

Introduction

This document articulates narrative themes pertinent to strategic planning that emerged from telephone and face-to-face interviews, conversations, and meetings among Keeling & Associates, LLC (K&A) and Hampshire College faculty, students, administrators, staff, members of the Board of Trustees, and alumni between late August and early December, 2013.

In this summary, we do not attribute comments or quotations to any source or identify meetings in which any comment or quotation was made. We do not attempt to record every comment made; the purpose of developing themes from abundant narrative data is to identify the ideas, issues, and concerns that are heard most frequently and with the most energy and passion. When it is important to clarify the frequency or intensity of comments, we do so using phrases such as “participants [commonly] [often] [occasionally] said..” or “a few participants noted that...” We use quotation marks when we cite statements verbatim; the appearance of quoted words, phrases, or whole comments in the summary indicates that we heard them many times, either exactly as quoted or in very similar words, across the many discussions held.

Narrative themes are inevitably overlapping, and some elements of the text are necessarily redundant. Individuals understand and use language in different ways, so words like “mission,” “identity,” and “purpose” may not have exactly the same meanings to all. Similarly, assessments and descriptions of the intensity, importance, or severity of conditions, situations, problems, and issues vary extensively among individuals and may be influenced by the tone of discussions in groups. We encourage readers of this summary to keep in mind that what follows is a record of subjective statements made in various contexts by more than 500 people over nearly four months of conversations; it is not an objective, evidence-based analysis of any of the issues identified in the themes.

Appendix A is a comprehensive list of the participants (individuals and groups) with whom K&A held these telephone and face-to-face conversations.

Overarching Theme: Sustainability

Across the many meetings, interviews, and discussions held by phone and on campus, the most consistent overarching theme that emerged was one of multidimensional sustainability—not just fiscal and financial sustainability, nor even environmental sustainability alone, but also educational, academic, faculty, enrollment, and student sustainability as understood and measured in multiple ways. Core concerns about resources, facilities, pedagogy, enrollment of the “right” number and type of students, retention, faculty creativity and workloads, staff and operational effectiveness, and the College’s carbon footprint all point toward this overarching priority. Making Hampshire sustainable has emerged as the key challenge for this strategic planning cycle.

Theme: Mission, Identity, and Differentiation

There are multiple different ways in which Hampshire’s identity, mission, and purpose are understood and articulated. These differences complicate the College’s ability to communicate consistently and persuasively about Hampshire’s goals, its strengths and accomplishments, and what makes the College distinctive. This makes it difficult to specify, describe, and communicate what kind of potential student is “right” for Hampshire, and how the “right” students should be identified and recruited.

Sub-theme: Mission

The existing mission statement, as represented on Hampshire’s website, is disputed on various grounds, especially among faculty. Draft revisions of the mission statement developed during the 2011 strategic planning process have not been widely discussed, endorsed, or publicized. Participants in many meetings said they could not remember what the current mission statement says. There was common agreement that consensus about the College’s core values and mission must precede determination of how it is distinctive and that values, mission, and a clear understanding of Hampshire’s distinctiveness must inform messages and communications that attempt to differentiate Hampshire from other liberal arts colleges and describe the factors that make students “right” for admission.

In many discussions of mission, the concepts of “transformation,” “changing students so they can change the world,” “lifelong learning,” and “making a difference in the world” were common. One formulation of a revised mission statement discussed at a meeting of the Monday Group was:

The mission of Hampshire College is to foster a lifelong passion for (or love of) critical inquiry and learning, social engagement and ethical citizenship that inspires students to contribute to positive change, social justice and well-being in the world.

Sub-theme: Identity, distinctiveness, and differentiation

Hampshire values its distinctiveness and considers it a strength of the College. However, members of the College community generally find it difficult to articulate exactly how Hampshire is distinctive and therefore how it can most effectively differentiate itself from other institutions. Characterizations of “what Hampshire does” and “what Hampshire means” vary widely. Therefore there is no universally accepted way to describe and promote Hampshire internally or externally. Students, echoing concerns of both faculty and staff, said that the College “needs to improve its overall image” and that it fails to successfully communicate “what we’re about.”

Discussions of the characteristics of the “right” Hampshire student were common in our meetings. Differences in views were common but generally subtle; more consistent were problems in expressing a coherent view of those characteristics. Students made suggestions such as these:

- Self-motivated. “If you need someone to breathe down your neck, this is not the place for you.”
- People who don’t want to follow the traditional path.
- People who want the world to be different.
- People who aren’t afraid to follow their own ideas.
- “Not just the weird kids from high school—students who think and want to lead.”

One dean suggested this formulation: “The ideal Hampshire student is very strong academically or is able to get there fairly quickly. This is a student who is asking critical questions that her or his peers aren't even considering. This student is able to take on

projects out of her or his own initiative, and is able to work well collaboratively. This student yearns to make a difference and knows that education is for life.” But some staff expressed concern about using the language of “the right Hampshire student” as it may be exclusive to certain historically underrepresented identity groups and populations.

Reactions varied in meetings—particularly with staff—regarding Hampshire’s representations and formulations of its own identity. This included the basis and purpose of the “four pillars” (creativity, sustainability, social justice, and entrepreneurship) proposed by the President; when participants raised the topic of the four pillars in meetings, they were rarely able to name all four or speak comprehensively about how they may or may not align with Hampshire's identity.

The discussion of distinctiveness often turned to Hampshire’s value proposition: What can/does Hampshire provide that makes it worth the investment? What justifies an investment in Hampshire, rather than in one of its peer institutions? Responses to those questions, asked by participants of each other, varied but tended toward affirmations of certain core educational principles—self-directed study, close engagement of students with faculty, interdisciplinary learning, and narrative evaluations, especially. Intellectual rigor was often advanced as a differentiating feature by both students and faculty; participants in all categories emphasized the “generative,” “mutual,” “amazing,” and “student-centered” nature of faculty-student learning relationships, often stating that those relationships are at the core of Hampshire’s distinctiveness. The combination of self-directed learning and “apprentice-like” relationships with faculty was often linked to descriptions of a Hampshire education as highly customized, tailored, or “artisanal.” Students shared that Hampshire’s innovative educational model was what differentiated Hampshire from other schools and attracted them to the College; they said they came to Hampshire because of the “ability to make it your own thing,” “create your own major,” “the lack of standardized testing,” and “it [an education at Hampshire] would really push my buttons.”

Some participants questioned the degree to which the distinctive characteristics of a Hampshire education, no matter how they are phrased, remain attractive in the current marketplace of higher education. Some interviewees asked whether faculty are willing to gather the requisite data to test Hampshire’s value proposition. If the College were to find that today’s students aren’t looking for what Hampshire offers, then is the College willing to change the value proposition?

Sub-theme: Fidelity to principles and values

In several meetings, faculty and staff said they felt Hampshire was “slipping away” from its core values in various ways. Some staff questioned how the College’s stated values match its practices. “How do we assess how we are espousing and realizing those values?” They stated that figuring out and reaffirming Hampshire’s values is going to be a “critical step” in the strategic plan. This “slip” was often described as a “drift,” and sometimes specifically as “mission drift.”

One example of “slipping away” from core values frequently cited in different settings was the use of primarily quantitative measures and criteria for admission of students. “How can a college that depends on narrative evaluations of students be satisfied with the use of GPA and SAT scores as the most important criteria for admission?” Similarly, others observed that the pressure to admit larger classes had resulted in significant “mission drift” — admitting too many students, students who are not prepared, students who do not match Hampshire’s distinctive models and features, all of that causing stress on the pedagogical and education approaches, and producing various “work-arounds” that are not mission-centered. Faculty spoke frequently of an increasing lack of preparedness for Hampshire’s unique model of study among newly admitted students. They regard these students as taking up the bulk of their (faculty) time in class, potentially to the detriment of more academically talented students—some of whom become frustrated by the resulting lack of faculty support, become disillusioned, and transfer out of Hampshire. Many faculty worried that these underprepared or poorly matched students were admitted to meet the financial needs of the College and not because they are an appropriate academic “fit” for Hampshire. These observations often led to conversations about who is the “ideal Hampshire student” and how Hampshire should go about communicating to—as well as admitting, enrolling, retaining, teaching, and graduating—these students.

Sub-theme: Restoration of spirit of innovation and experimentation in education

A participant in an open meeting reflected that “there is a problem of how we see our legacy and future. If our legacy is continued approximation and experimentation then that process is stalled.” This observation was mirrored by many comments made by faculty and staff in other sessions. “It used to be more, us versus the world, and that’s quite bonding. It brings cohesion automatically. And now everyone is more similar to us, we

don't have a foe to fight anymore," shared one staff member, reflecting the concerns expressed by many faculty and staff in other meetings. Many participants noted that what Hampshire did that was innovative and pathbreaking in the 1970s and 1980s has now been widely adopted in other institutions, and not just in liberal arts colleges. Several participants challenged the premise that Hampshire continues to be experimenting, as the community is "consistently resistant to change, novelty, and viewpoints from outside Hampshire."

Faculty commonly expressed their aspiration to once again "break the mold" at Hampshire, and in higher education more generally—a desire to be radically innovative again. In several iterations of that discussion, however, many faculty thought that "breaking the mold" might be "remaking (or reassembling) the mold"—that is, going back to Hampshire's core educational principles and returning to what the College does best, which those participants thought it no longer can consistently do given faculty workload demands, changes in the characteristics and needs of students, enrollment policies, and the pressure to "make budget."

A concept that gradually gained traction over the course of discussions during our campus visits was the desire for a "paradigm shift" about the educational model at Hampshire, from one focused on teaching to one that is driven by a greater focus on learning. One faculty member described this as "a shift from counting contact hours and professors in each area to what students are actually getting out of it...the administrative system would mirror educational values." This concept gained support from others in those discussions; some faculty noted that such a shift could contribute to defining Hampshire as a college of "transformative education" and support its differentiation from other institutions of higher learning.

Sub-theme: Entrepreneurship at Hampshire

We heard very varied reactions in meetings on the topic of entrepreneurship and what a focus on entrepreneurship means for Hampshire—especially on the point of whether entrepreneurship should be regarded, or developed, as a differentiating feature of Hampshire. Reactions included skepticism (or pessimism) about entrepreneurship because of its character as a traditional business practice that "leaves out the arts and humanities"; concern over how the concepts of entrepreneurship and social justice overlap and may

contradict each other; and how “faculty are excited” and “alumni feel connected” with the idea of entrepreneurship (especially social entrepreneurship) initiatives developing on campus.

Related efforts are currently the domain of the Entrepreneurship Task Force and its student-run steering committee. Task Force members with whom K&A met expressed optimism in determining how Hampshire can and should provide the ideal structures to support entrepreneurship efforts (e.g. “Is that a physical center? If so, what does that space look like and where does it live? How are we leveraging our alumni network with it? How do we supplement, nurture, and support Hampshire’s entrepreneurial nature?”) The President’s support of entrepreneurship—including making it one of the four pillars he proposed—was seen by some staff as “validating it at Hampshire” and creating a “night and day difference in traction.” The \$1 million Seed Fund for Entrepreneurship and Innovation (a gift from a 1975 graduate) has also raised the visibility of this concept on campus.

Theme: College Culture—Getting Things Done

Participants frequently identified barriers to change, efficiency, velocity, and progress at Hampshire.

- Staff, especially, shared that Hampshire can feel “disjointed” and that “our focus has never been focused.” “We need to have an institutional view of things”; “Nothing is universal here.” One participant noted that “there has always been a bit of balkanization here.” “We have developed a lot of programs and departments that spend a lot of time with themselves. We’ve lost the common thread we had back at the beginning when all people played from the same playbook.” Staff described a “scattershot approach to programming” and thought that Hampshire should focus on a few things that it knows it does very well.
- There is a strong desire to reach consensus before making any decision because any group that does not feel included will not buy into any change. However, this makes it very difficult to make changes that will bring about improvements or solve problems (and

there is often a lack of consensus about what the problems are, or what improvements are needed, or what changes are justified).

- The lack of systematic approaches in College operations creates challenges with Hampshire's communications to off-campus entities and community partners. Hampshire's inclusive processes have permitted an informal system of representation in the media to develop in which "anyone—students, faculty, or staff—can potentially communicate on behalf of the College."
- Students generally believe in the importance of the student voice and are not hesitant to protest or engage in "activist behavior" when they do not feel included or disapprove of something. The Re-Radicalization of Hampshire, or Re-Rad, student group was concerned about the selection of students for the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC), since the first three students were appointed and not elected by the larger student body.
- There is significant concern about the ability to reach consensus on a small set of priorities in the current planning process; the 2011 strategic planning process was heavily community-based and generated 100+ ideas but they were never "winnowed" down and therefore were never implemented or tracked. Little was done to communicate back to the Hampshire community about what happened to those ideas. The "final" plan identified and shared with K&A was still marked as a draft.
- One faculty member described the College as having become "heavy and leaden" and "lacking in agility, fluidity, and the ability to think creatively." Others said there is a desire among their colleagues to be able to make "curricular decisions without placating everyone." Faculty and staff commonly shared their concern over the high number of committee assignments and the time devoted to committee work because of Hampshire's governance assumptions and structures.
- Hampshire lacks widely understood structures and processes for developing and designing programs and determining "where they fit" within the College. This is not regarded as entirely negative, as ideas for new programs and initiatives may not encounter bureaucratic barriers, which may allow creativity to flourish. However, the process of program development tends to be focused on a specific initiative or area and

not strategically developed within the greater context of the College. “We decide first and plan later.” Staff shared concern that this process imperils the sustainability of programs already in existence as competition increases for limited resources. It also raises questions about the relationships between new programs and the five Schools. Some participants observed that many programs are not housed in a specific academic area but are often more “tied to a School or a faculty member.” One staff member summarized this as an “idea of interdisciplinary versus established little ivory towers.” Staff discussed hearing concerns about the College’s culture and operations from community partners: “Do we know that our individualized systems are a pain in the ass for communities trying to work with us?”

- Internal communications and information-sharing are a concern at some level for all categories of participants. Participants described a lack of awareness of various staff and faculty programming efforts. Some staff thought this may be complicated by the lack of an effective calendaring system. Students expressed frustration with the different systems they need to use to sign up and register with separate offices (e.g., Health and Counseling Services, CASA). One student thought it would be beneficial to have a manual for Hampshire because “we have sketchy outlines of procedures on how to do things.”

Theme: Enrollment Patterns, Policies, and Practices

After some very distressing enrollment results in recent years, admissions efforts have expanded substantially. Hampshire has been working on building the inquiry pool, increasing the number of applicants, increasing travel for Admissions staff, and improving marketing of the College. These efforts have resulted in the highest inquiry pool in many years and an overall enrollment of >1,400 students (N=1450 for 2013/2014). Achieving that number of students—and balancing the budget—required admitting 40+ students during the summer “melt” period in 2013. In recent years, 60-70% of applicants have been admitted, but yield (% of admitted students who enroll) has dropped progressively and is now below 20%. Only 7% of the entering class in 2013 is paying full tuition, room, and board fees. Hampshire is engaged in a strategic enrollment consultation with Noel-Levitz; their representative, who was on campus when K&A visited in mid-October, apparently

offered a very bleak perspective that concerned and depressed many members of the senior leadership team.

We heard many times from staff that Hampshire is “not the first choice school” for most students; an administrator said “we’re usually second, third, or worse.” However, Re-Rad students with whom we met spoke very highly of Hampshire and most indicated that it was their top choice. Several participants noted that if Hampshire is not the “first choice school” for most of its entering classes, it may be that some students do not consider its educational model at all—and therefore what is probably its most distinctive feature—when deciding whether or not to attend.

Admissions staff and some faculty and students said that some students leave Hampshire because they are not prepared for the level of academic rigor required at the College. When they leave, however, they too often “take with them” the top performing students—who, several faculty and staff said, are frustrated that not all students in their classes can keep up.

A large proportion of participants in our interviews—and a proportion that progressively grew larger over the course of our visits—questioned whether Hampshire is marketing itself in the right way to the right students. Many wondered if potential and admitted students do not fully understand how much responsibility they will have to assume in their own education. Others believe there are many high school students who would flourish at Hampshire but that never hear about it. Many participants in all categories affirmed that “there are certainly at least 1,000 students every year who would be ‘right’ for Hampshire.”

Increasing enrollments are a cause of major and serious concern for many on campus, especially faculty. Common concerns relate to the caliber of entering students, the degree to which their academic interests align with Hampshire’s programs, and their preparedness to successfully engage in Hampshire’s academic model. The perception is that the student demographic model is shifting to an increased proportion of students who are less prepared for the rigors of a Hampshire education and have less of an ability to pay for it (so, as noted above, both yield and the percentage of full-pay students are down). Some are also concerned that Hampshire is not accurately being described to many of those students (a frequently cited example: students enrolling in Hampshire in fall 2013 who are interested in a focus on engineering).

In the view of a large number of faculty and many staff, significantly increasing the size of the student body is not a viable strategic option for Hampshire, regardless of the question of tuition dependency to create financial sustainability, because of the very nature of Hampshire's curricular, educational, mentoring, and advising models. There is a sharp division in views between most members of the faculty who participated in our meetings and some administrators who advocate increasing size as a fundamental strategy for long-term viability. Faculty are deeply concerned about the impact of larger classes on their workload and the time needed to support academically underprepared students. They note that increased enrollment results in difficulty sustaining and applying Hampshire's traditional pedagogical models, especially divisional committee work and advising/mentoring and fear that larger classes will abolish the desired 12:1 ratio of students to faculty. They also point out that Hampshire's faculty complement and unique Division I, II, and III structure should limit the size of the student body, since more students enrolled results in a greater number of students needing to identify Division II and III committee chairs—faculty face larger class sizes and experience an increase in workload through their involvement on student committees.

It is not just the *number* of students, but the characteristics and needs of current students that are serious concerns for many, or most, faculty. Faculty members often described having to advise or counsel students in ways that were more like support “or even therapy” than educational and academic mentoring. They spoke passionately of the “diversion” of energy from teaching and learning to “taking care of” students, especially given the number of students with mental health concerns and challenges. Similarly, they described the challenges of working with students on self-directed, individualized projects when those students had inadequate basic preparation in writing, quantitative methods, and “thinking itself.” “We are no longer admitting enough of the ‘right’ students because we can’t say who they are or seem to find them, and we’re pulling in far too many students who shouldn’t be here,” one senior faculty member said; others, agreeing, added that they and their colleagues “aren’t prepared to provide and shouldn’t be expected to provide the kind of support, personally or educationally, that those students need.” Another faculty member summarized these concerns by describing their effects on her and her colleagues: “We’re exhausted. We’re all exhausted. And the better students suffer for it.”

Several other respondents in our interviews emphasized the existence of broad areas of inequity among faculty members regarding numbers of advisees or mentored students.

Faculty discussed challenges with the current divisional committee system burning out the most popular and talented faculty members. Several faculty expressed serious concern that workload is not evenly distributed among faculty members: “Those faculty in demand get more demanded of them. Those without demand get less demand put on them.” Some shared that faculty do not need to be scholars in a particular discipline in order to serve on a student’s Division II or III committee, even if the student’s project is focused in that discipline. Others agreed and observed that a greater understanding among faculty on this point could help distribute divisional committee roles when there is a concentration of students in one particular academic area or discipline.

Faculty strongly believe there is a need for greater alignment of goals between the faculty and Admissions; as it is, some faculty—the majority in some meetings—perceive Admissions as working toward goals that are obverse to theirs. This discussion occurs within the context of what faculty say are frequent messages from the administration about dangers to fiscal sustainability, budget pressures, and the need to “get enough butts in seats.” One faculty member, in words that reflect similar views expressed by many others, said “It’s all about the money, not the quality of the students.” This issue was frequently addressed in discussions with the faculty and was cited as an important source of distrust between faculty and senior College administrators.

Theme: Faculty and Staff Workloads

Faculty, staff, and students all repeatedly expressed concern about the high level of workload they experience themselves and that they observe in each other. This was most pronounced in discussions with and about faculty. Many faculty described feelings of “burnout” and expressed sadness, anger, or disappointment about the ways in which their teaching and governance workloads prevented them from devoting needed time to creative, scholarly, and research pursuits. One faculty member said, “As an artist, I can no longer create; there’s no time.” Another, in parallel: “I’m supposed to keep my mind and teaching alive through research and writing, but when am I going to do that when there’s always a line of students out the door?” A long-term faculty member observed that “It has definitely changed. I used to enjoy bringing students to my home or meeting with them over coffee somewhere, but now I’m just too tired from all the meetings—sometimes I have to see the same student several hours a week, every week.”

We heard that “Young faculty are on the verge of a breakdown.” One mid-level faculty member said she would leave—as a result of tremendous and “overwhelming” workload—if not for an upcoming sabbatical. It is not just the educational and advising work that creates stressful demands on faculty; many also feel burdened by the committee structure. Some faculty expressed how this burden feels heightened given the culture of “everyone having to be represented on every decision as well as a distrust of authority.” Faculty of color shared distinct challenges related to expectations for them to attend Admissions events and meet with students of color on top of their already heavy workload.

K&A observed that faculty, especially, seemed tired; their concern about workloads was among the most consistently heard comments in our meetings. One administrator spoke of this kind of observation in a meeting by sharing, “I think students are picking up on our fatigue. I don’t see time from faculty to have social moments with students. Students apologize when they come to make an appointment.” Some students shared these observations regarding high faculty workload and noted that faculty are not “role modeling balance” to them.

Staff also shared that they experience a high level of work; some expressed a perception that while Hampshire focuses on faculty and student workload that it does not recognize similar challenges for staff. One staff member stated, “it feels like we aren’t supposed to ask things of the faculty because we’re so busy here.” Some Admissions staff noted that the very high workload created by expanding the “funnel” of applicants reduces their ability to do thoughtful evaluations of applicants’ credentials and drives them toward the use of “simple-minded” metrics.

Theme: Faculty Hiring and Retention

Various members of the faculty shared several kinds of concerns about faculty recruitment, hiring, policy, and retention, including especially (1) questions about Hampshire’s equity model; (2) “taboos” regarding spousal hiring; (3) limited support and start-up resources, especially for international and science faculty; and (4) support for faculty professional development, including conferences.

- Some members of the faculty shared that the long-standing equity model does not allow flexibility in creating attractive hiring packages, especially for faculty of color and from under-represented groups; similarly, several other faculty noted that the equity model prevents recognition of superior work and disallows merit pay in any form. But other faculty vigorously defended the equity model, saying it prevented “valuing one discipline over others.”
- While there is apparently no College policy in place forbidding spousal hiring, several faculty members expressed their concern that the practice is “culturally discouraged” at Hampshire. They shared that raising conversations on this topic are “shut down right away” and result in a feeling that even the topic, “never mind the policy,” of spousal hires is “taboo.” The absence of faculty consultation in one instance of spousal hiring was frequently cited as an historical reason for cultural resistance to the practice. But faculty who questioned this resistance to spousal hires noted that, as one said, “Whether it is a policy or just a practice, it goes against common sense when it keeps us from hiring really gifted faculty.” Several others also noted that the “implied prohibition” against spousal hires “makes life more difficult than it needs to be when [a faculty member’s] spouse or partner has to take a job hundreds of miles away since there is no possibility here.”
- Some faculty members shared that new faculty are “disadvantaged” by not having access to housing on campus. This may then directly disadvantage faculty of color and international faculty who are less likely to be longer term, or senior, faculty members. Similarly, faculty often expressed serious concern about limited new faculty start-up funds and hiring packages, the very restricted annual professional development funds available to faculty (\$1,500), and limited support offered to assist international faculty with transitioning to Hampshire. We were told that in 2013, the Office of the President determined how to support international faculty with obtaining a visa, but faculty shared concerns that this is a recent addition and that no financial resources for interim or temporary housing exist to help international faculty in transitioning to the United States.
- Anticipated faculty retirements present both opportunities and challenges to the College. As members of an experimenting institution, Hampshire’s faculty often said they seek to be both flexible and visionary in envisioning what education might look like in the future and how this will be shaped at the College by changes in faculty. Challenges persist,

however, because of uncertainty about how the College's pedagogical infrastructure, which is very demanding of faculty time, will manage faculty transitions.

Theme: Student Well-Being

Administrators, faculty, staff, and, often, students themselves expressed several concerns about the well-being of students, as whole persons, during their enrollment at Hampshire.

Sub-theme: Social Isolation

Administrators, faculty, and staff shared concerns about students' feeling of isolation. They shared observations that these feelings may be more pronounced for first-year Division I students who are learning to transition to Hampshire (and usually living in single rooms) and for Division III students due to their very narrow focus on their division project. Some participants observed that Hampshire attracts students who are "very free-spirited" and "often are alienated in their high school"; they repeat that pattern upon enrolling at Hampshire. "There is a lot of isolation for such a small place."

Staff are concerned about how isolation and lack of a strong sense of community affect student retention. Staff reported hearing from students that the academic program is the most functional part of the whole college, but they "can't stand the social life." They perceive that this lack of a vibrant social life and solid sense of community may affect students' decisions to stay enrolled at Hampshire. Some staff referenced a recent Admissions event where the parent of a potential student questioned Hampshire's feeling of community. A student panelist responded to this question and spoke to Hampshire students creating community "in a different way" here. Students described that at Hampshire students organize themselves into "tiny groups of students that are passionate about certain subjects" or self-identify as a member of a certain identity group, and these groups tend not to interact with each other. "That's why students say they feel lonely," one student opined: "they are supported by their immediate group, but everybody feels they are in the minority." As many as 20 percent of Hampshire students live off-campus but several staff members said, and some students agreed, said the College has no "commuter" or "off campus student" services to support them. One staff member

questioned how this undermines the development of community and engagement of those students in particular.

Staff suggested that students' feelings of isolation weaken the creation of community at Hampshire and that a lack of community contributes to a lack of respect for communal space. This may be demonstrated by such activities as leaving common areas "trashed" and smoking in the residence halls and mods despite the fact that this is clearly banned.

Although most comments about isolation referred to students, some faculty of color also shared that it is common for faculty who are new, international, or of color to feel isolated at Hampshire and that the College is lacking in support for them; they believe this results in a challenge to retaining faculty of color.

Sub-theme: Mental health concerns

Faculty and staff expressed serious concerns about many students' mental health in various interviews. These concerns embraced students' own welfare, the impact of mental health concerns on students' readiness to learn and effectiveness in learning, the specific interference caused by mental health problems with Hampshire's rigorous and demanding curriculum, the difficulty students with mental health challenges might feel in working within the College's self-directed educational models, the demands that mental health issues placed on counseling and advising services, the effects of mental health problems on retention of students, and the ways in which students' mental health needs affected faculty work and priorities. Several of these points are addressed in other sections of this summary.

Faculty and staff observed that the number of students with mental health needs (notably depression and anxiety) who attend Hampshire seems to be increasing (participants were generally aware that this is also a national trend). Several faculty expressed the view that the types of creative students that Hampshire attracts, admits, and enrolls may be more prone to mental health issues.

Students reported mixed opinions about the College's Health and Counseling Services. Some thought those services could "use a complete fixing" while others expressed positive experiences. Health and Counseling Services' location (not centrally located on

campus) and it being closed on weekends and weeknights were mentioned by students as frustrations.

Sub-theme: Alcohol and other drugs

Drug and alcohol use and abuse were topics of much debate between students, including varying perceptions about student drug use (e.g., “The use of drugs is out of control here,” versus an attitude that perception is worse than reality and that Hampshire student drug use is on par with that of peer institutions). One student observed that “drug culture perpetuates rape culture.” Some students complained that Hampshire administrators “fail to enforce the law,” while others linked drug use with the College’s “experimental” culture (“Who are we to judge?” one student said). In interviews, students shared that students transfer or drop out of Hampshire because of the perceived “drug culture” of the College. One staff member said that students who are substance free feel they have to “come out” as such at Hampshire. Many students, faculty, and staff expressed a concern that the perception of Hampshire as “drug-friendly” impairs recruitment and admissions efforts; in a number of our meetings, at least one participant described hearing concern from prospective students or their parents about sending their student to Hampshire because of some reference to drugs made during tours or informal conversations with current students. Several staff shared concerns that the perception of drug use may provide a unifying cultural element for students (despite the fact that actual rates of substance use are lower than they are perceived to be); they said that Hampshire students are generally proud of being different but “there are dangers to these stereotypes even though they have some unifying quality.”

Student smoking (both tobacco and marijuana) is regarded as problematic by many staff, faculty, and students. It was suggested to the consultants that smoking policy is such a controversial issue at Hampshire that invitations to strategic planning conversations should include intentionally provocative language on the topic in order to increase student attendance and participation in meetings.

Theme: Student support services

Students with whom we met regularly expressed ignorance or confusion about the roles, functions, and responsibilities of Student Life. Their reactions to questions about Student Life ranged from not knowing about the department or its place in the organization of the College to confusion about funding for student groups and how that funding is provided and monitored (e.g., FundCom). Students who said they are aware of Student Life generally seemed to be most knowledgeable about Campus Leadership and Activities (CLA), though some expressed their frustration with this operation, saying it is “heavily bureaucratic.” Students did not generally perceive a central or core role for Student Life in supporting their engagement with Hampshire. On the other hand, many students knew of, and had met, the Dean of Students, who is in his first year in the position; they said that the new Dean inspired their confidence, and they saw him as an advocate for their needs.

Sub-theme: Student preparedness after graduation

Students nearly universally spoke very highly of their Hampshire academic experience and of the engagement, helpfulness, and attention of faculty members with whom they studied. They expressed confidence that Hampshire was preparing them well for life after graduation. Faculty and staff also shared their perceptions that Hampshire graduates are effectively educated to weather challenges (e.g., changing economic circumstances) as graduates. Among all categories of participants, there were various reports of the successes of Hampshire graduates—a high proportion who go on to graduate study and complete master’s and doctoral degrees; entrepreneurs who start environmentally and/or socially-conscious businesses; artists and creators who work in various media; and a very low percentage of graduates who default on their student loans. In all of these discussions, there was vigorous defense of the value of Hampshire’s educational model as a strong foundation for any career and any pathway of graduate or professional study.

Recommendations for improvement focused on better retention (“They’re not well prepared if they don’t graduate.”) There were a few more specific suggestions, such as allocating more resources for internships because students who participate in internships “have a greater world context for their course of study” and because graduates who did internships are “more likely to come back to Hampshire and offer internship opportunities to current students.”

Theme: Quality, Quantity, and Functionality of Physical Space and Infrastructure

Students, faculty, and staff frequently shared concerns about the lack of sufficient on-campus physical space as well as the poor quality (including various maintenance concerns) and limited functionality of currently available space. These concerns embrace the full spectrum and diversity of classroom, laboratory, and academic support spaces; the library; recreation and activity spaces; galleries, practice and performance spaces; and on-campus housing, as well as communal spaces for gathering, socializing, and group meetings—not just for students, but for all members of the campus community. K&A experienced these challenges and limitations related to physical space on multiple occasions during our campus visits because of the difficulty of scheduling enough rooms in efficient proximity and with appropriate sizes and arrangements for various meetings.

- Deferred maintenance estimates are ~\$75M; currently, Hampshire makes small attempts as it can to address high-priority maintenance problems using operating funds. Administrators note that the lack of sizable alumni gifts and endowment income that sustain many small college campuses creates a gap that Hampshire must fill with its operating budget. In meetings with physical plant staff, we heard detailed reports of serious maintenance issues involving not only the physical structures of buildings themselves (including, notably, roofs), but also their electrical, mechanical, plumbing, telecommunications, and heating and ventilation systems. We learned that much of the College’s information technology hardware is used equipment purchased from resale websites. Several physical plant workers observed that the College’s commitment to sustainability was undermined by the loss of heating and cooling efficiency consequent to maintenance problems in old buildings and by the need to ferry personnel and equipment from an off-campus location to the College to conduct maintenance activities. They, like other observers, also commented on the difficulty that poor conditions in residence halls create for attempts to build community or reinforce the need for students to attend to their rooms and small gathering spaces. There is wide agreement among students, faculty, and staff that the poor conditions in residence halls of all types undermines Hampshire’s efforts to recruit and retain the “right” kinds of students; one staff member, articulating the concerns of many other participants, said, “After all, if you’re going to pay all that money for college, wouldn’t you at least expect a decent dorm room and someplace to sit and hang out with your friends? What parent

wants to send their kids [sic] to a place where the dorm furniture is so scarred and marked up?”

- Access to space, in addition to the quality and quantity of spaces, is a concern for many faculty, staff, and students as well. When K&A met with the Events Services and Summer Programs staff, we were unable to use the assigned room since the space was locked—but Events Services and Summer Programs is the operation tasked with managing room reservations. Coordination and control of access to space is a particular issue of concern regarding Prescott Tavern; many students spoke critically of policies and practices limiting their ability to use that facility. Many staff shared their experience that access and control of space is decentralized and “rather political” on campus. We heard a number of other examples to that point, including how the gallery space in the library is managed.
- The absence of a campus or student center was identified by students, Student Life staff, faculty, and others as a significant limitation for Hampshire that undermines recruiting, community building, retention, and academic productivity for students while “keeping faculty and staff isolated in their offices and rooms.” Staff stated that the lack of communal space creates a barrier for new members to the Hampshire community to form initial connections with each other; as a result, they report creating their own connections “remotely” or electronically because “there isn’t much [physical] infrastructure” with which to do so. Faculty in some larger Schools, especially HACU, noted that dispersion of their offices in different buildings undermines their ability to collaborate, build community within their own School, and uphold Hampshire’s commitment to interdisciplinary work; they suggested that some kind of campus center might at least offer ways to gather faculty and students for shared work on projects and provide facilities for faculty and staff meetings. Students were similarly concerned: “We need more places to just hang out. There is no campus center where students can get together.” Many students said they believed the absence of such a central gathering place was a major issue in the lack of a strong sense of community among students at Hampshire.
- Library staff noted that the library functions in some ways as a campus center as well as being an essential academic and learning resource (“the academic aorta” of Hampshire) and that it should be improved through the addition of a coffee shop, more “maker

spaces,” improved access to technology, and better facilities to support student-faculty work on shared creative, research, and scholarly projects. Among library staff there are plans for sequenced improvements to the library that depend not only on funding, but also on the construction of the new Campus Portal Building, to which would be relocated the bookstore now located in library.

- There is generally enthusiasm among most participants in our meetings for the creation of the planned new Campus Portal. This will be a new physical building, centrally located on campus, that Admissions believes will better “position” the College to prospective students and their families. It will also provide new meeting and gathering space for students, faculty, and staff, and will house the campus bookstore. There was, however, some dissonance about the projected location of the Portal; a location chosen by Hampshire administration (and championed by student groups) was different from one suggested by members of the Board of Trustees. We heard this issue had been resolved and the original location was selected. However, we later heard from senior administrators and members of the Campus Portal committee that this information was incorrect; a “hybrid site” was developed and presented by the building architects that was accepted by the Campus Portal committee and approved by the Board of Trustees.
- Among faculty, the single most commonly cited need for new construction was for a new science building; several faculty (and not only science faculty) specifically said that “the new science building is the most important thing for us to do” through the strategic planning process. At the same time, even faculty who spoke passionately about the need for improved educational and research facilities in a new science building often acknowledged that there are many other pressing needs—deferred maintenance and financial aid being most often cited—that might put development of a new science building lower in priority, and almost every faculty member who advocated a new science building also acknowledged that the costs of such a facility would likely put it outside the sphere of achievable goals for the next five years “unless a very concerned and very well funded donor comes along.”
- Staff strongly believe that space for health and counseling is sub-par and that it is located too far (on route 116) from the core areas of campus, especially the residential buildings. They spoke of examination rooms lacking things as basic as sinks, “problematic” noise levels, and a lack of sufficient privacy when seeing students. Both

the location and the quality of space are perceived as probable barriers for access and use of the health and counseling services by students; some students affirmed these observations, noting that “it’s a long way to walk on a sprained ankle,” for example.

- Similarly, Admissions staff noted that their location, which is near Health and Counseling Services, is far enough away from central campus to create significant barriers to participation in campus meetings and events; one staff member said it was “very difficult to know what’s going on up there” since the hour-to-hour demands of her position kept her focused on her computer and in her office; “It would be easier if it didn’t take so long to get there and back.” However, Admissions moving to a more central location with the construction of the Campus Portal is seen as a potential solution.
- Staff, especially, shared concerns related to the accessibility of many physical spaces at Hampshire. Buildings such as the library require a separate entrance for individuals using a wheelchair. Housing options for individuals using wheelchairs are very limited. Many buildings on campus are not easily (or at all) accessible. Several staff members shared that “disability” —when discussed— is generally grouped in either conversations about “diversity” or “deferred maintenance” at Hampshire. Students, staff, and faculty members with disabilities were characterized by several participants as being “an invisible minority.” Many faculty, staff, and students expressed frustration about the lack of attention to accessibility and to the needs of people with disabilities given Hampshire’s values of inclusion, diversity, and social justice. One staff members said, “How can we say we’re all about social justice when we look the other way about this?”
- “Safe spaces” for historically underrepresented identity groups are perceived by some groups of students as insufficient or lacking among current campus facilities. Space is also a significant concern for staff and students involved in spiritual life activities on campus; staff, which includes a contemplative life advisor, director of spiritual life, intercultural community advisor, and advisor for identity in praxis, along with students involved in various spiritual and contemplative life groups, occupy the same space— making it difficult to have private conversations including spiritual counseling along with larger group gatherings.

Theme: Multiculturalism, Social Justice, Equity, and Inclusion

Discussions of multiculturalism, social justice, equity, and inclusion were frequent in our meetings; they focused on creating a campus that is actively anti-oppressive and anti-racist. Some participants observed that these discussions reflect continued attempts to address what they said was one of Hampshire's founding values, and more recently one of the President's "four pillars"—social justice. Faculty, staff, and students all said that Hampshire generally prides itself as a radical institution founded on this value. Many participants in our meetings mentioned the President's fall 2013 convocation address, in which he spoke specifically of the value of social justice, encouraging Hampshire to "commit to honesty, openness, and respect toward one another; that we each take responsibility to challenge race-based assumptions, stereotypes, and actions when we see them...and to acknowledge them when we find them in ourselves."

Sub-Theme: Creating an Inclusive, Equitable, and Just Campus Culture

Participants in all categories said that Hampshire experiences significant challenges regarding open expression of varying opinions. Despite its general emphasis on diversity and social justice, some aspects of Hampshire's culture and norms are viewed as emphasizing allegiance to certain philosophical and educational principles (as articulated primarily by founding faculty) and fidelity to a variety of desired social and relational behaviors. Some participants in our interviews said that "political correctness" or "PC" attitudes have grown in strength and that there is high social pressure to conform to a group of social, educational, and pedagogical values. Members of the community often said during our meetings and discussions that they don't want to be perceived as saying the "wrong" thing or asking the wrong question out of fear of being ostracized. "We're a bit of a hothouse here," one participant said; "We talk the talk about inclusivity and respect for difference, but that doesn't always apply to differing opinions." One staff member described a gap between social justice theory and practice as follows: "We're good at teaching students to be critical, but having civil dialogues with other people is missing. It makes me feel that anything I put out into the community will be harshly criticized. There is emphasis and pressure on students to close the gap. How do faculty, staff, and administrators start closing it as well?" In summary, staff and faculty alike said in many meetings that while Hampshire espouses ideals of liberal education, it can be harshly

critical of differences in opinion, especially regarding “less liberal” political perspectives and certain religious beliefs and identities.

We heard expressions of concern that Hampshire’s interpretation of social justice is so “narrow” that it “interferes with the focus of a liberal arts education.” One faculty member reported hearing from prospective students that the College’s reputation for political activism made them worried that if they were not “that way” [politically and socially liberal and/or activist] they would be “uncomfortable” at Hampshire. Current science students said they are sometimes “looked upon with suspicion” and “derided” when they try to join conversations about social justice; one reported that another student said “What would you know about any of this [social justice]? You’re in the lab all the time.” Other faculty acknowledged these and other students’ concerns; some also said that faculty, like students, could be “very judgmental” about differing social and political views. What was often described as a lack of respectful discourse also emerged as an important issue in conversations with staff. One staff member attributed it to Hampshire’s culture being one that is outwardly focused on trying to “better the world,” with less attention to the dynamics of internal relationships. The same staff member observed that Hampshire’s culture is one in which people then think “we don’t need to work on ourselves.” We heard that the creation of “safe” spaces for discourse has had some unintended negative consequences in at least one case; a staff member who has allowed students, staff, and faculty to use a certain space to “vent” has therefore been assumed by colleagues to have “cosigned” the complaints about the College made by those students.

Some students reported that they don’t see their needs met in the diversity realm, so they continue to “escalate the ask” with requests for larger and more public displays of anti-oppression. A few students shared their personal views that Hampshire doesn’t engage diversity well—“I’m a first generation American, and I’ve spent four years trying to figure out if there is space at the Cultural Center for me...There are very big divisions among diverse groups on campus. There is no willingness to sit down and have these conversations because everyone is comfortable within their own group. There’s a lot of self-segregation.” Some international students echoed this sentiment when they described that Hampshire “categorizes” them together with students of color. They too said they are not certain that the Cultural Center is meant as a resource and/or space for them.

When asked what type of culture Hampshire should move to, staff described a more compassionate and supportive community. “I’d like to see a community of care where people step up and speak up, there are active bystanders, where people interrupt micro-aggressions, where people challenge negative comments about female-bodied persons.” In response to the perception that many faculty and staff are unprepared to have conversations—especially about racism—that are “equitable, open, and safe,” some staff suggested that additional training and/or professional and faculty development may be needed. Specific suggestions made during our meetings for encouraging respectful dialogue included a core class that engages that topic and stronger partnerships between staff and faculty that model respectful discourse.

Sub-Theme: Campus Climate for Students, Faculty, and Staff of Color

Some students, faculty, and staff of color spoke of experiencing racist attitudes and practices during their time at Hampshire, including in the classroom. Students of color with whom we spoke expressed dissatisfaction at feeling singled out in class by a professor to speak on behalf of an under-represented community. Students also spoke of a “reactive” cycle where a racist incident occurs at Hampshire, the community discusses it, moves forward, and then another incident occurs to restart this cycle. Students of color reported that they perceive a “shallowness” from white students in conversations about multiculturalism and diversity. White students were regarded as speaking in favor of multiculturalism and social justice, but as being unwilling to listen to the experience of others or to examine their own privilege.

Some staff expressed the view that Hampshire “in the past hasn’t had the vision and expectation from senior administrators that attracting and retaining historically under-represented students—particularly students of color” is part of the responsibility of schools and offices across campus. Some students and staff described concerns about the future and sustainability of the James Baldwin Scholars Program given the impending retirement of its director, who they regard as having been critical to its success. A staff member noted that “I’ve been in a constant struggle with HR” to promote the hiring of a diverse faculty; the same staff member noted similar concerns about Admissions and Advancement functions.

Sub-theme: Spirituality on Campus

Staff and students who are concerned about spiritual life on campus said in their meeting with K&A that life at Hampshire can be “anti-spiritual.” They see this as a contradiction, given Hampshire’s stated values of diversity and social justice—“Campus is very secularly minded. We work against all kinds of oppression except religion.” Staff who provide spiritual leadership or guidance to students spoke of the challenge of ensuring that students felt supported in their observance of their faith.

Sub-theme: Institutional Support for Multiculturalism and Social Justice

There are currently administrative and academic staff positions and departments dedicated to multiculturalism and social justice at Hampshire, including the Chief Diversity Officer, Affirmative Action Officer, Dean of Multicultural Education, and the Community Advocacy department (incorporating multicultural and international student services, queer services, spiritual life services, wellness promotion, and women’s services.) However, one staff member described some of these new positions as “evolving”; Community Advocacy is relatively new and reports to the Dean of Students, who is in his first year at Hampshire. Relationships are still developing among these various positions and departments; in several meetings in which the positions and the relationships among them were discussed, there was no consistently expressed understanding of how these roles and responsibilities collaborate, overlap, and strategically reinforce each other.

Sub-theme: Environmental and Climate Sustainability

Climate sustainability and environmental stewardship often emerged as important topics with staff and students; many said that climate sustainability and environmental stewardship should continue to have a strong place in the College’s strategy and priorities. Most participants endorsed the President’s focus on sustainability and affirmed their own support for broad commitments to environmental stewardship. As noted elsewhere in this summary, however, some members of the staff, especially, questioned the College’s ability to be a trustworthy steward of the environment given the significant problems in deferred maintenance that so severely affect Hampshire’s ability to limit its carbon footprint.

One student group, Climate Justice League, focuses on the intersection of climate change and social justice by looking at the intersectionality of race, class, and gender issues, and how groups “who are the least responsible for climate change are the most impacted.” Hampshire is developing a climate action plan. This plan will build on Hampshire’s intention to be an institution that does not invest in fossil fuels. The Climate Justice League is working to determine its focus within this emerging plan and whether it should be more inwardly focused on sustainability at Hampshire or outwardly focused in advocating for national issues.

The Farm Center is a source of pride to many in the Hampshire community and is often praised as a resource to campus. Its partnership with Bon Appetit and the Dining Commons is a means for incorporating locally grown food into the diet of members of the campus community. Some staff and faculty see the Farm Center as “instrumental” in engaging students in learning about food, farming, and sustainability; it also employs many work-study students. The availability of CSAs has resulted in the farm being “more visible” to faculty. Hampshire’s Sustainability Initiative Director has been charged by the President with creating a strategic plan for the farm, and staff with whom K&A interacted advocated strongly for a land use plan as part of the College’s strategy for the farm. Such a plan might account for how campus land is used for farming and building construction as well as the financial sustainability of the farm. It is currently “soft funded” by grants and the Office of the President.

Theme: Resources and Financial Sustainability

Nearly all participants mentioned limited resources as a serious and critical barrier to achieving progress on any long-term goals. In some meetings, especially with administrative staff, these limitations were seen as the most important issues in developing the strategic plan—“Nothing else matters,” “If we don’t balance the budget we won’t have a college,” “There are no priorities except this one,” and “It all comes down to money.” Over the course of our multiple campus visits, this tone was consistent among administrative staff. During those visits, however, we heard a different emphasis from many faculty, other staff, and students, who strongly believe that Hampshire must determine its strategy, priorities, and goals on the basis of what it should most distinctively do in support of its mission, and that fiscal sustainability *per se* cannot be the goal of the College. This

difference of views did not seem to reflect naiveté or negligence on the part of the faculty, staff, and students who advocated for primary attention to mission and educational priorities; all acknowledged the realities of the budget and the long-term fiscal problems of deferred maintenance, changing enrollment patterns, and rising costs. But many faculty, especially, feel that just being a successful business is by no means enough for Hampshire: “If what we do doesn’t mean something and doesn’t matter, then there’s no reason to do it, even if it makes money,” one faculty member said.

Throughout these conversations, various members of the campus community said that Hampshire can be very aspirational, but is often not practical and may not consider the pragmatic implications of its aspirations and dreams. Most participants in our meetings agreed that the context for discussing and exploring aspirations must include data that inform questions of feasibility, requiring analyses of finances, resources, student demographics and academic preparedness, enrollment patterns, and the changing landscape of higher education. Some faculty and staff expressed optimism that the history of financial stresses had improved the community’s willingness to be more practical; others said they expected that “finger-pointing” would overcome any sense of community in trying to deal with costs or develop feasible plans.

Sub-theme: Culture of scarcity

There is a prevalent perception of a strong culture of scarcity at Hampshire. Resource limitations of course contribute to this perception of scarcity, but there seem also to be other factors and dimensions. The need for movement from a culture of scarcity to a “culture of possibility” was emphasized in several conversations. “We are so accustomed to not having enough that we don’t think big enough,” one faculty member said; others affirmed this observation and added that “many years of negative messages and warnings from the financial office have worn us down.” A few faculty members alluded to mistrust of

financial data, suggesting that “things aren’t as bad as they say,” but most faculty and staff simply stated their long-term concern about having enough resources to do their jobs effectively.

Sub-theme: Financial sustainability

Concerns regarding the financial sustainability of the College are nearly universal among administrators, staff, and faculty, and well represented among students as well. The community's awareness of the College's consistently narrow financial margins may be due in part to the fact that Hampshire's administration is "unusually transparent" with its financial statements and information: faculty, staff, and students are briefed on the College's finances annually. Nevertheless, as noted elsewhere in this summary, there is significant suspicion that the College's finances are not represented to the community accurately or completely; we heard specifically that one reason for this is that money "seems to be found somehow" for some projects while for others administrators claim there is no available funding. Reference to differences in the quality of furnishings and equipment in faculty versus administrative offices was made by faculty members in several meetings.

The general consensus is that Hampshire has a pronounced need for new revenue streams in addition to those provided through tuition, room, and board ("TRB"). Summer programs, targeted graduate programs, and rental or other income-producing use of currently underused real estate are potential methods under consideration for increasing revenue. But many faculty and deans are concerned about what those "other sources" might be and about their viability and relationship to mission.

Sub-theme: Advancement efforts

Most participants realized that the success of fundraising and development efforts is tied to the success of strategic plan. Advancement staff said that some donors with the capacity to make larger gifts have indicated their desire to see such a plan or set of strategic priorities from the College; they feel that the strategic plan can demonstrate that the College has ideas and options that make it a financially strong investment. There is skepticism about advancement goals given that the relative youth of Hampshire alumni will prevent them from giving at levels that would seriously improve the financial situation of the College; we heard that they are simply not old enough, nor employed in fields lucrative enough, to have acquired a level of wealth that would allow them to donate sums of money large enough to ameliorate nagging problems such as deferred maintenance, outdated facilities, and aging or insufficient technology and equipment.

At the same time, other participants emphasized that the strategic plan cannot be seen as mostly about money—whether financial resources or fund-raising. Several participants shared that members of the faculty are already suspicious that this is the case—even that the purpose of the strategic plan is to design significant cuts in programs, staff, or faculty. Several faculty and staff leaders shared their concern that the process not be perceived as being driven by fundraising and development interests: “If that happens, faculty will not participate or engage.”

Theme: What Should Not Change

Although the consultants were warned that they would find little openness to change in the academic programs at Hampshire, we heard faculty and academic leaders affirm flexibility on most points. Very few topics were suggested as things that “should never change,” or “what should not be on the table” for the new strategic plan. In the list that follows, we note the points most commonly endorsed as “never change” items.

- **Narrative Evaluation.** Hampshire’s use of narrative evaluation was almost universally mentioned as a strength of the College in interviews with students, faculty, administrators, and staff; there was virtually no support in any group for eliminating narrative evaluation or replacing it with traditional grading systems. On the other hand, some faculty claimed that recent changes in the academic policy amounted to “*de facto* grades,” and others indicated their openness to *adding* grades as long as narrative evaluations were not discontinued.
- **Student-Directed Learning.** This pedagogy forms the backbone of Hampshire’s curriculum and is spoken of with pride by almost all faculty, staff, and students in the community. There is a strong resistance to any modification of this principle of learning; traditional institutionally-defined majors, for example, remain uninteresting to most Hampshire faculty. There is some controversy among faculty about revisions to the Division I structure that amount to certain imposed requirements; in general, faculty seem united in opposition to the expansion of requirements, especially if such an expansion weakened students’ ability to design their own courses of study and to partner collaboratively with faculty to meet their learning goals.

- **Interdisciplinary Learning.** The interdisciplinary nature of Hampshire's educational model, pedagogy, and faculty was considered a major strength in interviews and was often claimed as something unique and distinctive about the College. If anything, faculty said they crave more opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration and fewer barriers to working with faculty from other schools.
- **Size of the College.** There was general agreement among faculty who spoke in meetings that Hampshire should maintain a small class size; most also agreed that it was important to keep a student-to-faculty ratio no higher than 12:1, though some were more comfortable simply advocating "small" class sizes.

Appendix A

K&A's telephone and face-to-face meetings are listed here by month and year.

August 2013

▶ August 27-28, 2013

- Monday Group Strategic Planning Retreat

September 2013

▶ September 19, 2013

- Board of Trustees Meeting

▶ Telephone Interviews (30-60 minutes)

- Chair, Board of Trustees
- Member, Board of Trustees, F. Bennett "Ben" Cushman
- President
- Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty
- Dean of the School of Cognitive Science
- Dean of the School of Critical Social Inquiry
- Dean of the School of Humanities, Arts, and Cultural Studies
- Dean of the School for Interdisciplinary Arts
- Dean of the School of Natural Science
- Vice President for Finance and Administration/Treasurer
- Chief Advancement Officer
- Chief Diversity Officer
- Chief of Staff
- Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
- Dean of Curriculum and Assessment
- Dean of Students
- Director of Communications
- Interim Dean of Advising
- Secretary of the College

October 2013

▶ October 8-9, 2013 Campus Visit (12 meetings)

- President
- Chief of Staff and Secretary of the College
- Chief Advancement Officer, Director of Administration and Individual Giving, Director of Development
- Dean of Students
- Monday Group
- Strategic Enrollment Committee
- Strategic Planning Steering Committee (The Committee was working to identify an additional, third, student member at the time of this meeting.)
- Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty
- Vice President for Finance and Administration/Treasurer
- Three Open Meetings for Hampshire students, faculty, and staff
- Campus Tour

▶ October 22-24, 2013 Campus Visit (28 meetings)

- Strategic Planning Steering Committee
- Students (includes meetings with students in Division I, II, and III.)
 - First-year students
 - Hampshire Student Union Coordinating Board
 - House Interns
 - Re-Rad
 - SOURCE students
 - Student Signers
- Faculty
 - Senior faculty group
 - Mid-level faculty group
 - Junior faculty group
 - Faculty of Color group
 - All Faculty Open Meeting

- Administration
 - President
 - Monday Group
 - Strategic Enrollment Committee
 - Dean of the School of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies
 - Deans Table
- Staff
 - Admissions
 - Career Options Resource Center
 - Communications
 - Community Partnership for Social Change
 - Dean of Students Office direct-reports
 - Disability Services staff
 - Financial Aid
 - Global Education Office
 - Health and Counseling Services
 - Housing Operations
 - Human Resources
 - Institutional Advancement
 - Institutional Research
 - Library
 - New Student Programs
 - Payroll
 - Residence Life and Housing
 - Students Accounts
 - Wellness Promotion

November 2013

▶ November 5, 2013

- President and Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty
- Faculty Meeting

▶ November 7, 2013

- Alumni Advisory Group (telephone)

▶ November 12-14, 2013 Campus Visit (29 meetings)

- Board of Trustees
- Strategic Planning Steering Committee
- Students
 - James Baldwin Scholars
 - International students
 - Climate Justice League
 - Students connected to spirituality groups
 - Two “open sign up” meetings attended by three students and ten students respectively
 - Two meetings with students were scheduled that resulted in no one attending: students of color identity-based housing and students connected to gender and sexuality groups.
- Faculty
 - Three “open sign up” meetings
- Administration
 - President
 - President, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty, and Vice President for Finance and Administration/Treasurer
 - Monday Group
 - Deans Table
- Staff
 - CASA
 - Central Records
 - Farm Center
 - College Advancement
 - Events
 - Buildings and Grounds
 - Staff connected to farm and College’s advisor regarding food services
 - Internet Technology
 - Civil Liberties and Public Policy/Population Development
 - Global Education Office
 - Global Education Advisory Committee

December 2013

▶ December 3-4, 2013 Campus Visit (25 meetings)

- Administration
 - President
 - Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty
 - Dean of the School of Cognitive Science
 - Dean of the School of Critical Social Inquiry
 - Dean of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts
 - Dean of the School of Natural Science
 - Dean of Students
 - Secretary of the College
 - Monday Group
 - Deans Table
- Strategic Planning Steering Committee
- Educational Policy Committee
- Strategic Enrollment Committee
- Entrepreneurship Task Force
- Staff
 - Community Advocacy
 - Health and Wellness
 - Administrative Staff in the Academic Schools
 - Administrative Staff in the Offices of the President, Dean of Faculty, and Diversity
 - Dean of Faculty Program Reports
 - Acting Director for the Center for Innovative Education and Acting Affirmative Action Officer
 - Director of the Library
- Open Meeting
- Chief Advancement Officer and James Langley, President and Founder, Langley Innovations
- Professor of Public Health, Elizabeth Conlisk
- Local Hampshire Alumni