



IAC HEARING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 13, 2015

INSTITUTION:	Pima County County Community College District
TYPE OF EVALUATION:	Probation Visit
STAFF LIAISON:	Karen J. Solomon
COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	David W. Wantz (Chair), Judy Colwell (Recorder), Eric Johnston-Ortiz, Ron Manderschied, Vaidehi Rajagopalan, Henry Rinne

INSTITUTIONAL REPRESENTATIVES:

Lee Lambert, Chancellor

Charlotte Fugett, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources (Acting) and President of East Campus
Sylvia Lee, Member of the Board of Governors

Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Services and Accreditation
Liaison Officer

Nicola Richmond, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Research

TEAM CHAIR:

Luis G. Pedraja

I. IAC HEARING COMMITTEE CONCLUSION: (Indicate one.)

The IAC Committee recommendation is the same or substantially the same as the evaluation team's recommendation.

The Hearing Committee's recommendations for modifications are described below.

The IAC Committee recommendation is different from the evaluation team's recommendation.

II. IAC HEARING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION OR ACTION:

Indicate whether the IAC has taken final action or is making a recommendation for Board action.

 IAC FINAL ACTION

 X **IAC RECOMMENDATION**

IAC Recommendation:

Modifications to Site Team Recommendation:

Based on its review of the evidence, the IAC Hearing Committee affirms the Site Team's recommendations regarding its determination of Core Components that were "met with concerns" except for the following:

- Criterion 1, Core Component b: MET
- Criterion 1, Core Component c: MET
- Criterion 2, Core Component c: MET
- Criterion 2, Core Component d: MET

See **Section III** below for the IAC Hearing Committee's rationale.

Recommended Action:

Notice: Recommend to remove the institution from Probation and place the institution on Notice, with a focused visit to occur no later than October 31, 2016.

Focused Visit:

The September 2014 Team determined that the Institution had implemented significant changes in a short time. Those changes appeared to the Team to be reasonable and appropriate given the challenges the Institution faced. There was, however, insufficient time or evidence to determine the effectiveness of those changes. Therefore, the Focused Visit Team will evaluate the effectiveness of policies, plans, procedures, systems, and structures that have been implemented since the September 2014 Site Visit, as described in the Institution's response to the September 2014 Team Report. Evaluators will determine if the HLC expectations for each Criterion and its Core Components are met in full, paying particular attention to the components that have been Met With Concern. The team will determine if the policies, plans, procedures, systems, and structures have been effective and are likely to be effective in the future.

III. IAC HEARING COMMITTEE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE, FINDINGS, AND RATIONALE FOR ACTION OR RECOMMENDATION

The IAC Hearing Committee acknowledges that Pima County Community College District (PCCCD) has made significant progress in addressing the concerns that led to Probation. Those improvements, however, are new with some put into practice just before the latest team's visit in September 2014. Both the IAC Hearing Committee and Site Visit Team determined that not enough time has elapsed to provide evidence of the necessary outcomes or the long-term viability

and effectiveness of all these changes. Should the interventions and changes not be sustained or fail, the College would be in clear danger of non-compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. Whereas the Site Visit Team suggested a March 2016 date for the next review, the IAC Hearing Committee determined a longer interlude was necessary and recommends a Focused Visit no later than October 31, 2016. This later deadline will allow for results of a full academic year to be evaluated and the accurate calculation of enrollment numbers—and the attendant State funding.

Based on review of the written institutional response from PCCCD, the Site Team's Report, and testimony from representatives from PCCCD at the hearing, the IAC Hearing Committee believes that Core Components 1b, 1c, 2c, and 2d are now met for the following reasons:

- Core Component 1b (The mission is articulated publicly.) Based on written evidence submitted and testimony at the hearing, the IAC Hearing Committee concluded the Mission is articulated publicly and widely understood. The evidence of concern cited in the Site Visit Team report explained its concern with the process for *review and development* of the mission, not with its public articulation. This concern is more appropriately addressed in Criterion 1 Core Component 1a, (already listed as "met with concerns"). The IAC Hearing Committee determined Core Component 1b to be met.

Core Component 1c (The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.) The IAC Hearing Committee investigated the written evidence reviewed by the Site Visit Team's concerning diversity at PCCCD, read the College's response, and received testimony by the College representatives. The College recognizes its duty to the community to alleviate educational disparities among all its members and to prepare them for leadership positions. The Chancellor made overt attempts to meet with the concerned citizens and understands their concerns. In a good faith effort to hire more Hispanics or Americans of Latino heritage, recent searches have focused on efforts to find additional such candidates.

In addition, there is a considerable pool of mid-level managers at PCCCD just below the VP level who are poised to take more senior positions as their careers develop. To encourage these employees to attain leadership positions, the College has begun a Hispanic Leadership program. The College is striving to demonstrate to its students a range of diversity, not defined merely by race or ethnic origin. To that end, the College cited among its leaders those who are visibly disabled, openly gay, Hispanic, African American, and female. As required due to the receipt of a federal grant, the College has implemented a formal affirmative action program and has adopted a diversity strategy modeled on the one found at SUNY Onandaga. A timetable for implementation was presented in the College's response. The College has rewritten its Diversity and Inclusion Statement to pledge *it will recruit, retain and develop the potential of students and employees from historically marginalized groups in the US and from any origin in the world regardless of ethnicity, religion, disability, political views, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, social status and other characteristics.*

Based on the institutional response and testimony from PCCCD representatives during the hearing, the IAC Hearing Committee is convinced PCCCD has made significant strides in addressing the issues cited in the Team report related to diversity. It appears to the IAC Hearing Committee that processes are in place to sustain these changes. The IAC Hearing Committee believes Core Component 1c is met.

- Core Component 2c (The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decision in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.) Core Component 2c is generally cited in schools where a superordinate board may overrule the institution's board of trustees or other situations where undue political (or other) influence hampers a board's freedom and autonomy. In reviewing the Site Team's evidentiary statements, it appeared the concern dealt primarily with allowing enough time to ensure effectiveness and sustainability of new or amended policies and procedures related to its governing board. Based on a reading of the evidence and the testimony of College officials (including the Board Secretary) the IAC Hearing Committee determined that the College's publically elected board has the autonomy and authority to make decisions in the best interest of the Institution. The Site Team's concern is more appropriately addressed in Criterion 2 Component 2a, (already listed as "met with concerns.") The IAC Hearing Committee concludes that Core Component 2c is met in full.
- Core Component 2d (The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.) The Site Visit Team determined there had once existed an atmosphere at Pima County Community College that made it difficult to express unpopular opinions or disagreements with the senior leadership. Though a new leadership is in place, some members of the campus community still felt uncomfortable in raising issues. Memories on campus are often long and it takes time to rebuild a trusting environment. Based on the institutional response and testimony from PCCCD representatives during the hearing, the Committee is convinced that the administration is making a good faith effort to rebuild trust on the campuses.

Core Component 2d deals with actions that affect *academic freedom*, the pursuit of knowledge and unfettered inquiry and teaching. The IAC Hearing Committee found no evidence that academic freedom has been adversely affected even if there had been an unpleasant atmosphere elsewhere on the campuses. Therefore, the IAC Hearing Committee concludes that Core Component 2d is met.

The IAC Hearing Committee concurs with the visiting Team's report that the following Core Components are "met with concerns:"

- Core Component 1a (The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operation.)
- Core Component 2a (The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.)
- Core Component 3a (The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education)

- Core Component 3c (The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.)
- Core Component 3d (The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.)
- Core Component 4a (The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its education programs.)
- Core Component 4b (The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.)
- Core Component 4c (The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.)
- Core Component 5b (The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.)
- Core Component 5c (The institution works systematically to improve its performance.)
- Core Component 5d (The institution works systematically to improve its performance.)

As stated in **Section II**, the IAC Hearing Committee determined it is appropriate to remove the institution from Probation and to place the institution on Notice. The IAC Hearing Committee recommends a follow-up focused visit to occur no later than October 31, 2016 to better evaluate the effectiveness and long-term viability of the changes that were recently implemented at the time of the Team visit.

IV. EXPLANATION OF ACCREDITATION ISSUE(S) AND THE CONDITIONS FOR REMEDIATION IF RECOMMENDING NOTICE, PROBATION, OR WITHDRAWAL OF ACCREDITATION.

Pima County Community College was given a sanction of Probation due to serious concerns about its ability to meet the Criteria for Accreditation. During that Probation, the College made significant changes, not only to be in compliance with HLC standards but to better meet the needs of its community. Still the Site Visit Team determined that there is work to be done and cited concerns in each of the five Criteria for Accreditation. The IAC Hearing Committee concluded the evidence of change is sufficient to warrant removing the sanction of Probation. Because all five Criteria are met with concerns, however, the IAC Hearing Committee determined a Notice recommendation is warranted in this case.

The Site Team recommended a Focused Visit to be concluded by March 2016. This IAC Hearing Committee believes that is too soon for a full evaluation of the changes and their effectiveness. In **Section II** above, the IAC Hearing Committee recommends a Focused Visit by October 2016. This later date would give time for data from a full academic year to be collected to provide documented evidence that the new/amended policies, procedures, and structures are effective. Moreover, the IAC Hearing Committee believes the later date requires more evidence from the Institution to demonstrate its ability to meet all of Criteria for Accreditation than would be possible with the March 2016 deadline.

In order to be removed from Notice, the IAC Hearing Committee recommends a focused visit occur no later than October 31, 2016. The College must be able to demonstrate that the recently implemented policies, plans, functions, and structures meet HLC Accreditation standards. These activities must demonstrate that they have been effective and are likely to remain so in the long-term. The Site Visit Team recommends and the IAC Hearing Committee affirms the institution must provide, at a minimum, the following:

- A well, defined, inclusive formal review process of the institution's mission, including description of implementation and resulting outcomes (Core Components 1a)
- Evidence of the effectiveness of newly adopted policies, processes, and procedures, including but not limited to the effectiveness and outcomes of the newly established Governance Council and Board of Governors' Finance, Board HR Advisory Team, and Audit Committee (Core Component 2a, & Core Components 5a and b).
- Evidence of a comprehensive assessment of the HR office, including structure and staffing, the resulting action plan, including goals, metrics, and key performance indicators, as well as the outcomes of the recently established HR Advisory Committee, and documentation of progress toward full implementation of the plan (Core Component 2a).
- The number and type of complaints and grievances filed with the Office of Dispute Resolution and the status of each complaint or grievance, as well as a process for assessing the effectiveness of the ODR, including appropriate measures and documented outcomes (Core Component 2a).
- Evidence of a process for reviewing syllabi to ensure that all of them have proper and specific learning goals (Core Component 3a).
- Establishment of a process to coordinate and ensure consistency in the review of dual learning courses and dual training faculty training (Core Component 3a).
- Progress to date of the Developmental Education Redesign Committee, including evidence of its effectiveness and outcomes resulting from it, as well as the allocation of sufficient resources to Developmental Education to serve the student population (Core Component 3d).
- Evidence of the of the effectiveness of the assessment process for making changes to teaching and learning based on the learning outcomes, including documentation of the completion of assessment cycles in all programs and of the changes made to improve learning and teaching (Core Component 4b).
- Evidence that persistence, retention, and completion metrics are used for making changes in programs, including metrics, action plans, and improvements made, as well as documentation of the development and implementation of a strategic enrollment plan that addresses retention,

persistence, and completion to support the institution's established goals (Core Component 4c).

- Evidence of stability in leadership, including campus presidents, and the hiring of key vacant positions, including the director of HR (Core Component 5b).
- Evidence of the implementation of the 2014-17 Strategic Plan, including completion of the campus plan, establishment of measurable key performance indicators to assess progress toward completion, and direct linkages to the budgeting process, as well as outcomes to date (Core Component 5c).

SIGNATURE PAGE

January 13, 2015

Chair

Mark W. Wentz

Recorder

Judy R. Colwell

Members

[Signature]
[Signature]

Vance R. [Signature]

[Signature]