submitted and will certify a list of the Five College grades the student chooses to include. Evaluations and contracts, other summary reports, and letters of recommendation constitute the portfolio.

9.2 The Role of the Faculty

The generation of adequate student records makes extraordinary demands on the faculty. Teaching and examination committee responsibilities require the compilation of course enrollment lists and the writing of evaluations
and reports, and the advising role necessitates the writing of cover letters for transcript/portfolios and collaboration with the student on preparation of learning activities lists at the end of each term and perhaps on writing summaries of these learning activities. In addition, faculty are usually called upon to write numerous letters of recommendation for their students or advisees. In sum, at the end of any semester a Hampshire faculty member may very likely find himself or herself expected to write course evaluations for all those students who request them (often twenty or more), Division III examination reports for graduating students (sometimes up to twelve), Division I and II reports, covering letters for transcripts being sent to postgraduate programs, and letters of recommendation for a number of students, each of whom usually applies to several schools or programs. This writing, of course, must follow or combine with reading the students' work, conducting examinations, meeting with advisees, and preparing for teaching the next term's courses.

During the semester extensive consultation with upper Division students should take place as the student begins to prepare his or her transcript/portfolio for graduate school. Each portfolio is custommade, and the faculty member and student must choose how best to present the student's performance and abilities through a combination of examination reports, examination proposals, course evaluations, learning activities lists, Five College grades, letters of recommendation, and/or samples of work.

These roles are, of course, ideal ones, and the ability of faculty members to meet these expectations varies. Faculty are sometimes sufficiently unacquainted with the transcripting process and with the admissions criteria of graduate programs, for example, to be as helpful as they might be. Some-
times they are negligent in writing requested course evaluations or reports of Division I or II examinations. Sometimes they do not take the time or care to work with their advisees at the end of the semester to prepare reviews of the semester's learning activities. The intensity of faculty load, the diffusion of responsibilities, and perhaps an incomplete understanding of faculty's role in the record-keeping process all contribute to the inconsistency in the quality of student records. Steps have been taken, however, by the Central Records Office and by the Senate to improve record-creation and record-keeping practices. These will be described in later paragraphs.

9.3 The Role of the Student

Just as students at Hampshire College are responsible for initiating academic progress, they are also responsible for developing a file which accurately reflects that progress. Students are responsible for insuring that they have followed the appropriate steps for matriculation and course enrollment. If they wish to receive evaluations of their work in courses, they must make this fact known to faculty and provide faculty with adequate input for commenting on their work. They must meet the requirements for all students in Five College courses if they want a grade and must make special arrangements with the teacher if they wish to have a narrative evaluation. They must file a formal Divisional contract before an official examination "pass" and report can be filed by the examining faculty. They must prepare the list of learning activities for their transcript, and they must tell the Central Records Office which materials in their file to include in the portfolio which accompanies the transcript. Often they must take the initiative to track down evaluations and examination reports whose writing or recording in the School or Central Records Office may have been delayed.
During the period in Division I when students may be "floundering," they are often unaware of the importance of building a Central Records file. If they are not exercising foresight in their academic and career planning, they may not be aware of the need for course evaluations and thus they may not request one or even complete their work in a course. Unless their adviser suggests the compilation of an end-of-semester or annual list of learning activities and the writing of a summary of academic progress during the semester, students seldom are aware of the advantages of preparing such materials for their file. Such tendencies also contribute to the incompleteness of some student files. Even when a file is quite complete, students sometimes have difficulty determining what should be contained in the portfolio which accompanies the transcript, and thus considerable anxiety can be experienced by the student. Too often they feel that the creation of a transcript is solely their responsibility. As later parts of this section will indicate, steps have been taken to inform students of their role in creating and maintaining their academic records.

9.4 The Central Records Office

The Central Records Office, the equivalent of the Registrar's Office on traditional campuses, acts as a support service for the academic and administrative needs of the College in regard to student records. It is its task to log and maintain student records. It also has responsibility for the production and distribution of class schedules; daily scheduling of special events; the design of forms and controls relating to data processing, matriculation, registration, and "academic progress;" the production and distribution of statistical information and computer reports; and the planning and coordination of fall and spring matriculation.
It has created systems to meet certain needs required by Hampshire's non-traditional academic program, e.g. the recording of contract filing dates and the receipt of examination evaluations, as well as by more typical registrarial functions such as registration and the production and certification of transcripts. The Office is responsible for the generation of a computerized academic history of each student as well as the maintenance of the general student data base.

The Central Records Office staff and functions have increased as the student population of Hampshire has grown, and the Office currently employs a Director and five full-time staff members with differentiated functions. Progress has been made in recent years to streamline the systems needed to produce accurate records in minimal time as well as to familiarize faculty and students with the implications of the College transcript policy.

In addition to logistical tasks in relation to record-keeping, the Central Records Office staff continually find themselves in a position of having to interpret student record policies and practices as stated and implied in the Student Handbook. The Director of Central Records, together with the Director of the Options/Graduate Relations Office, have held a series of meetings with faculty and staff advisers to introduce them to the transcriptng process, especially to the roles which the student and his or her adviser should play, and to emphasize the importance of course evaluations, especially when a transcript is required before the student reaches Division III. Despite this attempt to reinforce the importance of continuous file-building, many students arrive in the Central Records Office with little idea of what a good
transcript/portfolio should contain. Thus the staff in the Office find that they must provide quite a bit of transcript advising. Since the creation of the Options/Graduate Relations Office, a role has evolved for the Director of that office to work closely with students preparing their transcript for review by graduate program admissions committees.

The Central Records Office has also taken the initiative in holding an orientation session for new faculty each year which deals solely with the evaluation and transcriptng process, and new students each term are asked to attend an open house at the Central Records Office for an explanation and discussion of record-keeping practices and the importance of creating a substantive file.

Guidelines for the preparation of transcript/portfolios have been developed by Central Records which again stress the importance of close collaboration with the adviser at the preparation stage. The use of course evaluation excerpts in a portfolio has been clarified and the use of excerpts from examination evaluations invalidated. Because Central Records cannot guarantee the authenticity of the transcript/portfolio beyond examination passes and Five College grades, the guidelines emphasize the importance of a cover letter written by the adviser or Divisional chairperson to "introduce" the entire record of performance.

The Central Records Office now has two staff members whose duties are almost exclusively defined as the actual processing of transcript requests. This additional staffing has permitted the Office to process transcripts on an up-to-date basis. The familiarity of many college and university admissions offices with the Hampshire transcript/portfolio plus the practice
of Central Records of clearly identifying the transcript/portfolio as such has contributed to a significant decrease in the number of requests for clarification which formerly came to the Central Records staff.

Following numerous problems stemming from delays in receiving or recording examination "passes," the Central Records Office during the 1976 Fall Term introduced a new examination reporting procedure which has expedited record-keeping practices considerably. The link between Central Records and the School office has also been clarified by this procedure which permits the Divisional chairperson to put on record an examination "pass" before the actual report is written. This "verbal pass" is a signed form which is channeled to Central Records via the School office, which also records the "pass." When the actual examination report has not appeared in the Central Records Office within a month of receipt of the "verbal report," Central Records now communicates that fact to the School office which has responsibility for following up with the faculty member. This procedure has permitted Central Records to complete a student's official record more quickly; it also seems to have increased students' awareness of reporting procedures, and they frequently inquire whether their "verbal report" has been received and, if not, tend to prod faculty themselves. End-of-term reporting of examination "passes" has increased, and now the bulk of the reports are received at the end of each term rather than at the beginning of the next.

Much progress has been made in the amount and accuracy of information regarding Division examinations stored in the computer. The Central Records Office has also developed a clear system for manually recording informa-
tion on examination reports and on Division II and III contracts. Quick and easy checks on student progress and contract and examination report status can now be made.

9.5 Problems

Although new record-keeping systems and practices have alleviated many problems, students, faculty, and the Central Records staff continue to experience frustration stemming from Hampshire's unique means of generating student records.

It has been gratifying to note, however, that as the College has become established and gained experience in preparing and interpreting student records to admissions committees at other institutions, the Hampshire transcript/portfolio is now relatively seldom questioned. Guidelines have been developed to help colleges to which Hampshire students transfer "equate" evaluations and learning activities lists with credit hours when they question the content of the Hampshire College transcript/portfolio. Most graduate schools now accept the Hampshire transcript on its face value and spend the necessary time carefully reviewing the content of the portfolio. The impressive list of graduate and professional schools which have accepted Hampshire graduates (Appendix O) and the prestigious fellowship competitions in which Hampshire graduates have been successful attest to the viability of the Hampshire College transcript.

Nevertheless, the process which produces the transcript in the long run still leaves many opportunities for misunderstanding, inconsistencies, and voids. The time required by students, faculty, and the Central Records
staff to produce a good transcript is extreme, and the expectations of one another's roles vary.

In terms of the final content of a transcript, there remains a distinct discrepancy between the philosophy of presenting examinations as primary means of evaluation, and the actual fact of the student's dependence upon, insistence upon, and need for course evaluations as a valuable part of the transcript presentations. This has not been a fully recognized factor by the faculty, and there remains a split emphasis, on the one hand on the amount of time put in by both faculty and students on course work, and on the other hand between presenting examinations as primary. Students do progress towards their examinations in large part by taking courses, and they need to be given the opportunity to present this in their transcript.

The change in policy which made course evaluations optional has actually not had a great effect on their quality or on the rate at which they are written. Faculty are regularly reminded of the need to establish criteria for evaluations at the beginning of each term, and students are reminded of their value both in terms of their viability for the transcript and as a continuing evaluative tool.

Although Central Records has made great strides in upgrading its system of monitoring examintions, the Office is not able to monitor course evaluations by the term. Many students still do not submit an end-of-semester list of learning activities which would show in which courses evaluations had been requested, and thus the Central Records Office staff has no way of following up on unreceived evaluations.
No two Hampshire College transcripts are alike in either content or format. There is little consistency with respect to the content of the portfolio, and unless the student receives sound advice when preparing the transcript, the document can be extremely unwieldy and redundant. Alternatively, if course evaluations are missing or weak, and examination evaluations are skeletal, the transcript can be too spare.

Policies on examination reports differ from School to School in some respects (see pages 11-32 of the Student Handbook for policy statements), and none say anything about the content of the reports. Although there has been considerable improvement over the years, the quality and usefulness of the reports varies. There is little formal or informal guidance for faculty in writing evaluations or for students in having reasonable expectations about reports. Faculty who have had extensive experience working with students applying to graduate programs have a somewhat better idea of what is appropriate, but others can only guess. Each School does have a faculty member or committee responsible for reading all contracts and proposals; few reports are returned to the author for revision. Basically the School committee thus serves only the purpose of developing suggestions for faculty with respect to what should be included in the report.

9.6 The Task Force on Student Records

In recognition of the importance of the unresolved issues regarding the creation and monitoring of student records, the College Senate in the fall of 1977 mandated the creation of a Task Force on Student Records. Its charge is as follows:
A task force including representation from faculty, students, and staff shall be appointed to describe student record-keeping at the College and to make appropriate recommendations for change.

Specifically, the task force is charged with describing:

1) what is recorded and where;

2) the uses of student records in evaluating students' progress as well as in evaluating faculty effectiveness, and for any other administrative purposes;

3) access to records by students, faculty, parents, administrators and administrative units of the College;

4) the implementation of the policy on rights to privacy and an assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of that policy;

5) the amount of redundancy in record-keeping and reasons for such redundancy;

6) record-keeping policy and how it has evolved.

In addition to these descriptive tasks, the task force is charged with determining the efficiency and usefulness of the various record-keeping enterprises on campus and assessing the possibility of streamlining procedures in order to better serve students and faculty. One specific possibility that should be investigated is that of some form of decentralization of record-keeping.

The work of the Task Force on Student Records is still under way. Students and faculty are being interviewed to determine their knowledge and practices of record-keeping policy. A student member of the Task Force is consolidating policy statements and guidelines currently found in diverse publications into a comprehensive document. Individual Schools' record-keeping procedures are being explored, alternative possibilities of transcripts are being considered, and the generation and use of the student data base is being examined.

A report on the findings of the Task Force, with its recommendations, will be presented to the College Senate during the spring of 1978.
10. FACULTY LOAD

Any major change in the form and process of liberal arts education entails a change in the roles and responsibilities of faculty. Hampshire's efforts to give students more responsibility for their own education, to individualize the academic program, and to make the program more interdisciplinary have all, in combination with the 16:1 student-faculty ratio, made the faculty work experience at Hampshire significantly different than at conventional colleges. Faculty are required more to be generalists as well as specialists in their fields of competence and to perform as mentors to students in the development of their academic work. Faculty must also work within an interdisciplinary intellectual context that demands not only a general competence in their own field, but also an ability to collaborate with and evaluate the work of faculty from other disciplines. They must perform as advisers to about fifteen to twenty students, providing general advice and guidance for the student's total educational experience and shape that advice and guidance to the variety of needs represented by the faculty member's advisees. In terms of the structure of their work, faculty are heavily involved with teaching courses and at the same time with the one-to-one teaching and advising that goes on in the examination system. Hampshire has a highly participatory governance system, and faculty, both within their Schools and the College at large, have important responsibilities for governing their own affairs. Both the faculty biographical forms composing Appendix J and the graphs in Appendix X illustrate the work load of Hampshire faculty.
The College's 16:1 student to faculty ratio, the change in faculty roles from the conventional model, and the variety of faculty responsibilities have made it very difficult to arrive at a widely agreed-upon definition of the "faculty load problem." The Educational Policy Committee began to discuss the problem, but found it impossible to develop a definition that its members all shared. The Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation in its annual reports on "How Our Institutional Resources Are Used" has consistently documented imbalances among faculty in relation to overall course enrollments, Divisional examination chairpersonships and memberships, and advising loads.

Although there is no widely shared definition of the problem of workload, there are a number of consistent themes that emerge in discussions about it. The first dimension is one of large numbers of students in a field in relation to the small number of faculty available to students in that field. Historically, this has been most acute in the visual and performing arts, where student demand has far exceeded faculty resources. But, generally, the College has made real progress in dealing with this kind of faculty load problem. The visual artists have developed a system which is far from perfect but regulates their own work to provide a manageable situation both in terms of the number of students and the balance and flow of students in Divisions II and III. In other areas, we have either added staffing, such as in film/photography, or are temporarily filling in with soft money and part-time appointments, such as in music. In dance, we have joined with the other colleges in a Five College Dance Department and increased our own FTE from half to one full-time position. In other areas, too, we have been able to bring student demand into a tolerable relationship with faculty
resources. Judicious advising and student selection in relation to Five College interchange courses also eases the burden on Hampshire's faculty. But, under the constraints of a 16:1 ratio and an individualized program, there still is not enough opportunity for depth of coverage or curriculum development.

The other dimension of faculty load is the fragmentation of roles and responsibilities faced by the faculty. Their work-lives do not as easily achieve coherence as do the work-lives of comparable faculty. In most colleges, a faculty member can expect to bring together into some reasonably coherent and mutually supportive relationship their roles and responsibilities as teachers, researchers, and institutional citizens. At Hampshire, it is much harder. The individualized curriculum and examination systems, the interdisciplinary intellectual context, and the high student-faculty ratio all combine to fragment the faculty member's work-life and create a dynamic of mutually unreinforcing demands and responsibilities. In a given day a faculty member can teach a course in an area of his/her major interest, discuss a Division I exam in an area of very remote concern, meet with a Division II committee about yet another field of interest, and discuss a Division III project that is again in a completely different area of the faculty member's interests and/or training. The intellectual demands are wide-ranging and are often accompanied by a need to support students who are frightened by the work they are undertaking. In addition, faculty have responsibilities for advisees that entail academic planning, monitoring and evaluation of academic progress, academic record keeping, and general support and advice. Faculty are also required to write detailed evaluations of students' performance in individual courses and
Divisional exams. The writing of examination reports demands time and effort on the part of faculty to reconstruct the range of the student's work, the problems encountered, the quality of work, and the level of achievement attained in terms of the student's own goals. On the part of many faculty, this all makes for a sense of discontinuity in the exercise of responsibilities and a feeling of being over-worked.

The College has undertaken a number of steps to reduce this fragmentation. The President has begun a review of the governance system to identify areas that can be eliminated or streamlined. A number of proposals, especially from the Retention Task Force, have been developed to bring the course and examination systems into a closer relationship. It is not clear what the fate of this proposal will be, but in the meantime the School of Language and Communication has been discouraging Division I examinations for students who are not completely ready to take them or who have not had at least one Division I course in Language and Communication. For one year, the School experimented with a pattern of faculty alternating terms of course teaching and non-course teaching and advising, but the experiment was discontinued when it became clear that an insufficient number of courses was being offered. The Schools of Humanities and Arts and Natural Science, moreover, are also developing policies that will bring a closer articulation between courses and exams.

Faculty have also initiated team-teaching efforts and program clusters, both to share and support each other's work and to create greater coherence for themselves and the curriculum. Since the last accreditation review, the number of team-taught courses has increased substantially. In addition,
clusters of programs have emerged, such as cognitive studies in Language and Communication, family studies with faculty from a variety of Schools, a physics program in Natural Science, and visual studies with faculty from three of the four Schools. However, the problem of fragmentation remains and the College needs to continue defining the appropriate set of roles and responsibilities of faculty.

The third dimension of the work load problem is professional development. As in 1974, a large proportion of Hampshire faculty are young, newly graduated Ph.D.s or still in the process of working on their doctoral dissertations. Many of them have not had the opportunity to build an extensive reservoir of intellectual capital to support the variety and extent of the demands the Hampshire system makes on them. In addition, roles such as advising, which is a serious and integral faculty responsibility, are neither experienced in nor part of graduate school training. It is a set of skills learned on the job and takes a number of semesters, if not years, to learn well. Nevertheless, faculty who come to Hampshire without having finished their Ph.D.s are completing them at a faster rate than in the past. With the College's encouragement and help, such as through its sabbatical policy, they, for the most part, are able to complete their degrees within their first contract period.

Professional development is also an important issue for faculty who have been at Hampshire a number of years. New faculty need support to establish themselves as fully capable and competent professionals in their fields while at the same time they meet the special demands of Hampshire's system. Older faculty need the opportunity and support for continued professional
growth. They must be encouraged and enabled to pursue their professional
development and at the same time to contribute to the particular demands of
the College. So far, our record is encouraging, at least by the measure
of formal scholarship. (See faculty biographical forms.) Nonetheless, the
pressure and personal costs to faculty to achieve this are high.

We are attempting to address this dimension of work load in several ways.
First, we have sustained our active sabbatical policy. Twenty percent of
the faculty is on sabbatical leave each year. A substantial number of
faculty use outside sources to fund a leave of absence, most often to sup-
plement the sabbatical with an additional semester of leave. Recently, we
have actively begun to develop proposals for academic grants which would
enable the Schools to release faculty for certain program and curricular
development. For example, the School of Natural Science has submitted a
comprehensive undergraduate science proposal to NSF, the School of Language
and Communication has a cognitive studies proposal under consideration at
a private foundation, and the College is seeking a general faculty develop-
ment grant from another foundation. Several other such grants are in
preparation in an effort to seek outside assistance in this area of concern.

In an effort to assist new faculty develop the appropriate teaching and
advising skills, we have instituted a more extensive orientation program
which begins with a two-day workshop and continues with a series of lunches
throughout the semester, designed to assist and support new faculty. The
feedback on this endeavor is quite positive. For the first time, we have
invited all second-year faculty to a follow-up discussion to deal with
questions of advising and academic policy.
In another vein, the Dean of the Faculty instituted a works-in-progress seminar to provide a forum for faculty to address each other about their work. A small fund for travel enables faculty members to attend a professional conference each year. Limited research funds are available to assist faculty engaged in scholarship with small research expenses. Both of these funds are actively used by the faculty to support a wide array of activities, both for publication and other forms of professional development.

The success of Hampshire's academic experiment rests to a large extent on the faculty's capacity to undertake effectively and with high quality the set of roles and responsibilities that the College's academic experiment implies. So far, the record has been impressive. Faculty and students, by and large, have performed at a very high level. The faculty has an admirable record of scholarship, its teaching and advising performances are of very high quality, and it has governed itself in these hectic and difficult four years with confidence and wisdom.

However, the experience of the last four years has raised some important questions about what will be possible and/or desirable for the faculty's roles and responsibilities in the future. The 16:1 ratio is clearly neither an effective constraint on the size of the instructional salary budget nor a reasonable guideline within which to develop a sensible and high quality academic program. Even with doing less than we would like, there are simply too few faculty to fulfill the requirements of individualization, interdisciplinary study, participatory governance, and professional development. The problem of fragmentation also needs further attention. Professional growth is itself a difficult issue. Perhaps more than at
other colleges there is the danger of penalizing those faculty carrying the heaviest teaching loads for not also maintaining research productivity. There is no broadly shared definition of what professional development should mean for Hampshire faculty and how that development should incorporate Hampshire's demands and those of the faculty member's profession in general.

In the last eight years, the College has shown that a new and demanding academic environment can attract and hold a very high quality faculty. The current market inhibits turnover, which has required the College to adapt its original conception of a continually changing faculty to a more permanent body of faculty. The College is now in a different phase of growth and must find equally successful—and perhaps new—ways to recruit, maintain, and nurture a work-life that is beneficial to both faculty and College alike.
11. DEVELOPMENT

Since 1974 the changes in the Development Office, mentioned in Section 2.2 of this report, have aimed at designing a program to serve the College in its second decade. During the next ten years it will be important for new external supporters of Hampshire to be found, for endowment support to grow substantially, for a highly efficient Parents' Fund to be achieved, and for the increasing alumni body to be strengthened. At present physical completion of the campus, supported by capital fund raising, is near, and plans have been made with fund-raising counsel for a public Capital Campaign devoted to endowment as well as immediate capital needs.

As the College grew, it became readily apparent that those supporters of Hampshire in the past would be asked again to make significant contributions. Foundations which had given so much to Hampshire in its early years could not be counted on to contribute as much as they had in the past, however. Many of them had made special one-time gifts in order to help establish the College. Individuals were thus to be the primary source, although it must be kept in mind that alumni could not be counted on to contribute much because of their youth and small numbers.

In order to provide historical background, Appendix Y summarizes gifts and grants received by the College from the year of its accreditation to the present.

11.1 The Capital Campaign

In October 1975, the Trustees voted to initiate the pre-announcement soli-
citation for a ten-year, $31.8 million Capital Campaign. (The case state-
ment forms Appendix Z.) The money was to be raised in two phases, with
Phase I having a goal of $7.8 million, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3-Year</th>
<th>10-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Reserve</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>9,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplement</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chairman of the Board, Mr. John P. Kendall, was chosen as chairman
of a ten-person Campaign Cabinet. The Cabinet, consisting of Trustees,
parents and staff, would guide the Campaign. Its first task was to raise
"seed money," by soliciting the Board of Trustees. One hundred percent of
the Board contributed, and by June 30, 1976, a total of $1,123,717.50 in
pledges had been received. It was decided that the campaign would not be
announced until at least 25% of the first phase goal was pledged, and a
figure of $2 million was chosen.

In the spring of 1976, a new Director of Development was hired. His main
job was to work closely with counsel in running the Campaign and to re-
organize the Development Office to ensure good staff support for the Presi-
dent and for the Campaign Cabinet members' solicitations.

By the fall of 1976, a new organization plan and staff for the Office had
developed (see section 11.3). One of the first changes in reorganizing the
office was to separate public relations functions from fund-raising ones.
In the past, the professional positions were not differentiated, but it now
seemed that more professional spirit, pride, and efficiency would result
if the responsibilities were divided.
During the 1976-77 academic year the necessary pledges were secured to announce the Capital Campaign; however, the imminent departure of Hampshire's second president, Charles Longsworth, delayed the announcement. President Simmons decided to wait until a year in office had passed before formally announcing the drive, while she is introduced to our key potential donors and becomes acquainted with other relevant aspects of the College and the Campaign. During her first few months as Hampshire's President, she has pursued an ambitious calling schedule for foundations. Thus, although the Campaign is still unannounced, it has been actively begun.

The primary Campaign goal is of raising enough pledges to build the new Arts Village. A combination of Trustee gifts, a parent gift of $200,000, and a Kresge Foundation grant of $100,000 enabled us to proceed with the construction of building #1 for Studio Arts. By the spring of 1977 enough pledges had been raised to commence construction of building #2 for Music and Dance, which opened at the beginning of the Spring 1978 Semester.

The current status of the capital effort shows that $2,251,477 was pledged by January 30, 1977. Of this amount, $1,471,532.50 has been collected. The Arts Village, a $3,378,315 project, has received $2,249,747 in pledges with $628,568 still needed to be raised. We have a $500,000 challenge gift as incentive. When the Arts Village funding is completed, primary attention will be payed to raising endowment monies, especially for financial aid.

A series of cultivation luncheons and dinners are being held. Follow-up has been designed to elicit either membership in the Orchard Club (for
annual donors of at least $1,000) or a significant capital gift. These affairs are critical in terms of identifying and cultivating prospects for large gifts.

11.2 Annual Giving

The Annual Fund has been conducted concurrent with the Capital Fund efforts. Organized appeals to alumni and parents began in 1974-75. In 1976-77 these appeals were expanded to include Friends of the College, Trustees, and members of the National Advisory Council. Annual giving for the past three years appears below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1974-75</th>
<th>1975-76</th>
<th>1976-77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>56,876.49</td>
<td>44,045.36</td>
<td>42,238.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1,024.01</td>
<td>1,563.05</td>
<td>3,902.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends )</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,145.00</td>
<td>17,876.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations)</td>
<td>27,795.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>4,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations )</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,250.00</td>
<td>89,350.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential for raising funds through annual giving is much larger than our efforts have proved. Although serious effort in this area is difficult while conducting a Capital Campaign, the operating budget requires substantial amounts from Annual Gifts. A thousand-dollar gift organization, called the Orchard Club, was instituted in 1976-77, and considerable volunteer work by Trustees, parents, and friends will be required to effect significant increases. Analysis of the performance of comparable colleges with similar student bodies shows that strong efforts over the next three years could produce a parents fund of $125,000 and an alumni fund of $25,000.

A student phonathon to parents was introduced last year on a pilot basis. Serious telephone efforts will take place this year with students calling
parents, parents calling parents, and alumni calling alumni.

11.3 Current Staffing

At this writing the Development Office staff is apportioning its time as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Time Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>Spends 2-3 days per month in planning and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Development</td>
<td>Spends 85% of his time fund-raising. The remainder is spent on managing public relations and parent and alumni relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Development</td>
<td>Devotes most of his time to grants preparation. He works on support from foundations and corporations for the institution and for individual faculty members as well. He develops and writes proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Annual Fund and Parents Relations</td>
<td>Spends 80% of her time on annual gift raising and 20% on more general non-fund-raising parent relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Coordinator</td>
<td>Prospects and researches prospects. She also provides detailed staff support for the President and Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Secretaries</td>
<td>Provide support for above. One is responsible for all gift receiving, recording and acknowledging. She does the compilation of weekly and monthly gift reports as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Alumni Relations</td>
<td>One-half time organization of alumni affairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4 Problems and Issues

Hampshire College is currently facing the classic period which is the greatest hazard in funding. Initial supporters, however sympathetic to the
record of the first ten years, may not make repeat commitments of similar size. Hampshire alumni, however supportive, will not reach levels of mature income in the near future. With the low probabilities of major bequests, the picture is even more stark.

Someone has remarked that Hampshire's situation demands the skills of political fund-raising, where persons with little direct association with the College must be interested in participating in its future. Parents' solicitation is obviously an area requiring intense, and delicate, effort. But in the last analysis, the College needs friends, honestly won, able to assist, and genuinely involved.