Focused Visit Report

After the team reaches a consensus, the team chair completes this form to summarize and document the team's view. Notes and evidence should be essential and concise.

Submit the completed draft report to the HLC staff liaison. When the report is final, send a single electronic document (in PDF format) to finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution: Pima Community College District   City, State: Tucson, AZ

Visit Date: 09/26/16-09/27/16

Names of Peer Reviewers: (List the names, titles and affiliations of each peer reviewer. The team chair should note that designation in parenthesis.)

Dr. Russell D. Baker, Vice President of Academic Affairs and University Transfer Division, Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana

Dr. Jared Cutler, Assistant Provost of Accreditation and Assessment, Sinclair Community College

Dr. Lisa Gerow, Associate Professor of Nursing, Tulsa Community College

Dr. Jennifer Lynn McClure, Managing Director Enrollment Services, Elgin Community College

Dr. Scott R. Olson, President, Winona State University

Dr. Sherilyn W. Poole, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students (Retired), Governors State University (Team Chair)

Dr. Brett Powell, Vice President for Finance & Administration, Henderson State University

Part A: Context and Nature of Visit

1. Purpose of the Visit:

The College is required to host a focused evaluation focused on validating the contents of the Notice Report and on the effectiveness and long-term viability of changes at the College. At the time of the visit, the College must demonstrate that recently implemented policies, plans, functions, and structures meet Commission requirements and that they have been effective and are likely to remain successful. If progress in these areas does not continue or if other compliance issues develop at the College, the evaluation team should carefully consider a recommendation of Notice or Probation.

2. Accreditation Status:

Accredited On Notice

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 1

3. **Organizational Context**:

After its Comprehensive Visit in 2010, Pima Community College (PCC) was found to have met all the Criteria for Accreditation. Its next Comprehensive Visit was scheduled for 2018-2019. In 2012, the Commission received a series of complaints focused on "the former Chancellor's behavior, the engagement of the Board in overseeing the College and evaluating the Chancellor, the work environment at the College, and other related matters." In 2013, the HLC President called for an Advisory Visit to the College to investigate the allegations in the complaints and to assist in determining if the College continued to meet the Criteria for Accreditation and other requirements including the Assumed Practices if appropiate.The results of the fact-finding visit identified "… serious concerns with the College's compliance with several of the Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components." The HLC President recommended to the HLC Board of Trustees that the College be placed on Probation at the Board's April 2013 meeting and the Board took that action. Under HLC policy, an institution placed on Probation must host a comprehensive evaluation within two years after the sanction has been imposed. A large team visited PCC for a comprehensive evaluation in 2014. As a result of the team's findings during this visit, the HLC Board removed the College from Probation and placed it On Notice at its February 2015 meeting. This action was taken because "…while the College is now in compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it remains at risk of being out of compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components…" The HLC Board required that PCC host a focused visit…"no later than September 2016 focused on validating the contents of the Notice Report and on the effectiveness and long-term viability of changes at the College." PCC submitted a Notice Report in June 2016 describing the activities and progress the College had made to correct the issues identified in the On Notice letter.The report below identifies the results of the focused visit conducted September 26-27, 2016. Prior to the visit, the focused team members studied a large variety of materials including HLC archived documents and the PCC Notice Report June 30, 2016 with a number of linked documents included in the report. During the visit, the focused visit team members conducted meetings and interviews with a large number of College personnel, students, members of two community groups, and held an open for members of the greater Tucson community. The team also reviewed additional materials to determine the College's progress in the 11 areas of focus which were identified in the HLC President's March 9, 2015 letter to the PCC Chancellor.

4. **Unique Aspects of Visit**:

None

5. **Areas of Focus**

Complete the following A and B sections for each area of focus.

A1. Statement of Focus:

The College has addressed the concerns of the Commission related to Criterion Two, Core Component 2.A, "the institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff," for the following reasons:

• the College has implemented necessary internal controls to provide for oversight of its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions, including the implementation of a policy to promote communication between management and employees and the establishment of Board committees on Finance and Human Resources along with a College Governance Council;
• the College has adopted new policies in many areas including policies on sexual harassment, discrimination and retaliation;
• the College Board, employees and administrators have been trained on revised policies and procedures, as appropriate for their position;

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 2

• a new Office of Dispute Resolution has been initiated under the direction of the internal auditor to investigate and act on complaints;
• the College has made appropriate improvements to its Human Resource function;
• the College has changed its purchasing processes, particularly for non-competitive purchases, and has established an infrastructure for guiding ethical and responsible action;
• the College Board has recently undertaken a review of its bylaws.

While the College has addressed the concerns of the Board, it is still at risk of being out of compliance with Core Component 2.A because many changes, including the adoption of new policies and processes, have been developed and implemented only recently so that there has not yet been sufficient time to test and assess the effect of these changes.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Two, Core Component 2.A

B1. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:
The College has implemented necessary internal controls to provide for oversight of its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions, including the implementation of a policy to promote communication between management and employees and the establishment of Board committees on Finance and Human Resources along with a College Governance Council.

PCC has done a significant amount of work addressing concerns regarding its "financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions" since these concerns were first raised when the College was put on Probation by the HLC in 2013. Detailed evidence of progress on the concerns is presented below, but to summarize actions taken to address these areas, the College has done the following:

* Revised and where necessary, developed new policies on sexual harassment, discrimination, and retaliation;
* Expended considerable effort in revising and updating Board of Governors' Policies and Administrative Procedures/Standard Practices Guides;
* Created a timeline for regular, comprehensive review of Board Policies and PCC Administrative Procedures;
* Initiated training for members of the Board of Governors, College administrators and supervisors, and employees;
* Established an Office of Dispute Resolution, overseen by an Internal Auditor, that tracks extensive information on complaints and grievances submitted at the College;
* Created the position of Vice Chancellor for Human Resources;
* Restructured Human Resources, substantially strengthened HR policies and procedures, and developed goals and metrics for assessing the effectiveness of these policies and procedures;
* Created the Human Resources Advisory Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Board of Governors and includes members both from the College and the community at large; and
* Created the position of Director of Internal Audit.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 3

1. A revised policy has been implemented to promote communication between management and employees. Board Policy BP 1.25 – Meet and Confer with Employee Representatives was revised in December 2014. The purpose of BP 1.25 is to permit "individual employees and employee groups to participate in a formally structured meet and confer process to assist it in making its decisions regarding compensation, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment." BP 1.25 specifies which polices for all employee groups are reviewed and revised annually, specifies the composition of Meet and Confer Teams and how members are selected, provides for legal counsel review of memoranda associated with the Meet and Confer process, and provides guidelines for the conduct of the Meet and Confer process. The Meet and Confer policy is scheduled by the Board of Governors for annual review.

2. The College Governance Council has been re-named the All College Council, and was formed in response to the Probation Action Letter of April 2013 which stated that the College was out of compliance with Core Component 5.B because it failed to "engage appropriately or collaboratively with faculty and administration when it failed to engage these constituencies meaningfully as it changed its admissions policies over public opposition." All of PCC's internal constituents are represented on the twelve member council, with three representatives each from students, faculty, staff, and administration.   Its functions are guided by Administrative Procedure 1.06.01 which states that the Council "serves as a recommending body to the Chancellor" which "provides input into decision making based on critical analyses, ongoing inquiry, continuous improvement" and "is focused on the welfare and mission of the College and on student success". The minutes of the All College Council meetings are approved by members subsequent to each meeting and then posted publicly on the All College Council website. The All College Council meets monthly.

In meetings with the focused visit team, the All College Council provided several examples of specific issues that the Council had addressed:

•   The college's Diversity Plan was brought to the All College Council for review when it was still in draft form. The All College Council was able to provide input to the Chancellor regarding the diversity plan before it was made public for community input.   In its meeting with the focused visit team the All College Council indicated that its discussions on the Diversity Plan were very open, that participants didn't fear that their perspectives would be criticized, it was characterized as an "impressive discussion". The All College Council used this as an example of the collegial atmosphere present in the group and spirit of collaboration that exists among representatives of various stakeholder groups on campus who are on the Council. In discussing this, members of the All College Council indicated that the level of candor and good will in the group is admirable, that the group has "really impressive conversations", and that students on the Council feel like "they have equal input and their voices are both heard and valued."

•   Another example provided to the focused visit team in its meeting with the All College Council was a discussion prompted by the student representatives in the group regarding academic advising. Students had expressed concerns about certain aspects of academic advising, and out of that discussion an initiative moving the College in the direction of having assigned advisors, where advisors who know a lot about specific programs are assigned students who are in those specific programs on a case management basis.   This is an example of a concern that was brought forward by one stakeholder group represented on the All College Council that the group as a whole worked to address.

•   Based on discussions in the All College Council, student representatives created a task force that was overseen by the Provost's Office and worked with the faculty senate to research the

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 4

cost of textbooks. As a result, work was done to educate faculty on introducing cost effective ways for students to obtain textbooks that they could communicate to their students, such as the use of older editions of textbooks. As part of these efforts, courses were developed that didn't require textbooks. It was seen by the group as evidence that the College was responsive to the fact that of all the things that students at PCC are concerned about, this is one of the biggest ones.

• The above examples were provided to the focused visit team of issues that the All College Council had addressed, and members of the Council were unanimous in their praise regarding the functioning of the Council and the spirit of collaboration present in its discussions. A list of "All College Council Activities April 2014 – April 2016" is available at https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/notice-report-2016/docs/14-GOC-BOG-102610-all-college-council-activities-2014-2016.pdf, and lists more than 50 discussion topics, indicating whether each topic was an action item, information/provide feedback item, or a recommendation to the Chancellor, and what the final result of the discussion was.

3. Members of the focused visit team met with the entire All College Council, and in that meeting the general consensus of the group was that it is functioning well, with members saying that it is a collegial, collaborative and relatively conflict-free body where members feel free to speak their minds in a climate of good will. Members indicated that the Chancellor attends occasionally, but that the Provost attends each of the meetings. They felt it was a good forum for both concerns from the constituent groups to be distilled and brought forward to a more high-level body for consideration, and for information to be communicated from members of the Council to their constituencies. As noted on its website, the All College Council does not discuss issues concerning wages, hours and working conditions, individual personnel issues, or issues that are not of a College-wide significance.

The College has adopted new policies in many areas including policies on sexual harassment, discrimination and retaliation;

4. The initial work on new policies began in 2013, when the Board of Governors contracted with the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) to facilitate a review and update of its Bylaws. Subsequently new bylaws were adopted in December 2013, and put on a three-year review cycle, with the next review nearing completion at the end of 2016.   Subsequently, the Board Chair collaborated with the Chancellor and the General Counsel to review all Board Policies (BP), with input from each of the offices on campus responsible for implementation of each specific BP. Further input was sought from the College's Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and All College Council. In addition, the revised BPs were posted for public comment, and finalized in February 2015.These new policies are available at the PCC website. Board of Governors polices are available on the Board's website. Policies relevant to sexual harassment, discrimination, and retaliation include the following:

• BP 4.01 Financial Controls and Institutional Budget
• BP 4.02 External or Independent Audits
• BP 5.10 Equal Employment Opportunity, ADA, Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment (including Sexual Harassment)
• BP 7.01 Internal Audits

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 5

5. In addition to the Board policies, Standard Practice Guides (SPGs) are also available to the public on the College website. Review of the SPGs began in April 2015, and is expected to be complete by June 2017. As the SPGs are reviewed individually they are being renamed Administrative Procedures (APs). The SPGs/APs relating to sexual harassment, discrimination, and retaliation include the following:

- SPG-1501-AA Procedure for Complaints of Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation
- SPG-1505-AA Sexual Violence
- SPG-4301-AA Workplace Violence Prevention

6. Both the Board Policies and the Administrative Procedures (formerly SPGs) will be reviewed every three years, according to PCC policy.

The College Board members, employees and administrators have been trained on revised policies and procedures, as appropriate for their position.

7. Training on revised policies and procedures has been ongoing for several years. The Board of Governors has received Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) training on at least two separate occasions, September 2013 and July 2014. Additional training for the Board of Governors has included focused training on policy review and mission development (October 2014), financial and budget outlook, policy review, and board goals and objectives (November 2014), and newly elected Board of Governors' training (January 2015).

8. In the wake of serious allegations against the behavior of the former Chancellor of PCC that uncovered broken processes for dealing with complaints, particularly in regards to sexual harassment, the Board of Governors and higher level administrators at PCC participated in numerous training sessions. As new members of the Board of Governors are elected, they receive intensive, formalized training focused on the role of the Board, policies and procedures, and sexual harassment. Members of the focused visit team met with each of the members of the Board of Governors, including the newest member, who confirmed that intensive training over multiple days had taken place.

9. PCC has developed a strong training program for its Board of Governors. In addition, it has incorporated training into its onboarding processes for all employees who are hired at the college. All new hires are required to participate in both sexual harassment awareness training as well as "Pathways to Civility", which "emphasizes the value in clarifying perceptions, rather than simply acting on assumptions, and focuses on the open discussion of concerns and perceptions with the person perceived as abrasive or rude". Participation in these training sessions is also strongly encouraged for existing employees who have not yet participated in them.

10. PCC's Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) performed an analysis which "identified ineffective or inadequate supervision as an underlying issue in many reports it received", and in response in 2015 the Human Resources department developed two training modules for supervisors at the College, "Supervision 101" and "Supervision in the 21st Century". To date, 79 employees have participated in "Supervision 101" and 69 employees have participated in "Supervision in the 21st Century." The ODR reports that as a result "by the end of 2015, ineffective supervision was no longer a common underlying issue in ODR reports" (Pima Community College Notice Report: Evidence of Effectiveness June 30, 2016).

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 6

11. The College has met the HLC's expectations surrounding training on revised policies and procedures, and has made substantial progress in creating a culture where employees are empowered to respond appropriately to issues as they arise at all levels of the institution under the guidance of appropriate and publicly available policies and procedures.

A new Office of Dispute Resolution has been initiated under the direction of the internal auditor to investigate and act on complaints.

12. In July 2014, PCC created the Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR). According to PCC, "The ODR serves as a clearinghouse for complaints, grievances, and allegations of misconduct, as well as for inquiries and suggestions. The ODR guides people to the most appropriate office for resolving their specific concern, provides independent investigation of allegations of misconduct, and fact-finding to support complaint resolution."

13) The ODR provides multiple avenues whereby complaints may be submitted, including:

- a web hotline that is accessible on Pima Community College's public website
- a toll-free telephone line
- walk-ins
- email
- direct phone calls

14) The ODR reports directly to the Director of Internal Audit, who in turn reports to the Chancellor. The Director of Internal Audit is empowered to bypass the Chancellor and report directly to the Board of Governors in complaint and grievance cases that involve the Chancellor as indicated by section 5.2.a of SPG-1501/AA, which states that "If the person alleged to have violated BP-1501 and this SPG is the Chancellor, the complaint shall be reported to the Chair of the Governing Board or the College's Attorney, who shall inform each other. The Board Chair and the College's Attorney shall inform the other members of the Governing Board. "

15) The ODR has kept excellent records since its inception on July 21, 2014, and is able to provide information regarding the number and type of complaints, how those complaints were received, and the outcomes for those complaints. Since that time the ODR has received 219 complaints and grievances for the following types of issues as of September 27, 2016:

- Grievances: 11 (5% of the total)
- Allegations of Misconduct: 50 (23% of the total)
- Complaints/Concerns/Inquiries: 156 (71% of the total)
- Suggestions   2 (1% of the total)

      TOTAL: 219 (100% of the total)

The ODR has also tracked data regarding the outcome of each of these 219 complaints and grievances:

- Open/in-process: 4 (2% of the total)
- Withdrawn: 4 (2% of the total)
- Insufficient Information: 29 (13% of the total)
- Substantiated: 15 (7% of the total)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 7

- Unsubstantiated/unfounded*:   32 (15% of the total)
- Inconclusive/not sustained*:   2 (1% of the total)
- Exonerated: 0 (0% of the total)
- Reviewed and addressed: 82 (37% of the total)
- Referred for Resolution: 51 (23% of the total)

      TOTAL: 219 (100% of the total)

* "Unfounded, Not Sustained, and Exonerated are conclusions for only Law Enforcement Complaints

Additionally, the ODR indicates that of these 219 complaints and grievances 67 (31%) were made anonymously, while reporters self-identified in 152 cases (69%). Additional data are available regarding the filing method (Hotline web, Toll-free Hotline, or Walk-in/Email/Phone) and the reporter's relationship to Pima (Anonymous/undetermined, Student, Community Member, or Employee).

16) The ODR has established the following metrics to measure its effectiveness:

- Timely acknowledgement of all complaints, as measured by the percent of all complaints acknowledged within one business day
- Completion of investigations into employee misconduct within two weeks (10 business days)
- at least 90 percent satisfaction with the outcome, as measured by respondents' agreement with the following statement: "The matter was resolved to my satisfaction" on the "Allegations of Misconduct Satisfaction Survey Report" (implemented March 1, 2015).

As of September 27, 2016, the following results were available for these metrics:

- there had been acknowledgement of 100% of the 219 complaints within one business day.
- 90% of the 50 instances of alleged employee misconduct had been completed within 10 business days
- of 24 responses to the survey item "The matter was resolved to my satisfaction", 7 responded "not applicable". Of the remaining 17, 11 (64.7%) responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree".

PCC is able to provide convincing evidence that the ODR is functioning well, is fulfilling its intended purpose, is working to meet its goals, is tracking complaints and their resolution, and has provided multiple avenues for registering complaints and grievances that did not previously exist at PCC.

The College has made appropriate improvements to its Human Resource function.

17) Pima Community College has made extensive efforts to address the Human Resources shortcomings highlighted by the HLC at the time it was placed on Probation. In 2014 the College contracted with an external consulting firm, Baker Tilly Virchow Krause LLP, to conduct an extensive review of the College's HR systems and provide recommendations on how they could be improved. The consultants completed their review and presented their findings to the Board of Governors in February 2015, offering 19 recommendations related to strengthening HR at Pima. In early 2015 Pima hired a Vice Chancellor for Human Resources who was charged with developing and implementing an action plan to address these 19 recommendations. The 19 recommendations have been formulated into an HR Action Plan, and the College has been able to document that

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 8

most of these recommendations have been accomplished, and has been able to document prioritization and progress on the rest. . One area where a great deal of work remains to be done is in succession planning, but significant progress has been reported for the other areas.

18. Part of these efforts involved a reorganization and restructuring of the Human Resources department at PCC. In February 2015 the Vice Chancellor for Human Resources was hired. Subsequently, the reporting relationships in HR were streamlined as the number of direct reports to the Vice Chancellor was reduced from six directors to two. In addition, the HR department subsequently established the following seven metrics to measure its effectiveness:

• Average Number of Days from Closing of Job Posting Offer Acceptance Tracked by Faculty and Staff
• Number of Employees Hired Using the "External Competitive Process" Compared to the "Internal Competitive Process"
• Total Number of Performance Evaluations Completed Tracked by Employee Classification
• Total Number of Training Courses Completed by Employees
• Number of Employee Relations Issues Brought Forward by an Employee or a Manager Tracked by Employee Classification, Type of Issue, Time to Investigate and Resolution
• Rate at Which Employees Leave the College Tracked by Employee Classification and Reason for Termination
• Number of Position Reviews Completed, Tracked by Type, Average Time to Complete and Outcome

Results for these metrics are reported to the Human Resources Advisory Committee quarterly and to the Board of Governors annually, and the annual reports are publicly available in the "Board Meeting Documents & Video" section of the PCC website at https://www.pima.edu/meeting-notices/documents.html (see, for example, the entry for March 9, 2016).

19. The Human Resources Advisory Committee deserves special mention as a major initiative that the College implemented to address concerns raised by previous HLC teams. It is a subcommittee of the Board of Governors, and was developed to assist in "oversight and monitoring responsibilities of Human Resources." The membership of this Committee includes two members of the Board of Governors, the Vice Chancellor for HR, the College General Counsel, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for HR, and three community members who are HR directors for local businesses. The HR Advisory Committee met for the first time in June 2014, met five times in 2015, and met three times in 2016, with an additional meeting scheduled subsequent to the 2016 focused visit.

20. College hiring policies have been revised to address HLC concerns, particularly as evidenced by revisions to Standard Practice Guide (SPG) SPG-4201/BA, which addresses procedures for filling regular staff and administrator positions. The SPG provides comprehensive guidelines for the internal competitive process, the external competitive process, the acting assignment process, interim appointment, other recruitment options, and direct appointment or reassignment. The text of this SPG can be found at. The direct appointment or reassignment guidelines are designed to specifically address previous HLC concerns about appointment and reassignment of college employees, and to provide requirements for direct appointment or reassignment, oversight for the process, and a requirement that such appointments are made public in the Board of Governors agenda and reports. As noted by the report of the HLC's Comprehensive Evaluation Visit in September 2014, the HLC team reported that "The College revised SPG-4201/BA: Filling Authorized Vacant Regular Positions to emphasize that job related processes must be defensible in the filling of open positions. Recruitment request forms and business-case justifications must be

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 9

completed when filling interim, direct appointments, and reassignments. The Chief Human Resources Officer and the Chancellor must approve interim, direct appointments, and reassignments. Direct appointments must be reported to the Board of Governors. The business-case justification, requirement approvals, and Board notice would provide a system of checks and balances meant to mitigate excessive movement." Conversations between the current HLC focused visit team and various stakeholders at the College confirmed that SPG-4201/BA is followed faithfully at the College, and PCC reports that "since the adoption of this process, the number of direct appointments has decreased from four in FY 2015 to one in FY 2016." (Pima Community College Notice Report: Evidence of Effectiveness June 30, 2016).

21. In addition to the restructuring of HR at the College, the establishment of the Human Resources Advisory Committee, the revision of college HR policies, and the measurement of progress on the 19 recommendations and the seven metrics that have been established for the department, PCC has furthermore substantially upgraded and expanded the training that HR makes available to College employees. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the Office of Dispute Resolution data identified ineffective or inadequate supervision as a root cause of many of the complaints that had been submitted. In response, the HR department developed "Supervision in the 21st Century" in May 2015 and "Supervision 101" in September 2015. In the first three quarters of FY 2016 there were 211 employees who participated in "Supervision in the 21st Century" and 166 employees who participated in "Supervision 101". During this same period 117 employees participated in the "Pathways to Civility" training provided by HR, 132 had participated in the "Sexual Harassment Awareness" workshop, and 815 participated in "Service Excellence" workshops.

22. The College has invested substantial time, effort, and resources in addressing the HR related concerns raised by previous HLC site visit teams. Restructuring of the Human Resources office has been implemented, recommendations from external consultants have been addressed, metrics have been established with data regularly reported to oversight entities, and training modules have been developed that have been shared extensively with employees across the institution. Onboarding processes have been revised to ensure that required training in these areas is provided to new employees. It is well-documented that the College is now in compliance in regards to its HR processes with HLC Core Component 2A, and has made more than adequate progress in resolving concerns raised by previous HLC Site Visit teams.

The College has changed its purchasing processes, particularly for non-competitive purchases, and has established an infrastructure for guiding ethical and responsible action.

21. The college categorizes its purchases into three groups that include PCC bids, Cooperative Agreements that are aligned with the State of Arizona, competitively bid contracts available through cooperative agency agreements and non-competitive purchasing requests. For this fiscal year 16 of these purchases were non-competitive for a total value of $3.2 million or approximately 6% of total purchases. Of the total $3.2 million in non-competitive contracts, $2.5 million were for legacy systems and software to support Apple computers, its Oracle database, and similar enterprise-wide software." This HLC team also noted that "The Board of Governors received special training on adequately overseeing financial practices. A special meeting on July 25, 2012 presented areas of contract management. The Chief Financial Officer presented additional material on purchasing policies at a special meeting on September 14, 2013. A retreat facilitated by the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) in September 2013 provided Board training on how to oversee policies on fair bidding and financial practices effectively."

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 10

22. New policies have been in place for several years that are designed to avoid the type of contractual irregularities that were seen under a previous chancellor. One example is BP-7.01 Internal Audits, which dictates that "The Board of Governors authorizes the Chancellor, or his/her designee, to request the Office of Internal Audit (Internal Auditor) to perform audits, consulting engagements and related professional services that evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, internal controls, and governance processes. ". Furthermore, this BP specifies that "Internal Audit shall have direct access to the Chancellor and the Board of Governors." In addition, SPG-1302/AB, revised in April 2013, places limits on "the contract authority vested in the Chancellor or designee(s) for conducting College business."

23.Additional safeguards have been implemented to ensure fair practices in procurement, bidding, and contracts. PCC created a new position, the Director of Internal Audit, and hired the current Director in April 2012. The Director is a Certified Internal Auditor, and in addition to audit duties oversees the Office of Dispute Resolution. The responsibilities of the Director of Internal Audit are enumerated in BP-7.01 Internal Audits. The Director of Internal Audit reports to the Chancellor, however policies are in place that allow the Director of Internal Audit to go directly to the Board of Governors with allegations involving the Chancellor. As noted in BP-7.01, "Internal Audit shall have direct access to the Chancellor and the Board of Governors. Internal Audit shall remain independent and objective with the ability to report directly to the Board of Governors any situation where Internal Audit perceives a conflict of interest with, or on the part of, the Chancellor's involvement with the subject of an audit. If the auditor perceives a conflict of interest with, or on the part of, the Board of Governors' involvement with the subject of an audit, Internal Audit shall have the ability to report directly to the Chancellor, outside legal counsel or an applicable state or federal agency."

As noted previously, the HLC site visit team in 2014 had already established that PCC had made improvements in process for review and award of contracts, with only 6% of total purchases (for a total of $3.2 million) categorized as non-competitive, and that $2.5 million of that total was for "legacy systems and software to support Apple computers, its Oracle database, and similar enterprise-wide software." In a meeting with focused visit team members, both the Director of Internal Audit and the Chair of the Board of Governors Finance and Audit Committee, who is not an employee of PCC, indicated that in the past year the number of non-competitive contracts has remained at a similar level to the 2014 numbers. Between the previous site visit and information provided to the focused visit team, there is evidence that the process for review and awarding of contracts has in fact reduced the number of non-competitive contracts awarded, and the information provided in interviews with members of the Finance and Audit Committee, PCC Legal Counsel, and the Director of Internal Audit indicate that the new processes developed to curtail contractual abuses are being followed. The Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee also indicated that he is confident there is a framework in place with three watchdog entities – the Director of Internal Audit, the Financial and Audit Committee, and the PCC Legal Counsel – that would prevent the sort of contractual irregularities seen with the previous chancellor. Both the Director of Internal Audit and PCC Legal Counsel indicated to the focused visit team that they have the power to bypass the Chancellor and go straight to the Board of Governors if they discovered any of the type of contractual irregularities seen with the previous Chancellor. It should be noted that the Finance and Audit Committee is comprised of two members of the Board of Governors and several community members, and reviews the work of the Director of Internal Audit, providing an external watchdog function that is designed to surface concerns regarding awarding of contracts. All contracts are included as Board agenda items and are available to the public via the Board of Governors website. Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports for the past several fiscal years are available at https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/finance-reports/index.html. There is an extremely high

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 11

level of public transparency in the financial dealings of PCC, and there are two highly engaged and vigilant community groups that monitor the actions of PCC very closely. Between the new internal safeguards that have been put in place – that to all appearances appear to be working – and heightened external access to transparent financial information, it is clear that structures are in place to resolve the previous issues in this area, and the small amount of money associated with non-competitive contracts appears to indicate that these structures are doing what they are designed to do.

   The Internal Auditor's work includes review of such areas as Operational Audits (Clery Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, etc.), Special Reviews (Veteran's Benefit Compliance Review Follow-up Audit, Title IV Program Review Follow-up Audit, Aviation Controls Follow-up Audit, Contracts and Procurement Follow-up Audit, etc.) and Other Services, Duties, and Special Projects (Fiscal Year 2013/2014 Carry over Contract and Aviation Compliance Coordination Committee Participation, Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity, HLC Self Study and Site Visit Preparation, Governance Special Project, Management and/or Board Requested Special Reviews, Audits, Investigations, etc.).

25. In addition to the creation of the position of the Director of Internal Audit, the Board of Governors created the Finance and Audit Committee of the Board to "to assist it in its oversight and monitoring of the College's financial, audit, and investment-related performance, policies and procedures" (Pima Community College Notice Report: Evidence of Effectiveness June 30, 2016). The Finance and Audit Committee consists of two members of the Board of Governors and "five to eight community members who possess expertise in finance, accounting, auditing and/or investments. Qualified community members have been recruited through an open application process and by contacting local business organizations." As the current Finance and Audit Committee chair, who is a local businessperson who is not employed by PCC, indicated to the focused visit team "none of us are employees, we are members of the community from various walks of life and backgrounds, and we feel it is important to the community." The Chair also expressed the opinion that is good for administration to have an independent group of this background that can listen to financial and audit reports and provide feedback.

26. The Chair also indicated that the Committee feels that their recommendations are taken seriously, that through their work they have been able to close a number of loopholes in policies related to contracts, and that the Committee is providing input to the leadership of the College in a wide range of areas related to budgeting and finance. These areas include contract policy, budgets, investment policy, tuition rates and recommendations regarding tax rates that generate revenue for PCC. The committee met 8 times in 2015 and had met 8 times in 2016 at the time of the focused visit at the end of September. Additional information regarding the Finance and Audit Committee can be found on the Board of Governors' website including agendas and meeting minutes for all Committee meetings.

26. PCC has gone to great lengths to increase the transparency of its financial dealings. All contracts are included as Board agenda items and are available to the public via the Board of Governors website. Through this practice, contracts are made available for review by the public.Through the efforts of the College, procedures and practices have been revised and safeguards are now in place to ensure compliance with HLC Assumed Practices.

The College Board of Governors has recently undertaken a review of its bylaws.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 12

27. The first review of the Board of Governors' bylaws occurred in 2013, when the Board "retained the services of the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) to facilitate a review and update of its Bylaws" (Pima Community College Notice Report: Evidence of Effectiveness June 30, 2016) culminating in the approval of revised bylaws in 2013. The Board of Governors established a three year cycle for regular review of the bylaws, and consequently the revised bylaws were reviewed by the Board in 2016. For the June 2016 review the Board opted to engage outside legal counsel to review the bylaws, which resulted in some minor changes that will be finalized by the end of 2016. The next formal review of the bylaws will occur in 2019. The HLC focused visit team met with each member of the Board of Governors individually, and each confirmed the work on revision of the bylaws, and that they are strictly adhered to in practice. Not only has the Board of Governors revised the bylaws, it has implemented a structure for regular, periodic review on a three-year cycle. Moreover, for the 2016 review it utilized external consultants. There appears to be ample evidence that the Board of Governors has taken review of its bylaws seriously, and has provided a process for continued review of them in the future.

Based on the foregoing considerations, it is the judgment of the current HLC Focused Visit team that PCC has provided evidence that demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus, and has taken the necessary steps to bring PCC in compliance with HLC Core Component 2.A.

A2. Statement of Focus (if applicable):

The College has addressed the concerns of the Commission related to Criterion Five, Core Component 5.B, "the institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission," for the following reasons:

• the College has established a new framework for College governance that emphasizes collaboration, civility, transparency and respect, among other values, the College Board is working within that framework to engage collaboratively with faculty and administration;
• the College Board of Governors (BOG) has established a Governance Council including student, faculty, and staff representatives to empower these constituents to play a meaningful role in governance of the College;
• the College Board has started training on appropriate policy review and formation, and the Board has formed a Finance and Audit Committee and a Human Resources Advisory Team to strengthen its oversight of the College;
• the Board has implemented effective policies on the role of faculty in academics; and
• the team found during its visit that it appeared the College had improved the climate of openness and inclusivity of individual perspectives.

While the College has addressed the concerns of the Board, it is still at risk of being out of compliance with Core Component 5.B because these approaches have been developed and implemented only recently so that there has not yet been sufficient time to test and assess the effect of these changes; rapid turnover in senior administrative positions remains; and the College had additional work to do in documenting the outcome of its links with the community.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 13

Criterion Five, Core Component 5.B

B2. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

1. There is evidence that the new governance framework is increasing collaboration, civility, transparency, and respect at PCC. Members of the faculty and staff were uniformly aware of the changes and could describe the new administration model and how it related to the strategic vision of "one Pima" (a euphemism for college-wide coordination and planning) as evidenced in the minutes and agendas of faculty meetings and Inter Campus Council meetings and in consistent understanding of the framework expressed in interviews with groups and individuals. For example: District VPs, campus Presidents, and students all articulated similar understanding of the framework that is consistent with the Chancellor's vision, suggesting a collaborative and transparent approach. A participatory process was used with various campus stakeholders where they were issued green cards (signifying support of particular ideas), yellow cards (indicating a need for more discussion), and red cards (indicating concern or opposition). This red/yellow/green card process allows for civil and respectful discussions of various policy matters whereby everyone's "cards were on the table" in a literal and figurative sense. Honest and sincere differences of opinion could thereby be articulated and processed by the whole group, leading to collaborative modifications of proposals and more clear, concrete, and transparent resolutions to a debate and subsequent decision-making.

2. While it was demonstrated that faculty, staff, and students participate in shared governance, it is not yet clear the extent to which PCC's Board of Governors is following the new governance framework. There was slight and merely anecdotal evidence that some members of the Board may not be working through the agreed-upon governance structure, but rather "short-circuiting" the process by intervening in operational matters that should be the domain of PCC leadership. Upcoming Board of Governor elections will change the membership of the Board, introducing new members who are unfamiliar with college governance. Therefore, continued organizational attention to the Board's role in governance is warranted, with a special focus on assuring that the Board is working within the framework.

3. There is sufficient evidence that the new Governance Council is empowering students, faculty, and staff to participate in and lead the charge for change at PCC. Students were familiar with the All Campus Council and the district-wide Inter Campus Council which represents them, and many students reporting voting in the elections. Students cited two specific examples where initiatives they began had led to improvements at PCC: one, aText Book Task Force that lowers the cost of purchasing books for courses through a grant and matching-dollar program; and two, requests by students for covered parking stalls with solar panels atop, which was implemented swiftly. Students stated that their suggestions and concerns were taken seriously and expressed confidence that grass-root ideas would work their way through governance. A resolution by the Faculty Senate dated 5 February 2016 endorsed the new governance structure, stating "the Faculty Senate [will]

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 14

work with the Provost to develop a governance structure for overseeing district-wide academic matters...", and this has come to pass in the months since.

4.   There is evidence that PCC has trained its Board of Governors on its appropriate role and function, including policy review and formation. Furthermore, there is evidence that a Finance and Audit Committee and an HR Committee have been formed and are funtioning. PCC contracted with the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) to provide Board training, and this has occurred on four different occasions to date. The website of the PCC Board of Governors lists both a Finance and Audit Committee and an HR Committee and includes links to committee membership, agendas, minutes, and related materials. The Board website also includes archived videos of prior Board meetings.The ACCT consultants helped the PCC Board of Governors review and update its Bylaws to make the new ones more consistent with nationally recognized best practices in governance.

5.   Strong evidence exists that the Board of Governors and senior leadership at PCC are enfranchising the faculty in decision-making. For example, a document labeled "Course Release Request for Fall 2016" describes a process through which elected leaders of the Faculty Senate will receive reassigned time for their service in college-wide governance. According to the document, the Faculty Senate President will receive six credit hours of reassigned time annually for participation in the Senate, and five other Senate officers will each receive three credit hours of reassigned time annually.The goal of the reassignment is to provide more time for faculty leaders to work on shared governance matters, which according to the document include a revision of the Senate Charter, the drafting of institutional effectiveness documents, the review of Board policy, improvement of communication, and the establishment of standing committees on Assessment, Accreditation, Professional Development, and Strategic Planning and Budgeting, which had not existed in the past. Further evidence exists that the Faculty Senate has been included in decision making. Proposed changes in the Student Payment Program, whereby students would need to make payments or have a payment plan or financial aid before the start of classes, were routed through the Faculty Senate, All College Council, and Staff Council for review and comment. The process was managed effectively and the changes were implemented, whereas in the past such initiatives could be derailed outside the shared governance process.

6.   The climate of openness and inclusivity at PCC is improving according to a satisfaction survey (SAT) of college employees in Fall 2015. In particular, employees expressed a much stronger sense that "the leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose" and "efforts to improve the effectiveness of administrative leadership are paying off" – each of these dimensions showed statistically significant improvement when compared to Fall 2013. One of the areas that showed dramatic growth in the survey was the statement "the institution involves its employees in planning for the future," where the SAT mean score went from 2.62 in 2013 to 2.99 in 2015 on a 5-point scale, a statistically significant change. Other statistically significant improvements are found on the statement "Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff," where the SAT mean score went from 2.68 to 3.04, and the statement "there is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution," where the mean score went from 2.57 to 2.79. These are just a few examples: nearly all of the indicators on the employee satisfaction survey are moving in the right direction and indicate an improved climate of openness and inclusivity.   Anecdotal stories gleaned from faculty and staff members and from administrators are consistent with the data. While improvement has been demonstrated, the scores on many of the employee satisfaction indicators remain between 2.5 and 3.0 on the 5-point SAT scale, indicating there is still room for further improvement. Therefore, continued organizational attention on improving the shared governance structures and on enhancing a climate of openness and inclusivity is warranted.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 15

7. The leadership team at PCC is stabilizing after the Chancellor, who has served for three years, reorganized the structure to better serve the "One Pima" vision. The current leadership team, comprised of District Office Vice Presidents and campus Presidents, has an average longevity of service of five years with a range from one year of service to sixteen years of service. The Chancellor articulated a goal of having a leadership team with a mix of PCC experience and new ideas from elsewhere, and this is largely the case. Some of the new PCC leaders have had comparable experience elsewhere, whereas some of those with PCC experience have progressed through the PCC ranks (e.g., the Acting Provost, and the President of the Community Campus). Members of the faculty expressed an appreciation that the Acting Provost knew PCC well and could advocate for their perspective at the leadership level. Two members of the leadership team have been in their roles for a long time: the VP of Facilities (16 years) and the VP of Finance (12 years). Relatively few leadership positions remain open, and the three Dean positions have already been posted. The Provost position is scheduled to be posted in 2017. Members of the community generally expressed support for college leadership and its vision, though two community groups expressed concerns. In a meeting with this reviewer, Mayor Jonathan Rothschild stated "the changes are the exact right vision" and, referring to PCC, said "this is one of Tucson's quality institutions."

A3. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College has addressed the concerns of the Commission related to Criterion Five, Core Component 5.C, "the institution engages in systematic and integrated planning," for the following reasons:

•   the College has convened a conference and a committee to initiate a strategic plan; a 2014-17 Strategic Plan has been developed and includes directions and goals for the College and will include plans for each campus along with the development of key performance indicators; and
•   the College's strategic planning process engages all constituencies to a greater extent than in the past.

While the College has addressed the concerns of the Board, it is still at risk of being out of compliance with Core Component 5.C because not enough time has transpired to allow the College to fully implement the strategic plan or to demonstrate outcomes and effectiveness; the status of planning at the campuses remains uneven; key performance indicators for the Plan have not yet been developed; and the College needs to work on continuing the engagement of the community in the planning process.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion FIve, Core Component 5.C

B3. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 16

1. PCC has been engaged in multiple planning processes from 2014 to 2016. Following adoption of the 2014-2017 strategic plan, the following additional planning efforts have been undertaken.
- Adoption of Campus Operating Plans for each of the six campuses
- Adoption of Unit Operating Plans for the major operating units across the institution
- Initiation of Educational and Facilities Master Plans
- Initiation of a Strategic Enrollment Plan

As was reported in the 2014 team report, the institution formed a strategic planning committee in early 2014 made up of some 70 members from across the institution and from the local community. The committee's work was primarily informed by a Futures Conference, held in February 2014, and a Strategic Planning Workshop, held in March 2014. Despite the broad representation on the committee, members of the Faculty Senate reported that they felt faculty voices were not adequately represented in the strategic plan. Changes have been made in advance of the 2017-20 strategic plan development process as a result. The strategic planning committee membership has been reduced to 20 people but those individuals will have a more defined role representing a specific segment of the community. In addition, the faculty senate has formed a strategic planning sub-committee that will be actively engaged in the planning process. According to the strategic planning framework, approved by the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) in May 2016, the ELT directs the activities of the strategic planning team. However, when asked, none of the members of the strategic planning team were able to identify who has responsibility to ensure that strategic planning is successful.

2. After the adoption of the strategic plan in 2014, the institution began a process to review and update its mission statement. According to minutes of Board of Governor's meetings, the mission statement review was completed in early fall 2015 but the Board believed additional input was needed. A community survey was conducted and feedback incorporated into the mission, vision and values language. The new mission statement was then adopted in spring 2016.

3. In May 2015, PCC's chancellor announced an administrative re-structuring plan to consolidate oversight of the institution's six campuses into three presidents. In addition, the plan includes changes in responsibilities for many operational areas such that one administrator is responsible for an area across all campuses. An example is the addition of a Vice President for Workforce who reports to the Community Campus president but has responsibility for workforce programs at all campuses. Previously, each campus had organizational responsibility for all activities on that campus. Each of the campus presidents spoke of the benefits to the institution resulting from this reorganization, including individuals having a clearer understanding of who has authority over each area. The final phase of the re-organization was effective July 1, 2016.

4. Though changes in the institution's mission statement and organizational structure have been positive changes for the institution, which was confirmed through conversations with multiple groups and individuals at the institution, they have also caused delays in adoption of measurable goals and progress toward achievement of those goals. Despite the current strategic plan being adopted in 2014, the institution did not define measurable Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) until after the mission statement review was completed in spring 2016. As a result, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness only recently began reporting data to track the institution's progress toward attainment of its strategic planning goals. In September 2016, the first set of KPI data, related to student success, was released. Additional data related to the institution's seven core themes in the strategic plan will be released monthly through April 2017, two months before the current strategic planning period is set to end.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 17

5. Evidence was provided indicating progress has been made toward integrating planning and budgeting. The budget sub-committee of the strategic planning committee adopted, in 2015, several criteria to guide budget decision-making. Among those are principles which provide for modification or elimination of "underperforming areas" and "optimal alignment" of human resources. Members of the strategic planning committee provided examples of how these criteria are being applied including a strategic review of all hiring decisions by the ELT, the consolidation of the fashion design and fashion merchandising programs, and the elimination of a technology department at the West campus that had low enrollments and only two full-time faculty members.The Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration (EVCFA) indicated that funding has been set aside in the operating budget for strategic initiatives. Evidence was provided to the team which listed approximately $1 million in projects funded from the $1.25 million allocated to strategic initiatives in the 2015-16 budget. However, according to the EVCFA, these were one-time start-up funds that were not incorporated into the operating budget.

6. As a result of enrollment declines and elimination of state funding, PCC has faced declining revenues. The EVCFA initially estimated, in presentations to the institution, that budget reductions of $7.5 million would be necessary. However, in conversations with the team, the EVCFA indicated that the reductions would be more severe. Follow-up discussions with the EVFCA and the three campus presidents revealed that no plans have been completed to manage the budget reductions. There is evidence of aligning facilities planning with academic program needs. A 210-page report entitled "Educational and Facilities Master Plan Report" was prepared for PCC by external consultants SmithGroup JJR and Paulien and Associates, dated August 15, 2016. The plan aligns with the strategic framework goals. Specifically, it defines different PCC campuses as "Centers of Excellence" using specific and robust data points as to where students live, where they study, and what they study. It thereby identifies specific PCC campuses for specific strategic foci, e.g. defining the West Campus as the "Nursing and Allied Health" campus and the Downtown Campus as the "Technology" campus. PCC is beginning to align resources in fulfillment of this vision, frequently called "One Pima" by campus leadership. The plan, though, was still in draft form at the time of the visit, with anticipation of bringing the plan to the Board of Governors for approval by December 2016.

The Interim Report due September 1, 2017 should include a description of the plan to link budgeting to strategic planning and the plan to close the $7 million budget gap created by the enrollment decline and the reduction of state funding.

A4. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion One, Core Component 1.A, "The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations," because the College has not conducted a formal review of its mission in over a decade and should do so in alignment with the implementation of its strategic plan.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion One, Core Component 1.A

B4. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 18

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

1. Beginning in summer 2014, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IRPE) led a formal review process to create a mission fulfillment framework in connection with the strategic planning process. A detailed description of this process, including meeting presentations and participants is provided in the 2014-2015 Mission Development Process document. The IRPE conducted formal sessions across the district and a 58-member strategic planning committee provided feedback on potential vision, mission, and core theme statements. Members included community members, faculty, exempt and non-exempt staff, administrators, students, and Board members. In April 2015, the College conducted Futures Conferences to engage the broader Pima County community in discussions about the future direction of the college. Copies of the presentations were reviewed and confirmed this agenda. These conferences included working tables where constituents provided their thoughts on potential vision, mission, and core value statements. During the focused visit, team members confirmed PCC staff, faculty, and administrators were all familiar with the conferences and several indicated participating in them. Some faculty interviewed shared that the meetings were held when they were teaching and they were unable to attend. Futures Conferences were held in the early morning. In May 2015, PCC employees were sent an email requesting them to provide their first choice among six vision statements and four mission statements.The College reports they received 434 responses and revised those preferred by the respondents. Some faculty we met with said that they did receive an email survey but chose not to engage as they felt the process was rushed and not organic. These faculty members did not attend the Futures Conferences.

2. On August 12, 2015, the Board of Governors approved the College's vision, mission, values, core themes and objectives as stated in the minutes of the meeting. At a subsequent study session on September 17, 2015, the Pima Open Admissions Coalition (POAC), a community group, raised questions about the process. Although the Board agreed the process was thorough and inclusive they agreed to add the mission framework as an item for the October Board meeting. According to the October 21, 2015 Board meeting minutes, the option to reopen the review for 21 days to allow for additional comments was approved.

3. In November 2015, a survey was conducted to gather input on the mission. There were 537 respondents and 79 percent approved of the mission, vision and values the Board approved in August. Results were discussed by the Board on December 7, 2015 according to the meeting minutes and minor revisions were made to the mission statement and values to incorporate language about open admissions. The Board approved the updated mission framework at a special meeting held December 9, 2015 according to the meeting minutes.

4. To tie the mission framework to the strategic plan, PCC held district meetings in December 2015 to identify ways to assess the seven core themes. Using feedback from those meetings, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness drafted a list of potential Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). During the February 2016 discussion sessions, additional input was gathered from internal and external stakeholders. The list was also circulated among All College Council, Staff Council, Faculty Senate and the Executive Leadership Team.

5. At the March 29, 2016 Futures Conference, 159 PCC faculty, administrators, and students, along with community members and local high school administrators and teachers reviewed the draft key

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 19

performance indicators. According to the minutes, final approval for the Mission Key Performance Indicators was obtained on April 13, 2016 at the regular meeting of the PCC College District Board of Governors.

6. PCC identified three possible sources of data to use with the KPIs. After discussions in February and the March Futures Conference, the College determined the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) measures were most appropriate as they included developmental education and part-time students. The VFA along with the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) will provide external comparisons for PCC to assess the effectiveness of their KPIs. The Update Report for the 2015-2016 Academic Year of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan shows unit plans with KPIs and data, where available, along with linkages to the Strategy Goal from the current Strategic Plan and Mission Core Theme/Objective.

A5. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion Three, Core Component 3.A, "the institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education," because the team found that the College lacks consistency in maintaining program quality and learning goals

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Three, Core Component 3.A

B5. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:
1. PCC's student learning outcomes are developed by faculty experts to ensure quality.

• College Discipline Area Committees (CDACs) are college-wide committees of faculty and appropriate staff, defined by disciplines or aligned disciplines, and assigned an administrator. CDACs are responsible for curriculum development, development of student learning outcomes, program reviews, and textbook reviews.The team affirmed this when speaking with groups of Academic Deans and groups of faculty. As CDACs are college-wide, they cross campuses. For example, the Math CDAC is composed of math faculty from each of the PCC campuses.
• The faculty within the CDAC's are experts in the area and they determine the appropriate student learning outcomes for each course within the discipline.The team was presented a listing of the CDAC groups, which is located on the PCC intranet and which indicates as of 9/27/16, 26 CDACs are active, representing discipline groups across campuses. Some CDACs consist of one discipline (Math, for example) while other CDACs for smaller disciplines are combined with aligned disciplines (for example, English includes General Technical Writing, Journalism, Literature, Speech Communication, and Writing). In conversations with the Adjunct Faculty Committee, the Team learned that adjunct faculty are invited to attend the CDAC meetings. In fact, some adjunct faculty help create the SLOs for their courses. For example, the "Critical Languages" courses (Korean, Chinese, Russian, Arabic) are all taught by adjunct faculty who are the experts in their content and who created the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) within their Languages CDAC.
• When speaking with Academic Deans, faculty groups, and the Syllabus Work Group it was clear that the faculty within the CDAC groups review the student learning outcomes of each course at

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 20

least once each year and sometimes twice a year in order to ensure that the student learning outcomes are appropriate to each course. SLOs are updated yearly if needed.

• Academic Deans indicated that CDACs are currently working on Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Capstone Experiences for each program at the college. The Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator indicated that 95% of programs have PLOs developed at this time.

• PCC has gone to a "One Pima" approach, which was accompanied by a recent college-wide administration reorganization (July 2016). Through conversations with faculty, staff and administration at various campuses the team learned that the reorganization is welcomed and will help increase quality. For example, in discussions with the Dean of Nursing, it was evident that since this reorganization, programs are shared across the college instead of competing with each other. The nursing program now has one advisory council instead of 2 and faculty can be shared across the 2 campuses where nursing courses are taught.

2. Approved Student Learning Outcomes for courses (CLOs) are consistently applied in courses college-wide, including courses taught by adjunct faculty and dual enrollment courses.

• In order to maintain and track consistency PCC has developed a process for reviewing and maintaining syllabi to ensure that they have proper and specific learning goals.

• A Syllabus Work Group was formed to determine the process for reviewing and storing syllabi. The team met with the Syllabus Work Group, which consisted of faculty from different disciplines, the curriculum coordinator, and staff from web systems, instructional design, and provost office initiatives. The group explained the development and process and explained that prior to this process, there was no central repository for syllabi and no way to track consistency. Conversations with the Faculty Senate also revealed the process as evolving over a time period with the template being updated based on faculty feedback.

• A "Syllabus Review & Storage: Mechanisms and Processes" document was developed and published by the Syllabus Workgroup which outlines the process to ensure consistency in syllabi, which includes student learning outcomes throughout all courses, college-wide for all courses taught by full-time and adjunct faculty. It includes options that will meet the needs of all faculty regardless of the student population served or modality used for instruction. For example, the templates are ADA accessible so that they can be used for all courses including online courses. These guidelines are published in MyPima (the PCC Intranet) under the "Teach" tab.

• According to the Mechanisms and Processes document, faculty are given the option of choosing to use a syllabus checklist or a syllabus template. The templates are pre-populated with all of the required information for the course, including the approved CLOs. Faculty are allowed to add their own unique information as needed. The checklist identifies the components that must be present on the syllabus and can be "checked" off of the list.

• According to academic deans, adjunct faculty (which includes dual enrollment faculty) are provided with a pre-populated template that consists of the correct CLOs and other required information. They may also choose to use the checklist.

• From conversations with Academic Deans, various faculty groups, and consistent with the Syllabus Review and Storage process, beginning in spring 2016 adjunct faculty members submit their syllabi to their Department Chair for review. Full time faculty submit their syllabi to their Academic Dean for review. The reviewers read each syllabus and confirm that all required elements are present and the course information is correct. Online course reviewers must also ensure that each syllabus is fully accessible (the template is accessible, but sometimes faculty may add charts or other information that is not). Once the syllabi are finalized, the syllabi are copied to a central repository that is accessible to all through the MyPima intranet portal.

• Through conversations with the Faculty Senate and groups of Academic Deans, it was clear to the focused visit team that use of a syllabus template and syllabus checklist has helped faculty

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 21

provide consistency, and is especially helpful for new faculty. Additionally, students expressed to the team that they have noticed and appreciated the consistency with syllabi.

•   In May 2016, the District Office randomly sampled 150 spring 2016 syllabi in the repository and found that 82% included correct CLOs. The College says that syllabi will be randomly selected each semester and analyzed with a goal to increase proportion of correct CLOs by five percent each year for the next two years.

•   Upon review of numerous syllabi from the repository for Spring 2016 and Summer 2017 by the focused visit team, it is evident that the majority of faculty are using the template. Also reviewed by the focused visit team, the syllabi in the repository are organized in folders by discipline. All syllabi are placed within their appropriate discipline folder, using a standard naming convention that includes the term code, the course prefix & number, the CRN, and the faculty user name. Most syllabi that were reviewed contained the appropriate CLOs and were consistent. For example, when reviewing the 11 course syllabi for spring 2016 for CHM 080 (Preparation for General Chemistry) taught by 8 different faculty, 10 of the 11 had consistent (the same) CLOs for the course. All 11 used the template. When reviewing the 17 course syllabi for HIS 101 (Introduction to Western Civilization 1) taught by 12 different faculty, 15 syllabi contained the appropriate CLOs. Two of the 17 could not be opened for review (were not PDF or Word documents). One of the 15 syllabi that was able to be opened used the checklist and the others used the template.

3.   All PCC faculty are certified to teach at PCC in a uniform way regardless of full-time, or adjunct status. Dual Enrollment Faculty are considered adjunct faculty and are certified in this same manner.

•   Information about applying for a faculty position is clearly outlined on the pima.edu website. Through conversations with the PCC Human Resources Analyst and through viewing the website, the team determined that faculty qualifications are the same regardless of faculty status. All faculty go through a certification process and are officially certified to teach certain courses. According to the Faculty Certification Office, and further verified through a letter from the Provost dated May 2, 2016, the college has completed the certification process for all full-time faculty that is in alignment with HLC's new faculty credentialing guidelines to begin in Fall 2017. The college is beginning to go through that same process for adjunct faculty. Upon review of 18 of the current (fall 2016) 51 dual enrollment instructors, the team found all to be in compliance with the published Pima faculty credentialing guidelines. Currently teaching faculty are classified into 1. Academic (Transfer); 2. Developmental; and 3. Occupational/Workforce.The Human Resources Analyst indicated that the College is moving toward using the HLC terminology in the future.

•   When reviewing potential faculty transcripts, PCC uses a National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES) member for evaluation of foreign transcripts. If the Faculty Certification office has questions about specific courses on a potential faculty transcript, the office will redact personal information on the transcript. They then send the redacted transcript along with course descriptions to the CDAC for an expert determination.

•   Adjunct faculty who teach in dual enrollment programs are generally high school teachers. According to the Faculty Certification office, employees from the office go out to the area high schools (one different school each semester) to talk with teachers about credentials and how to apply for an adjunct position if they are interested and qualified.

•   All adjunct faculty information is placed in the adjunct faculty database that is searchable on the PCC intranet. Department chairs can then look at the database to determine hiring of adjuncts. Advanced Program Managers hire the dual enrollment faculty for that program. Any adjunct in the database can be hired according to their credential status. That means that some faculty who teach in the high school with the dual enrollment program may also teach outside of high school hours as an adjunct faculty in the PCC general enrollment programs.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 22

4. PCC has a process to coordinate and ensure consistency in review of dual learning courses and dual learning faculty training.

•   Following the 2014 HLC visit, a High School Dual Enrollment (HSDE) Task Force was formed to address all concerns related to needed improvements to the program. The task force included a broad representation within Pima (faculty and administration), including Advanced Program Managers and Program Managers, who are the people who support the dual enrollment program in the area high schools, as well as representation from the high schools themselves.
•   The Dual Enrollment Task force issued a final report in April 2015. The report is comprehensive and thorough, looking at five specific core themes related to opportunities for improvement: 1. Communication; 2. Curriculum; 3. Instruction; 4. Pathways/Student Success; 5. Processes and Quality Control.
•   One outcome of the task force was the clear explanation and process for reviewing dual learning courses. In this process, the HSDE Standing Committee requested assistance from the CDACs to determine appropriateness of dual enrollment courses and approval of those courses for HSDE in area high schools. In a memo dated August 2014, the request was made and the process was then included in the Dual Enrollment handbook as addendum H starting in Fall, 2015. This was further verified through conversations with general faculty groups, the Dual Enrollment Committee, and the Dual Enrollment Advanced Program Managers and Program Managers. The procedure outlines: "A list of courses is provided to the high schools as a tool for dual enrollment course selection. That list is comprised of Pima Community College credit courses already contained in the course bank. There are no courses that are developed solely for dual enrollment. All courses are developed, vetted, reviewed, and modified using the procedures outlined in the Curriculum Procedures Manual." Before the potential course offerings are presented to the high schools, the CDACs review them (annually) and approve or deny them for offering at the high school. The courses must be numbered 100 or above, but below 190. The team viewed course approvals and denials for 2014-2015. Some examples of acceptance are Accounting 100, Archeology 110, and numerous History courses. Some examples of denials include honors courses because they require that the students qualify for the PCC Honors program, some courses with laboratory needs which are not usually available in high schools, and courses where a requirement includes a High School diploma or GED (for example, dental assisting and hygiene programs).
•   Once the approved list is generated, it is presented to the high schools and the high schools request courses from that list. A listing of approved courses is in the PCC Dual Enrollment Handbook.
•   A Dual Enrollment Coordinator is at each campus – they are called Advanced Program Managers or Program Managers. The Advanced Program Managers and Program Managers manage the logistics and the basic training/orientations. The team viewed several agendas and sign-in sheets for various Orientations for High School Dual Enrollment Adjunct Faculty for AY 2016-2017. Although they differ slightly depending on PCC campus, common agenda items include Updates, Responsibilities, Resources Review, and Procedures Review. These general orientations take 2-3 hours.
•   Dual enrollment faculty also have a faculty liaison based on the discipline. Most of these positions are held by faculty chairs. A Dual Enrollment Handbook outlines steps for faculty, including timelines, assessment requirements, and support resources. The handbook outlines, in Addendum C, the role of the faculty liaison (one faculty liaison per discipline per high school) and includes a listing of faculty liaison contact information. When speaking with faculty liaisons during the visit, they shared that they help HSDE teachers in ways, such as meeting with them individually, emailing them, sending them templates and other curriculum assistance.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 23

• Additionally, all faculty (full-time and adjunct) are invited to attend other professional development. An Adjunct Faculty Professional Development Day was held at the beginning of the Spring 2016 semester and this Fall 2016, all faculty were invited to attend the All Faculty Day, which included all faculty, regardless of work status. When speaking with the Adjunct Faculty Committee, discussions revolved around the use of Faculty to include both full-time and adjunct faculty, with resources provided equally to both. Adjunct faculty have positions on the Faculty Senate. "Faculty 411" is being developed as a more static resource for all faculty. The team spoke with several faculty who have been involved with making videos to show other faculty how to complete certain PCC responsibilities related to teaching. All adjunct faculty have PCC email addresses, and according to the Adjunct Faculty Committee, receive all of the information regarding professional development opportunities that the full-time faculty receive. Some of the timing of the general professional development opportunities may be difficult, however, for adjunct faculty (including dual enrollment adjuncts). Additionally, each campus holds an adjunct faculty meeting and a department meeting each semester.

5.   PCC has processes planned to promote sustainability of the Dual Enrollment program.

• PCC is pursuing accreditation with the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) with plans to apply in 2018. Currently, PCC is a member of NACEP. Survey instruments that were developed by NACEP will be used to evaluate the current program. These surveys will be administered to instructors, principals, and guidance counselors in the High Schools. Prior to applying for accreditation with NACEP, PCC will begin incorporating the NACEP standards, which align with HLC criteria and also align with the recommendations from the Dual Enrollment Task Force.
• PCC is participating in the Pathways to Prosperity Network, which is a national initiative which the state of Arizona has joined. The purpose is to strengthen dual enrollment pathways and the college is actively working with area high schools to align curriculum for grades 9-14. In the Dual Enrollment meeting, an example was detailed regarding alignment with the culinary program.
• One of the recommendations of the Task Force was for a director of Dual Enrollment. Although the PCC Executive Leadership Team approved establishing a position to provide centralized leadership for dual enrollment at their June 2016 meeting, there has been no action. In speaking with the Dual Enrollment Coordinators the team learned that there is possibility of changing the role to a Coordinator position.
• In addition to the Dual Enrollment Task Force, a standing committee was created that meets monthly. The committee is charged to implement, coordinate, and review processes, procedures, and activities pertaining to dual enrollment district-wide. The Dual Enrollment Committee reports to the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. The committee is chaired by the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and membership consists of the Vice President of Student Development; an Academic Dean; staff representatives from Administrative Services, Faculty Certification, and Marketing; faculty from disciplines active in Dual Enrollment; and all Advanced Program Managers who administer Dual Enrollment.

Summary: PCC's CLO's are developed by faculty experts and are approved by faculty discipline groups (CDACs). All courses have CLOs that are identified and approved by CDACs and are used consistently regardless of course option (taught by full-time, general adjunct, dual enrollment adjunct, online). PCC has a system and process to ensure that course SLO's are consistent and that all mandatory information is in the syllabi. Faculty either use a template or a checklist to make sure all information is present; then the syllabi is reviewed by a dean or department chair for accuracy. Syllabi are placed in a central repository and are reviewed by the district office for accuracy. The last review showed 82% accuracy with a goal to increase accuracy by 5% each year

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 24

for 2 years. All PCC faculty are "certified" to teach in the same manner regardless of work status. PCC has developed a clear process to ensure consistency in review of dual learning courses. General Orientation for dual enrollment adjunct faculty is coordinated by the Advanced Program Managers. General faculty development is available to all faculty, full-time and adjunct. There are constraints in professional development for high school dual enrollment faculty due to teaching hours and start-date differences within school systems. PCC is planning to pursue NACEP accreditation and is encouraged to do this, as accreditation from NACEP will help ensure long-term sustainability of the Dual Enrollment Program through following national best-practices.

A6. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion Three, Core Component 3.C, "the institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services," because the College has increasingly relied on adjunct faculty to teach its classes and should monitor its full-time to part-time faculty ratio.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Three, Core Component 3.C

B6. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:
1. As a result of the Comprehensive Evaluation Visit to Pima Community College (September 15-17, 2014) Core Component 3C was met with concerns. One of the areas of concern was the high number of adjunct faculty compared to the number of full-time faculty teaching classes. The 363 full-time faculty (338 were instructional and the rest were counselors and librarians) and the 951 adjunct faculty equaled 3.7 adjunct faculty for every full-time faculty member. This placed the College on the mid-high range of its peers. During this same year, the student to faculty ratio was 27/1. This ratio also placed the College in the mid-high range among its peers. Peer institutions include Portland CC (OR), El Paso CC (TX), Tarrant County CC (TX), and Austin CC (TX). Peer institutions are also identified in the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA) and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). Since the 2014 Comprehensive Evaluation visit, the student enrollment at the College has decreased significantly. In 2013-2014, full time enrollment was 10,776 and part-time enrollment was 19,806. In 2016-2017, full-time enrollment is 6,911 and part-time enrollment is 15,308. Also, since 2013-2014 the number of faculty has decreased to 286 full-time and 864 adjunct faculty members in 2016-2017. The College student to faculty ratio has dropped to 25/1.

2. The 2014 team reported concerns expressed by founding full-time faculty members about the significant number of adjunct faculty members especially those teaching general education courses and those teaching in programs with high enrollments. Many of the adjunct faculty teach in the College Dual Enrollment Program. The majority of these adjunct faculty members are high school teachers who meet the same credential/experience requirements as faculty members teaching the College courses. Adjunct teachers also provide instruction in the College Developmental Program. In 2016-2017, the top six disciplines where adjunct faculty teach more than 50 classes are Writing, Math, Biology, Art, History and Psychology.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 25

3. Individuals who meet the credential/experience requirements are entered into the Adjunct Faculty Database which lists the individuals whose credentials have been verified by the Faculty Certification Office. Per the contract, full-time faculty have priority over adjuncts for assignment to classes to ensure they meet their teaching load requirements or if the full-time faculty member desires overload classes. The decision to hire an adjunct is made by the appropriate chair/dean. Adjunct instructors are required to follow the same course syllabi as full-time faculty do for the same course. Adjunct faculty members are encouraged to participate in training and professional development activities focused on pedagogy, student learning assessment, College policies and requirements. (Additional information about adjunct faculty members can be found in the B5. Evidence section).

The team encourages the College to continue to monitor its full-time to part-time faculty ratio to ensure students are receiving instruction from highly qualified faculty members.
.

A7. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion Three, Core Component 3.D, "the institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching," because the College has recently restructured developmental education and needs to ensure that these changes are supported with appropriate College staff and serve the adult student population well.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Three, Core Component 3.D

B7. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:
1. Since the last HLC visit, PCC has created a Developmental Education Redesign Plan 2015-2017 through the work of the Developmental Education Redesign Committee. The plan outlines three phases: 1. Plan and Pilot; 2. Study and Act; 3. Full Implementation.

• A new Developmental Education Council was formed. This Council is responsible for evaluating the implementation of the detailed plan.This is also in line with one item of the PCC Strategic Plan 2014-2017: "Operationalize the recommendations from the Developmental Education Redesign Committee". The focused visit team viewed the plan, which is outlined clearly in a dashboard-like document. At the time of the 2016 HLC focused visit, some of the plans have been fully implemented, while others are in an earlier phase and are slated to be implemented up to Fall 2017. In fact, most components are currently in the "Plan and Pilot" or "Study and Act" phase. Consequently, the College has not been able to evaluate the effectiveness of this plan with data.
• In January, 2015, a Director of Developmental Education was hired (title was changed to Dean of Developmental Education with the recent college reorganization). The Dean of Developmental Education also oversees Assessment and Testing. The team spoke with the Dean of Developmental Education about the program as a whole and through those conversations it is clear

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 26

that the Developmental Education Program is progressing and that resources are in place to support sustainability of the program. The Dean of Developmental Education now has an operating budget and administrative assistance. The Dean reports directly to the Provost.

2.   PCC has developed a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

•   PCC is implementing several approaches. In the past, the college placed students into developmental courses on the basis of a single test score. Currently, the placement process includes multiple measures designed to more holistically assess students' abilities for placement purposes. The multiple measures are being developed by a task force of Math, Reading, Writing and Student Success CDACs.   All students requiring placement will take the Accuplacer or CELSA (ESL students) placement tests. The Accuplacer has the ability to test noncognitive measures. Math will use a secondary test to place students beyond Topics in College Math, College Algebra and Precalculous I. In speaking with the Dean of Developmental Education, the team learned that currently the math faculty are deciding on either creating their own unit test for math or adding questions to the Accuplacer test.   Additionally, the team learned from documentation and discussions that other measures are being used. Some examples include GED scores, high school GPA, and SAT and ACT scores. A Multiple Measures Placement Information Form is used by Advising to document placement. Because the use of multiple measures for assessing is now being piloted, data have not been generated as to the effectiveness of the new system. This is currently in process.
•   To further assist in the correct placement of students in courses, PCC has developed several interventions. Students can prepare for and re-take the placement exams using the college's Brush-Ups, Boot Camps, and Boosts. These free offerings began in Summer 2016 and were located at all campuses. When reviewing Math Boost data, 100 % of students indicated that they felt better equipped to be successful in a math class and 90 % indicated that they planned to re-take the placement test. Additionally, anecdotally, when speaking with Developmental Education faculty, counselors, general faculty, and the Dean of Developmental Education, it seems that many students are able to benefit, for example, students who have not had math for several years and have forgotten some concepts that once reintroduced become clearer. The team viewed flyers, and course outlines for various classes. Additionally, students can use a newly adopted online program, EdReady, where students can assess their own readiness for college courses and participate in a study plan to help them fill in learning gaps. This is also free for PCC students. EdReady can help students prepare for more accurate placement testing and can also be used by students in Developmental Education courses to help them learn. PCC has developed a new Student Placement Process Tutorial that helps guide students through the placement process and emphasizes the importance of preparing for the assessments in order to be properly placed curricularly. All of these interventions will be able to be evaluated in the near future.
•   Academic advising for students who are in developmental education courses is intentional. Students, who after testing are placed into the Developmental Education courses, are provided with additional advisement support. Advisors partner with faculty in some courses to further provide academic support. Students have mandatory Orientation, and all are required to see an advisor. PCC has purchased a new student management system that offers early academic alerts to students, as well as faculty and academic advisors so that students may be assisted in a timely manner. The new system will also be able to provide analytics to support ongoing adjustments to the college's advising process. Full implementation is scheduled to begin in Spring 2917.

3.   PCC provides students infrastructure and resources to support effective learning and growth in the developmental education program and Adult Basic Education.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 27

- As mentioned previously, the Early Alert system is currently being used to help students be successful in the Developmental Education program. The Academic Early Alert system is accessed through MyPima. According to information provided to the college employees, first the faculty identifies a problem (missing class, low grades, etc.) and speaks with the student. If the problem is not resolved, faculty follow-up by sending an AEA notice to the student, with the campus student engagement team CC'd. Then, the campus Student Engagement Team contacts the student and advises the student to make an appointment within the week. If the student does not respond, the Student Engagement Team contacts the student again, CCing the faculty. The Student Affairs staff works with the student and after meeting, notifies the faculty that the meeting took place. A couple of weeks later, Student Affairs follows up with faculty regarding the student. This process is tracked with a campus-based spreadsheet available in Google Sheets.and is planned to be in full implementation in Spring 2017.

- In speaking with Developmental Education faculty and counselors, it was clear that this system is being used. Students who are placed in the lowest level classes in math, reading, or writing work with faculty and staff who provide wrap-around support in their first semester and are assigned a specifically trained advisor.

- With the re-design of the Developmental Education program, faculty have created new course designs that align with best practices and student success. For example, Developmental Education students take a course called Integrated College Skills (ICS) that addresses deficiencies in math, reading, and writing. These classes are capped at 20 students. A co-requisite course to ICS is Student Success (STU). In STU, counselors meet with specific cohorts of ICS classes about things such as study skills and life skills. In this way, each ICS course meets weekly, as a cohort with a counselor. The Developmental Education faculty and counselors indicated that this process has helped them work more closely with each other, and develop more intentional relationships with students in need. Counselors can also reach out to students and make individual appointments. Additionally, tutors are embedded in the ICS/STU courses, where students who are academically more advanced provide tutoring and are paid by the college for their service. Full implementation of this strategy is scheduled to begin in Summer 2017.

- PCC has been using the Emporium model for developmental math since 2011, with the purpose to increase student retention rates, according to math faculty. Emporium is targeted toward the lowest level math students. Developmental Education faculty and Math faculty report that this allows a student to enter college-level math classes a semester earlier than if they completed the traditional developmental math sequence. Additionally, now students in the Emporium program are participating in PCCs partnership with Stanford University's College Perspectives Program, which is designed to empower students to learn with a growth mindset.

- A group of Writing faculty created a course called Writing 101S. Using common assignments, they teach WRT 101 to students who assessed into WRT 100. WRT 101S consists of WRT 101 plus studio. The WRT 101 class is capped at 22 and faculty meet a third time during the week in a studio class capped at 11. The studio is designed to give students extra help with their assignments and teach strategies to deal with other problems (reading strategies, structure of paragraph, etc.). Data provided by the college looked at course success rate and retention and success in WRT 102. Findings indicate that students successfully completing WRT 101S are close to succeeding at the same rate of those going through the 2 semester sequence of WRT 100 and WRT 101 and students avoided taking an extra semester of coursework.

- According to the Dean of Developmental Education, the majority of developmental needs are math related. To support both developmental and adult basic education students, Math Bridge courses are being offered. They are taught in accelerated format, 3 hours a day, 4 days a week for 7 weeks. These have been offered through the Adult Basic Education for College and Career for the first year. In that year (2015-2016) 12 classes were offered to 152 students (97 Adult Ed and 55

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 28

Developmental Math) with a 66% completion rate. Starting this fall, the courses are being offered at five campuses and have been revised based on student feedback and outcomes.

4.	PCC provides faculty, advisors (counselors) the infrastructure and resources to support effective teaching and learning in the developmental education program.

•	When speaking with Academic Deans, faculty, and counselors, it was clear that the discipline faculty guide the curriculum development. The Developmental Education Courses lie within the disciplines (developmental math courses within the math discipline, for example) and the CDACs create the Student Learning Outcomes for the courses. The team was told that the Dean of Developmental Education attends the individual CDAC meetings. In addition to the discipline CDACs and the Developmental Education Council, college-wide Developmental Education committees help to reinforce the importance of the college's commitment to the Developmental Education Program.
•	PCC hosted a Developmental Education Conference in October 2014, designed as an opportunity for PCC faculty members and their colleagues from other institutions to explore innovative ways to support students, share teaching strategies and discuss best practices.
•	PCC is now a member of the National Association of Developmental Education (NADE) and its Arizona chapter (AADE). PCC sent a group from the Developmental Education Council to the most recent NADE conference. PCC will be hosting AADE's annual conference in 2017.
•	PCC provides annual professional development to all faculty, as well as adult education instructors and Learning Center Specialists in the form of a Teaching Strategies Workshop. According to documents provided by PCC, the most recent workshop took place on Saturday, August 13, 2016 with significant financial support from the college. In speaking with Developmental Education faculty, the event is traditionally geared toward reading, writing, and math. According to faculty (and verified by the program agenda), this professional development activity is presented by faculty with sessions on Contextualized reading, Active Learning, Group work in Class and others. Plans are currently being made by the Dean for Developmental Education for PCC to host a spring 2017 "Developmental Education Professional Development Conference" for all Developmental Education faculty, Basic Adult Education faculty, Gateway course adjunct faculty and Dual Enrollment faculty. Additional professional development is also provided to many Developmental Education faculty through grants. For example, a Title 5 grant is in place to train Developmental Education faculty in the use of active learning, technology, and contextualization.

Summary:
It is clear that PCC has embraced a new culture that includes a focus on Developmental Education and on Adult Education, including KPIs related to the development of both within the Strategic Plan. The Dean of Developmental Education is progressively leading an enthusiastic group of faculty, advisors and staff who are focused on student success. A thorough and thoughtful Developmental Education Implementation Plan has been established and is in the process of being implemented in many areas. Those areas where the plan is not fully implemented now have plans for future implementation. New ways of assessing student academic placement are in process. Students, faculty, advisors, adult education specialists and other support staff are receiving support from the college in order to create success. The Dean of Developmental Education was asked to revive the board policy on Developmental Education, which will renew the Board's commitment to provide financial and other resources to support Developmental Education. It will soon be open for review by the faculty Senate, Staff Council, All College Council and PCC Community for review. PCC does look at completion rates, persistence and retention rates and pass rates in general, but the new Developmental Education Redesign is not mature enough to assess its specific effectiveness

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 29

or to implement changes. Therefore, the Team recommends that PCC includes data demonstrating the effectiveness of the Developmental Education redesign in the materials submitted for the next Comprehensive Visit. Specifically, the data should demonstrate how the Developmental Education Redesign has contributed to increased persistence, retention, and completion rates.

A8. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion Four, Core Component 4.A, "the institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs," because, although the College recognizes that its graduation, transfer and success rates are low, the College has not yet set benchmarks for academic or institutional success and has limited data on graduate employment outcomes.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Four, Core Component 4.A

B8. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

1.   The institution has instituted several noteworthy data gathering and analysis efforts to monitor the success of transfer students to four-year programs. Data have been gathered showing the number of PCC transfer students by cohort year. These data are organized by program area defined by CIP codes, with trends showing the enrollment trends over a five-year period from 2009-10 to 2014-15. Using data from the state of Arizona (ASSIST), PCC also tracks the success of students at the University of Arizona after they have transferred from Pima. These data are categorized by subject area, thus facilitating the utilization of these data by appropriate program and discipline faculty.

2.   The 2014 HLC peer review team report identified a concern that PCC had "no specific graduation, transfer, or success benchmarks by which to measure success." The report went on to express further concern that PCC had established an "unrealistic completion goal of 1% increase each year for the next five years" since they had not yet "implemented a plan to achieve such ambitious goals." In the two years since that report was written, the institution has developed a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) which incorporates specific key performance indicators connected to goals for student enrollment, persistence, and completion. The plan includes improving student persistence and retention rates by utilizing Guided Pathways Data and using the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA) to establish benchmarks for progress. High failure courses and semesters are identified and other high impact practices for improving retention and completion are utilized. The 2016 focused visit team notes that the specific concerns identified by the 2014 team have been addressed with the development of a rigorous plan to meet the goals established earlier.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 30

3. PCC has implemented a strategy to track program completion rates and respond to the 2014 HLC team concern that no data are available to identify "percentage of students having either a livable wage or enrolled in further education." A graduate dashboard has been created that provides a calculation of the Pima County Livable Wage. The institution tracks the number of completers per year by program area along with data from EMSI that shows the anticipated number of position openings and wages in various job titles that align with that program. These data inform students and other stakeholders about potential economic opportunities and likely salaries upon degree completion and whether the anticipated position will produce a job paying a livable wage. It is noted as a positive effort to address the concern of the HLC team in 2014. However, a review of several of these program dashboards shows that the institution is generally not meeting its goal of increasing program completion for every year starting with 2014-15 that is 5% above the average of the three years from 2010-11 to 2012-13. Furthermore, PCC has not yet been able to implement a rigorous tracking system for students who have transferred. PCC staff acknowledged during an interview that there is still a data gap since they do not yet have transfer and success rates of students on the graduate dashboard.

4. PCC has developed an infrastructure to collect and analyze information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs. The College has demonstrated it has begun establishing a record of using retention, persistence, and completion data to inform academic planning and decision making. Due to the short time-frame these practices have been in place, continued focus by the institution is needed to fully implement these activities.

The materials the College will prepare for the next Comprehensive Visit should include data to demonstrate program completion that is "5% above the average of the three yearsnfrom 2010-11 to 2012-13." The materials should also include the implementation of a "rigorous tracking system for students who have transferred."

.

A9. Statement of Focus (if applicable):
The College meets with concerns Criterion Four, Core Component 4.B, "the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning," because implementing the assessment process has been slow, and sustaining progress on program review continues to challenge the institution.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Four, Core Component 4.B

B9. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☒ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted. (Continued On Notice status to September 1, 2017)

Evidence:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 31

1. PCC utilized TracDat for several years to organize and report assessment data on student learning outcomes in specific courses and programs and divisional learning outcomes. In 2015, PCC responded to numerous and persistent concerns by discontinuing utilization of the program. The prevailing complaint regarding TracDat was that users were not adequately trained on utilization, which resulted in persistent and widespread confusion concerning the types of outcomes being requested. In particular, TracDat intensified confusion between program and course level outcomes reporting. Interviews by team members during the focused visit revealed universal approval by faculty and staff of the decision to discontinue use of TracDat. Furthermore, there is widespread and consistent stakeholder sentiment that the replacement reporting system is much more effective for assessment outcomes reporting. The result is actionable data that is being utilized for course and program improvement. The HLC team believes that the new data system will provide more actionable data and reduce reporting confusion.

2. The focused visit team observed the implementation by PCC of a robust and user-friendly system for reporting program assessment data. Utilizing a reporting template developed internally to replace the discontinued TracDat system, each program, concentration, or certificate area program chair reports program level student learning outcomes (SLOs). Specific course level assignments and/or assessments are identified that measure achievement of the SLOs. The number and percentage of students successfully completing the success indicator is reported along with changes anticipated in the assessment process based on results. Interviews and documentation provided during the focused visit reveal that approximately 90% of programs plan to implement changes in their assessment strategy as a result of the results achieved last year.

3. Various faculty groups were interviewed during the focused visit, including the general education committee, assessment committee, and selected lead faculty members and department chairs. These interviews revealed a consistent theme that an overarching reason for the inconsistent progress on creating a culture of assessment at PCC has been lack of understanding of the assessment plan and considerable confusion created by the TracDat reporting system. Insufficient faculty training was also cited.To address this issue, PCC has instituted an arduous schedule of faculty workshops addressing specific assessment-related training objectives. Starting in July 2016 and running regularly through April 2017, six modules will be offered by various PCC presenters on topics such as course learning outcomes, assessing student learning, and guided pathways and capstones. The team applauds the effort to incorporate regular assessment workshops and believes they have the potential to greatly improve the campus community's understanding of PCC's assessment strategies and tactics.

4. Previous HLC teams were concerned that PCC had not demonstrated consistent progress with implementing a rigorous, consistent and sustained assessment process. The focused visit team is heartened by the successful hiring of an Associate Vice President who has been given direct responsibility for the assessment effort in a Cabinet level position. Previously, assessment was assigned to the Office of Institutional Research. Interviews with personnel on campus revealed that the new structure has enhanced visibility, consistency and stronger leadership of the PCC assessment efforts.

5. In addition to other structural changes, PCC created an Assessment Committee in February, 2016. This committee includes approximately 20 faculty and staff members, including the president of Faculty Senate and a variety of faculty from various program areas. Several district level administrative staff are also included. It is co-chaired by a faculty member and a member of the staff. Review of meeting minutes reveals that the committee met frequently during spring 2016, usually bi-monthly. The creation of this committee is promising however, given the recent history of

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 32

PCC, this committee needs to be given strong and consistent administrative support to sustain the assessment momentum of the last two years. Additional time is needed to solidify and establish the committee as an integral element of the assessment framework at PCC. regularly to monitor results.

6. The team applauds the development and implementation of the general education outcomes and the strategy of mapping those outcomes to specific courses where they will be addressed. Utilizing the AAC&U value rubric for evaluating written communication skills is an appropriate approach for collecting meaningful assessment data. Going forward, the institution should demonstrate that gathered assessment data are being actively utilized to inform appropriate pedagogical and content modifications.

7. In May 2015, PCC adopted a general education program designed to provide students with "a common core of knowledge that transforms them from college applicants to college educated citizens…" (Quotation from General Education Statement and Outcomes document). Five focus areas with sub-outcomes are identified. Using a standard reporting template, each general education course documents which general education outcome(s) the course addresses. Specific assignments are also indicated. A general education committee oversees this process and meets regularly to monitor results.

8. The 2014 HLC report noted that approximately 65% of programs had completed the assessment cycle. The 2014 team asked for evidence that program assessment had been completed in all programs by the time of the 2016 focused visit. The assessment program—appropriately named PIMA to stand for Plan, Implement, Measure and Act—has been completed by approximately 95% of programs. Documentation was provided to the focused visit team that demonstrates programs have completed the assessment cycle. However, some certificate (CT) programs and clock hour programs such as CNA have not yet concluded the assessment process. Furthermore, staff interviews revealed that while some programs have identified appropriate course and program outcomes, they have not yet implemented pedagogical or programmatic content changes (ACT) as a result of those outcomes. Additional time is needed for full completion of the goal established in 2014.

9. The 2014 HLC report noted that assessment efforts at PCC were making unsteady progress in "stops and starts". Interviews with numerous personnel on this visit revealed that PCC faculty and employees agree with that 2014 description of assessment progress at PCC. The 2016 focused visit team identified compelling evidence that PCC has taken significant steps toward establishing a consistent culture of assessment at the institution. Interviews and documentation indicate that significant and steady progress has been made in the last two years. However, the team also concluded that continued HLC monitoring is needed to insure that this progress continues without future disruption.

10. PCC is currently seeking to fill two critical assessment positions: a Director of Assessment reporting directly to the Associate Vice President, and a Research Analyst reporting to the Director of Assessment. PCC plans to fill the Director position by December 2016 and the Analyst position shortly thereafter. The team believes that the successful conclusion of these searches will demonstrate important milestones toward fulfilling the institution's long term commitment to sustaining an effective assessment program. Therefore, the team requests an notice report be submitted by September 1, 2017 that specifically reports on the status of these critical searches. Additionally, the interim support should include a description of the goals established and the

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 33

activities implemented by the Director of Assessment and the Research Analyst since they assumed their roles.

.

A10. Statement of Focus (if applicable):

The College meets with concerns Criterion Four, Core Component 4.C, "the institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs," because critical metrics on persistence, retention, and completion were added to the institutional dashboard only recently. There is limited evidence of analysis of data collected on course completion and retention and program completion, so the College has not yet established a record of using this data to inform planning and decision making.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):
Criterion Four, Core Component 4.C

B10. Statements of Evidence (check one below):
☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.
☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.
☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.
☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

1. PCC has defined goals for student retention, persistence and completion as outlined in the 2015-2016 Program Review Performance Indicators. These indicators include enrollment, retention, persistence, program cost, completion, and job placement data. The College created an enrollment management standing committee consisting of faculty and staff who recommended creation of an Office of Enrollment Management and the development of a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP). The SEMP was presented to the Executive Leadership Team and the Board of Governors on August 10, 2016 according to the minutes posted on the College website.

2. PCC has spent the last year creating an infrastructure to capture live data and produce a dashboard for ease of data consumption by college constituents. The enrollment data are being populated and will be the first dashboard to be launched in November 2016 according to staff interviews. The dashboard development was verified on site and allows for data exploration over a wide variety of variables.

3. PCC has created a process for academic program self-assessment and improvement as demonstrated by the plans provided for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. Faculty Senate described a process by which course assessment data are entered into the interface tool and is linked to student outcomes for review by discipline lead, the assessment office, and the faculty member. Faculty Senate also described ways they were involved in providing input into a syllabi template and the differences needed for face-to-face courses and distance delivery. PCC has in place a standard practice guide for the Inactivation of a Program of Study which is available on the website. This guide has been effective since 2003. PCC updated its Curriculum Alignment, Unification and Placement standard practice guide on April 7, 2009 according to the document on the website.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 34

4. One example of using data to make decisions is the admission modification project to collect student goal intention that can be linked to completion information. In addition, PCC made a decision to classify thirteen programs as selective admission to ensure students were aware of any compliance issues that might prevent retention or completion, such as felony conviction or drug testing prior to students being admitted to the program. Disclosure of selective admission is presented on the PCC website under Programs & Courses.

5. PCC provided to the team Academic Program Area Self-Assessment and Improvement Plans for 32 areas. Based on meetings with administrators and faculty, there is still a need to gain faculty buy-in in using data as an evaluation tool and not just a compliance tool. Student services administrators shared examples of using data to make decisions on academic advising, new student orientation, student life co-curricular programming, and early alert initiatives. Administrators have ideas about how non-academic services and programs impact persistence, retention, and completion. They are aware of best practices and expressed a desire to continue data collection and analysis to further inform these decisions.

A11. Statement of Focus (if applicable):

The College meets with concerns Criterion Five, Core Component 5.D, "the institution works systematically to improve its performance," because the College lacks evidence that information gathered in other processes informs planning and that planning is linked strongly to budgeting, and the College has not yet had time to demonstrate that its new structures are effective in addressing these gaps.

Note relevant Criterion, Core Component(s) or Assumed Practice(s):

Criterion Five, Core Component 5.D

B11. Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention and HLC follow-up are required.

☐ Evidence is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Evidence:

1. PCC has adopted a new Mission Fulfillment Framework which consists of a mission statement, vision statement, college values, and core themes and objectives, along with mission-level key performance indicators (KPIs). This framework was finalized in April 2016 when the Board of Governors adopted the KPIs for each of the seven core theme areas, a final step in the review process.

2. PCC participates in the Voluntary Framework of Accountability and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement as methods of benchmarking institutional effectiveness against peer institutions. Metrics from these instruments have been incorporated into the mission level KPIs.

3. In the first two years of the 2014-2017 strategic planning cycle, campus plans were adopted to identify the operating activities necessary to achieve the objectives of the strategic plan. In 2015-16,

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 35

the College began transitioning from campus plans to unit plans to better align with the administrative re-organization that had begun. These unit plans had the same purpose but focused on operations across the institution rather than individual campuses. A review of a number of unit plans submitted for 2015-16 revealed very detailed, comprehensive documents. As an example, the Human Resources unit plan for 2015-16 included 41 different KPIs across all seven of the college core themes. Through discussions with the campus presidents and strategic planning committee, a number of individuals commented that the approach resulted in plans that were too broad and that prioritization must be included in the 2016-17 unit plans. The second year of operating plans was due to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (OIRPE) by September 30, 2016.

4. OIRPE has begun development of a data warehouse and reporting dashboard to present information related to KPIs at the institution and unit levels. Though this work has begun, at the time of the focused visit, the dashboard only included data addressing one of the seven core themes at the institution level and had not yet incorporated any data at the unit level. As a result, there has been no significant progress to date on measuring effectiveness at the unit level though appropriate plans and systems appear to be in place.

5. Previously, TracDat was used to accumulate and organize assessment data for academic programs and courses. According to the Director of OIRPE, the system was never effective because it was implemented quickly and without training of faculty. A new assessment plan was adopted in 2015-16. The college is beginning to identify program and course changes based on this assessment data, though this process is not yet fully developed. Additional information is included in section B9 of this report.

6. College personnel were able to identify examples of how the institutional effectiveness process has led to budget changes. Examples include the review of all position hiring decisions that has resulted in re-allocation of funding across units and changes to the timing of student payments which has resulted in improved course scheduling processes. However, the institutional effectiveness process has not yet been systematically incorporated into the budget process because KPI measures are not yet available.

7. Students who met with the team mentioned Camp Connect, a student led mentorship program, as an example of an effective program at the college. Data collected on students who have participated in the program indicate higher student retention rates and higher cumulative GPAs for participants compared to students who did not participate.

6. **Other Accreditation Issues:** (If applicable, list evidence of other accreditation issues.)

None

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 36

Part B: Recommendation and Rationale

Recommendation:

☐ Evidence sufficiently demonstrated. No HLC follow-up recommended.

☐ Evidence demonstrated. HLC follow-up recommended.

☒ Evidence insufficient. HLC sanction warranted. Extension of Notice status to September 1, 2017.

Rationale for the team's recommendation:

Prior to the focused visit, the team members studied a variety of materials including the HLC archived documents, the Notice Report June 30, 2016 submitted by the College, and the linked documents included in the Notice Report. During the visit, the team members confirmed information submitted to document the College progress in addressing the 11 areas of focus described in the Notice Letter sent to the PCC Chancellor March 9, 2015. Team members requested and reviewed additional materials provided by College personnel. During team meetings, the members discussed the outcomes of the meetings and interviews and reached consensus about the College's progress meeting the requirements and goals of the areas of focus. As a result of the reviews, on-site activities, and discussions, the team verified evidence demonstrates adequate progress in areas of focus A1, A3, A4, A5, and A6; further organizational attention is required in areas of focus A2, A8, A10, and A11; further organizational attention and HLC follow-up is warranted on area of focus A7; and evidence for A9 is insufficient and demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted (continued On Notice status to September 1, 2017).

The team recommends the College remain On Notice for six months to demonstrate completion of activities identified in Area of Focus A9. These activities are hiring the Director of Assessment and hiring the Research Analyst. This positions are necessary and critical to the College meeting Criterion 4, Core Component 4.B and moving the College towards its long-term commitment to sustaining an effective assessment program. The team recommends the College submit a notice report by September 1, 2017 confirming these hires have been made and the individuals are in place. The report should include a description of the goals established and the activities implemented by the Director of Assessment and the Research Analyst since they assumed their roles,

The team finds the College has made significant progress meeting 5 of the areas of focus; 4 areas require fiurther organizational attention; 1 area of focus requires further organizational attention and HLC follow-up; and 1 area of focus warrants (continued) HLC sanction.While there is significant evidence documentng the College's progress meeting the the requirements for areas of focus A2, A8, A10, and A11, more work needs to be completed to assure the sustainability of the changes. The team recommends the College submit an interim report embedded in the materials required for the evaluation visit scheduled during 2018-2019. The interim report should include: 1) documentation that Board of Governors role in College governance is appropriate and Board members are working within the framework of the bylaws (B2); 2) data to demonstrate program completion is "5% above the average of the three years from 2010-11 to 2012-13" and the implementation of a "rigorous tracking system for students who have transferred" (A8); 3) verification that KPI neasures are available and being utilized in the institutional effectiveness process (A11); and 4) evidence that faculty are using data as an evaluartion tool and not just a compliance tool (A10). 4) the PIMA assessment process has been fully implemented; the assessment committee has received strong administrative support for its activities and is an integral part of the assessment framework at the College; that all programs, including certificate and clock hour programs, have completed the assessment process; and programs have used the results of

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 37

assessment activities to make pedagogical or progammatic changes.

Stipulations or limitations on future accreditation relationships: If recommending a change in the institution's level for review of future changes (locations, programs, delivery, etc.), state both the old and new level and provide a brief rationale for the recommended change. Check the Institutional Status and Requirement (ISR) Report for the current wording. (Note: After the focused visit, the institution's stipulations should be reviewed in consultation with the institution's staff liaison.)

Monitoring:
The team may call for a follow-up interim monitoring report. If the team concurs that a report is necessary, indicate the topic (including the relevant Criteria, Core Components or Assumed Practices), timeline and expectations for that report. (Note: The team should consider embedding such a report as an emphasis in an upcoming comprehensive review in consultation with the institution's staff liaison.)

The College should submit an Interim Report by September 1, 2017 documenting that the Director of Assessment and the Research Analyst have been hired and are in place. If these individuals are in place, the report should include a description of the goals these individuals have set and the activities they have implemented since they assumed their positions.

 The College should also embed an Interim Report in the materials for the 2018-19 accreditation visit to address the following:

• Establishment and continuation of a defined planning structure and process must be demonstrated. Though evidence of progress was apparent to the team, there continue to be changes which have delayed progress. Stability and continuity in the process, leading to effective planning, should be demonstrated in the report. This should include evidence that a manageable and measurable 2017-2020 strategic plan has been adopted through a collaborative process and that manageable unit plans have been adopted which link to the strategic plan.
•   Evidence that planning goals are being achieved must be provided. Measurable goals and key performance indicators have been established in some areas. However, throughout the multiple plans that have been adopted, the number of KPIs appears to be unmanageable. In addition, at the time of the visit data had only been reported for one of the seven core areas.
•   Evidence of further development of linking budgeting to strategic planning must be provided. As the institution begins collecting and reporting data regarding progress toward achievement of strategic planning goals, it should also demonstrate how the operating budget has been aligned with the activities necessary to achieve those goals.
•   Evidence of approval and implementation of the education and facilities master plan must be provided. The draft plan presented to the college in August 2016 appears to be robust and aligned with the strategic direction of the college but, at the time of the visit, there had been no opportunity for feedback from constituent groups and the Board of Governors had not adopted the plans.The monitoring report should provide documentation of the implementation of the activities in the Strategic Plan and the activities designed to move the assessment process forward. The monitoring report should demonstrate the pedagogical and programmatic changes that have been made based on the findings of the assessment of student learning.

The team may call for a follow-up visit. If the team concurs that a visit is necessary, indicate the type of visit, topic (including the relevant Criteria, Core Components or Assumed Practices), timeline and expectations for that visit. (Note: The team should consider embedding such a visit as an emphasis in an upcoming comprehensive review in consultation with the institution's staff liaison.)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 38

Interactions with Institutional Constituencies and Materials Reviewed: List the titles or positions, but not names, of individuals with whom the team interacted during the review and the principal documents, materials and web pages reviewed.

Institutional Constituencies-

Chancellor
Mayor, City of Tucson (at his request, met with Chancellor, team member, and HLC staff member)
Board of Governors (5)
Chair, BOG Audit and Finance Committee (community member)
Chair, BOG Human Resources Committee (community member)
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Executive Vice Chancellor of Finance & Administration
Vice Chancellor of Facilities
Vice Chancellor of Human Resources
Associate Vice Chancellor for Accreditation and Quality Improvement
Associate Vice Chancellor - Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Evaluation
Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Development
Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Legal Counsel
Campus Presidents (3 individually)
Academic Deans (13)
Campus Chief Academic Officers (8)
Dean of Developmental Education
Vice Presidents for Student Development (3)
Deans of Student Affairs (3)
Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator
Human Resources Directors (2)
All College Council (9)
Faculty Senate (10)
Select Department Chairs (7)
Select Lead Faculty (6)
Strategic Planning Team (16)
Enrollment Management Standing Committee (13)
Assessment Group (14)
Assessment Group Co-Chairs (2)
Syllabus Work Group (8)
Campus Dual Enrollment Coordinators (6)
Dual Enrollment Committee (10)
General Education Committee (10)
Developmental Educational Faculty (9)
Adjunct Faculty Committee (7)
Staff Council (10)
Students (15, West Campus; 12, Downtown Campus)
C-FAIRR community group (15+)
POAC community group (3)
General Community Forum (41 on sign-in sheet; 53 counted; time for 23 speakers)

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 39

Materials Reviewed

Pima CC Archived materials from HLC
PCC Notice Report June 30, 2016
Pima CC website
PCC ODR website
Strategic Plan 2014-17
Strategic Plan Update Spring 2016
Operational Plans & Status Reports
  - 2014-2015 Plans & Reports Administration
  - 2015-2016 Reports from Operational Units
2016-2017 Strategic Planning Process
2014 Futures Conference materials
Fall 2013 - Fall 2015 College Employee Satisfaction Survey Results & Snapshot
BOG Finance & Audit Committee Charter & meeting minutes
BOG Finance & Audit Committee - Highlights from current year & Workplan for next year
BOG Human Resources Committee description, 2015 - 2016 meeting schedule, agenda, & minutes
BOG meeting agendas, notices, supporting materials & minutes (selected 2014-2016)
FY 2016-2017 budget planning & outlook; FY 2016-20-17 tuition discussion materials
HR Resources Systems Metrics FY 2016, 1st & 2nd quarters
PCC Complaint file
Summary of Complaints & Grievances - July 21, 2014 - May 31, 2016
Office of Dispute Resolution Allegations of Misconduct Satisfaction Survey Report
Multiple Measures Plan
Student Placement Process Tutorial 2016
Developmental Education Implementation Plan 2015-2017
PCC Proposed budgets FY17, FY16, FY15
PCC Education Master Plan
PCC Facilities Master Plan
Diversity Plan (draft)
PCC Integrated Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Process description
Syllabus archive storage system
Time to hire administrators report
Developing Mission Key Performance Indicators PPT
Mission Fulfillment PPT
Administrative Structure Overview document

Websites Reviewed

www.pima.edu
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/board-policies/docs-bp-01/BP-1-25.pdf
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/administrative-procedures/docs-ap-01/AP-1-06-01.pdf
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/board-of-governors/all-college-council/
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/board-policies/index.html
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/standard-practice-guides/index.html
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/notice-report-2016/docs/14-HRS-102762-consultant-recommendations-college-actions-june-2016.pdf)
 https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/standard-practice-guides/SPG-4201-BA.html
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/board-policies/docs-bp-07/BP-7-01.pdf
https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/board-of-governors/board-committees/finance-audit-committee/index.html

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 40

https://www.pima.edu/meeting-notices/documents.html

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2015 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 41