

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

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 (ANED)  
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](http://www.osr-nw.org)> <[www.antiochsea.edu](http://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.