

APPENDIX E

Antioch College Renewal Commission Final Report to Board of Trustees June 4, 2004

Calendar, Curricular and Staffing Benchmarks For The Renewal Commission's Proposal To The Board Of Trustees

Preamble

This document summarizes the work of College faculty and administrators as they came together in retreats and task forces (March – April, 2004) to lay the groundwork for transformational change in matters of calendar, curriculum and staffing. Most of the essential questions and concerns have been identified and considerable creativity has been expressed as the College takes up the Board's and the Renewal Commission's call for a renewed Antioch. In the available 60-day timeline, however, faculty and administrators have not been able to fashion detailed plans and have had to work at the general level in regard to specific challenges and needs. In short, this document is the best contribution campus constituencies can currently make to the work of the Renewal Commission. Much more problem-solving remains to be done during 04/05, our Implementation Year.

Benchmark I

Antioch's Four-year Baccalaureate Experience will be informed by the developmental needs and progress of students across time. This developmental arc is entailed in Antioch's Four Architectural Organizers for the Academic, Experiential, and Co-op Curriculum

Year 1: Foundations and Exploration¹

The first year emphasis is on broad-based learning, focused on the general education and work competencies that are fundamental to any area of concentration in a liberal arts curriculum. Through exploring different areas and modes of inquiry, students should be exposed to the foundations of knowledge, disciplines, and work.

Year 2: Development and Experimentation

The second year emphasizes the further development of fundamental knowledge and skills. Students should be developing a familiarity with both the languages of and the work of leading thinkers in various disciplines. Through a guided process of conscious experimentation, students are expected to work on developing an understanding of "vexing problems and solutions" with an emphasis on developing critical thinking skills. Both the first and second years focus on students learning and developing the abilities to join communities of practice.

Year 3: Refinement and Fluency

¹ This model is organized by year, but cooperative education progression may occur in a different time frame (i.e. co-op 1, co-op 2,...).

Year three focuses on the continued refinement of vocabularies of specific disciplines—as well as the vocabulary of border crossing. Students should develop an understanding of what it is to be a practitioner and discover the complexities of practice. In the third year, the arguments, experiments, assignments become more complex, demanding general education knowledge, developed disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge, as well as an increasing refinement of those basic skills. At this stage, students focus on developing fluency in their chosen field/job in order to become meaningful contributors to their communities of practice.

Year 4: Concentration and Articulation

By the fourth year, students' studies become much more directed toward their own specific areas of inquiry, with an eye toward the senior project as a means of integrating and culminating their academic, experiential, and co-operative studies. Students should be familiar with the language of the discipline(s) and be able to clearly articulate original ideas, contributing to the body of practice in their chosen field/job.

Benchmark II

Faculty Load:

- All faculty must function on multiple levels in a way that is equitable, sustainable over the long-term for both the individual and the curriculum, and that does not compromise the quality of the academic program.
- Classroom faculty loads include classroom time, advising, professional development and scholarship, committee work, assessment, curriculum development, etc. We believe that faculty load should be based on a student-faculty ratio that is fiscally sustainable and quality sensitive. The Renewal Commission's proposed 15:1 ratio (classroom faculty per student) is a reasonable initial planning metric. We do know that such a ratio is the College's essential sustainability measure and that, as such, it must be attuned to the realities of fiscal resources and the limits of human resources.
- Co-op faculty have a workload that remains to be analyzed and determined in light of Co-op goals.
- We also have to determine an acceptable ratio of full-time to part-time teaching faculty. Here too matters of fiscal reality have to match the quality dictates of a selective liberal arts college.

Benchmark III

The 'New' Antioch: Outcomes-Centered

- The New Antioch must be Mission-loyal and 21st Century-appropriate in its purposes.
- The New Antioch must seek Coherence and speak to Accountability by centering on Learning-Outcomes.
- The New Antioch must create a curricular and co-curricular living and learning environment that is as inclusive as it is supportive.

- Next year the Implementation Team must identify the knowledge-sets, competency-sets, values and attitudes that constitute a fully formed and distinctly Antiochian literacy. See Appendix 2 (Appendix D, Renewal Commission Report) for a sample outcomes statement.
- An outcomes-centered learning enterprise is best kept on track and on task using Learning Portfolios. A Portfolio (electronic and print versions) is as much a way of thinking about learning as it is a record of learning. Please see Benchmark VII for further discussion of Learning Portfolios.
- The New Antioch will find it easier to assess student learning because of the attention we will pay to specific outcomes and to Learning Portfolios. See Appendix 3 (Appendix E, Renewal Commission Report) for a sample of a rubric for writing competence that can be used to assess in detail a student's performance level. Such a rubric, we stress, is ultimately the best way for the College to take measure of and improve what and how it teaches.

Benchmark IV

The Essential Curricular Event: The Experiential Learning Community

- We agreed that a new name for the ELCs is necessary but did not develop an agreeable alternative. Some faculty-generated suggestions include: Communities of Inquiry, or Inquiry Collectives (ICs). This issue may perhaps be best addressed by College Marketers.
- An ELC will have **2 or 3 faculty members** (this is a bedrock proposition based on the literature and praxis at Evergreen and Wagner).
- The ELCs will be of **variable lengths** (whole or parts of semesters). Based on discussions with experts at Evergreen and Wagner, we have determined that a year-long first year ELC will likely cause rather than solve retention issues.
- Variable length ELCs allows for more "instances" of developmental learning.
- All ELCs will include **experiential learning as an integrated component**. This integration could happen through a variety of models including multiple field trips of varying lengths, a discrete, isolated long-term trip, individualized weekly work in a community, internships, among others.
- ELCs in plan D: (although consensus was not reached on selecting D as THE calendar, we agreed that its ELC vision for the sophomore and junior years was a compelling option.)
 - This vision creates sophomore and junior level ELCs one full academic year in length, with at least 2 classroom faculty, and a co-op faculty "host."
 - The ELC faculty integrate co-op and other experiential learning events as they see fit. List jobs can be "checked out" of the full job list by the ELC faculty for exclusive use in their ELC.
 - In the fall, after an initial meeting with the whole ELC, the students would be shifted into two major groups—with one going on co-op in the fall and the

other remaining on campus to study. These two groups would be connected and communicating with each other.

- The students who leave for co-op in the fall (the “scouts”) report back to the studying students (the “mentors”) and help prepare them for the co-op experience. These “scouts” would be linked into the learning community through on-line lectures, readings, films, and other technology-supported activities. These students would rejoin their ELC in Yellow Springs at the beginning of fall semester for a decompression and then become “mentors” for the students who are now leaving for their co-op experience.
- This model also has room for the integration of “Warren Wilson” or “early Antioch (20’s and 30’s)” on-campus, co-curricular work experiences under supervision of staff.
- We support the possibility of crafting **opportunities for focused study** outside of an ELC in ways that do not increase faculty load or compromise the integrity and “cohort effect” of the ELC model. These focused studies **MUST** be limited and **MUST** differ from the current “course” model. Curricular planning is an organic process that will cohere in new ways and we support a new kind of faculty citizenship and membership in Curricular Planning Units (CPUs).
- **Curricular Planning Units** (CPU) are groups of faculty with similar interests. CPUs by definition cut across traditional disciplinary/departmental lines.
- We suggest that the classical division into humanities, social sciences, arts and media, and natural sciences is not the only possible configuration, and believe this must be sorted clearly by the faculty during Implementation 04/05.
- **Sequenced Learning remains a challenge.** How do we reconcile the need to be high-linear (Foreign Languages and Sciences) and high cross-connected at the same time? How will we accommodate the large blocks of time needed for Studio and Performance Learning?
- We recommend that we emulate Evergreen and set up a first-year science intensive ELC in order for students to track successfully in the natural sciences.

Benchmark V

A “Modular” (book-ended) Curricular Structure

The **modular** structure allows for:

- formalized ELC-based **sharing and digestion of co-op experiences.**
- a dedicated **orientation period** for 1st years which might include such things as SOPP training, math and writing assessments, social events and time for “reading and discussion” groups
- integrating and featuring the **registration/advising** activities that are currently “outside” the semester as part of the learning community environment,
- a recognition of the faculty time necessary for **intensive portfolio reviews** and other assessments
- the selection and training of the **Teaching Assistants** (honor-based

application/appointment system) who will be chosen by 1st year ELC faculty and will assist in the 1st year ELCs and act as Peer Mentors.

- faculty to convene with their ELC colleagues.
- dedicated time for **faculty mentoring of students**.
- the creation of **Individualized Degree Plans** at the end of the second year,
- **presentation of senior projects** in such a way that they are NOT “squeezed in” at the very, very, very busy end of term time
- a **Student/Faculty Conference** that will bring all levels of students as well as faculty together to share their academic endeavors of the past year, (the students would re-convene in their ELC’s after the conference for a discussion/writing/reflection period)
- a period of **intensive study** for non-seniors to complete their ELC projects prior to presenting them at the conference.

Benchmark VI

The Integration of Classroom and Co-op Learning

In the preceding Benchmark this document describes a “Modular System”, an attempt to create coherence and multiply learning. Indeed, the New Antioch will be an opportunity to suture classroom and co-op learning systematically into a seamless whole. In regard to such integration we will undertake three general approaches.

- First, in the modular approach we “bookend” each LC with an opportunity to reflect on past learning experiences as well as to anticipate upcoming learning experiences. In learning theory it is a foundational assumption that we learn most when we consciously accommodate existing knowledge to what we have just experienced and, conversely, when we consciously prep/prime for new learning by anticipating upcoming learning encounters.
- Second, in the Host Communities (See Benchmark X) we will expect all students to earn “classroom” credit during co-op experiences. There are reasoned methodological arguments why we have traditionally separated such learning, but it is a foundational Renewal Commission expectation that we erase these distinctions and divisions in the future. Accordingly, each student will earn the credit equivalent of a classroom course while they simultaneously earn co-op credit. This during-co-op credit may take several forms: an online course that is built and taught by campus faculty; a course taught in the field by an Antioch-adjunct faculty member; independent study
- Third, we refer to Appended Plan D. In this curricular scheme Antioch can pursue a perfect and ideal version of the Integration of Classroom and Co-op learning. It is perhaps best to understand this as a transactional model because its power lies in the ability of on-campus learners to bond with and learn from learning community peers who are at that moment off-campus and engaged in co-op. There is considerable potential in this scheme which may be, in intellectual terms, the most sophisticated teaching and

learning model we can envision. It is also complex and will require further study and actual field-testing before it can be endorsed as a full-College enterprise.

Benchmark VII

The Individualized Plan of Study (previously known as the Major)

- We envision the Individualized Plan of Study to follow either a (1) **specialized pathway** or a (2) **negotiated pathway**. Both pathways will be co-determined by CPUs, students, advisors, and tracked in the portfolio process. However, the negotiated pathways will involve greater student responsibility for pathway design and justification. All students will receive a degree in “Liberal Arts.” However, they may, with the approval of their faculty mentor, choose an appropriate name for their concentration.
- The pathway concentration will culminate in the senior year. The senior year will have some faculty in dedicated senior-level ELCs and will require the completion of a **seminar and a senior project**. The senior project should be developed in consultation with a faculty mentor(s) and will be required to stand as an appropriate culmination of the student’s work as documented through the portfolio and as appropriate to the title of the student’s concentration, whatever that might be.
- **The Learning Portfolio (electronic and print)** is a way of organizing, directing, summarizing, and measuring learning. It includes re-current planning, documentation, and assessment of the student’s trajectory through the Antioch experience.
- Portfolios will include ELC and co-op evaluations, key papers, evaluations of experiential learning, self-evaluations, documentation of performances/projects, assessment results, etc.
- Rules for inclusion of materials, storage of the portfolios, approval of student progress as manifested through the portfolio, the nature of the review process, student defense of included content, etc., are implementation questions that still need to be addressed. The content of the student portfolio could include oral components and assessment essays to illustrate the student’s growth and the cohesion of their studies.
- Some members of the design team proposed that portfolios might be reviewed periodically by a Portfolio Review Committee (PRC) comprised of Learning Community teachers, student-selected faculty and advisors. These reviews might occur at the end of the first year, the end of the second year, the beginning of the fourth year, and again at the end of the fourth year. The PRC would serve the function of assessing individual student outcomes.
- A larger, College-wide Assessment Committee would be needed for institutional assessment.

Benchmark VIII

Student Load (Student Load matters are complex and will be dealt with in detail during the Implementation Year 04/05)

- Students enroll in either one semester-long ELC or two half semester ELCs. Full semester ELCs could be worth 16 semester credits, while half semesters could be worth 8 credits each.
- While students are on co-op, they will earn co-op credits as well as be enrolled in some form of academic coursework (see possible co-op course options under Benchmark VIII). This combined experience could be worth 8 credits.
- We are not clear on whether (or how) credits should be awarded for the rising Senior Summer events.
- Students must be able to earn partial credit from ELCs. Students must also be able to take less than 16 credits and still satisfy existing higher ed norms for being a fulltime student. The details of how this might function still need to be developed.
- Transfer students are a steady anchor in Antioch's market. As at Evergreen we recommend a flexible system that is transfer-student friendly.
- The system described above will allow for a possibility of 120 credits to be earned over six ELCs and three co-ops.

Benchmark IX

Dealing with Problematic Consequences of a Full-scale ELC System for

Co-op (We agree that the items below are all potential, partial responses, but we have not reached consensus on the most tenable solution or solutions in terms of the ELC idea as a whole.)

➤ **Problematic Consequence #1: The "hole"**

The Problem: *At the end of the first year, because students are on summer vacation and then on a fall semester-long co-op, there is a "hole" in student participation with the Antioch campus. This presents a significant risk for retention of students.*

Potential, Partial Responses:

- (1) **Host Communities:** Host communities present a partial solution to the problem of the “hole” because they allow for the formation of genuine communities of inquiry in remote areas where there are already a large number of co-op jobs and in which there are supportive alumni and/or other Antioch campuses. (e.g.: New York, San Francisco, Seattle, Santa Barbara, Yellow Springs, and Keene) Thus, ELCs allow students to feel as if they are still “in college.” Furthermore, we could develop a set of first year jobs that are primarily located in the Yellow Springs Host Community, allowing students in their first co-op to still live on or near Antioch College and participate in community life.
- (2) **Integration of Academic Credit over Co-op in Host Communities:** A strong commitment to formal learning over co-op allows students to feel as if they are “still in college” and will address (in a fundamental way) the “retention hole” at the end of the first year.

Consider the following potential models for courses over co-op:

- Faculty at the home campus (YS) can design an **on-line ELC** (using “Blackboard” or “Web CT”) that students in any region can link into. This would count as part of faculty load, and would be led by at least 2 faculty members. This course could focus on any theme or content area.
 - Field faculty (alumni or recent grads or adjuncts) in the **host communities might hold a topical ELC**. Students in the region could opt into this community.
 - Students may choose to enroll in a **“course” at a local college or university**. We may be able to develop reciprocal relationships with key institutions in the host communities in order to simplify the enrollment/transfer process.
 - Field faculty in each region could offer a **seminar-style ELC for all co-oping students** in the region. This ELC could function as an “orientation” to the different aspects of the host community (diversity, ecology, economy, politics, etc.), and as a way of creating support networks and maintaining a cohort of students over the co-op period. Ideally, every student would take this Host Seminar—with the option of taking one of the previous options as well.
- (3) **Calendar Changes:**
 - **Plan C:** This calendar change plan addresses the “hole” by (a) moving from having students on-campus for only 9 months to having some students on campus throughout the calendar year, (b) by changing the sequence of some students in the first year, and (c) by creating divisions of students in the first and second years.
 - **Plan D:** This plans address the hole by creating larger ELCs in the second and third years that fully integrate co-op learning within the ELC and create pseudo-divisions of students (they are still connected with their ELCs electronically) in the second and third years.

➤ Problematic Consequence #2: The Bulge

The problem: *The current iteration of Plans A & B creates a bulge of placement work for co-op faculty at the end of spring term. This bulge is inequitable and unsustainable over the long-term.*

Potential, Partial Responses:

- (1) **Host Communities:** The creation of meaningful and useful host communities could help standardize the job list and streamline the placement process.
- (2) **Enforcement of Firm but Staggered Registration Deadlines:** Setting firm, staggered deadlines for registration, perhaps by alphabetical order, or by class rank (1st year, etc.), could spread the bulge from the end of spring to over much more of the semester.
- (3) **Reorganization of Work Responsibilities and Additional Staff:** The following changes would help to alleviate the “bulge” as well as serve other College needs.
 - Rather than being organized by “geographic region,” **co-op faculty could take charge of jobs related to their field of specialization.** This allows co-op faculty to join ELCs in their area of interest and to serve the needs to students with similar interests.
 - **Co-op faculty integration in ELCs.** Within ELCs, co-op faculty could help students process their experiential learning in a way that helps them develop the skills necessary for co-op. If they are part of the ELCs, co-op faculty can be working on student placement throughout the term, thereby spreading the bulge over the whole spring semester.
 - **Re-organization of Work Responsibilities:** Instead of having a department of 6 faculty who all do all parts of the co-op planning, we could envision that these 6 be allowed to choose their method of participation along the following lines:
 - i. **Director of Cooperative Learning:** The primary role of this 12-month administrative position is to develop and maintain list jobs in the host communities. The person filling this position would also be responsible for (a) being available and responsive to students (via email, phone, and campus presence) over the summer (when other co-op and classroom faculty are “off”), and (b) for assisting the rest of the co-op faculty in times of heavy advising/placement. This position would carry with it an on-campus co-op opportunity.
 - ii. **Assistant Director of Cooperative Learning:** This position would be a 12-month position and would be **roughly** equivalent to what the co-op faculty members do now. This person would be responsible for a very heavy advising load—indeed, that would be her primary role. S/he would be available and responsive to students year-round, and would also assist the Director when necessary. Similarly to the Director of Co-operative Learning position, there could be an on-campus co-op position to assist the ADCL as well.

- iii. **Director of Experiential Learning:** This person in this 12-month position would be responsible for (a) developing relationships and opportunities for experiential learning in the greater Dayton area, (b) assisting all ELC faculty by creating successful field trips or other experiential learning opportunities at faculty request, (c) being available to assist students on co-op over the summer, and (d) helping alleviate the co-op faculty advising/placement bulge. Similarly to the Director of Co-operative Learning position, there could be an on-campus co-op position to assist the DEL as well.
- iv. **Area Assistant:** This person would do the work of the area assistant as it is currently defined, with an emphasis on managing communication between students and students, between students and faculty, and between faculty and faculty.

Combined with carefully planned and ENFORCED deadlines for registration, the additional time made available by the Assistant Director, the student co-op positions, and the Director of Experiential Learning, and the removal of job development from the co-op faculty job description, the co-op faculty “bulge” is structurally (but without changing the calendar) reduced.

- (4) **Additional Staff:** We could simply hire 2-3 more full-time co-op faculty members to cover the bulge (seasonal work?) or we could re-conceptualize the work of co-op faculty to include much more integration with the ELCs—which would necessitate 2-3 more full-time co-op faculty.
- (5) **Spreading of Co-op Advising and Placement to Classroom Faculty/Advisors:**
We could reduce the bulge by shifting some of the work that is now done exclusively by co-op faculty to the classroom faculty, giving faculty who are interested in serving the College in this way an ELC reduction to make up for the time spent advising/placing students in co-op positions. Perhaps 3-4 classroom faculty could be converted this way.
- (6) **Calendar Changes:**
 - **Plan C:** This calendar change plan addresses the “bulge” by (a) moving from having students on-campus for only 9 months to having some students on campus throughout the calendar year, (b) by changing the sequence of some students in the first year, and (c) by creating divisions of students in the first and second years.
 - **Plan D:** This plan integrates the co-op experience into the ELCs in a holistic way. This, then, shifts the burden of co-op placement onto the classroom faculty who are participating in the second and third year ELCs.

➤ **Problem #3: The Developmental Curriculum**

Problem: *Co-op experiences should be (but currently are not) structured in a way that allows for and promotes increasing sophistication of both students and job options.*

Potential, Partial Responses:

- (1) **Scaffolding the Co-operative Experiences:** Requiring specifically, carefully designed, and enforced parameters for a student to “graduate” from one level of co-op education to another will demand evidence (placed in the portfolio) of increasing development. Students who do not demonstrate such advances in their reflection and skills would not receive credit—and would be required to repeat a co-op experience at the same level.
- (2) **Integration of Academic Credit over Co-op in Host Communities:** Formal learning activities, such as seminar style ELC’s in host communities could be used to develop and assess more detailed scaffolding for developmental learning over co-op.
- (3) **Increasing Work-Site Expectations:** In order to facilitate a developmental curriculum within co-op experiences, we could negotiate a set of additional job-site expectations with individual employers. Thus, when employer A has a rising second year student, s/he would have a certain set of expectations. And while the job description might remain essentially the same, the expectations of a rising senior student might be quite different in terms of jobs assigned, responsibilities delegated, involvement with the work community, etc.
- (4) **Combining Scaffolding and Increasing Site Expectations:** Cooperative education experiences could be made developmentally hierarchical by combining greater work-site expectations with greater scaffolding of the student’s reflection/processing.
- (5) **Calendar Changes:**
 - **Plan C:** This plan addresses the developmental nature of co-op experience by identifying the qualities that jobs would ideally offer to students at varying levels. This stepping of co-op jobs could be applied to any model.
 - **Plan D:** This plan addresses the developmental curriculum by having co-op jobs filled by both 2nd and 3rd year students year-round, thereby allowing for the development and maintenance of more advanced jobs for third year students.

Benchmark X

Host Communities (With the exception of the first bulleted point, we did not discuss Host Communities in enough detail to reach consensus.)

- We agree that (1) Host Communities are a promising way of centralizing and organizing co-op resources, and (2) that co-ops should be centered in but not limited to work in Host Communities.
- The co-op director does not think that a volunteer-staffed host community will be sustainable over the long-term.
- Host communities could be staffed by recent grads being paid a small stipend.

Employers could contribute space and resources (phones, copiers, etc.). The grad could help students find housing, navigate local customs and requirements, be a listener, and alert the college to problematic behaviors—allowing for coordinated intervention.

- Or, Host Communities could be areas where the College has secured dedicated housing for students, with a professional student affairs person managing the site. This person could be responsible for coordinating seminars, providing personal and professional support, and helping students navigate their new surroundings.
- The co-op director believes that Host Communities should include a border community (e.g., South Texas, Arizona, Miami, LA, Vancouver), a “new economy” community (Austin, Seattle, Silicon Valley, Boston, Pittsburgh), an “old economy” in transition (Detroit, Baltimore, Bridgeport), a government center (DC, or a state capitol), communities with diverse leadership (Atlanta, Miami, San Antonio), an “affordable” community (Portland, Chicago, St. Louis, Louisville, Indianapolis), several international sites (Brazil, Kyoto, Mali, China), and a rural or wilderness region (Maine, Arizona, Oregon, Montana).

Benchmark XI

Development and Maintenance Costs

- Continued Professional Development for faculty is imperative for success of the ELC vision.
- Curricular Development will be an on-going, creative process.
- On-line learning and the problems of student access to technology at remote sites are murky and will need further research and development.
- There will be new administrative, technological, and infrastructural needs if the ELC model is to succeed.

In short, we expect the New Antioch to be vastly more effective than the current way we conduct teaching and learning. However, because of the related costs of teaching and learning in new ways we do not necessarily expect the New Antioch to be vastly less expensive than the existing Antioch. We hope that all planning proceeds with the knowledge that institutional transformation must be fiscally responsible but also with the knowledge that each new avenue is not necessarily a cost-cutting venture.

Benchmark XII

The Merits of the Proposed Calendars

(See Appendix B, Renewal Commission Report.) We submit Plan B as the model that carries with it a consensus endorsement. This consensus was expressed in the response sheets from the recent Faculty Retreat as well as in the discussions of the Design Team that was so industrious in April. Plan C is the model that speaks to pitfalls and potholes for Co-op learning that may pertain from Plan B. Please see Benchmark IX for a full discussion. However, we will not submit Plan C as a viable option because it has one liability that looms large: Plan C requires the

College to plan for a 12-month learning experience in the Freshman/Sophomore years. That means that the College will also have to provide financial aid and forgo what is called “summer earnings” when packaging financial aid. This means that Plan C carries with it a price tag of approximately \$225,000 worth of unrealized revenue. As such, this Plan is untenable.

Plan D is submitted because it quickly convinced faculty and Renewal Commission members that it is the ideal version of what Antioch might be. Please see Benchmark VI, above, for a discussion of what this plan promises but the realization that it requires further study and could be the perfect extension of Plan B.