

Proposed Governance Structure of Antioch College: Narrative

This proposal is presented for discussion and comment by the Antioch College Alumni Board's Governance Committee.¹ It addresses the governance structure of Antioch College under a new Antioch College Board of Trustees. It does not address the relationship between the College Board and the University Board of Trustees.

The Committee supports the greatest degree of authority and autonomy for the College Board -- in hiring the President of the College and managing the assets, budget, curriculum, programs and faculty of the College -- that can be achieved consistent with the requirements for maintaining the College's accreditation. We are working with the Accreditation Task Force and the Legal Team to develop a proposal for the relationship between the College and University Boards of Trustees.

This proposal is inspired by two main goals:

1. Increase the real, original power of the stakeholders by giving AdCil the power to advise and consent on all matters other than curriculum, subject to veto by the President, with provision for appeal to the College Board of Trustees.
2. Return the Faculty of Antioch College to the center of the College's mission and curriculum. The Faculty's ability to serve as Trustees and on AdCil provide a much needed boost in its ability to guide the education of Antioch students.

This proposal does not offer a structure for the President and CEO's team, nor does it detail the procedures of the Faculty Senate. The President and CEO's team structure should be up to the President with the consent of AdCil. The faculty should create their own procedures for electing a Faculty Speaker, etc. The composition of the Faculty Senate proposed on the org chart is of tenured, tenure track and emeriti faculty. In the event that a non-residential education unit exists within the College, the level of participation and rank, if any, of its instructors needs to be determined.

At the administrative level it is assumed that non-residential education would be handled at the level of a dean or director.

Note there is no inclusion of reserved seats for specific constituencies. Following the advice given by Mort Rauh in Antioch Notes, such numerical division will

¹ Active participants in the discussion included Alumni Board members Ellen Borgersen (Committee Chair) Susan Opotow, Sheila Richmond, Steve Schwerner and Dave Thelen, faculty liaison Eric Miller, CG liaison Chelsea Martens, Bonnie Bazata, Steve Benowitz, Robert Lehman, Karen Mulhauser and Travis Sanford, who drafted the proposal.

never be satisfactory to the participants and would probably lead to factionalism. By keeping all Trustee spots open to any combination of Faculty, Staff, students, University trustees, or outside candidates, AdCil, the Alumni Board, and the existing Board will be able to craft the best slate to meet the needs of the college.

Direct election of trustees would most likely lead to the problem at Dartmouth where money starts entering the campaign and forcing out those who would lack the resources to run a campaign.

I. The Trustees of Antioch College

- a. Current and former practice was to have a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees.
 - i. BoT view tends to be the 10,000 foot view, lack current stakeholder viewpoints.
 - ii. Students, faculty and staff do not feel adequately represented before the Board and become alienated from them.
- b. Proposal: Alter the composition of, and manner of selection for the Board to include the following,
 - i. 1/3 of trustees appointed by AdCil.
 - ii. 1/3 of trustees appointed existing trustees.
 - iii. 1/3 of trustees appointed by Alumni Association Board of Directors
 - iv. The Faculty Speaker² to be added as an ex-officio, non-voting member.
 - v. The President of the Antioch Alumni Association as an ex-officio, voting member.
 - vi. The Community Manager as an ex-officio, non-voting member.
 - vii. Open eligibility for trusteeship to all whether employed by the Corporation (faculty and staff but not officers or Deans), students or outside candidates.
- c. Outcome:
 - i. Wider opportunities for participation in governance.
 - ii. Current interests of the institution represented by stakeholders
 - iii. Long term continuity preserved by self-selecting cohort.
 - iv. Faculty gains a permanent voice on the Board.
 - v. Alumni represented by a permanent vote on the Board.
- d. Objections:
 - i. Gives too much power to current stakeholders.
 - ii. Conflict of interest if stakeholders (faculty, staff) are appointed by AdCil
 - iii. Conflicts of Duty
 - iv. Complicates cycle of terms.

² See Faculty Senate

- e. Consensus: It is not uncommon for people to serve in multiple capacities. The other objections are outweighed by the benefits of having a Board that is closer to the stakeholders.

II. Chairperson and Committees of the Antioch College BoT

- a. Currently the Chair has no term limit in the position, the regular term of office as a trustee may be extended to the length of the term as Chair, controls committee assignments and appoints committee chairs.
 - i. Concentrates power unnecessarily
 - ii. Forces others to rely on the good graces of the Chairperson.
- b. Proposal:
 - i. The Chairperson of the BoT will be term limited to 6 years.
 - ii. The Chairperson of the BoT will not automatically have their term as a trustee extended but will be the Chairperson if they are re-elected as a trustee.
 - iii. Committee assignments will be made by consensus of the whole. Committee Chairs will be elected by the committee each year.
- c. Outcome:
 - i. Greater participation of all trustees.
 - ii. Power decentralized.
- d. Objections: ?

III. The Faculty of Antioch College

- a. The faculty does not currently have a “constitutional” role in the governance of the college, except as elected members of AdCil.
 - i. Faculty not encouraged viewing the college as theirs.
 - ii. Faculty not in charge of curriculum.
 - iii. Faculty is treated as employees rather than as peers.
- b. Proposal: Constitutionally empower the faculty.
 - i. A Faculty Senate shall be convened with its own rules of conduct but including all tenured faculty and emeriti.
 - 1. This Senate, is charged with the development of and final authorization and implementation of the curriculum, except where issues of finance are the proper purview of AdCil and the BoT.
 - 2. Create elected Faculty Speaker to serve on BoT as ex-officio, non-voting member.
 - 3. This Senate will approve and confer all academic and honorary degrees.
 - ii. Faculty eligible for appointment or election to BoT.

- c. Outcome:

- i. Faculty becomes first and final say on matters of curriculum.
 - ii. Faculty assured a voice on the BoT.
- d. Objections:
 - i. Diminution of Trustees power.
 - ii. Diminution of Presidential power
- e. Consensus: The lessons of recent years prove that excessive power in the hands of the Trustees and the President does not ensure the well-being of the College.

IV. The Administrative Council of Antioch College

- a. AdCil does not currently have a “constitutional” role in governance and is confined to an advisory or consultative role in administration of the college.
 - i. President able to disregard the elected representatives of the community.
 - ii. Faculty, students and staff not able to access information needed for informed participation.
 - iii. Faculty and staff relegated to employee status.
 - iv. No ability to check on Administrative or Trustee actions.
- b. Proposal:
 - i. AdCil to serve as legislative body of the college, with power of binding decisions. The President is granted veto power over decisions of AdCil. The veto of the President may be appealed to the BoT by AdCil. The veto power does not extend to AdCil’s tenure review decisions or to its selection of trustees.
 - ii. AdCil positions to be year long and attendance by teleconference allowed.
 - iii. Faculty tenure will be granted by AdCil, and financially approved by the BoT.
 - iv. AdCil will appoint 1/3 total number of trustees.
- c. Outcome:
 - i. AdCil as the legislative body of the College can protect the interests of the current stakeholders in the decision making process of the Administration.
 - ii. AdCil’s power is limited by the Presidential veto and the unlikely event that the BoT would override a veto except in the most extreme of circumstances.
 - iii. Control of tenure review maintains input to the tenure process by the community.
- d. Objections:
 - i. Diminishes power of President – would top candidates take the job with this level of oversight?
 - ii. Diminishes power of Trustees

- iii. Too much power in the hands of a body connected to the heat of the campus.
- iv. Lack of expertise among students and factionalism from the Faculty.
- e. Consensus: Shared governance is a core value of Antioch College and essential to its mission of producing leaders and change agents. AdCil was empowered by tradition for many years. Students, faculty and staff who are empowered to govern gain expertise. They take their responsibilities very seriously. A candidate for President who is unwilling to govern under a system of checks and balances does not have the commitment to shared governance that an Antioch President must have.

V. The Administration of Antioch College

a. General:

- i. The Administration (except the president) reports to AdCil administrative functions to be approved by AdCil as the legislative body.
- ii. Administrators of the College are not eligible for election to AdCil, or the BoT.
- iii. They may be elected to ComCil or CSB.

b. President of the College

- i. Will also be the Chair of AdCil
 - 1. Non-voting except to break ties or cast veto.
- ii. Reports the actions of AdCil to the BoT
- iii. Is hired by BoT after approval by Faculty Senate and AdCil.