

4

THE HAMPSHIRE ACADEMIC PROGRAM:

Base Points, Structure, Requirements

Not only do professors get tenure, but courses, fields, disciplines, and, above all, departments get tenure. At least a professor is mortal: departments go on forever. Perpetuity, as someone observed, is a long time. The discipline as the primary organizing principle of academic life is of course essential to the maintenance of standards of both faculty appointments and educational rigor. But to permit it to be the be-all and end-all of academic strategy is inevitably to risk the exclusion of generalizing, synthesizing college education on one hand and the pursuit of transdepartmental intellectual excitement at the most advanced levels of research on the other. . . . There is no gimmick solution.

KINGMAN BREWSTER, JR.
Ventures, Spring, 1966

AS PRESIDENT BREWSTER says, there is indeed no gimmick solution for the college or university to deal with the rate of intellectual obsolescence in its own house. Lofty academic tradition and earthy academic politics, according to Yale's president, make it difficult even to approach the question of change. Further, and as it rightly should, the very nature of the educational enterprise tends to confound ahead-of-time devising of strategies or plans for change. The nature of every college or univer-

sity, in its own way, is to try to develop people, ideas, and perceptions that will have a significant impact on thought, art, and action. To do that requires an element of creativity. And as President Brewster puts it, "the creative, by definition, will defy prediction's plan."

Professor C. L. Barber, one of the principal architects of the 1958 *New College Plan* and therefore no stranger to the devising of new academic strategies, has emphasized in discussion that the actual academic program of Hampshire cannot realistically be specified in advance. It must come from the able, exciting men and women who will form the faculty of the College. This *caveat* has been listened to at Hampshire; in its present stage of development, what is put forward concerning academic program is therefore provisional indeed.

1. THE OFFICIAL AND THE REAL IN CURRICULUM

But the ends of education are many, and a new institution must make the best choice among them that it can. A college pursues its ends in a variety of ways; the most manifest is its official curriculum of studies.

Curriculum is at once elusive in reality and inordinately changeproof once installed. No matter what the bulletin of studies says about "curriculum"—and it usually does so in a special labyrinthine prose—the *real* curriculum in fact turns out to be whatever a faculty member and his students do when they get together. The official curriculum, as contrasted to this, usually acquires a degree of infrangibility which makes it unbreakable for long periods of time. There is little originality but some truth in saying that it is as easy to change a curriculum as it is to move a graveyard.

Making a curriculum, then, seems superficially easier, but it is a rather presumptuous business. Once made, it conveys no necessary assurance that it really will serve the ends the college has chosen to pursue. Nor, given the happy independence and variability of human beings—a genus which includes faculty members—is there any assurance at all that its paper prescriptions will be followed dose by dose. On the other hand, once made, the written curriculum has such inertia that it can inhibit healthy institutional adaptation to change, even if it does not inform the day-to-day act of teaching with any very precise direction.

There are certain moral lessons to be drawn from this. One is that a formal curriculum of academic substance and sequence should not be expected to contain mirabilia which will bring all the educative ends of the college to pass. Another moral is that, since faculty and students in their dealings with each other construct the *real* curriculum, the official curriculum had best be a general framework. The third moral is that every formal curriculum should be born with a dated death warrant in its hand. If this figure of speech seems too inhuman the point can be put another way: any formal curriculum should contain a high frangibility factor—it should be made subject to termination or alteration from the beginning. You should be able, in the argot of this peculiar age, to "turn off." All of these moral lessons are in mind as Hampshire College's curriculum is planned.

The College expects that its formal academic program will be successful if it accomplishes *part* of the institution's aims in liberal education. Even so, the formal curriculum will need to be continually checked to determine whether in fact it is doing its part. The College expects that the real life of its academic program will be defined by its faculty and students, so only the most general and provisional structure is presented here. Finally, the moral of the dated death warrant is taken to heart; the framework discussed in this section should not be allowed to go without complete overhaul for longer than a period of five years.

To these lessons, Hampshire College adds a further proposition, which it proposes to test. This proposition is *that an academic program of good quality can be organized, in an independent college collaborating with nearby colleges and a large university, so that its costs can be met principally out of tuition income.*

2. BASE-POINTS OF HAMPSHIRE ACADEMIC PLANNING

The Hampshire College provisional academic program outlined in later discussion includes certain starting points which may be useful to note. The following are specific premises and features of Hampshire's present academic planning:

a. *The Idea of Successive Approximations*

Hampshire College subscribes to the view that curriculum develop-

ment is a continual process. The College does not believe it is possible to prescribe a fixed curriculum which will remain adequate to the demands liberal education must meet in a world of revolutionary change. Instead, Hampshire's basic principle of academic planning is one of development by successive approximations.

The academic program arises out of a continuous process of staged planning or approximations in which a variety of people play important parts. The first major approximation of the Hampshire academic program was developed by the four-college committee which prepared the *New College Plan* in 1958. The second major approximation of the College's academic program appeared in the 1966 Report of the Educational Advisory Committee, another interinstitutional committee of faculty in the four Connecticut Valley institutions.⁸⁴ The third approximation is presented in this paper. It is prepared by the College leadership as the academic year 1966-67 begins and is based heavily on the recommendations of the earlier documents and the advice of a number of consultants.⁸⁵ It is, as the introduction to this chapter pointed out, highly provisional. The current approximation will be revised as the result of critical examination by the College's academic consultants. As the academic leadership of the College is enlarged and faculty are engaged, the program will take further and perhaps different shape. Successive, frequent, and broadly considered approximations will be the rule in Hampshire's future.

b. *The Idea of Continuing Self-Study*

Along with academic program development by successive approximations, Hampshire subscribes to the view that continual evaluation of all of its work is essential. Institutional "self-studies" on an occasional basis are helpful. But for an "experimenting" college to be what it claims to be, there must be provision for steady observation, assessment, and interpretation of the consequences of the enterprise. This entails building into the College certain practical means for doing this kind of job. Kenneth Keniston sees three needs in this connection and suggests a solution which the College will thoroughly consider:

First, the College itself—particularly the faculty and the administration—must have rapid access to good information about what is happen-

ing . . . in order to evaluate the success or failure of experimental programs. Second, I think that students themselves should be encouraged to scrutinize and understand as well as possible the impact of the college on them, and their own contribution to college life. . . . Thirdly, the foundation of Hampshire College provides an invaluable opportunity for a really good study of undergraduate development. . . . One way to meet all three of these needs . . . might be to create a Council on Educational Development, which would consist of the President, elected members of the faculty, and elected members of the student body. Its size should be small—not more than seven. Such a Council might then act as an advisory body to a small number of researchers (some of whom might be teachers in the college, others of whom might be full-time staff researchers) who would be encharged with a comprehensive study of the College. Such a research group might . . . [provide] continual feedback to the Council on its findings. . . . The Council might then . . . make recommendations to the general faculty as to educational revision and reform.⁸⁰

c. *The Idea of Maintaining an Innovative Climate*

Both a. and b. above are integrally related to a third view Hampshire represents: that what starts as an "experimenting" college should continue to be one. An initial innovative stance, however, can too easily soften into institutional stasis. Academic program development by successive approximations, backed up by a process of continuous evaluation, will help to maintain an innovative climate. But more will be required than this.

Professor Barber urges the notion of a regular "diagnostic summer session" as a vehicle both for evaluation and innovation. His suggestion is that members of the academic community of the College should be enabled to work together on curriculum for sustained periods in the summer as a matter of course.⁸⁷ Professor Samuel Baskin of Antioch suggests that Hampshire faculty be allowed time for developing academic innovations just as they might be allowed research time of the traditional sort within their instructional loads. Both suggestions are being considered at Hampshire as viable ways to keep innovation, experimentation, and intellectual vitality at the liveliest level.

These qualities come back always to the men and women who make up the faculty and its leadership. For this reason, Hampshire intends if possible to take a leaf from the Claremont book. There, faculty members

are able to take a fully paid semester of sabbatical leave on a regular three-year basis. It is possible, as Professor Donald McNassor pointed out in consultation with Hampshire, for a Claremont faculty member to combine a summer and a sabbatical semester for a total leave of nearly seven months. Leaves of such frequency help to insure the kind of intellectual self-renewal out of which new and exciting teaching may come.

Many other ways and means to maintain an innovative liveliness for the College appear promising; one suggestion is to have "a vice-president in charge of revolution."⁸⁸

d. *The Idea that Hampshire's Campus is the World*

Without intended pretentiousness or melodrama, this view is that the curriculum of Hampshire aims at overcoming a dichotomy between "academic" and "real" life, which may seem irrelevant and unimportant to an older generation but is very much a reality for many undergraduates. The academic program of Hampshire College is intended to utilize field experience actively in connection with course work, to allow students time out either before or during college for extended leaves, and to use the "interim" midyear break for off-campus work and study projects, especially after the student's first year.

The College takes more than a passive position of permissiveness in this area, however, and intends to cultivate purposefulness more than opportunity for random drift. Where appropriate in terms of their individual needs and maturity, students will be *actively encouraged* by the College to take time off to work in ways that will enlarge their capacity for caring, for expressing concern through action, and for learning what it means to do a job. They will be given the sense that responsible experience in business or government, in poverty programs, Peace Corps work, community development, military service, and other endeavors is very much a part of Hampshire's idea of modern liberal education. Dr. Julius Stratton puts the basic rationale for such a position clearly:

The classical idea of a liberal education is important. But it is also important for students to have a purpose, to know what they are seeking an education for, and to plan their course accordingly. There is a great deal to be said for learning to do something with your hands, learning to do the world's work. The liberal view is, in fact, an attitude, not a particular course of study. . . . The transformation that comes

with sensing that you have something to give is a worthy goal both for the student and for the educator.⁸⁹

e. *The Idea of Academic Coordination with Related Colleges*

In practice, Hampshire's academic program is planned to complement in useful ways the programs of the other Valley institutions, to offer their students certain distinctive opportunities at Hampshire to avoid wasteful duplication of offerings, and to enable Hampshire students to pursue certain advanced or special studies on the other campuses. A separate later section deals with concrete potentialities for further collaboration of the Valley institutions.

f. *The Idea of Academic Program Flexibility*

The 1958 *New College Plan* in many ways helped break the lockstep features of undergraduate education. One of these ways was its "de-throning of the course as the unit of knowledge," whose steady accretion over four years would add up to a liberal education. Hampshire College's academic program will indeed offer students four years of study in a variety of basic, intermediate, and advanced work. But it will not consider an accumulation of any combination of courses as being either compulsory or equivalent to satisfactory completion of the collegiate phase of education.

While the Hampshire academic program will contain essential coherence and continuity, it will give students great freedom and equivalent responsibility in determining how they can make best use of what the College offers. The College will neither hold students to a rigid formula of required course sequences, nor will it allow flexibility to result in a random smattering or simply "the widest possible exposure to a variety of subjects."⁹⁰ Constraints of order will arise out of a field and integrative examination procedure, discussed later in this chapter, to which the student will determine his own response.

g. *The Idea of the Student as Teacher*

The *New College Plan* stressed, as a principal concern of its academic program, the active and practical preparation of students to teach *themselves*. The 1958 Plan and the 1966 Report suggested also that students

be engaged in teaching *others* through student-led discussion seminars, through acting as assistants to faculty in academic classes, and through serving as tutors and research associates. The Hampshire College academic program in its present approximation subscribes strongly to these recommendations. A great deal of faculty time will be devoted to teaching the student to teach himself. Time and care will be devoted also to training abler and more advanced students to act as teaching assistants. The principle which here affects the academic program of Hampshire was cogently put by the 1966 four-college advisory committee: "the best learning is that in which the student progressively acquires the ability to teach himself."⁹¹ To this, the College would add that the best teaching tends to bring students into a colleague relationship with faculty, where students and faculty alike are learners, and alike share on occasion in the act of teaching others.

h. *The Idea of the Teacher as Teacher*

The view expressed above is complemented at Hampshire by a stress on the central role of the teacher. The faculty at Hampshire, as at any college worth the name, will be infinitely more important than the organized curriculum. In Hampshire's program, with its emphasis on enabling the student to teach himself, a strong faculty role will be indispensable. If students are in effect to become scholars, in the sense of having the will and ability to pursue learning on their own, they cannot do so in an atmosphere where the adult models available to them are neuter.

Such students need exposure to faculty who are obviously willing and able to pursue learning themselves, and who teach one how to learn as much by their own vigorous example as by anything else. The real teacher is never an intellectual or moral cipher in his stance toward students. Nor does he ignore the full complexity of his relationship to students who need to be helped toward independence. He must be an example of man thinking, man concerned, man acting. Despite a tendency in current American culture to suggest that adults are best seen and not heard, Hampshire considers the adult teacher necessarily an "intellectual leader of his time," as Alexander Meiklejohn put it at Amherst in 1912.

The leadership role of the faculty member dare not be narrow in

Hampshire's program. The Muscatine Report at Berkeley includes a "homily on the importance of teaching" which is much to the point for Hampshire:

... some of the most lasting things that we also teach are qualities, abilities and attitudes exemplified in the way we have taught, in our stance toward the student himself. A class taught by an unprepared teacher teaches the student neglect of scholarship. A department which encourages professors to hide from students, teaches the neglect of human relations. If a scholarly attitude is—as it should be—part of what we teach, the teaching process must exemplify in all its details the scholarly attitude of the teacher. . . . [And] no defect of humane consideration is acceptable in our transactions with students. The image of the teacher will be no trivial part of what the world is or could be in the student's mind.⁹²

3. THE CONTROLLING EDUCATIVE FACTOR

The ultimately controlling factor in Hampshire College's academic program is the view of liberal education which the College has chosen to take. This view is that the College exists not alone to prepare students for the high level technical competency demanded by preparation for graduate school, nor to prepare them in skills of inquiry, nor to give them an opportunity to explore the development of themselves through art and experience. All of these things are subsumed under Hampshire's view of liberal education, but the College has a larger and higher aim than any of these taken separately.

Earlier it was said that the central task of liberal education at Hampshire College is to help young men and women learn to live their adult lives, fully and well, in a society of intense change, immense opportunity, and great hazards. For the academic program of the College, this central task controls what it chooses to try to teach. Earlier discussion sought to stress the logical implications of such a view of liberal education in connection with the entire design of the College.

Hampshire College is deliberately designed to equip the student, as best we know how, to *learn how to make his own way* as a whole person in the emerging age. Recapitulating a point made at the beginning of the preceding chapter, no institution has a 20/20 crystal ball which reveals the future in which our young will live. But we can be relatively

sure of its main features. It will be increasingly technological in every aspect; it will be marked by accelerating change, increasing complexity, and simultaneous tendencies toward diversity and uniformity; its society will be increasingly large and urban; individual human relationships within it will continue to increase in number but not necessarily in depth, and the impersonality that marks much of our present day-to-day dealings with people outside our own immediate circle will continue; it will be a society in which there is an abundance or overabundance of continuous and chaotic stimulation.

On the assumption that it will help them learn how to live in a future whose dimensions may have these general features, the academic program in Hampshire's view should enable students to acquire:

knowledge relevant to major sets of understandings about man's individual and social life and universe,

awareness of the ways of inquiry that have led to the present store of knowledge about these major considerations,

acquaintance with the ways man has of expressing the experience of living,

competence both in ways of inquiry and in ways of expressing the intellectual and emotional dimensions of their own encounter with reality.

The curriculum needs an underlying structural coherence so that there is a chance such gains can be approached with a degree of order. It needs equally to have enough explicit freedom so that students and faculty can come at such gains in ways which will engage them most fully and directly.

But beyond understandings, knowledge, and competence—hopefully arrived at through a mix of underlying coherence and explicit freedom in the process of education—students at Hampshire should confront *the question of what those things are for*. If the academic program fails to teach students to teach themselves how to face this question as their lives unfold, it has succeeded in too little, and the whole idea of "learning to learn" turns out to be shallow. The College has a view of itself as more than either a complex teaching machine or an academy for the creation of young gentlemen and ladies. In connection with James A. Perkins' *The University in Transition*, Professor Morton White commented that:

... I think that there is such a thing as knowledge of good, bad, right, and wrong, and that the university is as good a place in which to learn it and teach it as any in our society. Whatever one may think of some of the student demonstrations and teach-ins, many of them reveal a heartening concern with the moral problems created by an increasingly heartless world. More than ever, it is the responsibility of the university to help students transform their more admirable feelings into defensible beliefs and actions, for by doing so it may keep both students and professors from becoming mere technicians in the service of goals they never examine. The truth about prime numbers, electrons, DNA, the Civil War, and mass society is not enough for today's American university. . . . If it critically examines the ends it is asked to serve and serves only those that pass muster, it will go a long way toward convincing the American student that his teachers are still dedicated to liberal education, the civilized life, and the free society he is required to read about as a freshman but often advised to forget about when he becomes a graduate student seeking research grants.⁶²

Professor White's remarks were addressed to the moral role of a large university in our time. They seem equally applicable to the moral role of the undergraduate college today.

Of all the things it might do in liberal education, Hampshire College has chosen to pursue its stated goal through a program intended to enlarge certain major understandings mentioned earlier. These have to do with such complex sets of things as the nature of man, social order, power, culture, ideas, creative and aesthetic experience, growth and change, the interconnectedness of things, and the problem of value. Such major understandings are dealt with through an academic program which is organized into four principal fields of related subjects of knowledge and disciplines of inquiry and expression. At Hampshire, these fields include the three traditional ones: the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities and arts. In addition, the Hampshire program includes the field of language studies. Academic work within these four main channels is related to the central task of liberal education as Hampshire sees it, to the major sets of understandings identified above, and to the ultimate moral questions men must face for themselves.

4. THE FOUR SCHOOLS

At Hampshire College, the four fields noted above are called Schools.

Each field or School is a group of many related subjects; each School uses a common discipline or group of related disciplines in approaching the subjects and major understandings with which it is concerned.

In some cases a high-order problem or major set of understandings may be of concern to one School alone, but it is more likely that such a concern will be held by another School as well, or by all of the Schools. The disciplines with which the Schools deal are in each case a group of analytical concepts ordered into a body of theory and applied to subject matter. Thus Economics would be a discipline, while International Trade would be a subject. A subject is a specific matter, phenomenon, or group of many related specific matters or phenomena (Elizabethan drama, genetic codes, molecular structure, etc.) which can be studied via one or more disciplines.

A high-order problem or major set of understandings may be seen as a question likely to affect man perennially, likely to involve a variety of subjects, and capable of being understood—in the sense of successive approximations—by applying concepts from different disciplines. Thus such a perennial and pervasive matter of the human condition as the nature of power is a general high-order question involving a wide range of subjects and rationally approachable through many disciplines, such as those of political science, sociology, psychology, literature, and others.

The College and its four Schools are organized to enable students to get at major understandings through increased competence in disciplines of inquiry and experience without a departmental organization of disciplines.

One of the principal departures recommended by the 1958 *New College Plan* was the avoidance of departmental organization according to disciplines. The four-college committee of 1958 argued that:

It is the pressure generated by departmental organization, in combination with the course system, which is chiefly responsible for the proliferation of courses. The department as a whole seeks to produce thoroughly trained majors by offering many courses; individual teachers add courses to make a place for themselves and their interests in the department. The New College Plan eliminates departments while preserving the three customary academic divisions. But at the same time it recognizes that the intellectual life of a college must be structured to a large extent by the specialized disciplines. The training of faculty

members should be exploited rather than ignored. Individually, most of them approach learning from the viewpoint of a single discipline. It is the tool which they know best and can most effectively share. Further, students who are just beginning to learn the difference between facts and the analysis of facts can progress more rapidly if several approaches to understanding are not presented simultaneously in the same course. This is not to deny that the various disciplines have much in common; but what is common should emerge as the liberal arts student moves forward in his education.⁹⁴

When the Educational Advisory Committee of 1966 reviewed this thinking, its members found themselves in agreement with its essential principle, preferring only to stress the positive features of divisional organization rather than the negative features of departmentalization. The 1966 Committee concluded that the "departmental system is nurtured by the graduate school without regard to whether or not it is appropriate at the college level."⁹⁵ They agreed that a divisional organization of the College would not neglect specialization but would fit it into a broader background more suited to the exploratory and synoptic functions of undergraduate liberal education, and would thus make for a better college.

The 1966 Committee regarded the question of divisional organization from many points of view. They noted that:

possible combinations are numerous, convictions about them strong, and any choice among them so intimate a part of an educational philosophy that the ultimate decision about divisions at Hampshire College has to be made by the new administration. No divisional organization would be successful that did not represent the profound convictions of an administration and of the faculty which it appoints.⁹⁶

Out of their consideration of the question of divisional organization, the Committee produced a recommendation which has unusual originality and significance. The 1966 Committee recommended a structure of four rather than three divisions. To the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences, the Committee added a strong recommendation for a division of languages which would deal with human communication in its varying forms. The leadership of Hampshire College is convinced that, as the first chapter of the present paper indicated, the study of languages as a major field, in the sense meant by the 1966 Committee, would open up a new and promising dimension for liberal education.

The Committee stated its four-field recommendation as follows:

The *New College Plan* proposed three divisions: humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. In this three-fold set-up, however, there is no appropriate place for such semantical and syntactical studies as language, logic, mathematics and epistemology. We therefore suggest four divisions, as follows:

1. *The Humanities*. This division would concern itself with man as revealed in his art, his literature, his music, his history, his religion, and his philosophy. What are his values, his aspirations, his inspirations?
2. *The Natural Sciences*. This group would involve primarily a study of the inorganic and organic environment of man and a study of man himself as an organism. It would deal with such concepts as natural law and scientific method.
3. *The Social Sciences*. This group would bring together the studies of man and society: historical, economic, sociological, psychological and philosophical. It would examine the manners in which societies operate, the concept of social law, and methodology in the social sciences.
4. *The Languages* (including mathematics and logic). The central focus here would be communication. This would involve a study of language in its three uses: the analytic development of calculi and their syntaxes, the synthetical development of empirical statements and their semantical functions, and the creative employment of language in literature. The history of language would also necessarily be involved. The foreign language program would be the responsibility of this division.

Philosophically, these four divisions seem sounder than the earlier three.⁶⁷

Hampshire College agrees with the thinking of the Educational Advisory Committee about this general structure. In details and application, in each case there are points where the College will differ from the Committee; but the four-fold structure appears in broad outline both sound and intriguing enough to warrant serious trial. In consequence, the organization of the College begins, as noted earlier, with its studies grouped in four Schools, each with a basic faculty and a dean. These principal academic fields of the College are designated as:

The School of Humanities and Arts
 The School of Natural Sciences
 The School of Social Sciences
 The School of Language Studies

Students will distribute their studies among these four Schools, and usually will undertake a concentration of intermediate and advanced study in one School only. Field examinations, as explained later, will be given in a three-stage sequence. Integrative courses, examinations and advanced seminars will give students opportunity to test the linkages among fields and among disciplines.

The offerings in the School of Humanities and Arts will feature educational experience of a creative and aesthetic nature more strongly than the 1966 Committee proposed, as might be expected from what was said in the third chapter of this paper. Where the 1966 Committee proposed, for example, that the Humanities staff include a musicologist, the College is much more likely to invite a modern composer to join its faculty. The difference in this illustration is between an emphasis on *knowledge about* music which a musicologist might well provide, and an emphasis on what Whitehead called "the art of the utilization of knowledge."

Ulysses Kay, a contemporary composer and teacher, has suggested modest ways in which the College may offer students not only an introduction to theory, but opportunities as well to express themselves in music, through composition, reading of music, and performance, as well as listening.

It is this spirit which will be fostered in much of the program of the School of Humanities and Arts. But this is not to say that studies in history, literature, and the academic side of art will be neglected. In all studies of this School, however, a major emphasis will be on art as experience, as discipline, as something to be *done* as well as to be read about. The exact substance of offerings in the School will depend for determination on the interests of its faculty, who will be selected with an eye to their involvement in the aesthetic and creative, as much as in scholarship.

The School of Social Sciences will, in line with the recommendations of the 1966 Committee, focus on studies of *man in society* in ways that often cut across and link disciplines that are usually taught in almost

complete isolation from each other. Again, the precise formulation of curriculum in this School will rest on the faculty who come to comprise it.

But for the present, the 1966 Committee offers a striking set of proposals to consider. These will be the starting point for specific curriculum development in the School. In abridged but still rather full form, some of the Committee's recommendations are the following:

We have chosen to begin with the assertion that we wish to offer a coherent program focused on the study of man in society. Here we assume that the current state of knowledge permits us to define the major dimensions of such a study. Thus the initial grouping under *origins, organization, ideology, behavior, systems and methodology*. Assigned to each of these major topics is a set of courses. They draw from a variety of disciplines.

Suggested Areas for Division of Social Science

Origins

Pre-literate cultures—cultural anthropology
Early literate cultures—Egypt, Greece, Rome
Indian, Chinese

Study of Social Organization

Introductory sociology
Comparative governments
The family
Economic structure

Ideology

Comparative religions
Social ethics
Social values
Political philosophies—political theory
Constitutional law

Methodology

Sampling statistics—probability
Non-parametric statistics
Research design
Metatheory—computer

Social Behavior

Social development
Behavior change
Behavior analysis

Social Systems

Trade and commerce
Comparative economic systems
Political organization—parties
Social class—class structure
International—economy
—law
—politics
—conflict

The area titles can be seen to be a sampling of topics currently honored by several disciplines. We argue that instead of studying a discipline explicitly, and the subject of social science implicitly, we wish to reverse the process. The student is studying man in society explicitly in the programs offered, and implicitly encountering the disciplinary techniques and languages which have produced this knowledge. . . .

The subjects listed are offered as examples, and not as our best judgment of what should be taught. The area choices, however, require justification. The social sciences take as their common focus the social intercourse that men have with one another. Such intercourse may concern a wide variety of objects, functions and effects. These range from two-person systems for purposes of socialization, persuasion and personal gratification through multi-person systems for economic, protective and educative purposes to such impersonal systems as governments, international arrangements and major instruments of planning and policy. Traditionally, a variety of disciplines has contributed to our understanding of these processes, but there has been no responsibility for a unified approach. As a result there exist large gaps in our knowledge; e.g., of behavior modification and control, as well as gaps in our understanding of the relationships between existing bodies of knowledge; e.g., anthropology of pre-literate cultures and philosophies of social ethics. But at least the outlines of social science are coming clear.

. . . Several of the disciplines have felt the impact of "systems analysis" as a technique of study. This serves to remind us of the role that new methods frequently play. Methods have a way of creating their own intrinsic disciplines, of forcing new ways of looking at familiar observations, and of sharpening our understanding of older methods.

Hence the recognition of the study of method in its own right. It is expected that the choice of methods to study will follow from those

being used in the division as a whole. It is argued the methods courses must be cast as ways of creating techniques of analysis whose study leads to an appreciation of how to create such ways as well as how to use them.

It must be admitted that the creation of this division as suggested runs counter to the traditional set of attitudes characterizing the relationships between disciplines. The social science disciplines have tended to discount and deride the methods of one another, and hence their contributions. In asking that faculty trained to such loyalties work together, we require a willingness to place the problem before the discipline, an unfamiliar requirement.

The student whose interests lead him to a particular academic discipline will find that the present offerings provide not more than one-half the normal topical coverage found in the undergraduate major. Hence we must be prepared to create opportunities for tutorial and independent study to carry him well beyond the formal offerings. Here we estimate that again at least half of the normal coverage can be achieved at Hampshire. Once this has been accomplished, the student is faced with filling in his remaining interests through four-college elections. These will concentrate in those topics requiring particular facilities or teachers.⁹⁸

It must not be assumed, from the length of this excerpt, that the School of Social Sciences at Hampshire will necessarily follow this program. But the program suggested by the 1966 Committee will assuredly be discussed as Hampshire faculty in the social sciences organize their curriculum.

The School of Language Studies is treated in a later chapter of the present paper.

5. THE QUESTION OF DISTRIBUTION, CONCENTRATION, AND INTEGRATION

Curriculum in American higher education has in a sense been almost as much affected by fads as the curriculum in the much-criticized lower schools has been. Trivium and quadrivium gave way under the pressures of a changing society for preparation in the so-called new subjects, the modern languages and the sciences, as the pressures of an industrialized democratic society made themselves felt on American colleges and universities in the 19th century. The triumph of the elective principle by

the beginning of the 20th century brought with it substantial benefits and debits as well, as Frederick Rudolph has noted:

Election permitted the professor to indulge his interests and the students to follow theirs; it encouraged the accumulation of knowledge and welcomed into the world of learning subjects that had been forbidden through an ill-considered belief that the ancients knew everything worth knowing. . . . The elective principle moved the individual to the center of the educational universe and boldly asserted that all educated men need not know the same things. The elective system, by giving free play to the great motive power of interest, freed the curriculum from the deadening influence of latent or open disinterest and hostility. . . . The elective principle was the instrument by which the departments of knowledge were built, by which areas of scholarly interest were enlarged, and therefore it was the instrument that enabled colleges to become universities. . . . Of course the ledger had its debits. The elective principle, enemy of one kind of superficiality though it was, could spawn a limitless number of short courses that might not add up to anything very substantial. On occasion it could make for a system that was (as Samuel Eliot Morrison wrote) "haphazard, illogical, postulated on too high an expectation of a young man's will to learn and too low an estimate of the many attractive side shows outside the main tent."

It surely underwrote a good deal of the motivation problem in the American college and university by encouraging the notion that one subject was no more important than another and by making it possible for the non-serious student to find an easy berth.⁹⁹

By 1931 at the University of Nebraska the elective principle had succeeded so far that a student could take courses in Early Irish, Creative Thinking, American English, First Aid, Advanced Clothing, Ice Cream and Ices, Third-Year Czechoslovakian, Football, Sewerage, and A Man's Problem in the Modern Home.¹⁰⁰

As a kind of Thermidorian reaction to the revolution of the elective system, the general education movement began at Columbia University in 1919, continued through the famous Harvard Report which was prepared between 1943 and 1945, and on into the 1950's. As Bell has said about general education at Columbia, the movement came about as the result of a curious mixture of parochial, sociopolitical, and philosophical motives. The radical growth and changing composition of the

American college student population in the years of World War I and after contributed to an increased sense of need for higher education to provide the educated leadership of a heterogeneous nation with an understanding of the principles of a free society and a consistent image of American experience and our heritage of Western culture. Certainly, too, the movement was affected by the New Humanists, such as Irving Babbitt, who found that under the elective system "the wisdom of all ages is to be naught, compared with the inclination of a sophomore."¹⁰¹ The position of the New Humanists was that the full, free, unexpressed, undisciplined chaos of the elective curriculum needed to be countered by an assertion of the validity of intelligent control, an interest in what is human about a student rather than what is merely individual about him.¹⁰² Whatever the background and causes, as Professor Rudolph has pointed out:

Where the general education or core-course program received its most dramatic treatment, there the forces of chaos had earlier made their most dramatic impact. Columbia, Chicago, Amherst, Wesleyan, and Harvard were especially vulnerable to the charge that they had lost touch with the ideal of learning as a body of thought and values by which an educated man was identified, for in all these institutions the elective principle had substituted an era of almost uncontrolled individualism for the older humanistic tradition.¹⁰³

Colleges moved toward varying schemes of general education which diminished the electives available to students and strengthened the demand for students to take certain common, core, or basic courses. One example was the new curriculum that Amherst College established in 1947, which required all freshmen and sophomores to take a two-year sequence in science, history, and the humanities within the framework of a four-course program.¹⁰⁴ Of special interest in connection with later developments, the Amherst curriculum of 1947 also moved toward the institution of *laboratory or seminar* courses in history, the humanities, and the fine arts as well as in the sciences.

The ferment of American higher education has been such that wherever schemes of general education were installed they very soon came under further faculty study and scrutiny; in some cases they became the object of academically cosmic conflict. *General Education in a Free Society*, the Harvard Redbook of 1945, tried to formulate a complete

educational philosophy for American society in the course of dealing with curriculum and other matters. The Redbook became the bible of general education, particularly in smaller colleges and state universities, but, like the Bible itself, was often either unread or sometimes read too literally.¹⁰⁵ At Harvard, the Redbook was followed by the Bruner Report of 1949 (known as such because of the committee chairman, Professor Jerome Bruner) on the problem of science in general education, and the 1964 Doty Committee Report (named for its chairman, Professor Paul M. Doty) reviewing the status and problems of Harvard's general education program. Elsewhere, in varying degree and with differing results, faculties assessed the consequences of general education.

Five major approaches to general education were common; distribution requirements; comprehensive survey courses; "functional" courses; the Great Books curriculum; and individual guidance. The first of these approaches involved a simple limitation on complete elective choice, so that the student was required to distribute a flexible portion of his course work among different fields. The second approach involved comprehensive survey courses organized most often in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The "functional" course approach to general education was intended to prepare students for immediate problems of life such as those of personal and community health, social adjustment, marriage and family life, and vocational guidance. The Great Books approach was identified with St. John's College, and required four prescribed years in the study of approximately 100 important books of the Western heritage, along with the study of ancient and modern languages, mathematics, and laboratory science. The fifth approach, that of individual guidance, was found in such colleges as Black Mountain, Sarah Lawrence, and Bennington; after a student had explored various fields for two years he or she would pursue a reading and tutorial program planned around a central individual interest. No matter what the approach, general education represented an effort to give a degree of coherence and some commonality to the first years of college for all students. The approaches also characteristically involved a move toward specialization or a "major" in the last two years or "upper division." There were exceptions to this, as at Chicago, where the original intention was for a common four-year education.

The general education movement persisted in various forms, but it was subject to increasing tension as the 1960's approached. Stress came from at least three sources.

One of these sources was a strong feeling that the values of an elective system must be expressed in a curriculum which would indeed be liberalizing for the student. This feeling was reinforced by improvements in secondary education which introduced pre-college students to "basic" subject matter more adequately than before. And it was expressed by faculty and students who disliked the apparent regimentation of uniform requirements.

A second source of stress was the pressure for specialization, reflected in the interests and demands of departments and a sense of urgency students increasingly felt about being able to enter graduate specialization as well prepared as possible. Pressure of this kind underlined a view that general education courses, even if intrinsically well handled, meant time lost in getting on with a special line of study of greater importance than "shallow breadth" could claim.

Finally, stress came from the knowledge that somehow liberal education should provide for all students an awareness of the indivisibility of knowledge, of the connectedness of events, of the wholeness of things. This was the stress which in various manifestations had helped to produce the general education movement in the first place. Caught on the horns of this trilemma, higher education began looking for a new mode or style.

The emerging modishness, in America but not in England, turns sharply away from a pattern of required general education "core" courses. In some instances, as at Harvard, the dominant note is set by the press for specialization, reflecting a strong impulse in the society toward insisting upon and rewarding the highest possible professional competence among the well-educated young. In other instances, the mode is the reverse of this, accenting virtually complete freedom of individual choice of what to study and how to study it. Some experimental colleges, such as Goddard in Vermont, provide pure examples of this mode. But they are not alone.

"Experimentalism" in the late 60's generally tends to mean adventures in making the curriculum flexible, sometimes to a point which

conservatives regard as formless. Flexibility is interpreted most often in current experimentation as the "individualization of academic programs," the principal canon of orthodoxy in this new mode. Such experimentalism, in a sense, is part of the general cultural impulse toward radical subjectivism discussed earlier. In some few other instances, strenuous efforts are being made to reconcile the impulses toward focused specialization and subjective individualization of curriculum within programs that retain a degree of common intellectual experience for all.

This is principally being attempted by two means. One involves reliance upon "distribution" and "concentration" requirements, with the first intended to assure that, even with electives, students will have some exposure to studies in several fields, and with the concentration requirement intended to assure that he will also focus on a special field, discipline, or subject. The distribution-concentration formula alone provides no inherent solution to the need for liberal education to perform an integrative function. Current efforts to add a dimension to the formula which would satisfy this need try to do so not through common courses of study, but through centering attention on *inquiry*. The new mode in liberal education, in other words, accents process rather than substance as the unifying element in general education.

The latter solution was foreshadowed in a 1954 reexamination of the Amherst "new curriculum" of 1947. Among many other things, this reexamination commented that:

If integration is to occur at all, then, it must occur in the student's mind. No mere juggling of courses and scrambling of course contents will achieve it. . . . It is mere *knowledge about* that produces what Whitehead calls "inert ideas," and it is inert ideas which cause mental dry rot. The only possible way, therefore, of obtaining an education is through active participation in some type of project. It is this participation which brings us into real contact with things and makes us genuinely acquainted with them. And it is for this reason that Whitehead defines education as "the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge." . . . This is the part of Amherst's "new" curriculum which, wherever you find it in the new curriculum, is, for a college course, really new. . . . [When] one attempts to reach the art of utilizing knowledge, one deliberately gives up the attempt to teach subjects and instead more modestly tries to initiate the student into the kind of work that is done by the professors of those subjects. . . .

For the truth of the matter is that one cannot integrate by using the encyclopaedic approach. Such omnibus survey courses must progressively include less and less about more and more.¹⁰⁰

The reasons for moving to the establishment of *conceptual inquiry* as the central organizing principle in the college curriculum are stronger and deeper than this relatively informal Amherst commentary of 1954 might suggest. These reasons may be summarized as follows:

Conceptual inquiry (*i.e., seeing the uses of mind as involving learning, using, and revising propositions, theoretical constructs, concepts, and methodological principles in inquiry, not inquiry simply as gathering and classifying or categorizing data*) has become an intellectual necessity in general background or basic courses as well as in advanced courses of a specialized nature: it cuts across all fields and all levels.

A grounding in methods of conceptual inquiry is the only practical way to become educationally equipped for the kind of intellectual mobility and continuing self-renewal the rapidly changing world of knowledge and work requires; it is no longer sensible to educate a person for a static "job," when all specializations are swiftly modifying (or becoming obsolescent) and new ones are constantly appearing.

Conceptual inquiry has been made central to the advanced sections of all fields of knowledge since the conceptual revolution in physics in the 1920's and the subsequent overturn of the structure of scientific thought. In physics, new discoveries in radioactivity, the principle of relativity, the nature of the atom, and the like, made obsolete the older view (held by men like Karl Pearson and Lord Kelvin) that inquiry in science was involved only in laying bare the facts of nature and reporting on the observable and measurable. Physicists were forced to treat space, time, place, magnitude, and other matters in a new way, not as objects of self-evident truth or mere empirical verification. New conditions of knowledge made it necessary to rely heavily on *science as conceptual structures or principles of inquiry*, which could be revised as developing complexes of theory, bodies of data, and criteria of scientific progress dictated. A shift of emphasis from Whitehead's *knowledge about* to an emphasis on conceptual structures and principles of inquiry has tended to occur in all the sciences (e.g., biology) and in the social sciences. The latter still retain some of their earlier flavor of positivism (seeking to discover "regularities" in social phenomena comparable to the laws of Newtonian physics), and still are

heavily involved with traditional descriptive history.* But it is increasingly clear that the problems the social sciences now face require a reliance on conceptual and analytical structures and their constant reexamination.¹⁰⁷ And in the humanities, too, there is evidence of some shift in this direction, as the work of Professor E. H. Gombrich on perception in art suggests.¹⁰⁸

Conceptual inquiry is at the heart of the apparently permanent revolution in knowledge in which we now live. Currently the rate of *revision* of theoretical knowledge in the sciences may be twenty to a hundred times higher than it was less than 100 years ago. In such a state of flux in all the fields of knowledge, the centrality of method becomes clear. Inquiry; ways of discovering and knowing; of analyzing; of going from hunch to hypothesis to test to reconsideration, with conceptual tools to help you;—these make up a reasonable keystone for general education now.¹⁰⁹

Hampshire College finds these reasons persuasive, and in consequence variety and depth of experience with conceptual *inquiry* is a principal element depended upon to give a sense of coherence to liberal education in the College.

The *New College Plan* in 1958 developed a curriculum for a college with a relatively large enrollment compared to the number of its teachers. The Plan disavowed a return to some new version of the old system of required courses for all, even as a means of economy. Instead, it proposed to preserve "the vital freedom of choice among courses and teachers" and include a requirement of distribution and concentration. The New College model aimed to devote faculty time principally to teaching students to teach themselves, fitting students to master subjects chiefly on their own initiative "by providing them with the necessary skills, resources, and intellectual stimulation."¹¹⁰ Training for self-conducted inquiry was a central emphasis of the *New College Plan*. This would occur in a variety of courses in the regular curriculum and was to:

be complemented by the common experience all students will share in taking two college-wide courses during a month-long mid-winter term, to be held each year after the Christmas vacation, between the fall and spring terms. This will be an occasion for projects integrating different disciplines.¹¹¹

*Witness the fairly acrimonious conflict between traditional descriptivism and behavioralism in political science.

The *New College Plan* foresaw that the two mid-winter courses would include subjects or problems of general importance. One course would deal with some aspect of the Western cultural heritage; the other would deal with one or another of the great non-Western cultures. In a four-year cycle of mid-winter terms students would have studied four different aspects of their own culture and a central feature of each of four other great cultures. Thus, in addition to variety and elective specialization, students would have shared in common, broad studies.

Since 1958 many colleges here and in England have tried or are trying other solutions to the problem of distribution, concentration, and integration. At Harvard in 1965, Dean Franklin Ford proposed a scheme which sought to maintain a commitment to general education along with accommodating the impulse toward specialization. In the new Harvard plan each student would be required to take at least four year-long courses outside of his own field of concentration. Three of these would be in general education in the fields of the social sciences, the humanities, and the natural sciences. But the student would *not be required* to do so by taking any of the broad introductory lower-level courses; instead, he could satisfy the general education requirements by taking upper-level courses in the three main fields if he could meet departmental prerequisites. Under Dean Ford's proposal the student in the natural sciences could forego any general education courses in that field.

At the University of Chicago the question of general education is being met beginning in the fall of 1966 by a plan put forward by University Provost Edward Levi. The Levi system divides the college into five "area colleges," each with its own Master and its own comprehensive program. Chicago's five "area colleges" are in physical science, biology, social science, humanities, and "civilizational" studies. The "area colleges" will not be residential in nature, but will be "intellectual unities." While patterns remain to be worked out by faculty, students will take two courses in common in the first year, one in the second, and an integrating seminar in the final year. The relationship between concentrations and the general courses will be established by the faculties in each "area college." The basic principle is that in each field of specialization the emphasis would be on the *structure of inquiry* as it

becomes manifest through subject matter. The underlying proposition is that by developing experience in the processes of inquiry in a special field; students would understand the principles of description, exposition, and argument that are applicable in other subjects as well.¹¹²

At a time when common requirements in general education are being de-emphasized in the United States, it is interesting to note that in England a somewhat different line is being followed. This is especially true at the new universities formed in England during the early 1960's.

The University of Sussex provides an illustration relevant to plans for Hampshire College. At Sussex, as at Chicago, the faculties are not organized in department, but in "schools." The Schools at Sussex are in such fields as Physical Science, the Social Studies, European Studies, Educational Studies, England and American Studies. The Schools of the University of Sussex are designed to bring students and faculty together in a common field, instead of in specific disciplines. Courses in each discipline are given, but the principal effort is to (a) provide students with interdisciplinary work within fields and (b) *provide them with common course work which links the fields of the several schools.* Degrees at Sussex are given in Science, the Arts, and the Social Sciences. There are certain required first-year courses which all students must take. Before a student is permitted to concentrate either in the Arts or Social Studies, he must, for example, take a common course in "Language and Values" and a common course in "An Introduction to History."¹¹⁸ Students taking degrees in Science are required to take two common courses in "Structure and Properties of Matter" and "Mathematics with Physics," plus electing either "Further Mathematics" or "Chemistry."

In the Sussex program, as at Hampshire, there is an emphasis on educating individuals for contemporary life and problems. The Sussex design for accomplishing such education is to emphasize early in the college program analytical and methodological questions and procedures, to progress through common or linked subjects, and finally to specialize in particular subjects or disciplines. One American observer concludes that:

It is clear that general education in this British conception does not mean survey courses, or simply a distribution requirement of work

*in diverse fields, but a genuine effort to "find links between subjects." It is an experiment well worth watching.*¹¹⁴

In his reconsideration of general education at Columbia, Professor Bell has made recommendations which are distinctive in themselves but have an interesting resonance with the new developments at Chicago and at Sussex. The Bell proposals have two objectives: first, to reorganize the two years of Contemporary Civilization courses and relate them to the Humanities courses in order to accomplish a more unified early college experience; second, to try to integrate the lower and upper college courses to provide for a coherent development of analytical skills and ideas.

The Columbia recommendations emphasize the first year of college as the time for acquisition of necessary historical and background knowledge, the second and third years as the proper time for training in a discipline and the application of the discipline to diverse subject matters within a field, and the fourth year as the proper time for advanced seminar work in a specific discipline along with participation in integrative courses in the major areas of the sciences, the humanities, and the social sciences.¹¹⁵ Daniel Bell summarizes his own position by saying:

The nature of college education can now be envisaged as a series of logical steps in which first comes the acquisition of a general background, second the training in a discipline, third the application of this discipline to a number of relevant subjects, and fourth the effort to link disciplines in dealing with common problems. It is this progression, involving at each step of the way an awareness of conceptual innovation and method, that is the heart of the ordering of a curriculum.¹¹⁶

Professor Bell sees necessity for the restoration of history as a central subject in his triadic design for liberal education and as the first logical step in the ordering of a curriculum. He argues this position because history can:

redress the passion for the abstract by emphasizing the concrete, thus demonstrating a social situation in its manifold complexity and actuality;

provide a "vocabulary of reference" for the historical imagination, both to stretch the imagination and to forestall the limited (and sometimes false) analogies that can be invoked to justify or explain events;

emphasize the role of contexts in establishing the meaning of ideas; identify the relevant antecedents that have shaped the present;

be a source for comparative analysis.¹¹⁷

In arguing for the teaching of history as a basic part of general education, Professor Bell is far from advocating historical survey courses. Instead, he feels it necessary for students to study historical problems and periods with some intensity and depth in order to (a) "see history as the efforts of peoples and societies to deal with some recurrent problems of social order" and (b) to grasp principles of historical explanation and the nature of evidence as ways of understanding basic complex social processes. In urging this view, Bell suggests examples of studies which are not dissimilar from those being developed by the Social Studies Program of Educational Services Incorporated, under the leadership of Professor Elting E. Morison.¹¹⁸

For Hampshire College, examination of past trends and recent developments in general and liberal education has led to certain conclusions about the questions of distribution, concentration, and integration in the academic program. These will become evident in the broad framework of the Hampshire academic program. Hopefully, the discussion of Hampshire's academic program that follows will make clear that curriculum at the College:

is not committed to a totally elective or individualized approach to studies, while allowing great room for choice;

is determined not to allow narrow specialization to dominate its character;

regards its central task and major understandings as requiring certain common studies for all students;

accepts *conceptual inquiry* as its pervasive pedagogical style, and training in it for continued self-use as a principal obligation of the College.

The academic program will give students from the beginning an idea of what the College means by "liberal education." Students will have direct experience in inquiry in each of four fields, will learn the principles of a discipline and its uses in inquiry and expression. They will have the experience of applying the resources of a discipline to an ad-

vanced special project, and will have opportunities from the beginning of college until graduation to deepen their understanding of some very complex sets of things.

6. THE DIVISIONAL SEQUENCE

The academic program for the College as a whole and for each of its Schools is organized in a three-phase divisional sequence. Each Division constitutes a stage in the academic program with its own purposes, related studies, and field examinations.* Each divisional stage has an expected usual duration within the usual four years of the College. But individual students may in some cases take a longer or shorter time than is the usual pattern for any one or more of the Divisions. In a sense, the three Divisions as a sequence take the place of the traditional Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior class sequence according to which colleges are most frequently organized. Just as Hampshire College, in the words of the 1958 Plan "dethrones the course as *the* unit of knowledge," so it also departs from the class-year sequence as *the* mode of progression through the College.

The nature of Divisions in relation to their purposes, course work, field examinations, and integrative examinations will be dealt with more fully in later discussion. They are noted briefly here:

a. *The Division of Basic Studies*

Ordinarily this divisional sequence would require approximately one academic year for a student to complete. Its major purpose is to introduce the student to the intentions and process of liberal education at Hampshire, giving him limited but direct experience with the use of disciplines of the four broad School fields for inquiry and expression, and certain common elements of background, method, and skill necessary in undertaking one's education within Hampshire's terms. A student will have completed this sequence when he has passed Division I field and integrative examinations which assess his development in the College's four

*"Division" in the present Hampshire terminology is not to be confused with its earlier use in 1958 and 1966 documents. The term does not here mean a *field*, but a *stage*.

areas and his development in background and methods which link these fields.

b. *The Division of Disciplinary Studies*

This divisional sequence would usually occupy two academic years out of a student's usual four in the College. The principal objects of Division II are to enable a student to explore the disciplines of the four School fields further, to become accepted as a major student in one of the Schools, to become initially trained in the concepts and methods of a single discipline through inquiry and experience applied to real subjects and projects, and to broaden his knowledge of the linkages among disciplines and fields. Completion of this phase will be reached when a student has passed a School examination directly involving the application of his selected discipline to subjects, field examinations dealing with the treatment of subjects in areas and disciplines other than his own, and an integrative examination requiring the application of all the disciplinary resources at his command to a high-order problem which cuts across fields. The student's work in this sequence will increasingly be independent, with time for individual projects and studies, the pursuit of reading programs, and study at other institutions.

c. *The Division of Advanced Studies*

Usually this final sequence would require the last academic year for completion. In at least one-half of the sequence, a student will independently pursue an intensive study or project related to one limited subject within his discipline. The study or project will have been outlined by the student during the latter part of his Division II studies; it will have to have been approved by his School as a suitable advanced undertaking prior to the completion of the Division II sequence. The completion of a student's study or project will take a form appropriate to his discipline or field. In many cases, perhaps particularly in the Schools of Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Language Studies, completion of an advanced study will result in a thesis submitted to a faculty advisor or committee. In the School of the Humanities and Arts, an advanced project might instead result in an artistic creation (as, for example, a sculpture, a musical composition, a painting, a novel, etc.) executed at a

level of competence considered by the School to demonstrate advanced performance.

A further element of Division III is participation in an advanced integrative one-term seminar, in which the student will encounter a broad topic requiring the application of various disciplines, including his own. Such a seminar might deal, for example, with the Development of New Nations, or with Science and Government, or with other complex topics which cannot be handled alone by a single discipline, and which involve value and judgment as well as data and method. The student would have time available for other studies of an elective variety. His work in Division III and his College studies would be completed when his intensive study or project was accepted by his School, when he had passed an advanced School examination in his discipline and ones related to it, and when he had passed an advanced integrative examination involving problems that require a relating of fields and disciplines to major sets of understandings with which the College is principally concerned.

7. REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION

Undergraduate education in America, as the 1958 *New College Plan* and other critiques have pointed out, has been dominated by a view of knowledge as being acquired in units called courses. Most commonly, courses are given "unit" values in terms of the amount of "class time" they require students to "put in" during a given semester. Thus a course meeting in classes three hours per week for a sixteen-week semester may be a "three-unit" course. If a student "passes" four or five courses of two to five unit values each during each of eight semesters, in what a college regards as a suitable combination of studies, he will have "accumulated enough units" to graduate.

Other requirements, such as a comprehensive examination, a language examination, or a senior thesis, may have to be met as well. But the basic thing is to accumulate enough units of knowledge, measured in hours of course work with passing grades, to justify the baccalaureate degree.

The accompanying features of this system are familiar. A student registers each semester for a series of courses, some of which may be "required," and some of which may be elective. In every practical

sense, *all of his course work is required*, since he must accumulate a prescribed number of course units in order to graduate.

Once enrolled in his courses, the student is expected to attend them. Indeed, attendance with minimum absence is usually compulsory if the student plans to pass the course. His physical presence is regarded as essential in order for him to acquire the units of knowledge which the course is intended to impart to him. The good sense of this is self-evident if one accepts the initial premise that education occurs through the accretion of units of knowledge measurable in hours of class time.

To insure physical presence, it is not uncommon for attendance at each class meeting to be verified in one fashion or another. Sanctions are applied to a student if his attendance becomes irregular or spotty, or if he is not prompt in appearing for class.

The course in any given instance is likely to require the completion of considerable outside reading and problem-solving; to present the student with frequent short tests, periodic larger tests, and a final examination; and to require him to prepare one or more papers on topics related to the subject of the course. All of these, like his attendance, are evaluated.

Evaluation takes the form of scaled grading, usually by numerical values from 0-100, by letter-categories of value from F-A, or by some complex variation or combination of these. The mysteries and subjectivities of this process are at least as painfully evident to the professor as they are to the student.

Somehow at last, the student finds himself at the end of a course with a grade, which is presumed to symbolize the degree of adequacy he demonstrated in acquiring the units of knowledge in the course. Hopefully, the symbol indicates he has "passed"—that the intricate evaluational bookkeeping and his record of attendance warrant his being regarded as successfully educated in the content of the course.

This simplified description of the dominant process in undergraduate education leaves out variations and exceptions which can be found in most institutions. To this extent it is exaggerated and not altogether fair, but not enough so to diminish it significantly as a reasonably accurate depiction of the largely prevailing system.

Hampshire College, in its academic program, provides a sharper break with this system than the 1958 Plan suggested. The present system is regarded as having so many disabilities and undesirable consequences

—both in terms of “academic” education and the larger development of the student as a person—that a departure from it is warranted.

Essentially, the present system is one of frequent extrinsic rewards and punishments which tend to produce short-term high performance behavior in connection with discrete and limited objectives. The system in the long term produces diffuse behavior in terms of its educational results, and by its mechanical authoritarianism tends to contribute to self-hate and generalized hostility. Short-term learning, unreinforced by its further use in a structured context of larger understandings, fades fast.

For these and other reasons, the Hampshire academic program does not view education as an evaluated accretion of course-units of knowledge, nor does it assess a student's education in customary terms. Instead, the College has a very limited set of absolute academic requirements which all students must meet in order to graduate. These are:

- (1. The Division I basic field and integrative examinations noted in the preceding section.
- (2. The Division II intermediate School examination, other field examinations, and the integrative examination noted in the preceding section.
- (3. The Division III advanced School examination, and advanced integrative examination.
- (4. The completion and School acceptance of a Division III intensive independent study or project.
- (5. The Foreign Language Examination, an individual demonstration of oral-aural competence in understanding and speaking a language other than English. This examination may be taken at any time prior to two months before graduation, suitable to the readiness of the student and the convenience of examiners.

No courses in the Hampshire College academic program are in the ordinary sense required for graduation. Outside accreditation and other demands aside, it would be possible in academic principle for an admitted Hampshire student to receive his baccalaureate degree without attending any seminars or courses, if (a) he and his advisors considered him realistically able to attempt all of the five requirements noted above, and (b) he could satisfactorily demonstrate this ability.

Such a case would be rare, to say the least. The point that this

extreme example illustrates, however, is that the academic program of courses and studies can be abridged or modified. It is not rigid and unyielding, either in its common courses or its elective ones. On the other hand, abridgment or modification is not a matter of absolute free choice by the student. He may propose abridgments or modifications, but appropriate faculty will determine whether his proposals are realistic in connection with his preparation to meet the fundamental academic requirements at his highest potential level of performance.

With the five fundamental requirements noted above as the only central *academic* criteria of student progress through the College, it is likely that some students may receive their degrees in less than the usual four years. Others may take a longer time, either because of a need for further learning or because of off-campus leaves.

The eventual nature of the required examinations, intensive advanced studies, and individual advanced projects will be determined by faculty in consultation with outside examiners. All examinations and advanced studies will be either School (field) or inter-School in character, in the sense that they will examine in disciplines as related to a context of other disciplines. They will not be departmental “comprehensives” or narrow course subject finals. As the 1958 Plan suggested, “breadth of factual knowledge will be required, some of it acquired independently; and the ability to apply analytical skills to large areas of subject matter will be tested” (1958, p. 22). Outside examiners will assist in evaluating the fundamental examinations, studies, and projects, thus helping to assure that students will be held to recognized standards, and that faculty will benefit from detached judgment of their students' work.

While Hampshire's academic program does not compel a sequenced fulfillment of courses, and rejects the concept of course-unit accumulation as the criterion of educational progress, it does present each student with a coherent academic offering in each Division. Some of these are specified in provisional form in the next chapter.

The College recommends that each student take the fullest advantage of such offerings, including common courses intended for all students and optional courses intended for special interests and needs. This recommendation is based on the premise that the divisional offerings will enable students to gain background, analytical and methodological skills, synoptic views, and powers of synthesis which they will need in meeting

the College's fundamental requirements. The College considers that a four-year program of basic seminars, lecture-student seminars, lecture-demonstrations, independent study, and advanced seminars provides an essential framework for the academic program.

Students, as noted, may on occasion find it desirable and possible to abridge or lengthen this sequence. The policy of the College to allow sanctioned leaves or student sabbaticals in any case will require the four-year framework to be subject to amendment for individual students.

Examinations may be given in courses where faculty find them useful. Only three categories of grades, as suggested by the 1958 Plan, will be used: fail, pass, and distinction. No grades, however, will be more than advisory to the student and helpful to his faculty counselors, except the grades on the fundamental Division examinations, studies and projects. Grades in the latter instances will be determinative.

The usual program for a student in any semester will be the equivalent of three full courses. Division I courses will vary in size of enrollment but in general will emphasize the use of tutorials and small groups in order to give entering students direct experience with scholars actively exploring limited subject matter, and to allow students maximum immediate involvement in inquiry and discourse. Division II courses will have some small faculty-led seminar work, but will emphasize larger lectures combined with student-led seminars, and independent studies under faculty supervision. Division III courses, or equivalents, will be as noted earlier.

Degrees will be awarded *rite*, *cum laude*, *magna cum laude*, and *summa cum laude*.

8. THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM

The College requirement for every student to pass a proficiency examination in speaking and listening comprehension in a language other than English was noted in the preceding section.* The required level of

*This requirement runs counter to the 1958 Plan which eliminated any language requirement for graduation "in the conviction that students who take a language on compulsion and without aptitude gain too little from the experience to justify what it costs them and the College." See pp. 26-27 of the 1958 Plan. The 1966 Educational Advisory Committee Report made a similar recommendation, but with somewhat less certainty. See pp. 38-41 of the 1966 Report.

specific performance in this examination will be determined by faculty, but it is intended to insure that each Hampshire graduate will be capable of a reasonable even if limited fluency in conversation in another modern tongue.* There is no College requirement for foreign language course study, but the College program contains many opportunities for students to increase their proficiency in other languages. These are touched upon in subsequent discussion.

For admission to Hampshire College, students ordinarily will have completed no less than three years of high school study in one of the modern foreign languages, most often French, German, Spanish, Russian, or Italian. At entrance, a student ordinarily should have already scored satisfactorily in the College Entrance Examination Board Achievement Test in the language of his high school program.

In those cases where, because of special conditions of his background, a student has not had such high school preparation, it will be possible for him to take an intensive summer course in elementary language, complemented by scheduled special training in the Foreign Language Laboratory.

Course experimentation in elementary language instruction during the academic year will likewise provide such students with opportunities. An example of such an experiment is described in Appendix IV of the 1966 Report:

... a recent innovation at MIT for Italian merits the attention of the planning committee. There a two-semester course in Dante is given, in the original, for students who have *never* had any Italian before. A first unit is devoted to an intensive presentation of the most irreducible essentials. Then the students, with the help of several dictionaries, reference books, and even translations, start in reading *The Divine Comedy*. By the end of the year, they have learned a tremendous lot of Italian, and have made a commitment to one of the greatest masterpieces of literature. . . .

*An exception to this general requirement may be made with students whose secondary school preparation has been in ancient languages, and who desire to continue in these languages at the college level. Students desiring Latin and/or Greek in the College, either as electives or as concentrations, may be enabled to do so by arrangement with other institutions.

Such elementary course experimentation in the regular academic year will be limited at Hampshire, however, because extensive course offerings in foreign languages are not part of the Hampshire plan.

In seeming paradox, the Hampshire College academic program gives intense attention to foreign language learning, but in special ways.

a. *The Foreign Language Laboratory*

A subsequent chapter on the College community and its campus design details the installation and operation of a high-capability language laboratory in Hampshire's School of Language Studies. The College intends to have the most modern and well-equipped laboratory it can develop. The laboratory will provide electronic systems and instructional programs for group and self-instruction in elementary and intermediate foreign language according to need during the academic year. Its resources will be managed by the Director of Foreign Language Studies with the assistance of a staff which will be small in the fall and spring terms and substantially larger in the summer. The permanent staff will include part-time or joint-appointment faculty, technical assistants for laboratory operation (some of whom will be student associates or interns from Hampshire and the other institutions), and native-speaking part-time assistants to act as tutors. Students may elect group or independent foreign language study as part of their regular three-course programs after completion of Division I. It will be possible, of course, for them to make voluntary use of the laboratory for individual reviews, brush-ups, and other purposes.

b. *The Intensive Summer Language Institutes*

One of the most prominent features of the Hampshire academic program is its intention to serve its own students, those who may be interested from the other four institutions, and students from elsewhere (ranging in age from their early teens or younger to late adulthood, and including independent students as well as those who may be enrolled in regular institutions)* in special summer programs.

*One model for such a range is the summer program of the University of Poitiers at Tours, where a class group has been known to include a ten-year-old English boy, a fifteen-year-old American boy, a twenty-four-year-old Australian girl, and a sixty-six-year-old Turkish businessman—as well as a number of others—all taking elementary French by the “direct method.”

It is likely that, at least in the beginning, the Hampshire Foreign Language Institutes will be a small experimental program.* In time, the intention of the College is to build a highly active, large-scale summer program. One purpose will be to give Hampshire and other students who desire it intensive experience in elementary, intermediate, and advanced study *and use* of foreign languages. A second purpose will be to create, among the five institutions of the Valley, a unique and strong instructional service which will contribute to the educational resources of the five-college complex in a significant way. A third purpose will be, for a period of eight weeks, to make use of facilities at Hampshire which would otherwise stand vacant and idle. It is economically essential for the College to make as nearly full year-round use of its plant (residential as well as academic facilities) as possible.

The Hampshire Foreign Language Institutes will *not* be of the nature of usual “summer schools.” They will instead be *total-culture simulations*, somewhat in the sense the 1966 Committee Report suggested:

. . . taught exclusively by native speakers in a simulated foreign atmosphere in which students pledge themselves to hear and speak nothing but the language of their choice. . . (The 1966 Report, p. 42)

If Spanish, for example, were the focus of an Institute, the simulation would perhaps take the following form, including elementary, intermediate, and advanced programs. One of the Houses (see the chapter on the College community and campus design) would be, in effect and as far as possible, converted into an Hispanic environment. All students of the Spanish Institute would live in the House cluster, as would their faculty. The dining hall would, to the degree feasible, serve food characteristic of Spanish and Latin American cuisine, *paella* instead of pork chops. Students and faculty would take all meals in the House. *Decor* would be altered in inexpensive but striking ways to increase the sense of being in a Spanish setting. All bulletin boards, announcements, directions, and the like would be solely in Spanish. Music available would be Latin; recreation activities, sports, and social customs would reflect Spanish culture; a modest House library of Spanish materials would re-

*In initial summers, it is planned to concentrate on only one Western European language and with a relatively small enrollment.

place any other House library collection; a news store would sell only Spanish-language newspapers, periodicals, and paperbacks. All conversation and all instruction would be in Spanish. Teaching would be done exclusively by faculty native to the tongue. This would mean assembling a temporary faculty from Spain, Latin America, or other parts of the United States.

A higher faculty-student ratio than that in the regular academic year would be needed. Tutorials and small-group instruction would be the predominant pedagogical mode. On frequent occasions, students would attend lectures, motion pictures, and other presentations in larger groups. All formal and informal instruction not requiring the laboratory would occur in the academic and lounge facilities of the House. The laboratory would, of course, be used daily.

Tests in the ordinary sense would be minimized. A Hampshire student desiring to complete his required language examination, however, might well do so through the Institute. Tuition charges for the Institute would at minimum equal those for one-half of a regular semester; room and board fees would approximate those for a similar period.

This description of a Spanish Institute as a total-culture simulation is abbreviated and oversimplified; it serves only as an illustration of the College's intent. Actual Institutes would be a matter for careful planning by the permanent foreign language staff of Hampshire during the regular academic year and for detailed management during the summer term. After the College's initial experimentation with an intensive summer program of this kind, it would be desirable and possible to mount several Institutes in different languages in each summer. Adjustment of certain of the Institutes to serve the teacher training purposes of the National Defense Education Act could be a useful service. The dual aim is to achieve as comprehensive summer offerings in language as the College can provide at a level of high quality, and to achieve as full summer use of campus plant as possible.

c. *The Opportunity for Language Study Abroad*

Hampshire students, because of the College's encouragement of sanctioned leaves and student sabbaticals, may find it convenient and useful to incorporate any further language proficiency development they need

in residence abroad. At this stage, the College has no plans for establishing its own centers overseas as many other institutions have done. But Hampshire students financially able to do so will have opportunity to arrange academic and residence programs in other countries with the assistance of the College.