

Report
Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
Fact-Finding Visit
To
Pima Community College District

January 16-18, 2013

Team Members:

Dr. Carmen Gonzales
Vice President Emeritus, New Mexico State University
Vice President for Student Success,
Santa Fe Community College, NM

Dr. Brian Inbody
President
Neosho County Community College, KS

Dr. David Meabon
Associate Professor of Higher Education
University of Toledo, OH

Dr. Kathleen Nelson (Chair)
President Emeritus
Lake Superior College, MN

Background:

Between April, 2012 and December, 2012, written complaints by individuals and two community groups were received by the Higher Learning Commission concerning issues involving Pima Community College District (PCCD) in Tucson, Arizona. Throughout this time the Commission requested and received written response to some of these complaints from the institution through its Interim Chancellor. The issues raised in these complaints and the response provided by the College signaled to the Commission that further investigation was necessary to determine if the institution was meeting the Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components required of all institutions accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. In November, 2012, the Commission determined that it would send a fact-finding team to PCCD to investigate the complaints and to determine the actual facts underlying them. Additional complaints and phone calls to the Commission throughout the months of December and January of 2012 became a part of the team's deliberations and review.

Issues for Review:

The complaints received by the Commission centered around several themes the fact-finding team reviewed during its on-site visit in January, 2013. These themes included the following:

- Claims of sexual harassment and inappropriate behaviors by the college's Former Chancellor and failure of the Board of Governors to institute an appropriate investigation into these claims.
- Claims that a hostile work environment existed at the college, perpetrated by and/or overlooked by senior administrators. The claims suggested inappropriate use of the institution's discipline and hiring processes, bullying and demeaning actions and comments toward employees, general fear of reprisals and intimidation, and the Board's knowledge of inappropriate behaviors of senior leadership and inaction on their part to stop such behaviors.
- Claims that excessive turnover of administrative positions made continuity of leadership and institutional progress towards goals difficult or impossible.
- Claims that processes within the HR department were unclear and not uniformly followed.

- Claims that the college and its Board violated its own procurement policy in regard to sole sourcing and that it lacked transparency on fiduciary matters.
- Claims that an elemental change in the mission of the college took place impacting the general makeup of the student body of the institution, that the change was not thoroughly discussed within the college and community, and that such a change took place without due notice to and review by the HLC.
- Claims that the college lacks support for developmental education and suggestions that actions were taken to mask changes in the college's initiatives to further develop its developmental education initiatives from the 2010 HLC visiting team. Claims that adequate discussion and debate about changes in the developmental education policy and practices did not take place.
- Claims that the Interim Chancellor has not been candid or honest in her responses to the HLC.
- Claims that the Board of Governors has failed to uphold its responsibility to conduct its work ethically, honestly, and in the best interests of the college, its employees and its students.

Resource Review and Team Preparation:

The fact-finding team prepared for the on-site visit by reading all complaints with complete documentation and responses to some of these complaints from the PCCD's Interim Chancellor. The team also reviewed pertinent institutional documents from the HLC files.

The team met on-site in Tucson, Arizona during January 16-18, 2013. During that time the team members met with individuals who set forth initial complaints with the Commission, all members of the institution's governing Board, the Interim Chancellor, members of the Chancellor's Cabinet, and additional institutional employees as deemed appropriate by the team members. To ensure that members of the learning community had adequate opportunity to speak individually with members of the team, 48 20-minute discussion slots were established (12 at each of 4 campuses) as individual one-on-one meeting times for employees and community members. Notification was provided to the institution's employees and a local news article provided notice that such discussion sessions would be available. Individuals requesting such discussions were asked to contact the Commission to determine a time and place for such meetings. The team conducted 46 individual one-on-one interviews with college employees and community members while on-site. Individuals contacting the

Commission who indicated concerns about meeting on-campus or who were not available for such meetings were provided the opportunity to speak via phone with a member of the HLC team. All individuals requesting such discussions were contacted following the team's January 16-18 visit for phone interviews. Another 12 individual interviews were held with current and former employees and community members either via phone or off-site. The formal agenda (names of the one-on-one meetings are not listed) for the on-site review can be found in Appendix A, and the numbers and general titles of individuals with whom the team met can be found in Appendix B. No titles are provided for those individuals who asked to speak confidentially with the team either on-site or following the site visit.

Findings:

Following a thorough review of extensive printed materials submitted by the institution and the complainants and interviews with a total of 108 individuals representing Pima Community College District (PCCD) and the Tucson community, the team reached its findings of fact as stated within this report section. In all cases the team used evidence-based reasoning to reach its conclusions and, in all but a few cases the team did not make a conclusion based on a single reported incident. If a single incident is used within this findings section, it is so indicated. In all cases, except for the 58 individual interviews on-site, off-site or via phone, team members interviewed individuals within a team of two or more so that team members could cross-reference their notes from the meetings with one another. The team's deliberations centered around the nine major complaint themes previously identified in this report. Patterns of evidence were discussed prior to concluding that a fact should be included in this report. The facts listed in this report are organized around the major complaint themes. Extensive review and discussion led the team members to find facts as indicated below each major issue.

Claims of sexual harassment and inappropriate behaviors by the college's Former Chancellor and failure of the Board to institute an appropriate investigation into these claims.

- Eight female employees came forward to tell their personal stories regarding the fact that they were the recipients of unwelcome and inappropriate attention and advances by the Former Chancellor. These contacts took place both on and off campus. Some of these employees reported these incidents to their superiors and to a member of the Human Resources staff. None of these employees knew, exactly, how many other women, if any, may have been subjected to such inappropriate behavior.
- The recipients of such behaviors suffered physically, financially, and emotionally. They feared and experienced retaliation in the form of

inappropriate verbal communications and employee working condition changes following the employees' refusals of such attentions and advances.

- Several of the women who rejected the Former Chancellor's actions towards them were, within approximately six months, subjected to disciplinary actions through the HR process and were demoted or transferred to another position within the District.
- One employee has settled an EEO claim as a result of her claims involving the Former Chancellor's actions.
- Sexual Harassment training is not required for all employees beyond orientation. Supervisors are required to complete initial sexual harassment training as a part of their training in supervision.
- In 2008 one or more Board members received an anonymous complaint regarding inappropriate behavior by the Chancellor. The Board discussed, in a public meeting, that anonymous complaints (unspecified at the time) had been received by the Board. The Chair of the Board asked individuals to contact him if there were concerns or complaints. Another anonymous complaint was received in 2010, and a third in November of 2011. The Board took no action to investigate these anonymous complaints until December of 2011 when several Board members brought these issues to the attention of their legal counsel.
- The Former Chancellor reported at an executive board meeting in June of 2011 that rumors existed regarding his inappropriate behavior. He vehemently denied such actions. The Board took no additional action at this time to discipline the Former Chancellor or to investigate the rumors as he described them.
- At least one of the Board members described some of the allegations of inappropriate behavior on the part of the Former Chancellor as "minor" and did not take the complaints seriously if he/she believed the employee was not a "good" employee or if the individual making the claim was a former employee who left the employ of the college in disfavor with the college's leadership.
- In February 2012 an individual made public, through a blog, the allegations that eight female staff had come forward with claims of sexual harassment on the part of the Former Chancellor.
- After the blog post came out the Board met frequently in executive session to discuss this situation.

- The Board engaged a member of its legal counsel's firm to investigate the allegations against the Former Chancellor. The Board did not make use of any other alternative source that had no connection to the College to investigate the allegations. The investigator, one of the principals of the law firm contracted by the Board to provide legal advice, is married to the Board's legal counsel. In February, 2012, the legal counsel advised the Board of its findings prior to the Former Chancellor's departure from the college.
- One member of the Board indicated that he/she did not know that the investigator was married to the Board's legal counsel until after the investigation into the charges against the Former Chancellor was completed.
- The Board accepted the Former Chancellor's resignation dated February 29, 2012 with a special assignment granted from March 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012.
- Some of the Board members indicated that the verbal report regarding the investigated actions was an important element in the Board's decision to accept the Former Chancellor's resignation.
- None of the women (other than the individual who filed an EEO complaint and received a settlement) whose accounts to the Board were part of their decision-making in regards to the Former Chancellor's resignation has been financially compensated, apologized to or in any other way addressed by the Board.
- Board members have yet to receive any training on sexual harassment.
- The Harassment (including Sexual Harassment) policy had not been revised since 1999. The first revision since then has received a first reading at the Board meeting on January 9, 2013.

Claims that a hostile work environment existed at the college, perpetrated by and/or overlooked by senior administrators. The claims suggested inappropriate use of the institution's discipline and hiring processes, bullying and demeaning actions and comments toward employees, general fear of reprisals and intimidation, and the Board's knowledge of inappropriate behaviors of senior leadership and inaction on their part to stop such behaviors.

- Nearly all of the employees interviewed during the 58 one-on-one interview sessions and other meetings held throughout the visit stated that there was a culture of fear at the college, that employees dared not speak

their minds for fear of retaliation. Many felt threatened with losing their jobs if they spoke freely. One administrator stated he/she would write "Don't Speak" on his/her notepad before going into an executive meeting with the Former Chancellor, as he/she was afraid of displeasing the Former Chancellor or of being chastised for such comments. Dozens of interviews conducted with individuals at various levels throughout the college indicated example after example of fear, intimidation and perceived retaliation.

- Many individuals indicated that the culture did not disappear following the Former Chancellor's resignation and that the same patterns of intimidation and bullying continue in some areas of the senior administrative structure.
- Many other examples were given by employees who were confronted by their supervisors for offering different opinions than those of senior leadership. Those who gave differing opinions were at times warned by their supervisors that such contrary positions could be detrimental to their employment.
- Many examples were provided which described overly harsh, sometimes belittling feedback from the Former Chancellor, including statements where he would resort to name-calling in meetings, screaming and using profanity when confronting employees.
- Some employees who experienced unprofessional behavior at the hands of some senior leaders became physically ill and emotionally fragile following such interactions.
- Many interviewees described how questioning the Former Chancellor's decision or that of his closest senior leaders would result in verbal abuse and/or perceived retaliation in the form of a position change, cutting off of interactions with leadership, and negative verbal comments.
- Employees believe that such a culture of fear stifled innovation and productivity. New ideas were at times squelched with profanity-laced, demeaning comments by the Former Chancellor made in both private and public meetings.
- One former administrator described how the Former Chancellor blamed him/her for actions outside his/her control and that the pressure threatening to fire him/her led to severe physical ailments and, eventually, to this administrator's decision to leave PCCD as soon as the opportunity arose.
- Under the Former Chancellor's leadership some other senior administrators were allowed to bully and intimidate some college

- employees. The pattern was learned and continued into the present culture at PCCD. A current employee described an interaction with a senior administrator where, because the employee would not follow directions to change information he/she was presenting, the employee was threatened and told that, if he/she didn't like being a team player, he/she could look for another job. The threat, according to this employee, was direct and clear.
- Several faculty voiced the belief that under the Former Chancellor's leadership there was a significant change on their parts from feeling supported by administration to feeling as if they, the faculty, were merely being kept in line.
 - At least one individual in a supervisory position was given orders from the top senior administrators to find negative evidence of performance against a subordinate so that the college's disciplinary system could be employed to either justify transfer within the college or to force the individual's choice to make an employment change by leaving the college's employ. Several interviewees speculated that similar actions had been taken against them, but they could not offer evidence to support this belief. Some supervisors expressed their own fear of reprisal or loss of employment should they not comply with the senior leaders' requests.
 - Prior to and following the Former Chancellor's departure from the college, some senior administrators were allowed to demote, transfer, or reassign individuals. The authority to make these changes rested with the Former Chancellor and Interim Chancellor. At times little substantial reasoning was provided for such changes in employment conditions, though reasons were given to the transferred employee indicating that he/she needed to help fix issues arising at the new campus assignment or that the new assignment was an "opportunity" for the transferred employee.
 - Employees described how the lack of transparency in decision-making by the administration created a cloud of suspicion when major organizational or college changes occurred. Efforts to understand the rationale behind these choices often caused uncomfortable confrontations between employees and the decision-makers. Silence was considered an expected response from senior leaders and the Former Chancellor. Staff at various levels noted that they had become jaded about attempts to understand directives; they learned to acquiesce to administrative instructions from superiors without question.
 - During the past 8-10 years PCCD has undergone significant organizational change. Most of the individuals that were interviewed expressed an appreciation for the direction and focus of many of the changes. Employees stated, however, that a climate of distrust was

created as these institutional changes took place. On a regular basis, changes were dictated, according to interviewees. They believe that deviation from proscribed administrative directives was not tolerated. It was unacceptable professional behavior to exercise individual judgments that might lead to a different pathway or direction to achieve the organizational objective or goal. One former administrator described how he/she was asked for an opinion regarding an issue at the College. When the idea was presented to the Former Chancellor, he yelled at the employee in the presence of his/her supervisor and was told that the opinion (a different view than that of the Former Chancellor) was not wanted and that the employee should not give an opinion again unless expressly asked by the Former Chancellor to do so.

- Collectively, members of the Interim Chancellor's Cabinet, most of whom were also members of the Former Chancellor's Cabinet, expressed few concerns about the communication style of the Former or Interim Chancellors and did not express any sense of urgency regarding the claims of the culture of fear and intimidation expressed by many employees.
- Official leaders of the PCCD Faculty Association presented information to the Board in 2007 which highlighted the faculty responses to three questions on an annual faculty culture survey. The presentation brought about silence from the Board and an angry outburst from the Former Chancellor, who later apologized. One statement in the survey queried: "Faculty can express their views openly without fear of recrimination." The PCCD results indicated that 49% of the respondents said "false" and an additional 28% said "more false than true". Nationally in that year faculty responded with 13% "false" and another 22% "more false than true". The Board never officially responded to this finding.
- One Board member indicated that he/she was fully aware of complaints against the Former Chancellor' leadership style and his use of belittling and derogatory comments. However, the Board member was happy with the direction of the College and did not want to jeopardize that through disciplining the Chancellor.
- One employee stated to a Board member, "We are firing on all eight cylinders, but it is an unhappy place." A member of the Board told the HLC team that he/she was only concerned that the college was firing on all eight cylinders and not whether employees were happy.
- The Board was aware of the Former Chancellor's unprofessional behavior as far back as 2004. At that time the concern was about his "tough" demeanor and his strong verbal language. The Board held "coaching sessions" for the Former Chancellor regarding the Board's expectations

that he “soften” his approach. Some of the leadership team indicated that he would appear to change his demeanor but that he would soon go back to his previous behavior. The Board never disciplined him for these actions.

- The Board accepted the Former Chancellor’s letter of resignation and completed an early-contract-exit agreement with him effective June 30, 2012, two years before his formal contract end date of June 30, 2014.
- In September of 2012 the college contracted with EthicsPoint to provide an additional, confidential resource for employees to report concerns of any type. Between September and the end of December, 2012, thirteen concerns were listed on the EthicsPoint site. All were reviewed by the college’s Internal Auditor.
- Several employees expressed that their sessions with the HLC’s visiting team was the first time they have had to express themselves at PCCD without fear of retaliation.

Claims that excessive turnover of administrative positions made continuity of leadership and institutional progress towards goals difficult or impossible.

- The college’s administrative roster demonstrates employment movement within the college as evidenced by the following data:
 - In July of 2007 the college had 56 administrative positions. In January of 2013 they had a total of 55 administrative positions. During this time a total of 94 individuals were listed as holding administrative assignments at the college.
 - 20 of these 94 administrators represented ethnic/racial diversity. In 2013, 10 of the 55 administrators on the official roster were ethnically/racially diverse.
 - During these 5.5 years 39 individuals were once employed as administrators but were no longer on the administrative roster in 2013. Reasons for such departure from administrative positions were listed in the official file and included retirement, return to home position, voluntary transfer to faculty position, voluntary transfer to staff position, reassignment, other employment and resignation.
 - 28 of the 55 administrators on the employee roster in 2013 were employed as administrators in 2007 or earlier.

- Of these 28 administrators, 7 of them were hired directly into their administrative positions. All others were employed at the college in some other capacity prior to becoming an administrator.
- 15 of the 28 administrators who were on the administrative roster in 2007 and still administrators in 2013 held the same administrative category title in 2013 as in 2007. The remaining 13 administrators had 2-4 different administrative position titles during their tenures as administrators. It is impossible to determine how many actual different positions within one title category were held by any one administrator during his/her tenure.
- Many employees found the rate of turnover in administrative leadership to lead toward discontinuity of strategic direction and inconsistent policy interpretation. They believed that the excessive administrator movement negatively impacted their individual effectiveness, student services and other areas that impact student success. With this constant movement of administrators, faculty felt they had to continually mentor and teach new administrators about their areas of new supervision, thus taking time away from their faculty duties. One individual described having four campus presidents in four years with just as many direct supervisory changes.
- The 2010 report from the Office of Auditor General to PCCD stated, “High turnover of experienced employees within the District’s Budget and Reporting Department and time constraints made it difficult for the District to ensure that less experienced employees had adequate information to help prepare the financial report. In addition, because of the loss of employees, the financial information was not always adequately reviewed by someone knowledgeable.”
- Concerns exist from faculty and other employees that the college is losing institutional memory and foregoing the opportunity for relationship-building due to the administrative shuffle in place at PCCD. They are concerned about salary inequity and a lack of appropriate employee training.
- The Board has three standing agenda items which allow them to become knowledgeable about a portion of the leadership change in the college. One item, under an information section of the agenda, allows them to learn about separations from employment. The second item, under the consent agenda allows them to hear about new appointments, administrative appointments, and temporary appointments as well as other related personnel actions. The third agenda item provides them with the opportunity to approve new administrative hires.
- There is no annual review of the administrative component of the institution with the Board in a setting where in-depth conversation can take

place regarding how the administrators are deployed in their roles, what changes have taken place during a particular year and what changes are anticipated for the upcoming academic year.

- The Board does not have a designated Human Resources committee charged with overseeing personnel policies and becoming knowledgeable about the college's leadership structure and change to any greater extent than the three standing agenda items on its agendas.

Claims that processes within the HR department were unclear and not uniformly followed.

- Many employees challenged the fair and equitable placement of employees within particular salary ranges and called into question the fair and deliberate treatment of employees as they have attempted to understand such discrepancies.
- Many complaints were offered in interviews with employees about the HR department and the manner by which vacancies are filled at PCCD. Many gave examples of individuals hired who had fewer years of experience or academic credentials which did not fit the position descriptions for the jobs within which they were placed. Leadership in the HR Department asserts this is not true and that all candidates for positions are screened by the HR Department for qualifications and experience.
- The HR Department leadership claims that all positions created at PCCD go through the same level of scrutiny and the creation of a job description with equal opportunity for college employees to apply for open positions. The HLC team heard several examples of employees being offered "new" positions or positions which were coming open before the actual HR process took place. Often these employees were told by senior leaders and individuals "in the know" to not tell anyone about the personal conversations about the positions.
- There is a prevailing perception that senior administrators at PCCD manipulated college employment policies to reward or punish employees. The word "cronyism" was often used. For example, the upper level administration was described as proficient at using search committees and paper work to provide the appearance of following institutional policy to control the final outcome of filling vacant positions. Many individuals stated that search committee recommendations were often ignored. This employment practice was described as occurring frequently enough to create skepticism about the validity of job openings. Comments by various interviewees were particularly critical of extremely quick career advancements for individuals moving up the PCCD administrative

structure only to be reassigned after short tenures or displays of disagreement with the administration.

- Several current and former employees described how they were approached by senior administrators or their representatives and offered new positions at higher pay ranges and were told not to tell anyone about the offers. These employees had come into conflict with the senior administrators and believed the offers to be “payment” for not causing additional problems, as these offered positions were not open to others on any type of competitive basis. Some employees noted that they did not have an opportunity to compete for some positions into which others were transferred or for newly created positions.
- The team also received two complaints that accommodations for disabilities are not properly executed. Some employees are required to get proper documentation many times, while other accommodations are given without the same level of documentation. One of these complainants alleged that the failure to grant accommodations was another example of retaliation for expressing a contrary opinion to upper administration.
- Many employees experienced frustration with and lack of support from members of the HR staff while attempting to understand disciplinary actions being taken against them.
- The HR department maintains two files on employees, their personnel files and second files housing investigative and disciplinary matters. An employee was told at first that he/she could not see the second file. The HR department relented and allowed the employee to review the investigative/disciplinary file, though the employee was told that he/she could not copy any of the materials in the file.
- The Interim Chancellor posted and hired a new Provost for PCCD in the summer of 2012 and reassigned herself to a college presidency rather than return to the position she held prior to her move into the Interim Chancellor’s position (Provost). This action took place simultaneously with the Interim Chancellor’s move into the interim position and the Board’s discussion regarding whether or not the Interim Chancellor would be promoted to the position permanently. Many individuals questioned why the Provost position was not left vacant until a new Chancellor arrived at PCCD and why the current Interim Chancellor reassigned herself to a position other than the one from which she most recently came.
- At the same time Campus Presidents and other Executive Administrators were offered two-year rather than one-year contracts, a move allowed within new Arizona law. The Board approved the two-year contracts for

this group on February 8, 2012, effective July 1, 2012. Other administrators were not, by law, allowed the two-year contracts.

Claims that the college and its Board violated its own procurement policy in regard to sole sourcing and that it lacked transparency on fiduciary matters.

- Over the course of approximately 7.5 years, PCCD paid a total of \$586,986 to two contractors who were offered annual contracts through the college's sole source process.
- In 5 of 6 completed contract years and 6 of 7 contract years for these two vendors, the total contract amounts surpassed the amount of \$30,000.01 in college policy which requires either sealed bids or RFP's unless sole source justification is provided and approved.
- The justifications on file for both contractors for all years but 2012-13 for one of the contractors (justification written by the Interim Chancellor) did not address the standards required in the college's policies. The Interim Chancellor's justification for hiring a consultant brought to the Board on 6-20-12, while more extensive than previous justification statements, did not meet the requirements of "justification" as outlined in college policy.
- The Former Chancellor personally ordered members of the Business Office to issue these contracts each year, and justification sections often referred to the Chancellor "sanctioning" them.
- No formal annual evaluation of services rendered was completed for either of the two contractors during the tenure of their work on behalf of the college.
- The Board has no standing agenda item which provides an opportunity for them to review sole source contracts unless the amount exceeds \$100,000. Board members did indicate that they reviewed sole source contracts as a part of the overall budget allocation, though the allocated amounts were not identified by individual contractor, so it was not possible for them to adequately oversee the annual contracts for these two contractors.
- Some members of the college's leadership suggested that the State Auditor might indicate that the sole source policy at PCCD is inadequate and must be greatly strengthened as it completes its 2012 annual audit. It is believed that the Auditor General will conclude that while the college may not have technically violated its own policy with the hiring of outside consultants using the sole sourcing procedures, the policy itself is not in

alignment with state requirements and may represent a lack of proper responsibility. (Results from this audit were scheduled for public announcement following the team's review and report.)

- In FY2005 and FY2006 the College was made aware of and negotiated repayment for an \$8,000,000 overpayment of financial aid to its students. The College reimbursed the Department of Education \$2,000,000 in FY07. This payment was discussed only in a Board retreat, with few if any members of the public in attendance and in the Board's executive session. The general public was not notified of this significant payment during the public portion of a regular Board meeting.

Claims that an elemental change in the mission of the college took place impacting the general makeup of the student body of the institution, that the change was not thoroughly discussed within the college and community, and that such a change took place without due notice to and review by the HLC.

- Early in his tenure and consistently through the remainder of his employment, the Former Chancellor discussed his intent to change the nature of the college from a community college to a four-year institution. He often referenced his interest in creating a model similar to the "Florida model" where community colleges became state colleges offering baccalaureate degrees.
- The Former Chancellor reportedly told senior leaders that he wanted to hire only Ph.D.-qualified faculty and leadership and that those with other doctorates such as the Ed. D. would not be considered for upper level positions. This was cited as a reason for the departure of several administrators.
- The recent admission policy change requiring that individuals who did not meet a minimum standard on the COMPASS test not be allowed to enter PCCD was instituted by using the Standard Practice Guide (SPG) process rather than the shared governance process at the institution. The SPG process does not require Board approval but remains within the purview of the Chancellor. The SPG process does require a 21-day comment period and that comment period was held for this change. The Board of Governors did review and supported this change.
- Many individuals expressed concerns that the approval of the change was not sought through extensive discussion with faculty and without the full support of academic and college leadership.

- Evidence exists that presentations were made by the college's leadership on the issue of an admission policy change as early as 2010. However, there exists a tremendous amount of disagreement about whether or not these presentations were enough to garner the needed support for such a major change.
- While various "admissions standards" comments were made by the Former Chancellor and other leadership as early as February of 2010, more specific presentations and discussions were held with various college constituencies (Department Chair Academy, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Exempt and Non-Exempt Staff Development Days) throughout the first 8 months of 2011.
- Presentations regarding the development of admissions standards were made by the Former Chancellor and college leaders to various public groups (Rotary, Workforce Investment Board, Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and others) from February, 2011 to August of 2012. Three community forums were held in late August of 2011 and September of 2011 to discuss the admissions standards with the public.
- The administration often claimed that the change in admission policy was faculty-driven. However, the vote by the Faculty Senate to support the new admission policy occurred at a meeting where the proposal was not on the original agenda and was hastily approved in executive session in the late afternoon, without extensive college-wide faculty and academic administrative discussion. Notably, the proposal was brought to the Senate by the Former Chancellor directly, not through Faculty Senate channels. Some members of the faculty were not convinced that this action was legitimate and representative of the fuller faculty voice.
- Throughout the second half of 2011, numerous media essays, editorials, and articles and individual letters written by community leaders voiced deep concerns about the change in the admission policy and its affect on the low-income and minority populations within the District. The Interim Chancellor did meet with members of one of the community groups to discuss the changes in the admission policy and offered, through written emails, to continue to meet with them.
- Representatives from the National Center for Fair and Open Testing challenged, in June of 2012, PCCD's use of the COMPASS exam as a "de facto admissions test". A letter was sent to the Former Board Chair with copies to all Board members and the Interim Chancellor. Nearly four months later the Interim Chancellor and the Former Board Chair responded to the group and explained that "misconceptions" had been created. A representative of this organization made a public statement regarding fair testing and the organization's continued concerns at a

January 9, 2013 Board meeting. They continue to call for holistic evaluation using a set of measures rather than one test result to make a final decision on student admission to PCCD.

- PCCD’s leadership has established a special committee scheduled to meet for two hours three times, Feb. 28th, June 20th, and September 26th of 2013 to review the prior semesters’ enrollment data. It is unclear whether or not this committee is charged with also reviewing and critiquing the new admission’s and registration processes. Interviewees expressed concern about the limited time frame allowed for each meeting to discuss and identify recommendations based on the data reviewed.
- There is no evidence that the college’s administration discussed these impending changes with HLC personnel. Commission policy 3.2(a)1 requires institutions to gain approval for changes in “actual or apparent mission of the institution or its educational objectives” and 3.2(a)2 requires institutions to seek approval if there are “significant changes in the character or nature of the student body.” The institution did not seek approval of a change of mission or student-body through the official HLC change review process because they did not see the admission policy change as being a mission change nor a change which would significantly change the makeup of the college’s student body.

Claims that the college lacks support for developmental education and suggestions that actions were taken to mask changes in the college’s initiatives to further develop its developmental education initiatives from the 2010 HLC visiting team. Claims that adequate discussion and debate about changes in the developmental education policy and practices did not take place.

- Enrollment data for the past two years include the following as provided to the team by PCCD’s Institutional Research Office:
 - Fall 2011- Fall 2012 Developmental Education (DE) full-time student equivalent (FTSE) dropped **30%**
 - Fall 2011 – Fall 2012 Non-DE FTSE dropped **16.7%**
 - Spring 2012 – Spring 2013 DE FTSE dropped **28.2%**
 - Spring 2012 – Spring 2013 Non-DE FTSE dropped **10%**
 - Fall 2011 – Fall 2012 Developmental Education (DE) full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) dropped **27.8%**
 - Fall 2011 - Fall 2012 Non-DE FTFE dropped **13.7%**
 - Spring 2012 – Spring 2013 DE FTFE dropped **29.9%**
 - Spring 2012 – Spring 2013 Non-DE FTFE dropped **8.4%**

- Early in his tenure at PCCD, the Former Chancellor was described as noticeably critical of the developmental education program. He openly criticized the developmental education program as problematic and not working. This pronouncement occurred during a Developmental Education Committee meeting presentation of its final report detailing its work over the previous eighteen months.
- During subsequent years, it was perceived that the Developmental Education program received little, if any, administrative support that would sustain or strengthen it, though the HLC 2010 team identified that positive changes had been made to the program and the support shown by PCCD. The timing of the resignation of the program director corresponded with what was perceived as a public effort by the College to change its mission by altering its admission policy.
- A Ph.D.-qualified faculty member was hired to coordinate PCCD's developmental education program on January 1, 2010. His contract ended on June 30, 2010. At that point the responsibility for this coordination was transferred to the Vice Provost's office.
- The college's administration created the Prep Academy to assist students who could not meet the revised admission standard and who were in need of academic support to gain knowledge in order to successfully pass at the required standard. Admission into the Prep Academy is not supported by financial aid, as students are not admitted PCCD students, therefore they cannot receive federal funds that would support living expenses while enrolled in college.
- Individuals who are listed as faculty within the Prep Academy have various undergraduate and graduate degrees. The Director of the Prep Academy holds a Baccalaureate degree in Management.
- The faculty assigned within the Prep Academy are responsible for case management activities, instruction, tutoring, and mentoring individuals enrolled in the non-credit program. They hold part-time temporary appointments at PCCD.
- The Prep Academy uses a software package to allow students to move through basic learning units in a self-paced manner, and the College provides the technology needed for students to work on these units.
- Faculty claim there was not adequate conversation about nor input sought on the software and teaching methodology used in the Prep Academy.
- The original design of the Prep Academy had no formal evaluation process established as a way to determine either the impact of the

program upon the College's developmental education program nor to determine the demographic data of those most affected by the new program and related admission policy changes.

- The HLC comprehensive visit to PCCD was held on September 13-15, 2010. At that time the visiting team praised PCCD's attention to serving the needs of developmental education students and recommended following through with actions planned to enhance their services to this particular student demographic.

Claims that the Interim Chancellor has not been candid nor honest in her response to the HLC.

- There are discrepancies between the Interim Chancellor's letter to the Commission and facts learned during interviews with the Board members and PCCD employees. The letter indicates that the Former Chancellor retired from the Chancellor's position due to failing health. Team member interviews and statements by members of the Board indicate that while his health was a factor, the time table for the Chancellor's retirement was greatly altered due to the allegations pending against him. One Board member indicated that the Former Chancellor was "forced out" due to the allegations.
- The Interim Chancellor indicated in her letter that she was unaware of any administrators who were aware of any complaints against the Former Chancellor. At a meeting with 5 members of C-FAIRR (Coalition for Accountability, Integrity, Respect and Responsibility) in May of 2012, the Interim Chancellor, following an outburst from one of the other administrators, was heard to say, "I wish we could get back into a civil mode. You are doing exactly what we put up with for nine years. We've been threatened like this for nine years."
- The Interim Chancellor's letter focused more on the messengers than the message itself. Those making the claims are discussed more than the claims themselves. This is part of a larger theme often heard in interviews with leadership and the Board - where the term "the opposition" was mentioned many times and information from those filing complaints or with opposing views would be immediately discounted. The Interim Chancellor referred to those who made complaints as being politically motivated or unhappy former employees. The team discovered concerns about the negative institutional culture and actions by the Board and some senior administrators from a range of employees at all levels of the organization and from a host of well-respected community leaders.

- Following the Interim Chancellor's appointment to serve in this role, she undertook a series of actions aimed towards review and change of policies and procedures which had been unclear, misunderstood, or incomplete. It was unclear to the team if these changes were sought through collaborative discussion or through the Interim Chancellor's sole direction. These policy and procedure changes included the following:
 - Personnel policies surrounding issues of personal and professional responsibility for maintaining respect among all employees.
 - Strengthening the reporting processes for employees experiencing unprofessional, unethical, or illegal actions from other college employees or vendors.
 - Changes clarifying processes relating to whistle-blowing reports.
 - Revised policies and practices regarding filling authorized, vacant regular positions.
 - Revision of contracting policies.

Claims that the Board of Governors has failed to uphold its responsibility to conduct its work ethically, honestly, and in the best interests of the college, its employees and its students.

- The Board has never acknowledged in a public meeting nor through an official public statement, anything about the actual charges against the Former Chancellor, their actions to investigate these charges, and why they did not investigate anonymous complaints received as early as 2008. They took no formal action until late 2011 or early 2012 when they asked their legal counsel to look into charges of inappropriate behavior. They have made no public statements regarding how they intend to ensure that such behaviors on the parts of any administrator not recur.
- The Board does not conduct periodic review of all policies and how those policies are translated into regulations and standard policy guidelines, including HR policies, many of which have not been altered since the late 1990s. The Board has no regularly scheduled review of Board policies, institutional regulations or standard practice guidelines established in their operating procedures and annual agenda planning.
- The Board of Governors' Bylaws and Policy Book includes many bylaws which were first implemented in 1978 and revised in the mid-1990's and then not again until the fall of 2011. The Code of Ethics, as an example, was first adopted in 1983 and then revised in 1995. It has seen no revision since that date. It appears that no regular, on-going review process for Board policies is in place in the district, some of which have the latest review dates in the early 1990's. Some of these policies recently underwent review and revision in late 2012.

- One of the Board members described how members of the Board discussed with one another on a one-on-one basis, prior to the Board meeting, the potential of hiring the current Interim Chancellor as the permanent Chancellor and to “ensure we were all on the same page.” However, three of the Board members “flipped” (Board member’s actual words) at the meeting and voted to hold a national search.
- The Board knew, as early as 2004, that some employees were unhappy with and fearful of the Former Chancellor. They “coached” him on softening his administrative style, but they did not discipline him nor investigate, further, the complaints.
- At least one Board member knew, as early as 2008, that claims regarding the Former Chancellor’s inappropriate advances toward some employees, and the Board took no action to investigate the anonymous complaint. The Board learned, again, in 2010 and in late 2011 that similar complaints existed. Some Board members indicated that they could not investigate anonymous complaints.

Conclusion:

The fact-finding team carefully reviewed hundreds of pages of written materials presented to them before, during and after its site visit to Pima County Community College District (PCCD). Members of the team listened carefully in individual interviews with 71 individuals from within the learning community and from the external community as well. A total of 108 individuals participated in either individual or group interviews. The team met with various groups of community leaders and college executives. Team members diligently sought to discover relevant facts within the materials and interviews which were most critical to understanding the initial complaint themes they were charged with reviewing. Additional issues beyond those with which they were originally charged to investigate became known to the team during and after the on-site visit. The team thoroughly discussed the issues and the facts as they saw them and determined, collectively, that the conclusions discussed in this section of the report are accurate and reflective of their fact-finding mission.

The issues raised in the complaints to the Commission prior to the on-site visit by this team and the issues discussed with members of the college’s learning community and the community at large are highly complex. The roots of many of these complaints are grounded in historical context which negatively impacts the present culture of the college.

When the Board of Governors hired the Former Chancellor in 2003, the college was faced with an abundance of challenges, both economic and academic. The

Former Chancellor was hired to bring about change, to help to establish accountability, to unify different college cultures into one district, and to maintain fiscal stability. There is no doubt that some of the changes sought were accomplished and praised by both internal and external constituents. However, an unhealthy college culture was established through the use of intimidation, fear and an abuse of executive power. The Former Chancellor engaged in inappropriate, unwanted and unprofessional behavior towards many employees. Board members knew about complaints regarding such behaviors as early as 2008, and the Board failed to act to investigate the complaints. This team believes that the explanation provided by the Board members (that the complaints were anonymous) is not a viable reason for leaving very critical complaints against a senior college officer uninvestigated. Similar complaints went unaddressed by the Board in 2010 and in 2011.

While an explanation was provided by the Board's legal counsel that it was typical in Arizona for a group's legal counsel's firm to conduct such investigations (claims of sexual and inappropriate behavior) on behalf of its clients, this team believes that the relationship between the Board's legal counsel and the investigator (marriage) could be perceived as a conflict of interest. The legal counsel was responsible for advising the Board throughout the time the anonymous complaints were received by the Board, thus the investigation into the complaints could have led to an investigation into both the Board's knowledge of the claims as well as the legal counsel's knowledge and actions. This latter matter was not a part of the investigator's review.

The Former Chancellor's behaviors referenced by some Board members as "strong" and "tough" and by employees as "intimidating, rude, and of a bullying nature" were known by some Board members as early as 2004. Some senior institutional administrators had also experienced or seen these same behaviors on the part of the Former Chancellor but failed to take appropriate actions to ensure that such behaviors would not continue. The institutional culture at PCCD was shrouded in the shadow of silence that was fostered through a pattern of protection created by members of the Board of Governors. The culture persists today. This team sees deep scarring in individuals and in the culture of Pima Community College which is in need of healing and rebuilding.

Personal actions by the Former Chancellor and his general administrative style have had deep and long-lasting negative impacts on many employees. The Former Chancellor's aggressive and combative communication style developed an organization that followed directions with little if any question. The generally-accepted practice of unprofessional behavior on the parts of some administrators has resulted in a severe lack of trust within the college community. The administrative style has not disappeared from PCCD with the exit of the Former Chancellor.

Some personnel have felt fearful of retaliation for disagreements in college governance, policy review, and other college matters. Other administrators have experienced “transfers” or have accepted “voluntary transfers” in order to maintain their employment at the college. Still others have left the college’s employ due to their inability to withstand the mounting personal stress and unprofessional treatment within the college. Whether or not the steps in the college’s disciplinary process were adequately followed at all times is difficult to determine, though it is clear that the view of the Human Resources functions from within the department are much different than those expressed by individuals experiencing the processes or observing from outside the department. This team believes there are policies and processes within the Human Resources department which make it difficult for many employees to move through the complex array of standard practices, for them to receive fair and honest treatment, for them to receive appropriate and timely advice and for them to feel supported as a valued employee.

The Former Chancellor and the Board appear to have established a symbiotic relationship which prevented the Board from acting independently and from taking appropriate steps to safeguard the well-being of many of the college’s employees. The team believes that some of the college’s senior leadership, both past and present, have misused and abused the power of their positions. Several senior administrators, by virtue of their positions, were ethically if not legally required to stop inappropriate behaviors or to report those behaviors directly to the Board of Governors. They failed to do so. It is the team’s belief that, with the close working relationship established between the Former Chancellor and the Interim Chancellor, it is highly unlikely that the latter had not heard about claims from others about the former’s inappropriate advances towards some employees. Comments made in a public meeting would suggest just the opposite, that the Interim Chancellor was definitely aware of the threatening nature of the Former Chancellor’s administrative style.

The team is challenged to determine whether or not the loss of 39 administrators within a team of 55 positions over the course of 5.5 years is excessive or not. Without other data with which to compare PCCD’s administrative turnover, the team is not able to make a conclusion about these data. However, the team does believe that the college appears to have used “interim” and “acting” administrative positions excessively, and it is unclear with the data provided how many different actual positions individuals held under the same administrative title. Complaints are common among the employees interviewed regarding the processes used to fill administrative positions or to grant internal movements within the administrative structure. The examples shared with the team by those interviewed provided evidence that administrators were routinely moved within the district’s structure, sometimes on very short notice (from a Friday to a Monday) and at other times for very short periods of time (months). The team believes this churning has caused disturbances within the district’s colleges and programs and that it has proven to be unhealthy for the institution.

The Board has lacked appropriate oversight in personnel policy and general Human Resource matters. It has no formal Human Resources Committee. The Board does not have a standard agenda item calling for an ongoing review of institutional personnel policies and procedures, nor has it routinely used a review by the Internal Auditor as a way to gain knowledge of internal college personnel actions, policies, and procedures. The Board has failed to appropriately review and update many of the college's policies, regulations, and standard practice guide procedures as a matter of routine business or to review these items following administrative action. Example: the Harassment (including Sexual Harassment) policy was not revised since its last revision in 1999, and its Code of Ethics has not been revised since 1995. The Board has yet (as of the date of the on-site visit) to receive updated training in issues relating to sexual and general harassment, and such training is not required (other than in orientation) for all employees. While the Board has attempted to remain in a policy-only position, it has failed to understand how very general Board-approved policy statements (sometimes 2-3 sentences) are translated into actual regulations and standard practices. Without a proper level of public review of such regulations and standards, these operating regulations and guides can be left unchanged for a decade or longer. Without a proper level of public review, these regulations and standards can fall under the total purview of one individual for the length of his/her tenure as Chancellor. This team believes the Board has essentially abdicated appropriate oversight of college operations in personnel policies and actions.

As in any organization, job performance and organizational change can and does affect employee promotions, however, the personnel movement within the PCCD organization occurred so frequently and without explanation that a cloud of suspicion surrounds reassignments and promotions. This team believes that a careful review of HR hiring, promotion, transfer and dismissal policies and procedures is warranted.

Careful, detailed attention to college policy and procedures has been overlooked on several occasions in the past, thus building within the college and external communities a sense of mistrust. Decisions calling for administrative judgment in the continuance of external contracts have not been well-documented and do not follow the standards outlined in college policy. Administrators at the highest levels of the organization signed off on contracts they knew didn't meet the justification standards in institutional policy and did so because they were told to do so by the Former Chancellor. Annual reviews of contracting services prior to contract renewal are nonexistent. There is no annual list of individual external contracted services brought forward to the Board for review and discussion as a matter of routine Board agenda proceedings within the public section of Board meetings. The Board has no Finance Committee to routinely review these contracts as part of its budget-setting process. The highest levels of financial data, including monthly financial statements, are shared with the Board in public

sessions, as are the results of the annual audit from the State Auditor. However, some issues involving financial problems or errors are not brought into full public view during Board meetings. They are, rather, dealt with in executive sessions closed to the public or in executive retreats where few public members are in attendance. This review team believes that more attention to policies regarding contracting, bidding, and procedures involving justification of exceptions to policy must be strengthened at PCCD. An appropriate level of oversight of these activities is needed by the Board, and transparency of all fiscal matters must become the standard for the Board.

The Former Chancellor and other senior leaders have attempted to move forward with a mission model change by incrementally changing its admission policies and the college's preferred minimum qualifications for faculty and administrative hiring as identified by the Former Chancellor. Discussion of the recently designed Prep Academy, the changes in the approach to developmental education over the past two years, and the change of the admissions policy have been examples of these incremental changes. This team believes it was the Former Chancellor's desire to move the College toward becoming a four-year institution and that such a desire influenced the treatment the institution's Developmental Education program received from its administrative leaders. It was reported that, upon receiving a report on the Developmental Education program and recommendations for improving it, the Former Chancellor held up the report in front of staff and said, "You see this report. This is shit!" He then dropped it into a trash can. The team also believes that the lack of consensus-building in issues surrounding developmental education, the admissions change and the Prep Academy is an example of the administration's disregard for campus involvement and input into institutional decision-making. The more robust discussions held through true shared governance rather than the SPG process would have allowed for more meaningful discussions and an opportunity for the college community to reach consensus on these important matters. The team believes that faculty as a whole were not adequately consulted and, on at least one occasion, faculty leadership appears to have been coerced into supporting the college leadership's desire to make such changes.

There is no evidence that PCCD held a discussion with the HLC's leadership regarding these pending changes and the potential impact they might have upon the makeup of the college's student body, and no mission change request was made through the HLC's change process. The team believes that the PCCD leadership should have consulted its HLC liaison about these changes to validate whether or not a "change" was potentially taking place. It is this team's opinion that some of the college's leadership may have failed to understand or respect the basic premise of PCCD's long-standing mission in their community. The team believes that the senior administration used the SPG process, under total administrative control, to short-change thorough input and discussion in the decision-making process.

Whether or not the addition of the Prep Academy is philosophically a sound decision to be made at PCCD is not within the purview of this team to determine. The team does note that the decision to create the Academy and the change to the admission policy was not well accepted by many faculty and other employees. This lack of acceptance centered around the lack of adequate communication and discussion as well as the minimal faculty role in determining the structure of the Prep Academy and the use of software as a central component of the Academy. Concerns about the use of the COMPASS test as “the” measure of acceptance or rejection of students was strongly voiced by employees, community members, and members of the National Center for Fair and Open Testing. The team does not believe enough rich academic conversation took place prior to the implementation of the Academy and the resulting changes to the college’s developmental education program and its admission policy. This major change (creation of the Prep Academy) was implemented without any form of pilot program and without a solid evaluation process in place. While data were used in presentations regarding the change in the admission standard and the creation of the Prep Academy, the lack of adequate discussion created a situation where data without perspective prevailed.

The admission policy change was a significant factor in the reduction of both student enrollment and faculty work between FY12 (11-12) and FY13 (12-13). These reductions in FTSE and FTFE were two to three times larger for developmental education students and teaching faculty than for non-developmental students and teaching faculty. The time line for these discussions and decisions in relation to the HLC’s 2010 comprehensive visit does not, in itself, suggest any intent to hide the discussion of the admission change from the 2010 HLC team, though the major public presentations took place in the winter and spring of 2011 following the fall, 2010 HLC visit. The comments made in that 2010 report suggest that the team had no conversation with individuals about the admission policy change and how that might affect developmental education at PCCD. It is this team’s belief that the 2010 team was not aware of the upcoming conversations about the admission policy change and that the senior administrators did not openly address this potential change with them.

Transparency and openness on the part of the Board is not a part of its working ethic, yet PCCD’s core values include “Integrity” and “Accountability.” Openness, transparency, and a willingness to discuss and debate various points of view and opinions must be more readily imbedded in the Board’s culture and operations. Past actions of the Board indicate that secrecy and protection of individuals is more important than transparency and a willingness to deal openly with difficult and sometimes embarrassing situations. Some members of the Board and some of the college’s senior leaders have developed what this team describes as a siege mentality. They view those who might disagree with them as “the opposition” and refer to others’ actions as “being politically motivated”. Some members of the Board and some senior administrators describe the

actions they have taken or failed to take under the guise of doing “what is right for the college.” Some members of the leadership reference the complaints as coming from “disgruntled employees or former employees”. When outcomes become more important to a Board and its senior leaders than telling the truth or caring for the people in its employ, then members of that Board and those administrators have been misdirected or fallen into patterns of behavior which do not reflect the levels of integrity expected of higher education leaders. Failure to act quickly and with all due diligence on serious complaints against the institution’s CEO, lack of a structured review of its institutional policies and procedures, knowledge without action regarding the Former Chancellor’s inappropriate and unprofessional actions toward employees, failure to become aware of and to investigate an institutional sense of distrust and fear, and its general sense of being concerned more with fiscal outcomes than with the well-being of its employees all delineate a Board which has become dysfunctional. This team concludes that serious breaches of acting with integrity have been demonstrated by PCCD’s Board of Governors, the Former Chancellor and some other senior administrators at PCCD.

The HLC fact-finding team recognizes that this report does not deal with each issue described in the various complaints provided to the Higher Learning Commission or with some issues which became apparent during the on-site visit or in post-visit interviews. It is, rather, a summary report of the major findings and the conclusions of the visiting HLC team around 9 major themes. The team recognizes that serious issues exist at PCCD which are in need of review, attention, and action, and it believes that new leadership is needed to help address these issues. The team’s work is intended to inform the HLC of the facts behind the complaints and of the team’s conclusions drawn from an examination of those facts. To that end the team submits this report.

APPENDIX A

Pima Community College District Fact-Finding Visit Agenda

The members of the Higher Learning Commission’s (HLC) Fact-Finding Visit Team will conduct its review using the following schedule.

Day	Time	Individual or Group / Activity	Location	Team
Wednesday	5:30	Team Dinner and Meeting	Hotel	ALL
Thursday	8:00 – 8:30	Meeting with Dr. Suzanne Miles, Dr. Brenda Even, and Mr. Scott Stewart	DO/C-239	ALL
	8:45 – 9:30	Dr. Suzanne Miles, Interim Chancellor	DO/C-239	A
		Ms. Sherryn Marshall, Board Member	DO/C-228	B
	9:45 – 10:30	Mr. Scott Stewart, Board Chair	DO/C-228	A
		Dr. Brenda Even, Board Secretary	DO/C-239	B
	10:45 – 11:30	Mr. David Longoria, Board Member	DO/C-228	A
		Ms. E. Marty Cortez, Board Member	DO/C-239	B
	11:30 – 12:30	Team Lunch (provided by PCCD)	DO/C-226	ALL
	12:45 – 2:15	C-FAIRR Executive Committee **	DO/A-206	C
	12:45 – 1:15	Dr. David Bea, Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration	DO/C-239	D
	1:30 – 2:00	Current Cabinet (exclusive of Dr. Miles)	DO/B-218	D
	2:15 – 2:45	Travel		
	3:00 – 5:00	On-Site Open Visits **		
		Northwest (12 20-minute slots)	B213, B214, B215 & B216	E
		East (12 20-minute slots)	L131, L132 L144 & L146	F
	5:00 – 5:45	Dr. Sylvia Lee, Board Member	District Office	F
	6:00	Team Dinner and Meeting	Hotel	ALL
Friday	7:00 – 8:00	Breakfast and Travel		
	8:30 – 10:30	On-Site Open Visits **		
		Desert Vista (12 20-minute slots)	B111, B131, C111 & C112	C
		West (12 20-minute slots)	JG16, JG18, F124 & F125	D
	10:30 – 11:15	Travel		
	11:15 – 12:00	Interviewee A	DO/A-206	E
		Interviewee B	DO/C-226	F
	12:00 – 1:00	Team Lunch and Meeting (provided by PCCD)	DO/C-226	
	1:00 – 1:45	Ms. Janet May, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources	DO/C228	A

		Ms. Charlotte Fugett, President, East Campus; Former Vice Chancellor for Human Resources	DO/C239	B
	2:00 – 2:45	Ms. Doreen Armstrong, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources	DO/C228	C
		Interviewee C	DO/C226	D
	3:00 – 3:45	Pima Open Admissions Coalition Steering Committee:	DO/A206	F
		Ms. Lori Cox, Internal Auditor	DO/C239	E
	4:15 – 5:00	Mr. John Richardson, Legal Counsel	DO/C228	ALL
		Ms. Alice Callison, Complaint Investigator/Legal Advisor	DO/C238	ALL
	5:15 – 5:45	Exit Meeting with Dr. Miles, Dr. Even, and Mr. Stewart	DO/C-239	ALL
	6:00	Team Dinner and Meeting	Hotel	ALL

KEY:

Team Members:

- ALL (Drs. Gonzales, Inbody, Meabon, Nelson)
- A (Drs. Inbody and Nelson)
- B (Drs. Gonzales and Meabon)
- C (Drs. Gonzales and Nelson)
- D (Drs. Inbody and Meabon)
- E (Drs. Meabon and Nelson)
- F (Drs. Gonzales and Inbody)

** The team has set aside time slots to meet with community groups and with other individuals from the community, including any individuals who have filed a complaint about the College with the Commission. In addition to time slots for community groups (C-FAIRR and POACC, as noted) the team has also set aside forty-eight 20-minute sessions for members of the PCCD learning community and/or the community at large to meet with a member of the Fact-Finding Visit Team. Individuals wishing to reserve one of these meeting times should contact Ms. Carrie Caine at the Higher Learning Commission at ccaine@hlcommission.org or 800-621-7440, Ext. 125 for scheduling assistance. The team will maintain confidentiality about the names of individuals or groups who request and participate in a meeting and the remarks of participants provided to the team members unless participants provide their permission to associate their names with specific remarks. The Commission will attempt to balance availability of these individual interview meetings to ensure access by both employees and community members.

APPENDIX B

Titles of Individuals Interviewed

Current Board of Governors' Chair
Previous Board of Governors' Chair
Three Current Board Members
One Previous Board Member
Board Legal Counsel
Investigator/Legal Advisor to the Board

Interim Chancellor
Executive Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration
Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
Internal Auditor
~15 members of the Chancellor's Cabinet (all District Administrators)

6 members of the Executive Committee of C-FAIRR (Coalition For Accountability, Integrity, Respect, and Responsibility)

~16 members of POAC (Pima Open Admissions Coalition)

58 members of the college community, including current and former college employees at all levels of the district's organizational structure; community members