

Dear Colleagues,

In the last few days several questions have come up. Thus, to try to answer these questions I have collected some data, consulted with various faculty, and tried to come up with answers that were supported by facts or at least based on historical trends. Many questions have answers that are only well grounded theories or hypotheses, but there is no way to truly know what exactly would happen, just well informed hypotheses. As there are many long emails flying about I'll keep my answers short and sweet to start for those who just want the answers, and put some graphs that inform my answers below.

1) What are the workload implications of EPCs proposed distribution (MBI, PBS, CHA, PCSJ) versus the proposed amendment (CHL, SI, ADM, PCSJ)? (in addition to descriptions see graphs below)

School	EPC Distribution	Amendment Distribution
IA	Pressure for Distributions - Down Pressure on Electives - Same	Pressure for Distributions – Same or Up Pressure on Electives - Up
CS	Pressure for Distributions –Down Pressure on Electives – Same	Pressure for Distributions – Down Pressure on Electives - Same
NS	Pressure for Distributions – Same or Down Pressure on Electives - Same	Pressure for Distributions – Down Pressure on Electives - Same
SS	Pressure for Distributions – Same Pressure on Electives - Same	Pressure for Distributions – Same Pressure on Electives - Same
HACU	Pressure for Distributions –Down Pressure on Electives - Same	Pressure for Distributions – Up (but only relatively to now, not beyond capacity) Pressure on Electives - Up

2) What are the concerns about EPCs distribution (MBI, PBS, CHA, PCSJ) and the proposed amendment distribution (CHL, SI, ADM, PCSJ)?

EPCs Distribution

- Students need to take 2 “sciences” – This is false. Students may take courses in language to satisfy MBI thus giving an “out” for students less interested in science.
- Students leave because we require 2 “sciences” – The data does not support this. Anecdotes abound on both sides (arts students leaving due to science, science students leaving due to arts), neither is supported by the retention data. Data suggests students leave for many reasons, among them not getting into classes they want due to popularity of particular areas of study.

- The faculty cannot support an MBI and PBS distribution – These two distributions would be the most strained under the EPC proposal, but likely less than current demands, particularly for CS (see graphs below).
- EPC’s distribution lacks an ideological basis and/or the categories are not coherent – EPC’s vision for Division I suggests that “Division I is designed to prepare students to craft and execute their individualized programs of study by engaging them in a broad course of study across the College while delving deeply into distinct critical and creative approaches and ways of thinking that are mutually informative.” This EPC distribution does this based on the faculty we currently have. While more coherent categories may exist, they are ones that we cannot support with our current faculty.

Amendment Distribution

- More pressure will be placed on the “arts” – Based on historical trends in elective choices and waitlists, any distribution that does not encourage students take courses outside of the arts (this includes studio arts, writing, theater, etc.) will put additional pressure on these faculty as Hampshire attracts students interested in the arts more than in the social, cognitive, and biological sciences.
- With only one science requirement we will look like an arts school – The amendment requires students take a course in applied arts and this is attractive those interested in the arts and may put off students interested in the sciences. While this is hypothetical, we do already attract more arts students, looking more like an arts school may exacerbate this.
- Faculty lines may be lost in SS, NS, and CS – While we would presume the administration would not hire simply based on pressure (or at least they have not done so in the past), if we REQUIRE students take an ADM that we cannot fully support (see graphs below), the administration may see cutting positions in schools that do not see this pressure for courses. Those likely to be cut are in NS, CS, and SS (SS and NS both have vacant positions not being refilled at the moment that would be prime candidates for movement over to arts positions). This is of course hypothetical.
- We may lose upper level students in NS – The current concern is the loss of NS students due to a lack of upper level courses. The amendment would result in the opposite, a reduction in students exposed to 100 level courses. This is a trade-off and one the EPC proposal tries to address by lower the stress on 100 level courses. The amendment simply reduces 100 level courses through including many CS courses in SI, some of which would not be taught as 100 level NS courses are currently taught.
- We are reducing our requirements – If you equate sciences with rigor (as some trustees do) it looks as if we are reducing requirements. However, this is a perception problem, rather than a real one. As for incoming students, some might see this as less rigorous, but as incoming students don’t know anything different, it’s unlikely they would note this distribution as not rigorous.

- This is a reduction in our quantitative skills requirements –If the portfolio does not contain quantitative skills we are relying on the SI distribution area to cover quantitative skills. Thus, only ONE opportunity to gain exposure to these important skills. With the current distribution and the EPC distribution students would get this exposure plus it is likely they would get additional exposure through the MBI requirement. Not all would as they can take a language if they do not wish to take more science oriented courses, but those that do take such courses get additional exposure. Thus, compared to the EPC proposal it is a reduction.

Where is the information coming from that these answers are based on? While many of the answers above come from reasoning out the consequences, some come from hypothetical numbers. Below are some graphs that may help explain the workload changes as a function of the amendment versus EPC's proposal.