

ASSURANCE SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

Antioch University
Yellow Springs, Ohio

October 14-16, 2002

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Larry A. Braskamp, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Thomas Brown, Davenport University, Grand Rapids, MI
Anne Caldwell, MGH Institute of Health Professions, Boston, MA (NEASC)
Stephen G. Jennings, University of Evansville, Evansville, IN
Keith Johansen, Capella University, Spring Lake Park, MN
David O. Justice, DePaul University, Chicago, IL
Ann Leffler, Utah State University, Logan, UT (NWCCU)
Janet M. McNew, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL
James E. Moore, Creighton University, Omaha, NE (Chair)
Andrea Morrison, Argosy University-San Francisco Bay Area, Point Richmond, CA (WASC)
Manfred Ruddat, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Kathleen White Smith, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI
Roger Dale Smjitter, North Central College, Naperville, IL
Randall L. Thompson, Adler School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL

Table of Contents

	Page
Assurance Section	3
I. Context and Nature of Visit	3
A. Purpose of Visit	3
B. Institutional Context	3
C. Unique Aspects of Visit	3
D. Sites or Branch Campuses Visited	3
E. Distance Education Reviewed	3
F. Interactions with Institutional Constituencies	4
G. Principle Documents, Materials and Web Pages Reviewed	7
II. Commitment to Peer Review	10
A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process	10
B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report	10
C. Capacity to Address Previously Identified Challenges	11
D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment	11
III. Compliance with Federal Requirements	11
IV. Affirmation of the General Institutional Requirements	11
V. Fulfillment of the Criteria	11
A. Criterion One	11
B. Criterion Two	12
C. Criterion Three	14
D. Criterion Four	16
E. Criterion Five	17
VI Accreditation Relationship	18
A. Continued Relationship	18
B. Definers of Relationship	18
C. Commission Follow-up	19

ASSURANCE SECTION

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

The purpose of the visit was to conduct a comprehensive evaluation for continued accreditation at the doctoral level.

B. Institutional Context:

Antioch University is a single institution with two campuses located in Yellow Springs, Ohio (Antioch College and Antioch University McGregor); one campus in Keene, New Hampshire (Antioch New England Graduate School); one campus in Seattle Washington (Antioch University Seattle); and a campus in Southern California that operates in two sites – Los Angeles and Santa Barbara (Antioch University Southern California).

C. Unique Aspects of Visit:

Antioch University is a single institution accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, but three of its campuses are located in areas that are under the accreditation oversight of other accrediting organizations: the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), the Northwest Commission of Senior Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

Integral to an Antioch College education is the liberal arts co-operative educational experience. This may be the only "liberal arts," institution-wide, undergraduate, co-op educational program in the country.

D. Sites or Branch Campuses Visited:

Antioch College – 11 team members

(Pre-visit: 10/2-3/02; Evaluation visit: 10/14-16/2002)

* Antioch New England Graduate School – 2 members, plus 1 member from NEASC

(Pre-visit: 10/7-8/2002; Evaluation visit: 10/21-22/2002)

* Antioch University McGregor – 2 members

(Pre-visit: 10/2-3 /3003; Evaluation visit: 10/12-16/2002)

* Antioch Seattle – 2 members, plus 1 member from NWCCU

(Pre-visit: 10/7-8 /2002; Evaluation visit: 10/21-22/2002)

* Antioch University Southern California – 2 members, plus 1 member from WASC

(Evaluation visit: 10/7-8/2002)

* Referred to by the University as "non-residential campuses" and/or "adult campuses."

E. Distance Education Reviewed:

Antioch is just beginning to offer significant numbers of courses and programs online. Currently only the Ph.D. program in Leadership and Innovation is designed to fully use the capabilities of online learning to provide full interactive communication, including instant messaging, phone support, private chat rooms, dedicated library support, and assessment. Distance education programs are also being developed at the New England, McGregor and Southern California (SB).

F. Interactions with Institutional Constituencies:

Antioch University	
Chancellor	Professor History; Editor of the Antioch Review
Chancellor Emeritus	
Vice Chancellor & Chief Financial Officer	Station Manager – WYSO public radio
Vice Chancellor for Development and External Relations	Director of Information Systems
Director of Human Resources	University-wide Dean and Director, PhD in Leadership
University Comptroller	PhD Program Administrator/Registrar
Exec. Dir., Glen Helen Ecology Institute	Board of Trustees (6), including Chair

Antioch College	
President	Director of Housing
Dean of Faculty	Director of CCL
Associate Dean of Faculty	Director of Physical Plant
Dean, Admissions & Financial Aid	Director Student Accounts/Business Operations
Registrar	Director of Kettering Library
Director of Financial Aid	Director of Academic Advising
Director, Multicultural Affairs	College Professor Emeritus
Dean of Students	Chair, Arts Department
Associate Dean of Students	Chair, Masters in Education Program
Director, Academic Support Center	Director of Co-Op Education Program
Counseling Ctr. Director	
Health Advocate (Wellness/Dean of Students area)	

Committees

Assessment (chair; faculty – 1 active and 1 emeritus)
 Faculty Executive Committee (5 members)

ComCil (135)
 General Education (5 faculty)

Faculty

Antioch Education Abroad
 Arts
 Biology
 Co-Op Education Programs
 Creative Writing
 Cultural & Interdisciplinary Studies

Environmental Sciences
 Executive Management
 Literature, Language, Culture
 Physical Sciences
 Social & Global Studies
 Sociology (Self, Society, Culture)

Forums

Administrators
 Faculty
 Staff
 Students (17)

Students (40 at informal lunch interactions)

Antioch University McGregor

President
Academic Dean
Registrar
Director, Financial Aid
Program Director, Bachelor's
Completion

Program Director, ILPS
Director, Enrollment Management
Student Alumni Services
Director, IT Services
Board of Visitors, 5 members

Faculty

Conflict Resolution, Program Director
Education
IMA
Graduate Management

Committees

Curriculum Committee, Chair

Forums

Students (30)
Open (20)

Antioch New England Graduate School

President
Director of Administrative Operations and Finance
Director of Antioch New England Institute (ANEI)
Registrar
Director of Financial Aid
Director of Admissions
Associate Director of Student Accounts
Director of Human Resources and Fiscal Services
Director of Facility Services
Administrative Forum: Consisted of President's Council & Department Chairs
(President, Chancellor, Chief Financial Officer, Chair—Clinical Psychology, Director of Admissions,
Associate Chair—Clinical Psychology, Chair—Organization and Management, Chair—Education,
Chair—Environmental Studies)

Faculty:

Education Department: (Chair and six faculty)
Education by Design Program: (Program Administrator and Assistant Director)
Environmental Studies Department
(Chair and three faculty)
Organization and Management Department (Chair and four faculty)
Applied Psychology Department - Chair and three faculty/directors
Clinical Psychology Department - Chair and three faculty/directors
Psychological Services Center (PSC) - Director and Assistant Director

Forums:

Administrators (9)
Staff Forum (17)
Students (12)

Clinical Doctoral students (8)
Alumni (11)

Antioch University Seattle	
----------------------------	--

President	Director, Center for Programs in Psychology
Director of Library Services	Financial Aid Officer
Dean of Administration & Finance	Board of Visitors (Chair & member/ former Trustee)
Academic Dean	Project director of the "Early College High Schools for Native Youth" program
Special Assistant to President/Self Study Committee Chair	

Forums

Core Faculty (28)
Students (
Support Staff (30)

Antioch University Southern California
--

A. Los Angeles

President	Registrar
Dean of Academic Affairs	Director of Facilities
Regional Chief Financial Officer	

Committees:

College Council of Los Angeles (2 Deans, 5 program chairs, Registrar, director of Admissions and Financial Aid, 2 staff representatives)
AcWorks/LA (Academic Dean, plus 6 program chairs)
BA Degree Completion Program - Chair
Education Program - Chair
Fine Arts - Creative Writing Program - Chair
Organizational Management Program - Chair
Psychology and Clinical Psychology Programs - Chair

Forums:

Staff (15 attendees)	Faculty (17 attendees)
Student (14 attendees)	Alumni (13 attendees)

B. Santa Barbara

Executive Dean	Registrar
Dean of Academic Affairs	Information Technology Staff

Faculty:

Psychology Program - Chair	Organizational Management Program - Chair
----------------------------	---

Committees:

College Council (10 members)	PresWorks (6 attendees)
AcWorks (6 attendees)	

Forums:

Core Faculty Forum (12 attendees)	Alumni Forum (10 attendees)
Student Forum (16 attendees)	

G. Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed:

Self-Study materials for all Antioch campus sites were reviewed. Other information:

University

1. Auditor's University Financial Statements—June, 2000
2. Report to the Board of Trustees—June, 2000
3. Year End Projections & Proposed 2001 Budget
4. 1999 Strategic Plan
5. Five-Year Capital Budget: June 2002
6. University Overhead, Rebates, and Subsidies, Streamlining the Process: April, 2001
7. Antioch University Budget Planning for Fiscal Year 2002: April, 2001
8. Needs Assessment for Institutional Support to Strengthen Antioch University: March, 2001
9. Inventory of Antioch University Buildings: November 2001
10. Report to Board of Trustees Five Year Capital Budget 2002-2006 (University): June 2002
11. Report to Board of Trustees 2001-02 Year End Projection/2002-2003 Proposed Budget
12. First Class for the Ph.D. program in Leadership, including link to New England library.
13. Datatel system and its screens.
14. Tech Learning Circle, A Proposal to FISPE: May 24, 2002
15. Information Technology Infrastructure Plan 1997-2001
16. Indoor Air Quality Survey Report: April 2002

College

17. Capital Projects 5-Year Plan for Antioch College FY 2002-2004
18. Outline for a Case Statement for Antioch College: June 2002
19. ComCil Minutes: January-August 2002
20. Antioch College Facility Planning 1999-2001
21. Antioch College Campaign Progress Report: September 2002
22. Antioch College Facility Condition Assessment Survey
23. Computer Hardware Inventory: October 2001
24. A Report on the Capital Campaign for Antioch College 1986-1993
25. Antioch College Three-Year Gift Comparisons: 2000-2002
26. A Special Study and Report on the Fund-Raising Potential of Antioch College: May 2001
27. Organizational Chart Antioch College Office of Development & Alumni Relations: October, 2002
28. Reviewed Home Page and web pages associated with admission.

McGregor

29. Indicators of Progress
30. Self-Study Addendum and Updates
31. Board of Visitors purposes and Goals
32. BA degree audit forms

33. Random student portfolio files in Registrar's office
34. Sample degree plans and course outlines for IMA/ILPS courses
35. Thesis approval forms
36. Sample ILPA Assessment instruments (completed)
37. Sample Instucotr's Evaluation form (compelted)
38. IMA/ILPS Faculty Responses to 1999 Antioch University Program Review
39. McGregor Strategic Plan
40. IMA/ILPS Student Handbook
41. Classics Assessment (completed)
42. Sample capstone projects and theses
43. Enrollment data

New England

44. Budget Reports: Institution, Programs, Audits, last five years
45. Governance Documents, Minutes, Reports
46. Antioch New England Annual Reports, last five years
47. Academic Admissions Policies
48. Policies for Curricular Reviews
49. Course/Instructor Evaluation Forms
50. Antioch New England Student Handbook 2002-03
51. Antioch New England Personnel Manual
52. Departmental Handbooks
53. Faculty Publications
54. External Accreditation & Licensure Approvals
55. Department of Organization and Management Faculty Handbook
56. Antioch New England Graduate School Strategic Plan 1999/2000—2003/2004.
Academic Team Minutes
57. Reviewed web pages associated with admission.

Seattle

58. Seattle team reviewed all documents in the Resource Room, including samples of student work, faculty evaluations, and the Antioch Seattle web page
59. AUS Strategic Plan 2000-2005
60. State of Washington Degree Authorization correspondence: August 22, 2002
61. AUS Revenue and Expense Statement: June 30, 2002
62. Report of External Evaluation of AUS by Altes & Nolan: December 21, 2000
63. Antioch University Seattle Catalog 2002-2003
64. Antioch Seattle NCA Self-Study Update
65. AUS Organization Chart: 2002-2003
66. Future Directions for Antioch University Seattle White Paper by President Murdock: May, 1999
67. Affiliation Agreement with the School for Innovative Leadership: September 15, 1998
Amendment to Affiliation Agreement with the School for Innovative Leadership: August 12, 1998
68. Correspondence (3) related to School for Leadership Contract/NCA approval: August 23 & 29, 2001

69. Memo to NCA and Request for Institutional Change regarding School for Leadership Contract: August 30, 2001
70. Letter to Terminate Agreement with School for Innovative Leadership effective 12/31/2002: September 27, 2001
71. Continuation and Termination Agreement with the School for Innovative Leadership: June 12, 2002
72. Letter of Agreement with Heritage Institute: August 1, 2000
73. Contractual Agreement with Organization Systems Renewal Midwest: November 1, 1999
74. Correspondence (3) related to authorization to do business in the State of Illinois: August 16, 1999
75. Sample Student Transcripts/Records
76. Log of Student Complaints
77. List of students not making adequate Satisfactory Academic Progress
78. Course Syllabi
79. Student Projects
80. Publications by AUS faculty and students
81. Student evaluations of faculty
82. Minutes of Academic Council and administrative/President's Team meetings
83. Copies of Grant Proposals/Funded Grants
84. Review of library materials and data bases
85. Review of texts and materials in Bookstore
86. Web sites, e.g., <www.osr-nw.org> <www.antiochsea.edu>

Southern California

87. Antioch Southern California NCA Self-Study and BIDs
88. AULA General Catalog
89. AUSB General Catalog
90. AUSC Core Faculty Handbook
91. AUSB and AULA Fall 2002 Course Schedules
92. AULA and AUSB Telephone Directories
93. MFA in Creative Writing Internal Program Assessment and Residency Guide
94. MA in Education and Teacher Credentialing Student Teacher Handbook
95. Student Handbooks in Education, Psychology, and Organizational Management
96. AUSC Strategic Plan
97. State Licensure Materials
98. Admissions Materials regarding transfer of credit
99. Sample print media ads
100. Selected Core/Adjunct Faculty Narrative Evaluations of Students
101. MA in Organizational Management Program Review
102. Annual Budgets
103. Fact Book 2000-2002
104. Personnel Files of Regional Employees
105. Accreditation Task Force Administrative Materials
106. Minutes of Regional Council Southern California
107. Student Complaint Logs for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW

A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process:

Antioch University chose to engage in a de-centralized self-study process, reflective of the semi-autonomous operating style of the University. Representation on each of the self-study teams varied by the campus, but from comments at open meetings and interviews with students, faculty, and staff, the Team concludes that most of the major sectors of the University participated in the self-study process. Given the unique nature of Antioch University, the de-centralized form of self-study was a comprehensive process.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report:

Reflecting the general Antioch approach, the University and each of the non-residential adult campuses carried out its own self-study activities in accordance with local committee structures. The result was that each self-study report differed in structure and approach, which made it somewhat difficult for the Team to collectively assess the non-residential sites. While there were some similar elements in the reports, there was not a consistent form of presentation. Each of the reports touched on the major issues facing the institution and the campuses. However, some appendices referred to in the reports were not included. Materials in the Team rooms were comprehensive and helpful to the team.

1. Antioch University

Overall, the Antioch University Self-Study Report was accurate and valid. The Report was designed around the five evaluative criteria. The AU Report appropriately reviewed the institutional evaluative criteria differently than the individual campus reports.

2. Antioch College

Overall, the Antioch College Self Study Report was accurate and contained many evaluative sections that were helpful to the Team. Summaries of quantitative data visually through charts and tables would have been helpful.

3. McGregor

The McGregor Self-Study Report addressed the major issues facing the institution. Materials in the Team room were comprehensive and helpful.

4. New England Graduate School

Overall, the ANE Self-Study Report was accurate and valid. The Report was well designed around the evaluative criteria and was sequenced appropriately.

5. Seattle

The Antioch-Seattle self-study report accurately listed the challenges faced by the campus. The challenges are a fairly valid representation of the facts as determined by observations, documents and interviews during the site visit.

6. Southern California

Overall, the AUSC Self-Study Report was accurate, valid, and has well served both the Team and institution in identifying and addressing the most significant issues facing the region. The Report is open, honest, and exceptionally analytical.

C. Capacity to Address Previously Identified Challenge

Based on the institution's response to previously identified challenges, the Team concludes that the institution has inadequately addressed the following issues.

1. The University's "administrative decentralization and restructuring" and concerns about "anxieties, morale, and communication" throughout the University.
2. University finances
3. Assessment plans were found to be uneven
4. College enrollments
5. Decentralization of the University administration structure.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment:
Requirements were fulfilled.**III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS**

The Team reviewed the required Title IV compliance areas and the student complaint information.

IV. AFFIRMATION OF THE GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Based on the self-study review and other documentation, the Team confirms that the institution continues to meet each of the twenty-four General Institutional Requirements.

V. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA**A. CRITERION ONE**

The institution demonstrates that it has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to an institution of higher education.

Salient Evidence of Fulfillment of Criterion**1. Evidence that demonstrates that the criterion is met:**

- a. Antioch University has remained committed for 150 years to its core mission of integrating academic study with experiential learning and community service.
- b. Interviews indicate a clear understanding and commitment to the historical values of the College and Antioch University.
- c. The University mission statement is clearly stated in its University publications.
- d. The mission statement of each of the non-residential campuses is clearly stated in the publications of each campus.
- e. Students, faculty and staff at the non-residential campuses expressed knowledge of, and passion for, the mission statement of their campus.

2. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion needs institutional attention
 - a. Even though each campus of the University remains committed to the historical values of the College, each non-residential campus has crafted an individualized mission statement that reflects local priorities. These differences continue to generate on-going discussion concerning the question of singleness of purpose.
3. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention and Commission follow-up.

None noted.

Recommendation of the Team

Pattern of evidence sufficiently demonstrated; no Commission follow-up recommended.

B. CRITERION TWO

The institution demonstrates that it has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes.

Salient Evidence of Fulfillment of Criterion

1. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion is met
 - a. The University has improved its ability to effectively budget and manage financial resources to accomplish its purposes. In particular:
 - Finances of the University are stabilizing as evidenced by the elimination of the internal debt of \$3.1 million in 1999 and in an improved current asset to current liability ratio.
 - A budget building and monitoring process under the Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer has been able to generate a small surplus on a net cash basis recently, with a small cash liquidity reserve of \$2 million.
 - Implementation of an integrated computerized financial system (Datatel).
 - Institutional advancement is improving with a realistic feasibility study, early successes in a five-year \$100 million Sesquicentennial College Campaign, and recent increases in grants, contracts, and the College Endowment.
 - Investment of \$11 million in the Yellow Springs plant and infrastructure.
 - Acquisition of permanent campus facilities in Seattle and New England.
 - An increase in external funding, grants, contracts, and College Endowment.
 - b. Interviews indicate that all constituencies believe the University organizational structure allows for frequent and meaningful participation on committees and inclusion in campus governance.

- c. Trustees have reaffirmed the key role of the Chancellor in the administration of Antioch University.
- d. The University Leadership Council (ULC), under direction of the Chancellor, considers all significant administrative matters.
- e. The University improved oversight and coordination of administrative functions, most notably in the areas of finance and administrative technology. The University also implemented cost savings measures to decrease expenditures.
- f. Each non-residential campus has an organizational structure, such as a Board of Visitors and/or a community task force, to assist in identifying key issues for the institution and to create linkages between the campus and the local community.
- g. Faculty and staff at the non-residential campuses report mutual respect for each other and demonstrated an obvious spirit of teamwork to the Team.
- h. The faculty of each Antioch campus is well qualified to provide educational experiences consistent with each institution's commitment to academic excellence, experiential learning, and community service.
- i. The Registrar function is working better under the coordination of the University Comptroller and through regular collaboration among the campus Registrars.
- j. The Human Resource function has been centralized and each campus has an on-site HR generalist who has provided a more timely, efficient and higher quality delivery of services, policies and standards to local campus employees.
- k. The three-year-old Academic Support Center at the College provides an important service to a great number of students (over 25% of the student body).

2. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion needs institutional attention

- a. Low Fall 2002 enrollments at the College and some non-residential campuses jeopardized University enrollment planning and contributed to serious budget problems. The University needs a more effective student enrollment plan.
- b. The non-residential campuses are responsible for providing approximately \$3 million annually in support of the University Administration, other University-wide operations, and the College. This constitutes essentially all campus surpluses and produces a strain on their operation, growth, and development.
- c. Significant deterioration in facilities and deferred maintenance compromise the capacity of the College to attract and retain students.
- d. Each campus has physical facility and maintenance needs that are not addressed.

- e. The University lacks a chief academic officer and therefore lacks coherence and consistency among academic programs throughout the University.
 - f. Key staff positions have gone unfilled for extended periods of time. Turnover among faculty and staff continues to be one of the University's greatest human resources challenges.
 - g. The Datatel software does not extend uniformly to all campuses and in some cases is not adequately used on all campus sites.
3. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention and Commission follow-up.
- a. The University's most pressing problem is a lack of financial resources for the educational programs that it offers.
 - b. The University has operated at a deficit for the past two fiscal years, and projects another deficit this fiscal year, in part because of an increase of \$1.5 million in tuition discounts at the College.
 - c. As is 1993, student enrollment at Antioch College continues to be low. The Strategic Plan goal to enroll 800 new students has not been met.

Recommendation of the Team

Pattern of evidence demonstrated; Commission follow-up warranted.

The Team recommends a Focused Visit to determine if the institution has adequate resources to achieve institutional objectives.

C. CRITERION THREE

The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.

Salient Evidence of Fulfillment of Criterion

1. Evidence that demonstrates that the criterion is met:
- a. Students, faculty, staff, and alumni from all campus sites confirm that the institution is accomplishing its stated purposes.
 - b. Interviews with students and alumni across the university reveal a high level of satisfaction with the academic experience - faculty, programs, experiential learning, personal attention, small classes, and effective support systems.

- c. Graduate academic programs are clearly defined, coherent and intellectually challenging. The new PhD program in Leadership and Change effectively utilizes resources from all of the Antioch campuses.
- d. The redesign of the College curriculum to consolidate the 23 majors into 8 interdisciplinary majors is a creative and bold way to make best use of scarce faculty resources to deliver a comprehensive liberal arts education to a small student body. The revised College General Education Program, linked with the Co-op program, enables students to structure an individualized program of study.
- e. Students at the College indicated the Co-op Program was a significant enrollment factor and it was crucial to their Antioch educational experience.
- f. Academic programs throughout the University stimulate the examination and understanding of personal, social and civic values.
- g. Antioch College maintains a broad-based international study program.
- h. At the non-residential campuses, the academic programs emphasize critical thinking, self-reflection, mentoring, focused research, workplace applications; and intellectual interaction between students, and among faculty and students.

2. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion needs institutional attention

- a. The College does not have sufficient resources to support all of its current academic majors.
- b. Staffing and financial resources are limited across the University, adversely affecting the delivery of programs and services, as well as the upkeep of facilities.
- c. The University as a whole, and particularly the College, has failed to achieve enrollment goals for the past five years.
- d. The College attrition rate is high and the 6-year graduation rate is low.

3. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention and Commission follow-up.

- a. The "student portfolio" system of evaluating student course performance is unevenly applied at the College.
- b. Multiple methods to assess student learning are inadequate in some areas and uneven across the University.
- c. There is a lack of institutional research on students - for admissions and retention.

Recommendation of the Team

Pattern of evidence demonstrated; Commission follow-up warranted.

The Team recommends a Focused Visit on the implementation of assessment of student learning.

D. CRITERION FOUR

The institution can continue to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.

Salient Evidence of Fulfillment of Criterion**1. Evidence that demonstrates that the criterion is met:**

- a. The Board of Trustees and the Chancellor are aware of the serious issues that need to be addressed and committed to acting on them. New initiatives have already been implemented.
- b. A College campus plan that supports the University plan has been developed.
- c. The non-residential campuses continue to meet the needs of the regions in which they are located.
- d. Fundraising success in the \$5 to 6 million range is evidence of the continuity of leadership in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Development. Further evidence of this momentum has been the 24 million dollars pledged or in-hand in the "quiet phase" of a campaign.

2. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion needs institutional attention

- a. The College looks to the past for its powerful legacy, foundations and method of governance, even as the composition of the student body changes.
- b. The system of governance currently in use at the College slows decision-making at a time when the University needs to quickly make important decisions to ensure the viability of the institution.
- c. Additional resources will be required in the area of institutional research to implement new programs, especially in the marketing and admissions.
- d. The non-residential campuses have the potential to prosper, but only if the enrollment and financial problems of the College are resolved.

3. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention and Commission follow-up.
 - a. Antioch University has changed its strategic planning processes with each change of leadership, both at the University level and at individual campuses. Planning is primarily ad hoc and situational. There is no consistent formal process linking campus-planning initiatives with an overall University planning structure. Plans often state intended outcomes with no corresponding accountability. It's not always clear who is responsible for actions or when results are expected. Planning is not clearly connected to financial resources and budgetary decisions.
 - b. The College's inability to meet enrollment goals jeopardizes the entire University.
 - c. Significant financial resources are needed at the College and across the University to increase student enrollment, recruit and retain new and experienced faculty and improve the physical plant.

Recommendation of the Team

Pattern of evidence demonstrated; Commission follow-up warranted.

The Team recommends a focused visit on the effectiveness of linking planning, budgeting, development and enrollment management.

E. CRITERION FIVE

The institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.

Salient Evidence of Fulfillment of Criterion

1. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion is met:
 - a. Antioch University handbooks, view books and publications are up-to-date and accurate and meet the expectations of the Higher Learning Commission regarding operations and relationships.
 - b. Handbooks for student, staff and faculty reflected appropriate grievance procedures and policies on Drug and Alcohol Use, Behavioral Standards, Sexual Harassment, Research on Human Subjects, Intellectual Property Rights and Academic Appeal processes.
2. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion needs institutional attention
 - a. Some Antioch publications do not consistently describe components of the institution.

3. Evidence that demonstrates the criterion requires institutional attention and Commission follow-up:
 - a. Antioch University Seattle has a number of partnership agreements. The Team is concerned about appropriate University oversight for these partnerships.
 - b. The Team is concerned whether the University has the legal approval from the appropriate agencies in states where contract programs are provided to offer some of its educational programs.

Recommendation of the Team:

Pattern of evidence demonstrated; Commission follow-up warranted.

The Team recommends a Monitoring Report on whether the University has the legal authority to operate in every state in which it offers educational programs.

VI. ACCREDITATION RELATIONSHIP

A. CONTINUED ACCREDITATION

Next Comprehensive Visit: 2012-2013

Rationale: In the past ten years, Antioch University has improved many aspects of its administrative and financial operations. While there are still a number of serious issues that need to be addressed, the Team concludes that the University meets all of the GIR's and the Criteria. Based its review, the Team concludes that Antioch University has demonstrated an awareness of the serious issues that need to be addressed. The Board of Trustees has committed to resolving these issues and has hired a Chancellor who has already begun to address these issues. These initiatives provide the evidence to warrant another ten-year accreditation cycle.

B. DEFINERS OF RELATIONSHIP

1. Degree Level Doctor's

Rationale: Retain original wording

2. Ownership Private, not for profit institution

Rationale: Retain original wording

3. Stipulations None

Rationale: Retain original wording

4. New Degree Sites: No Prior Commission approval required for Antioch-Seattle to offer BA and MA site based programs for educators in the state of Washington.

Rationale: Retain original wording

C. COMMISSION FOLLOW-UP

Focused Visit: Spring 2006

Report Topics:

1. Adequacy of resources to achieve institutional objectives.
2. Effectiveness of linking planning, budgeting, development and enrollment management.
3. Implementation of assessment of student learning.

Note: If the University does not demonstrate progress in these areas, the date of the next comprehensive visit should be moved forward.

Rationale and Expectations:

The University's most pressing problem is a lack of financial resources for the educational programs that it offers. Each campus has facility and maintenance needs that are not being addressed. Significant financial resources are needed to increase student enrollment, recruit and retain new and experienced faculty and staff and to improve the physical plant.

College and University enrollments have not achieved budget targets for the past decade. Antioch must either recruit, admit and/or retain more students, or find new sources of income. With a limited endowment, this institution cannot continue much longer to tolerate these shortfalls. The results of the upcoming development campaign are crucial to the continued viability of the institution. The continuing inability to meet enrollment goals jeopardizes the entire University.

Assessment is done well in some settings, but is unevenly addressed across the University. There is not a consistent understanding of the benefits and limitations of a multi-faceted assessment program. Based on reviews of numerous student files, the portfolio system is used inconsistently, and there is no quality review to ensure the integrity of the system of evaluation. There is little infrastructure to support the institution's assessment program. There is limited institutional research.

Expectations:

In preparation for the focused visit, the University will need to provide evidence that includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. That it has adequate financial resources to accomplish the mission of the University. Adequate resources may be demonstrated by the following:
 - a. A demonstrated increase in student enrollment, especially at Antioch College.
 - b. A realistic enrollment management plan.
 - c. Demonstrated annual enrollments that reflect the plan goals.
 - d. Increased revenues - from tuition, gifts or Development Office campaign efforts - to adequately support University programs and services at all of its campus sites.
 - e. An end to annual deficits.
 - f. An increase in annual funding from the endowment, which assumes growth in the endowment.
2. That it has adequate human resources to adequately offer academic programs, administrative programs and services and student support services.
 - a. Staffing, programs and services need to match institutional resources.
 - b. Staffing, programs and services need to be adequate to meet student expectations of the institution.
3. That it has adequate physical resources, to include:
 - a. Adequate facility lease or purchase arrangements for Antioch University Southern California;
 - b. Significant additional investment of funds in Yellow Springs facilities, equipment, technology, infrastructure and housekeeping/maintenance operations to dramatically improve the quality of academic programs, the appearance of the campus, the maintenance and safety of buildings and the adequacy of facilities for the academic programs.
4. That it has an effective system that links planning, setting priorities and allocating resources.
 - a. If resources have not been sufficient, demonstrate how the institution has adjusted its academic and administrative programs and services.
5. That it demonstrate the implementation of an assessment program that meets the expectations of the Commission. Each campus may utilize a different assessment plan, one that is appropriate to its student population. Each component of the assessment program must include multiple measures of assessing student performance and the University must demonstrate how the feedback from the assessment program is used to improve the educational program at each campus.
 - a. The portfolio system of evaluation must have standards that are consistently applied, and there must be a system of quality review to ensure the integrity of the portfolio system of evaluation.
 - b. There must be evidence of an infrastructure to support the institution's assessment program, and an institutional research program.
 - c. Antioch must provide evidence that it is using the results of its assessment program to improve student learning.
 - d. Antioch must provide evidence that it is using the results of its' institutional research programs to improve institutional planning and decision-making.

Monitoring report:

Antioch University must provide a report on its legal authority to operate in every state in which it offers educational programs. If the University cannot provide evidence of this legal authority for each state, then those programs must be terminated. The report is due September 15, 2003.

Rationale and Expectations:

Based on materials reviewed by the Team, the Team has concerns about the legal authority of Antioch University to grant credit in some states where it offers courses and programs.

The Team's concerns about Antioch University's "legal authority" are:

1. If Antioch is a single institution, the University must demonstrate how each of its non-residential, "adult" campuses in states other than Ohio (i.e., Antioch University Seattle, Antioch New England Graduate School and Antioch University Southern California) has the legal authority to operate as an out-of-state institution or as a separately authorized campus.
2. The University must provide documentation of its legal authority to offer education programs in every state in which it or its agents operates.
 - a. In particular, Antioch must demonstrate how Antioch University Seattle has the proper legal authority to grant AUS academic credit for courses offered via contractual relationships with educational training companies in other states, including but not limited to Illinois and Indiana.

ADVANCEMENT SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

Antioch University
Yellow Springs, Ohio

October 14-16, 2002

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission
A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Larry A. Braskamp, Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Thomas Brown, Davenport University, Grand Rapids, MI
Anne Caldwell, MGH Institute of Health Professions, Boston, MA (NEASC)
Stephen G. Jennings, University of Evansville, Evansville, IN
Keith Johansen, Capella University, Spring Lake Park, MN
David O. Justice, DePaul University, Chicago, IL
Ann Leffler, Utah State University, Logan, UT (NWCCU)
Janet M. McNew, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL
James E. Moore, Creighton University, Omaha, NE (Chair)
Andrea Morrison, Argosy University-San Francisco Bay Area, Point Richmond, CA (WASC)
Manfred Ruddat, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL
Kathleen White Smith, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, MI
Roger Dale Smitter, North Central College, Naperville, IL
Randall L. Thompson, Adler School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL

Table of Contents

	Page
Advancement Section	
Overall Observations about the Institution	2
Consultations of the Team	3
Recognition of Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress and/or Exemplary and Innovative Practice	10

I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE INSTITUTION

While Antioch University impresses the Team as an authentic and idealistic academic institution, at the same time the visual element of the Antioch College and other facilities in Yellow Springs are unimpressive. While the setting is small town and picturesque, there are few signs that the campus itself has been carefully tended. In fact, the grounds and many of the buildings appear to be seriously overdue for maintenance and remodeling; quite frayed around the edges. Indeed, it was not until after frequent and focused dialogues with administrators, faculty, staff and students, and observations of documents, records and artifacts on all campus sites that the Team developed a degree of respect and admiration for the institution. This is a place where administrators, faculty and staff appear to be extraordinarily committed to implementing the Antioch mission and academic excellence. The spirit of idealism and academic excellence is alive at Antioch University. In spite of the Team's concerns about finances, enrollments and facilities, the Team believes that Antioch is a place that has earned continued accreditation – primarily because of the people who work for the University.

As academic colleagues from other campuses, the Team's visit to Yellow Springs generated great respect for Antioch mission, history and programs, as well as admiration for their commitment and accomplishments. However, in 2002, Antioch seems to be an institution that has somehow neglected to reach its potential and lost its ability to maintain and renew itself.

Antioch University is a complex institution (comprised of multiple campuses) that may be on a path of "too little, too late." While plans for changes are visible everywhere, one is left with an overwhelming impression that the institution's viability in the 21st century is still in serious question. The strategic plan of the institution appears to be still missing some essential ingredients for survival, including, most notably, a savvy, aggressive and entrepreneurial approach to the "business" of higher education. For example, the academic programs at Antioch College appear to be transparent and unknown to the wider, nationwide audience that must be tapped if the institution is to survive and thrive. Antioch College is a place where everyone seems to be tradition-bound to a fault, while the very survival of the overall institution appears to be in jeopardy. Antioch University is a place where people who should know better seem to be content with hoping that more students "find us," when they should be taking charge and openly, aggressively experimenting with new ways to market its true strengths.

Antioch University has academic programs that are critically important to the lifeblood and perpetuation of American society, but today in 2002, its own health and potential as a sustainable institution is seriously in question. One is left with the impression that Antioch is too self absorbed, strangely more concerned with preserving traditions than in taking charge of its own destiny. If Antioch University can find a way to adapt to and leverage the 21st century realities of American higher education, it will gain greater control over its destiny, while experiencing renewal and a more prosperous future.

Although Antioch University is clearly intact, and has met the GIR's and five criteria for continued accreditation, the College appears to be in failing health according to all important indicators: a frayed physical appearance, high student attrition and the collective voices and faces of especially faculty and staff that show signs of fatigue and strained optimism. The obvious pride and commitment to the Antioch mission is sometimes juxtaposed and over-ridden by voices that include signs of stress, frustration and resignation. The hope for a better future is palpable, yet in the eyes of administrators, faculty and staff that future appears to be far away.

II. CONSULTATIONS OF THE TEAM

Advice - Mission

The Antioch University Self Study Report states: "each of Antioch's five campuses is a well-integrated academic whole, operating within its region in concert with the University mission; that the University, as a single entity has one vision and mission, is administered as a multifaceted comprehensive institution..." Team Interviews with administrators, staff, faculty and students at all sites reveal differing opinions regarding the accuracy of this claim. Faculty members at the non-residential sites are not clear about how their focus on adult learners relates to the residential College's co-op/study focus for traditional-aged undergraduates.

The Team recommends that the University consider creating a single mission statement for the institution, and eliminate individual campus mission statements. Instead, the individual campuses could describe their unique characteristics through goals, objectives, and strategies as prescribed by a standardized strategic planning process.

Advice - Organizational Structure

The 1993 NCA Team expressed several concerns related to the reorganization of Antioch University, along with related issues of leadership and management. Since then, the University has continued to search for the optimum balance between centralization and decentralization; shared or dedicated governance; and national or regional or local management of shared services.

Apart from the accreditation question, Antioch University would be well served by making a decision about how it will be governed and managed, and then clarifying the formal and informal relationships between the University, the College, the non-residential campuses and the regional accrediting organizations. It needs to determine the optimum balance between centralization and autonomy, and determine how those relationships impact teaching, learning, planning, financial management, and organizational effectiveness. Antioch's history of shared governance, participative decision making, and consensus building might be viewed as living the institution's mission, but those same characteristics inhibit its growth and make it difficult to attract and keep strong leaders in key positions.

One question that has surfaced during discussions with faculty and staff is the specific question of whether or not the College and the group of non-residential adult campuses are really two very different kinds of institutions that might require a new and creatively

different organizational structure in the future. It would be helpful now that a new leadership team is in place to clearly articulate the structure, not simply through electronic and published media, but through several face-to-face meetings with all constituencies of the College and the greater University.

The Team recommends that, because of its strong leadership, its long and stable history, its regional board members, and its educational reputation, the Antioch New England campus take the lead in defining and describing an overall University organizational structure that more clearly articulates collaborative benefits and intercampus relationships.

Advice – University Leadership

The Team recommends the University Leadership Council strengthen the hand of the Chancellor. This would send a clear signal to all of the campus sites of Antioch University. Additionally, it would underscore the interest of the Board of Trustees in the transformation of University governance.

The Team agrees with the many individuals on the collective campus sites who suggested that greater collaboration and increased unity among campuses can only occur with strong centralized leadership and operational coordination. Without Board and/or ULC action, this leadership and coordination would be difficult to evolve, primarily because of geographical boundaries, differences in institutional culture, and historical differences.

Advice – Academic Leadership

The Team recommends that the University create a position for a university-wide academic leader, such as a provost, who could provide needed direction in areas of mutual interest, such as uniform degree requirements, assessment, faculty development, program development, support services, and technology. Another reason to create a chief academic officer position is because of the increasing demands that the campus presidents are facing.

Advice - Contracts

The Team is concerned whether or not Antioch University has an established procedure for its individual campus sites to enter into contractual agreements with other legal entities to offer academic courses for Antioch credit, and whether or not these agreements meet state, federal, and accreditation requirements. In particular, the Team is concerned about such matters as faculty oversight of the curriculum, ensuring quality control, awarding of federal financial aid, obtaining required accreditation and other approvals, assuring appropriate university course/ program/degree requirements, delegating authorized agent(s) representing the University, establishing appropriate financial terms, and reviewing provisions contained within these contracts from both legal and educational perspectives. A summary of the concerns is presented below:

In a discussion of the new Ph.D. in Leadership and Change in the University Self-Study Report, it is stated that Provisional Approval was obtained from the Ohio Board of Regents in September 2001 and "in addition, all appropriate education

agencies in the states where the program hold residencies were notified of the program and approval to operate was secured (p. 91). The team is uncertain about what state approvals were secured, and, in particular, the team is concerned about conducting residencies at Antioch Seattle as evidenced by the following statement:

"Antioch University Seattle has not been authorized to offer a PhD program in Washington State. Reference to a PhD program was made in a promotional brochure submitted with the application [renewal for Certificate of Authorization]. Should Antioch University Seattle wish to offer the PhD program or any other additional programs, please contact the HECB/DAAA to apply for authorization prior to their offering. Programs may not [emphasis added] be mentioned in any promotional literature until such time as authorization may be granted." (Higher Education Coordinating Board Correspondence, August 22, 2002).

Heritage Institute. In September 2000 Antioch University Seattle entered into a three-year agreement with Heritage Learning, Inc. dba Heritage Institute (HLI). A review of this agreement indicated that Antioch University Seattle shall make available university credit for all HLI course offerings (regular classes, field studies, external education & independent study) for K-12 educators in Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho and other states that HLI selects for expansion in accordance with the provisions of the Letter of Agreement.

During the course of the on-site visit, the AUS did not provide evidence that it and/or Heritage Institute had approval to offer graduate courses in the states listed above nor that Antioch University had approval from the Higher Learning Commission. Antioch University should review Antioch Seattle's contractual relationship with Heritage Institute to ensure quality control and that it meets appropriate state(s) authority and Higher Learning Commission approval.

Organizational Systems Renewal. Documentation was provided to the Team detailing an agreement dated November, 1999 between Antioch University Seattle and Organization Systems Renewal Midwest, Inc. (OSR-MW) located in Chicago, Illinois. Students enrolled in the OSR-MW Chicago program who earn 70-quarter credit hours earn a Master of Arts Degree in Whole Systems Design from Antioch Seattle. OSR-MW has its own faculty.

In addition, there are two M.A. program options in Whole Systems Design offered on the Seattle campus offered by Antioch Seattle faculty. The 2002-2003 Catalog describes two options for obtaining the M.A. degree. The degree on-campus "Individualized Option" has one set of admission, required and elective courses (60 cr. hrs.) and degree requirements, whereas the degree program offered either on-campus or in Chicago by Organization Systems Renewal has different admission requirements, individually designed curriculum, and 70 credit hours for graduation.

Although Chicago, Illinois is listed as "Other degree sites in other states" on Antioch University's Statement of Affiliation Status, the Team is of the opinion that Antioch University/ Antioch Seattle may not have provided the Commission on Higher Learning with approval to operate a degree program in Chicago from the appropriate State of Illinois agency (i.e., Illinois Board of Higher Education vs. Illinois Secretary of State). Furthermore, the University should review Antioch Seattle's contractual relationship with both OSR-NW and OSR-MW to ensure that it meets appropriate state authority and the accreditation concern of the educational appropriateness of awarding the same degree with different requirements.

School for Innovative Leadership. In September 1998 Antioch University Seattle entered into an affiliation agreement with the School for Innovative Leadership (SIL), a not-for-profit educational and consulting corporation chartered in Washington State. This agreement allowed employees of Aluminum Corporation of America (ALCOA) to earn a Master of Science in Management. The primary site was in Gatlinburg, Tennessee and subsequently relocated to Indianapolis, Indiana in September 2001. During the Team visit, evidence was provided that the University had exercised its option to terminate this agreement effective December 31, 2002. Approximately six months later a Continuation and Termination Agreement extended this relationship until December 31, 2003.

Documentation provided the Team indicated that the University administration realized in August 2001 that approval from the Higher Learning Commission had not been obtained and a Request for Institutional Change was drafted and perhaps submitted. Nevertheless, the Seattle team was not provided with evidence that the University had appropriate authority from either of the respective states (Tennessee nor Indiana) or the Higher Learning Commission. This matter is of concern to the Team and a teach-out plan should be developed that will satisfy all parties (e.g. SIL, enrollees, Antioch University, Antioch Seattle, State of Indiana, and Higher Learning Commission).

Advice: The Team recommends the University file a Monitoring Report on this topic.

Advice – Faculty

The Team recommends that the University consider how to develop and encourage leadership among the faculty.

The College faculty can lay claim to the intellectual heritage of the Antioch vision. The University needs to find ways to bring academic leadership into institutional prominence. These moves toward greater faculty prominence and power will take careful negotiation with students and staff members who might otherwise see the professors as turning away from sharing power with them. If they are skillful, these faculty leaders will find ways to demonstrate how the Antioch community as a whole would benefit from intellectual leadership centered in the faculty.

Faculty at the non-residential campuses are deeply committed to the core principles of the Antioch vision that serve adult learners, while infusing them with regional values. They believe that the vision and heart of the University lives in the faculty. These faculty are concerned that new campus administrators may not understand this vision and that their new leadership may sever the vital connection to the Antioch mission if they do not find ways to put faculty and academics back at the center of policy and planning for the University.

Faculty on the non-residential campuses believe that their campus sites are in serious danger of being starved of the resources they need to feed the academic mission in which they so strongly believe. Especially in areas where the cost of living is extremely high, the low faculty salaries need immediate attention. Perhaps more pressing, however, is the oppressive workload of the core faculty who teach year-round on a four-quarter calendar without regular sabbatical leave or dependable professional development funding for their own research or for curricular innovation. Faculty members generally have very scant on-site resources for instructional support, and budgets often do not allow for more than minimal materials—videos, books—to do the creative things in the classroom that they believe necessary.

In times of scarce resources, these faculty members need some assurance that Antioch is focusing on its educational heart—the faculty and academic programs. The faculty is any university's most valuable resource, and no university can afford to defer maintenance of its intellectual heart.

Perhaps the most effective way for the collective Antioch faculty to make its concerns and needs known is to consider its own governance structures. Each campus site tends to focus on its own local interests, and within each campus, each program operates relatively autonomously. How might the faculty organize itself so that it operates as a united entity and speaks with one voice about its needs and interests? A careful consideration of how the faculty might lend more significant authority and support to its leaders, both deans and elected officers, would be a good first step toward this goal.

The College faces major challenges in the areas of recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty: obtaining a budget that will enable fair and competitive compensation for faculty, and obtaining the money to properly recruit and train new minority faculty. Retention of minority faculty and staff at the College, especially of African Americans, is problem because of low salaries and the lack of a support system on a small campus in a small town.

Advice - Assessment

The Team recommends that a comprehensive program of assessing student learning be developed. This was a concern 10 years ago and continues to be a concern. Examination of student files and portfolio evaluations at the College suggest that the narrative assessment is sometimes formulaic and not clearly evaluative the individual student's performance. Portfolio evaluations are better done at most of the non-residential campus sites. A set of standards is needed for the entire University (whether uniform for the

entire institution or specific for each campus site), as is a system to monitor portfolio comments to ensure the proper application of those standards.

Faculty assessment of learning should include more direct as opposed to indirect measures. In addition, faculty should receive periodic training, supervision and coaching about how to write clear, complete and consistent narrative evaluations. In summary, assessment is about more than portfolios and specifics techniques. It is about having an institutional process that gathers and uses data to improve learning. The most important step for Antioch University is to provide evidence of how it uses the results of assessment to improve student learning.

Advice - Institutional Research

As Antioch University has worked for the last ten years to reorganize and refocus its attention on the structure of the University and its five campuses, several challenges have been consistently identified and discussed. Everyone seems to agree that the institution needs to grow enrollment and improve its financial position in order to remain vital and to prosper in the future. Overall, however, plans to achieve these goals have been, at best, only modestly successful. For the most part, these challenges have been accurately identified and discussed from within, but frequently outside resources have been employed to help resolve them.

The Team agrees with the many individuals with whom the Team met who suggested that it might be more productive to address these issues from within. All campus sites need the same things, but lack the understanding or resources to adequately secure them. The Team recommends that a central administrative team in Ohio, working in tandem with an office of institutional research, be completely focused on the institution's most pressing problems, and thereby enable all sites to mutually benefit. Effective internal research would help the institution understand who its students are, where they come from, why they attend, where they go, and where they could be found in greater numbers. Such research could lead to consistent and effective marketing and promotion strategies, admissions and enrollment management strategies, new processes for program development, a comprehensive package of alumni services, career development initiatives, and improved development efforts.

Advice - Marketing

The Team recommends that the University develop a University-wide marketing campaign in order to generate wider name recognition and emphasize the institution's core values of experiential learning and social justice. Such a campaign has the potential to attract more students to the collective campuses.

Advice - Program Development

The Team recommends that the University consider developing additional academic programs that would increase enrollment while enhancing the mission of the institution. Many individuals at non-residential campus sites believe that more business programs should be offered, with the MBA most often mentioned. There is a feeling that many prospective students who otherwise would desire the Antioch experience go elsewhere

because they are not interested in the MAOM. The majority of prospective students inquiring about the MBA are men; a group the institution is attempting to attract to help reach its diversity goals. Efficiencies could possibly be gained through an additional program that could share core courses.

The Team recommends that the University consider developing educational programs that would appeal to alumni. Alumni may be interested in engaging in post-degree educational experiences including discipline specific seminars, post-graduate professional certification programs, or just continuing education in their fields.

Advice - Career Services:

Students and alumni expressed a need for a more formal approach of delivering career and employment services. Because of the institution's commitment to the integration of study and work, many students are either already employed or expect to secure new employment through related internships or community connections. Still, they articulated a need for services that would better enable them to search new careers, to participate in career development experiences, to learn how to better balance the demands of work and family, and to achieve assistance when interested in finding new jobs after initial placement, and how to network with colleagues in their professions.

The Team recommends that the institution consider a centralized approach toward the development of career services. This could prove to be a unifying initiative while at the same time providing job and networking opportunities for students and alumni throughout the nation, and even internationally because of the worldwide co-op initiatives at the College.

International Students, Language and Study-Abroad Programs

The Team recommends that the University review its "international" programs (advising and supporting visa students, study abroad programs and language instruction) and make a mission-based decision about whether sufficient resources exist to support these programs. Currently, some international students are advised by a member of the study abroad office, while others are advised by the Dean of Students. Evidence was not clear that the current program of advisement meets the needs of all students.

The University should review whether on-campus language instruction can support its study abroad options. While language study is not the main focus of many of the Antioch study abroad programs – integration into the student's field of study being the primary goal -- it would seem that the availability of language study on campus has some impact on participation in study abroad programs and its impact on student learning.

III. RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS, SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS, AND/OR EXEMPLARY AND INNOVATIVE PRACTICE

PhD in Leadership and Change

The new designed Ph. D. program in Leadership and Change is the only University-wide academic program, building on the identity of Antioch and utilizing the resources of all campuses. This program reflects the spirit and identity of Antioch - its concern for the common good and engagement in society. The program has been thoroughly researched and is built on a premise that it will be most applicable and useful for the practitioner-scholar. The program uses the latest in educational technology to organize and manage both the program and individual courses. The learning environment relies on the twelve residencies - four per year for the first three years - to build community, to motivate the students; to develop a structure, and to provide feedback to the students. The program has built in a high level of interaction among the students and faculty.

The faculty selected for the program are highly noted for their scholarship and leadership in their respective fields, have embraced the philosophy of the academic program, and are academically and socially secure in leading this innovative academic program. The program has a business plan to be financially solvent, partly due to the low overhead required for the program and the use of existing resources and facilities. The interest in such a program is initially high, with the program finding a niche in the advanced degree academic program field. It is however too early to know how sustainable the interest will be in the program.

Cooperative Education:

Arthur Morgan, President of Antioch College from 1920-1936, introduced the Antioch work-study program, making the institution different from all other colleges of the time. Although cooperative education is no longer a unique strategy in higher education, Antioch's unusually strong commitment to developing and maintaining linkages of study and work in a liberal arts institution remains one of its most distinguishing characteristics. Antioch students clearly are attracted to the College and remain because of the perceived importance of the program.

Requiring students to complete five units of work experience in their degree programs is no easy task; it demands a large number of faculty and staff completely dedicated to helping students locate, design and complete their co-op experiences. The task has been further complicated because of the role of multiculturalism, which has necessitated a large number of international work assignments—there were 104 such assignments during 2001-2002.

It's also a demanding task for students, requiring them to become self-sufficient, flexible, and resolute in their determination to complete a degree. Many find themselves moving on and off campus several times during the pursuit of their studies, and there is little doubt that these complexities have a somewhat negative effect on retention. However, the College and its students continue to benefit from this fine program.

It would be tempting for the College to reduce co-op requirements and/or to replace faculty with lower paid staff to manage the cooperative education center, especially during times of limited financial resources, but it has done neither. The College has remained steadfast in its determination to continue advancing the vision of Arthur Morgan and is to be commended for doing so. The program continues to be, even if no longer unique, still special in liberal arts higher education.

The non-residential sites have also created ways to integrate work and study, but because of their need to meet the needs of part-time adult students they have out of necessity had to take a different approach than the College. Instead of requiring traditional co-op experiences they have creatively found ways to have students document work and community experiences as part of their programs of study. Students at these locations consistently identified these linkages as one of the primary reasons they chose to enroll at Antioch.

WORKSHEET FOR STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

INSTITUTION: ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY
150 E. South College St.
Yellow Springs, OH 45387

TYPE OF REVIEW: Continued Accreditation

DATE OF THIS REVIEW: October 14, 2002 — October 16, 2002

COMMISSION ACTION:

STATUS: *Accredited (1927- .)*

<u>Institution</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING
<u>Team</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

HIGHEST DEGREE
AWARDED: *Doctor's.*

<u>Institution</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING
<u>Team</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

MOST RECENT
ACTION: *November 28, 2001.*

TO BE CHANGED BY THE COMMISSION OFFICE

STIPULATIONS ON
AFFILIATION STATUS: *None.*

<u>Institution</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	None.
<u>Team</u>	<i>Recommended Wording:</i>	None.

NEW DEGREE

SITES:

No prior Commission approval required for Antioch-Seattle to offer BA and MA site based programs for educators in the state of Washington.

Institution

Recommended Wording: RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

Team

Recommended Wording: RETAIN ORIGINAL WORDING

PROGRESS REPORTS

REQUIRED:

None.

Team

Recommended Wording: None.

MONITORING REPORTS

REQUIRED:

None.

Team

Recommended Wording: 9/15/03; A report on legal authority to operate in every state in which it offers educational programs. If the University cannot provide evidence of this legal authority for each state then those programs must be terminated.

CONTINGENCY REPORTS

REQUIRED:

None.

Team

Recommended Wording: None.

OTHER VISITS

REQUIRED:

None.

Team

Recommended Wording: 2005-06; A focused visit on resources, planning, budgeting, development, enrollment and assessment.

LAST COMPREHENSIVE

EVALUATION:

1992-93.

TO BE CHANGED BY THE COMMISSION OFFICE

NEXT COMPREHENSIVE

EVALUATION:

2002-03.

Team

Recommended Wording: 2012-13.